

The Cell: *Evidence of Design*

By Dr. Dallas Burdette

WEBSITE: freedominchrist.net

The basic postulate of this book [*The Evidence of God*], its point of departure, is that science can establish, by the observed facts of Nature and intellectual argumentation, that a super-human Power exists. It cannot identify that Power or describe it, except in very general terms. For identification and more detailed description, special revelation (the Bible) is needed. But proceeding from the basic postulate I feel our scientists have struck effectively at the heart of atheism.¹

THE COMPLEXITY OF THE CELL: EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

The focus of this chapter examines the “cell” as evidence for the existence of God. The complexity of the cell is sufficient proof for God. There is design within the cell, which design requires a Designer. The question of the existence of God baffles the minds of men and women. Where did the world come from? What is the origin of humanity? What is the source of the animal kingdom? Why is there something rather than nothing? Is there design in the universe? Is there design in humanity? Did the human race evolve over billions of years? Did men and women advance from lower forms of life? Did life originate from some kind of pre-biotic soup? Is there design found in the human body? **Does an analysis of the cell within living things demonstrate design?** Are there logical answers to these questions? Have we examined the evidence available to determine our belief system in the Creator God mentioned in the Book of Genesis by Moses? This in-depth study seeks to unfold evidence to substantiate the existence of God. This study relies upon comments by atheist, evolutionists, theistic evolutionists, and creationists to set forth a rational belief in the God of the Bible.

Has God given sufficient evidence to testify to His existence? This question was proposed to Bertrand Russell (1872-1970) by a London lady who sat next to him at a party. Prior to her question to him, she commented to him that not only was he the most famous atheist in the world, but that he was probably the oldest atheist in the world. “What will you do, Bertie, if it turns out you were wrong?” she asked. ‘I mean, what if—uh—when the time

¹John Clover Monsma, *The Evidence of God in an Expanding Universe: Forty American Scientists Declare Their Affirmative Views on Religion* (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1958), 12.

comes, you should meet Him? What will you say?’² Russell responded: ‘Why, I should say, ‘God, you gave us insufficient evidence.’”³

Is Russell correct in asserting that God has failed to give sufficient evidence about His existence? No! The complexity of the cell within the human body is sufficient evidence to warrant belief in an Intelligent Designer. Is the universe here as a result of accident or of design? Every individual is confronted with materialism and astronomy in his or her search for meaning in this universe. In April 1944, C. S. Lewis (1898-1963) responded to questions submitted to him. The sixth question dealt with materialism and astronomy. The question is to the point concerning the origin of the universe:

Materialists and some astronomers suggest that the solar planetary system and life as we know it was brought about by an accidental stellar collision. What is the Christian view of this theory?⁴

Lewis’ comments are logical and forceful, which arguments should silence any honest seeker after the truths concerning God and His creation. The following response to the above question strips away all extraneous matter and goes right to the heart of reality:

If the solar system was brought about by an accidental collision, then the appearance of organic life on this planet was also an accident, and the whole evolution of Man was an accident too. If so, then all our present thoughts are mere accidents—the accidental by-product of the movement of atoms. And this holds for the thoughts of the materialists and astronomers as well as for anyone else’s. But if their thoughts—i.e., of Materialism and Astronomy—are merely accidental by-products, why should we believe them to be true? I see no reason for believing that one accident should be able to give me a correct account of all the other accidents. It’s like expecting that the accidental shape taken by the splash when you upset a milk-jug should give you a correct account of how the jug was made and why it was upset.⁵ (Emphasis mine)

Intelligent Design

The thrust of this chapter focuses upon the cell with its nucleus (DNA) as evidence for an Intelligent Designer. Accident or Intelligent Design confronts every individual. I believe in **I**ntelligent **D**esign with a capital “**I**” and a capital “**D**.” I do not believe in the modern day intelligent design movement, that is to say, intelligent design with a lower case “**i**” and a lower case “**d**.”⁶ I speak of humanity as a special creation as mentioned in the Book of Genesis, which

²Al Seckel, *Bertrand Russell on God and Religion* (Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books, 1986), 11.

³Ibid.

⁴C. S. Lewis, *God in the Dock: Essays on Theology and Ethics*, ed. By Walter Hooper (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970), 52.

⁵Ibid., 52-53.

⁶See Owen Gingerich, *God’s Universe* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2006), 65-68. Gingerich is a theistic evolutionist. He denies the young earth and **I**ntelligent **D**esign in the universe. He maintains that God brought about men and women through evolution. Yet, we stand in awe as Gingerich reveals the complexity of the universe with its complexity of life. He rejected atheism and accepted belief in God because of the complexity of life itself. He demonstrates the complexity of the cell and accepts evolution as the means whereby God brought life into this world. His book contains excellent information about the marvelous construction of the

is the capital “I” and “D” in the words Intelligent Design. The “cell” within the human body exhibits evidence for the Creator of the Bible. The complexity of the cell as well as the complexity of the universe is sufficient evidence to testify to the truthfulness of the existence of God.

David Green (1910-1985) and Robert Goldberger, both biochemists and evolutionists, assert that there is no scientific evidence for the cell in all of its complexity to have originated on Planet Earth without outside sources. They set forth a chart leading from atoms to ecosystems. In the third process (Macromolecules) to the fourth process (cell),⁷ they encounter insurmountable problems with the chart as outlined in their most informative book. The following citation from their book is quite frank concerning the lack of scientific evidence for such a postulate that cells came into existence without outside intelligence:

In Figure 16.2 an evolutionary scheme is shown. It is a very general scheme, intended to show merely the increasing organizational complexity that the evolutionary process produced. Although seven steps are shown, leading from atoms to ecosystems, there is one step that far outweighs the others in enormity: the step from macromolecules to cells. All the other steps can be accounted for on a theoretical grounds—if not correctly, at least elegantly. However, the macromolecule-to-cell transition is a jump of fantastic dimensions, which lies beyond the range of testable hypothesis. In this area all is conjecture. The available facts do not provide a basis for postulating that cells arose on this planet. This is not to say that some parapsychical forces were at work. We simply wish to point out the fact that there is no scientific evidence. The physicist has learned to avoid trying to specify when time began and when matter was created, except within the framework of frank speculation. The origin of the precursor cell appears to fall into the same category of unknowables. It is an area with fascinating conceptual challenges, but at the present time, and perhaps forever, the facts cannot be known.⁸ (Emphasis mine)

DNA WITHIN THE CELLS

Has God left Himself without sufficient evidence to establish belief that He is? When evolutionists or atheists allow their bias to impact their interpretation of the available data, we witness their denial of what is obvious, which they freely admit is beyond their comprehension, that is to say, it all just happened by chance. Two thousand years ago, Paul, a convert to Christianity, testified as to the evidence for belief in God.⁹ His testimony is found in his Epistle to the Christians in Rome:

cell. Nevertheless, I reject his hypothesis of evolution and accept the Genesis account of creation. I am thankful that he believes in God and Christ. I believe that Gingerich is a Christian, but, at the same time, I find it difficult to understand one's refusal to accept the Genesis account of creation in six literal days.

⁷See David E. Green and Robert F. Goldberger, *Molecular Insights into the Living Process* (New York: Academic Press, 1967), 406. The Figure 16.2 is a chart that presents an evolutionary scheme, emphasizing increasing orders of complexity: (1) Atoms, (2) Simple molecules, (3) Macromolecules, (4) Cells, (5) Individuals, (6) Populations, (7) Species, communities, and (8) Ecosystems.

⁸Ibid., 406-407.

⁹See Dallas Burdette, “Paul’s Conversion: Apologetic for Christianity,” in Dallas Burdette, *Biblical Preaching and Teaching: Jesus and Our Privileges*, Vol. 1 (Longwood, FL: Xulon Press, 2009), 92-120.

The wrath of God is being revealed from heaven against all the godlessness and wickedness of men who suppress the truth by their wickedness,¹⁹ since what may be known about God is plain to them, because God has made it plain to them.²⁰ 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 1:18-20)¹⁰

As we reflect upon the cells within the human body, we are immediately confronted with the DNA found within each individual cell. Just a cursory examination of the cell provides proof that evolution did not and could not occur. Luther D. Sunderland (1929-1987), aerospace engineer, sought to expose the fallacies in Darwin's postulations concerning evolution. He calls attention to the optimism, following Watson's and Crick's discovery of the helical structure of the DNA molecule, of setting forth the scientific explanation for the origin of life. He explains the buoyancy of anticipation as well as the glumness, or darkness, which ultimately overshadowed their initial expectations:

When Watson and Crick discovered the helical structure of the DNA molecule and the general way that it coded the formation and replication of proteins in cells, there were great expectations that a plausible scientific explanation for the origin of life was just over the horizon. The laboratory synthesis of amino acids from basic chemical further heightened the expectations that man, with all his intelligence and resources, could synthesize a living cell. These hopes have also been dashed with the failure to generate life in the laboratory, and researchers are stating that **new natural laws will need to be discovered to explain how the high degree of order and specificity of even a single cell could be generated by random, natural processes.**¹¹ (Emphasis mine)

The complexity of DNA baffles the imagination. In addition to Sunderland's observations, we are also confronted with the words of Dr. Paul Brand (1914-2003), pioneering physician in the field of leprosy, as he, too, reflects upon the enormous amount of information contained within each cell. He writes:

The secret to membership [a hundred trillion cells within the body] lies locked away inside each cell nucleus, chemically coiled in a strand of DNA. Once the egg and sperm share their inheritance, the DNA chemical ladder splits down the center of every gene such as the teeth of a zipper pull[ed] apart. DNA re-forms itself each time the cell divides: 2, 4, 8, 16, 32 cells, each with the identical DNA. Along the way cells specialize, but each carries the entire instruction book of one hundred thousand genes. **DNA is estimated to contain instructions that, if written out, would fill a thousand six-hundred-page book.**¹² (Emphasis mine)

Once more, we stand in bewilderment as to the amount of information found in each cell. Dr. Brand captures the wonder of the cell as he pens the following words:

¹⁰For a defense of the credibility of the New Testament writings, see Dallas Burdette, "The Credibility and Candor of the New Testament writers," *Ibid.*, 144-166.

¹¹Luther D. Sunderland, *Darwin's Enigma: Fossils and Other Problems*, 4th Edition, Revised and Expanded. (Santee, California: Master Book Publishers, 1988), 8.

¹²Dr. Paul Brand and Philip Yancey, *Fearfully and Wonderfully Made* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1980, 2nd ed.), 45.

The DNA is so narrow and compacted that all the genes in all my body's cells would fit into an ice cube; yet if the DNA were unwound and joined together end to end, the strand could stretch from the earth to the sun and back more than four hundred times.¹³

Francis S. Collins (b. 1950), a theistic-evolutionist and American physician-geneticist, explains the wonder and marvel of the DNA, the hereditary code of life, in his *The Language of God*:

The human genome [the genetic material of an organism] consists of all the DNA of our species, the hereditary code of life. This newly revealed text was 3 billion letters long, and written in a strange and cryptographic four-letter code. Such is the amazing complexity of the information carried within each cell of the human body, that a live reading of that code at a rate of one letter per second would take thirty-one years, even if reading continued day and night. Printing these letters out in regular font size on normal bond paper and binding them all together would result in a tower the height of the Washington Monument.¹⁴

Dr. Lewis Thomas (1913-1993), who attended medical school at Harvard and later taught at various universities, calls attention to endless wonderment of the cell in reproduction. We should pay attention to him as he seeks to unfold the marvel of the cell as it develops into a human being. He strips away all extraneous matter as he writes:

For the real amazement, if you want to be amazed, is the process. You start out as a single cell derived from the coupling of a sperm and an egg, this divides into two, then four, then eight, and so on, and at a certain stage there emerges a single cell which will have as all its progeny the human brain. The mere existence of that cell should be one of the great astonishments of the earth. People ought to be walking around all day, all through their waking hours, calling to each other in endless wonderment, talking of nothing except that cell. It is an unbelievable thing, and yet there it is, popping neatly into its place amid the jumbled cells of every one of the several billion human embryos around the planet, just as if it were the easiest thing in the world to do.

If you like being surprised, there's the source. One cell is switched on to become the whole trillion-cell, massive apparatus for thinking and imagining and, for that matter, being surprised. All the information needed for learning to read and write, playing the piano, arguing before senatorial subcommittees, walking across a street through traffic, or the marvelous human act of putting out one hand and leaning against a tree, is contained in that first cell. All of grammar, all syntax, all arithmetic, all music.

It is not known how the switching on occurs. At the very beginning of an embryo, when it is still nothing more than a cluster of cells, all of this information and much more is latent inside every cell in the cluster. When the stem cell for the brain emerges, it could be that the special quality of braininess is simply switched on. But it could as

¹³Ibid., 46.

¹⁴Francis S. Collins, *The Language of God: A Scientist Presents Evidence for Belief* (New York: Free Press, 2006), 1-2. Even though Collins is a believer in God, nevertheless, he downplays **Intelligent Design**, that is, intelligent design with capital "I" and "D," Ibid., 181-195. Collins denies that Genesis 1—11 records actual history, Ibid., 205-206. I stand in wonder and bewilderment at Collins' logic in denying **Intelligent Design** concerning the DNA in every cell.

well be that everything else, every other potential property, is switched off, so that this most specialized of all cells no longer has its precursors' option of being a thyroid or a liver or whatever, only a brain.¹⁵

When we contemplate the number of cells within the human body (100 trillion), we appreciate the words of the psalmist:

For you created my inmost being; you knit me together in my mother's womb. ¹⁴I praise you because I am fearfully and wonderfully made; your works are wonderful, I know that full well. ¹⁵My frame was not hidden from you when I was made in the secret place. When I was woven together in the depths of the earth, ¹⁶your eyes saw my unformed body. All the days ordained for me were written in your book before one of them came to be. (Psalm 139:13-16)

William S. Beck, an evolutionist, calls attention to the complexity of the human organism through the number of cells within the human body. His comments attest, whether consciously or unconsciously, to the truth that the body is designed by an **Intelligent Designer**, namely, God. He writes:

The human body contains about 100 trillion cells. We have spoken of the structural and functional attributes shared by *all* cells and those that permit the grouping of cells into different categories. Obviously, the differences among body cells account for the integrated nature of body organization. Specialized cells are woven into tissues, tissues into organs, and organs into functioning systems whose "purpose" is the preservation of a constant and ideal internal environment.¹⁶ (Emphasis mine)

As we reflect upon Francis Collins comments about the complexity of the cell, we are reminded of comments by Ashley Montagu (1905-1999), British-American anthropologist and humanist. He writes about how minuscule the sperm cells are in size. His description staggers the imagination, and, at the same time, inspires awe and wonder at the marvel of God's creation. Listen to him as he seeks to paint a graphic picture of the wonder and marvel of it all:

At the present moment [1960] there are about 2,890,000,000 human beings alive on the face of this earth. Allowing one sperm and one egg to each of them as being responsible both for their existence and their genetic heredity, we have a total of 5,780,000,000 germ cells involved, a number which could be contained in about two and a half quart milk bottles. **The sperm cells would occupy the space of less than an aspirin tablet.** In fact, the chromosomes, the actual bearers of the hereditary particles, the genes, within the cells of this huge number **would occupy the space of less than half an aspirin.** Reflect upon that! All the hereditary materials, the heredity of the whole human race, of all those now living could be contained within the space of half an aspirin.¹⁷ (Emphasis mine)

¹⁵Lewis Thomas, *The Medusa and the Snail: More Notes of a Biology Watcher* (New York: The Viking Press, 1974, 1979), 156-157.

¹⁶William S. Beck, *Human Design: Molecular, Cellular, and Systematic Physiology* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1971), 189.

¹⁷Ashley Montagu, *Human Heredity* (New York: The New American Library, 1959, 1960), 22.

The complexity of the cell rules out the philosophy of evolution. Once again, when we examine the possibilities of life originating through evolution, we become more and more conscious of the impossibility of life beginning through evolution. Michael Denton (b. 1943), an evolutionist, admits the impossibility that the cell originated through evolution. He writes with candor as he explains the dilemma:

The complexity of the simplest known type of cell is so great that it is impossible to accept that such an object could have been thrown together suddenly by some kind of freakish, vastly improbable, event. Such an occurrence would be indistinguishable from a miracle. An estimate of just how improbable it might be is made in Chapter Thirteen [in his book--*Evolution*].¹⁸

Evolution cannot account for the origin of life. If evolution is true, then life had a random beginning with no design. This philosophy usually begins with some kind of “prebiotic soup.” It is in this vein that Sir Fred Hoyle (1915-2001),¹⁹ English astronomer, mathematician, and cosmologist, and Chandra Wickramasinghe (b.1939),²⁰ Professors of Applied Mathematics and Astronomy, denied that life had a random beginning. The back cover to their book (*Evolution from Space: A Theory of Cosmic Creationism*) by Martin Garner is quite revealing:

Both were former disbelievers in a life creating god, are now persuaded that ...a god exists.... They believe that the existence of a creator can be established by mathematics, with a probability greater than $10^{40,000}$ (1 followed by 40,000 zeros) to 1.²¹

What does $10^{40,000}$ (1 followed by 40,000 zeros²²) to 1 mean? To illustrate how large this number is, the number of known atoms in the known universe is infinitesimally small by

¹⁸Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (Bethesda, Maryland: Adler & Adler Publishers, 1986), 264. In this book, Denton questioned the validity of neo-Darwinism and argued that evidence of divine design exists in nature. This book was instrumental in starting the **Intelligent Design** movement [Intelligent Design with a capital I and D =ID].

¹⁹Even though Hoyle became a staunch critic of the theories of chemical evolution, he, nevertheless, held to the theory that life evolved in space. Where did life come from? Both Hoyle and Wickramasinghe rejected the proposal that life originated by pure chance in the so-called “primordial soup.” This philosophy was simply nonsense. We, as Christians, believe that God created all life, which creation of life is mentioned in Genesis 1-11.

²⁰Strange as it may sound, Wickramasinghe advocated that life did not start with the theory of the “primordial soup,” but rather, life on earth originated about 4000 million years ago on comets that traveled through space to earth and countless other planets. Yet, even their theory, does not allow life to just appear without God. The cell is too complex in order for it to just have happened by chance. Fortunately both men understood something about the complexity of the cell and realized that life did not create itself.

²¹Sir Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe, *Evolution from Space: A Theory of Cosmic Creationism* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981), backcover.

²²Sir Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe explain the enormity of zeros in $10^{40,000}$ with the following comments in their *Evolution from Space*, xii:

A number $10^{40,000}$ appears frequently in this book. Forty thousand zeros would be needed to write this number in full, which at sixty zeros to a line would occupy rather more than sixteen pages of zeros. This example makes the advantage of the compact power notation very obvious.

comparison (10^{70}).²³ His argument is that if the whole universe was one primordial soup, this probability of $10^{40,000}$ would make the evolutionary theory impossible. In the reading of their book, I found several statements that are extremely informative concerning the origin of existence of life. They write:

From the beginning of this book we have emphasized the enormous information content of even the simplest living systems. The information cannot in our view be generated by what are often called 'natural' processes, as for instance through meteorological and chemical processes occurring at the surface of a lifeless planet. As well as a suitable physical and chemical environment, a large initial store of information was also needed. We have argued that the requisite information came from an 'intelligence', the beckoning spectre.²⁴ (Emphasis mine)

Toward the end of the book, Hoyle and Wickramasinghe write: "No matter how large the environment one considers, life cannot have had a random beginning."²⁵ They continued to develop their ideas about information contained in living cells:

As our ideas developed, a monstrous spectre kept beckoning. Just as the brain of Shakespeare was necessary to produce the famous plays, so prior information was necessary to produce a living cell.²⁶

Earlier, they discussed the so-called "organic soup" in which life came into being. They called attention to the utter impossibility of life coming into existence this way. They discuss enzymes in its functioning form. The following comment explains the "outrageously small probability" of this happening, that is to say, zero chance of getting hold of the necessary set of enzymes for even the simplest living cell:

By itself, this small probability could be faced, because one must contemplate not just a single shot at obtaining the enzyme, but a very large number of trials such as are supposed to have occurred in an organic soup early in the history of the Earth. The trouble is that there are about two thousand enzymes, and the chance of obtaining them all in a random trial is only one part in $(10^{20})^{2000} = 10^{40,000}$, an outrageously small probability that could not be faced even if the whole universe consisted of organic soup.²⁷

Once more, they explain that *necessary instructions* are essential for the origin of life:

²³Some scholars give the number as 10^{80} . See Jonathan Sarfati, *Refuting Evolution* (Australia: Creation Ministries International, 1999, 2008), 33. See also Michael Denton, *Evolution*, 310, where he writes: "There are only 10^{70} atoms in the entire observable universe." Professor John Lennox's book (*God's Undertaker: Has Science Buried God?* [Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 2007], 132) states that there are "about 2^{80} " particles in the universe. I discussed this with him on January 14, 2010 at the "Seeking 7" seminar in Birmingham, AL. He told me that this should have been 10^{80} not 2^{80} .

²⁴Ibid., 150.

²⁵Ibid., 148.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Ibid., 24.

For life to have originated on the Earth it would be necessary that quite explicit instructions should have been provided for its assembly.... There is no way in which we can expect to avoid the need for information, no way in which we can simply get by with a bigger and better organic soup, as we ourselves hoped might be possible a year or two ago.²⁸

The following chart²⁹ is reproduced from Hoyle and Wickramasinghe dealing with powers in order to assist one in grasping the use of powers of ten:

10^{10}	=	10,000,000,000
10^9	=	1,000,000,000
10^8	=	100,000,000
10^7	=	10,000,000
10^6	=	1,000,000
10^5	=	100,000
10^4	=	10,000
10^3	=	1,000
10^2	=	100
10^1	=	10
10^0	=	1
10^{-1}	=	0.1
10^{-2}	=	0.01
10^{-3}	=	0.001
10^{-4}	=	0.0001
10^{-5}	=	0.00001
10^{-6}	=	0.000001
10^{-7}	=	0.0000001
10^{-8}	=	0.00000001
10^{-9}	=	0.000000001
10^{-10}	=	0.0000000001

Again, Hoyle and Wickramasinghe are forthright in their candid confession about the probability of life originating from randomness is beyond the likelihood of life originating by chance. Listen to them as they express their utter amazement at those who accept the randomness philosophy:

Once we see, however, that the probability of life originating at random is so utterly minuscule as to make the random concept absurd, it becomes sensible to think that the favourable properties of physics on which life depends are in every respect deliberate.... It is therefore almost inevitable that our own measure of intelligence must reflect in a valid way the higher intelligences to our left, even to the extreme idealized limit of God.... Any theory with a probability of being correct that is larger than one part in $10^{40,000}$ must be judged superior to random shuffling. The theory that life was assembled by an intelligence has, we believe, a probability vastly higher than one part in $10^{40,000}$ of being the correct explanation of the any curious facts discussed in preceding chapters. Indeed, such a theory is so

²⁸Ibid., 30, 31.

²⁹Ibid., xi.

obvious that one wonders why it is not widely accepted as being self-evident. The reasons are psychological rather than scientific.³⁰ (Emphasis mine)

Some scientists are bewildered at the structure of the DNA. Yet, many are still writing about a “good soup” from which life originated. Many scientists deny **Intelligent Design** and resort to fanciful theories about a mixture of simple organic compounds forming life. It is in this vein that Francis Crick (1916-2004), British molecular biologist, physicist, neuroscientist, and one of two co-discoverers of the structure of the DNA molecule in 1953, sought an answer to the problem of life. He writes about the hugeness of our own galaxy, and, at the same time, writes about a “good soup—a mixture of simple organic compounds in water,” and “seeds everywhere” from outer space, which came to earth in an “unmanned spaceship sent by a higher civilization.”

We cannot help but wonder why this kind of belief is credible to some (“unmanned spaceship sent by a higher civilization,” but, on the other hand, for one to believe Moses when he wrote—“In the beginning God created”—is too credulous, or gullible, to accept as historical. The Genesis account, according to atheists, evolutionists, and theistic evolutionists, is too far out to view with historical accuracy. **Did life simply appear without a designer?** Crick is conscious that the DNA molecule is too complex for it to have originated from inanimate, or non-living, objects. When he sticks to facts, his comments are quite revealing concerning the immensity of our own galaxy:

Our own galaxy has perhaps 10^{11} stars and there are at least 10^{10} galaxies and probably more. Many of these stars are likely to have planets circling around them.³¹

In order to explain evolution, he resorts to the idea of *panspermia*, meaning “seeds everywhere,” which seeds came to the earth in an unmanned spaceship and dropped off its seeds that eventually became a “good soup” from which life originated on earth. Yet, other scientists see the utter nonsense in such wishful and speculative thinking. Charles Thaxton (b. 1939),³² Walter Bradley,³³ and Roger Olsen³⁴ reject the wild imaginations of some scientists

³⁰Ibid., 141, 144, 130.

³¹Francis Crick, *Life Itself: Its Origin and Nature* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981), 13-14. He explains the powers of ten in a footnote on page 14:

This notation is so convenient that I shall use it throughout this book without further explanation. 10^{11} simply means a number consisting of a one followed by eleven zeros. That is, 100 billion. So a thousand is 10^3 , a million 10^6 , a billion (American) is 10^9 , and so on. [See page 11 and 12 of my chapter for a detailed chart dealing with “powers.”]

³²Charles Thaxton, creationist author and fellow of the Discovery Institute’s Center for Science and Culture. He has a doctorate in physical chemistry from Iowa State University and has completed post-doctorate programs in the history of science at Harvard University and the molecular biology laboratories of Brandeis University.

³³Walter L. Bradley receive his Ph.D. in Materials Science from the University of Texas

³⁴Roger L. Olsen received his Ph.D. in Geochemistry from Colorado School of Mines.

who advance the notion of a “prebiotic soup” from which life sprang into existence. They write with logic and common sense as they expose this kind of mindset:

Based on the foregoing geochemical assessment, we conclude that both in the atmosphere and in the various water basins of the primitive earth, many destructive interactions would have so vastly diminished, if not altogether consumed, essential precursor chemicals, that chemical evolution rates would have been negligible. The soup would have been too dilute for direct polymerization to occur. Even local ponds for concentrating soup ingredients would have met with the same problem.

Furthermore, no geological evidence indicates an organic soup, even a small organic pond, ever existed on this planet. **It is becoming clear that however life began on earth, the usually conceived notion that life emerged from an oceanic soup of organic chemicals is a most implausible hypothesis.** We may therefore with fairness call this scenario “the myth of the prebiotic soup.”³⁵ (Emphasis mine)

Even 20 billion years is not sufficient time for evolution to have occurred. Paul S. Taylor seeks to illustrate the utter impossibility of life originating within the time frame set by evolutionist for life to have come into existence. Many evolutionists estimate the universe to be about 20 billion years old.³⁶ Taylor cites from two well known scientists (Sir Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe)³⁷ who calculated the odds of life forming by natural processes. Taylor summarizes statements from their book:

They estimated that there is less than 1 chance in $10^{40,000}$ that life could have originated by random trials. $10^{40,000}$ is a 1 with 40,000 zeros after it.³⁸

After summarizing these two scientists, Taylor writes:

How can one gain some conception of the size of such a huge number? **According to most Evolutionists, the universe is less than 30 billion years old—and there are fewer than 10^{18} seconds in 30 billion years.** So, even if nature could somehow have produced trillions of genetic code combinations every second for 30 billion years, the probabilities against producing the simplest one-celled animal by trial and error would still be inconceivably immense.³⁹ In other words,

³⁵Charles B. Thaxton, Walter L. Bradley, and Roger L. Olsen, *The Mystery of Life's Origin: Reassessing Current Theories* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1984, 1986), 66.

³⁶Paul S. Taylor, *The Illustrated Origins Answer Book* (Gilbert, Arizona: Eden Communications, fifth edition, 1995), 79.

³⁷See Sir Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe, *Evolution from Space: A Theory of Cosmic Creationism* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1981), 24, 30, 31, 148, 150.

³⁸Paul S. Taylor, *The Illustrated Origins Answer Book*, 23.

³⁹Taylor adds an endnote with the word *immense*:

10^{18} seconds = 31.7 Billion years, assuming 31,536,000 seconds per year. Even if an awesome 1,000 trillion random combinations could be tried every second each year for 30 billion years (i.e., 10^{33} trials), the remaining odds would still be an enormous $10^{39,967}$ to 1 against the formation of the necessary genes, based on Hoyle's $10^{40,000}$ figure. *Ibid.*, 78.

fact, single cell bacteria display about 3,000,000 nucleotides, aligned in a very specific sequence. This means, that there is no mathematical probability whatever for any known species to have been the product of a random occurrence—random mutations (to use the evolutionist’s favorite expression.)⁴⁴ [Emphasis mine]

Cohen’s statement above—“**Mathematicians agree that any requisite number beyond 10^{50} has, statistically, a zero probability of occurrence**”—when compared to Hoyle’s statement about the chance of life originating by random chance is $10^{40,000}$, **which number ($10^{40,000}$) illustrates the utter impossibility of such an event occurring**. In spite of the evidence for special creation, nevertheless, many evolutionists still advance the notion of chemical evolution. Biochemists Thaxton, Bradley, and Olsen lay bare the utter futility of seeking to prove evolution. The following remarks uncover the bankruptness of evolution:

A Major conclusion to be drawn from this work is that the undirected flow of energy through a primordial atmosphere and ocean is at present a woefully inadequate explanation for the incredible complexity associated with even simple living systems, and is probably wrong.

Many will find this critique “interesting” but will not draw the same conclusions we have. Why will many predictably persist in their acceptance of some version of chemical evolution? Quite simply, because chemical evolution has been *falsified*. One would be irrational to adhere to a falsified hypothesis. We have only presented a case that chemical evolution is highly implausible. By the nature of the case that is all one can do. In a strict, technical sense, chemical evolution *cannot* be falsified because it is not falsifiable. Chemical evolution is a speculative reconstruction of a unique past event, and cannot therefore be tested against recurring nature.⁴⁵

The existence of an **Intelligent Designer** is the only alternative to evolution, which philosophy fails to provide evidence for its postulation for the age of the earth and the beginning of life. Again, we call attention to the true confession of Michael Denton (Ph.D., M. D.), an evolutionist:

As on so many occasions, paleontology has again failed to substantiate evolutionary presumptions. Considering the way the prebiotic soup is referred to in so many discussions of the origin of life as an already established reality, it comes as something of a shock to realize that there is absolutely no positive evidence for its existence.⁴⁶ (Emphasis mine)

These comments by Denton confirm the words of Cohen as cited above. Once more, **Cohen states that the debate between evolutionists and creationists should have come to a “screeching halt” with the discovery of the complexity of the cell.** In spite of the data available today, we still witness evolution being postulated without any evidence to verify wild

⁴⁴I. L. Cohen, *Darwin Was Wrong: A Study in Probabilities* (Greenvale, New York: New Research Publications, 1984), 205.

⁴⁵Charles B. Thaxton, Walter L. Bradley, and Roger L. Olsen, *The Mystery of Life’s Origin: Reassessing Current Theories* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1984, 1986), 186.

⁴⁶Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (Bethesda, Maryland: Adler & Adler Publishers, 1985, 1986), 186.

imaginings, minds that refuse to look at the evidence for the God of creation. Cohen points out with justice:

At that moment, when the DNA/RNA [RNA = ribonucleic acid] system became understood, the debate between evolutionists and creationists should have come to a screeching halt.... The implications of the DNA/RNA were obvious and clear.... The present book submits the theme and argument that evolution could not have taken place along the lines depicted by evolutionists. Mathematically speaking, based on probability concepts, there is no possibility that evolution was the mechanism that created the approximately 6,000,000 species of plants and animals we recognize today.⁴⁷ (Emphasis mine)

The arguments for evolution are extremely fragile, but, at the same time, the arguments for special creation by someone outside creation are extremely strong, which “someone” is none other than God. Denton is correct as he writes about the complexity of the cell:

The complexity of the simplest known type of cell is so great that it is impossible to accept that such an object could have been thrown together suddenly by some kind of freakish, vastly improbable, event. Such an occurrence would be indistinguishable from a miracle.⁴⁸ (Emphasis mine)

The evolutionists provide no concrete evidence for their presuppositions. It is in this vein that Sir Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe reject evolution as a viable solution to solve the riddle of life. The following extract from their famous book illustrates the utter impossibility of life originating without an outside source, that is to say, God:

Any theory with a probability of being correct that is larger than one part in $10^{40,000}$ must be judged superior to random shuffling. The theory that life was assembled by an intelligence has, we believe, a probability vastly higher than one part in $10^{40,000}$ of being the correct explanation of the many curious facts discussed in preceding chapters. Indeed, such a theory is so obvious that one wonders why it is not widely accepted as being self-evident. The reasons are psychological rather than scientific.... Once we see, however, that the probability of life originating at random is so utterly minuscule as to make the random concept absurd, it becomes sensible to think that the favourable properties of physics on which life depends are in every respect deliberate.... It is therefore almost inevitable that our own measure of intelligence must reflect in a valid way the higher intelligences to our left, even to the extreme idealized limit of God.⁴⁹ (Emphasis mine)

David Green (1910-1985) and Robert Goldberger, both biochemists and evolutionists, assert that there is no scientific evidence for the cell in all of its complexity to have originated on Planet Earth without outside sources. The following citation from their book is quite frank concerning the lack of scientific evidence for such a postulate:

⁴⁷I. L. Cohen, *Darwin was Wrong*, 4, 5, 8.

⁴⁸Michael Denton, *Evolution*, 264.

⁴⁹Sir Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe, *Evolution from Space: A Theory of Cosmic Creationism* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981), 130, 141, 144.

However, the macromolecule-to-cell transition is a jump of fantastic dimensions, which lies beyond the range of testable hypothesis. In this area all is conjecture. The available facts do not provide a basis for postulating that cells arose on this planet. This is not to say that some parapsychical forces were at work. We simply wish to point out the fact that there is no scientific evidence.⁵⁰ (Emphasis mine)

It is in this same vein of reasoning that Thaxton, Bradley, and Olsen correctly marvel about the DNA, with all its complexity, which originated, according to some scientists, “without” outside intelligence. They have convincingly pointed out the need for intelligence in the design of the cell.

We know that in numerous cases certain effects always have intelligent causes, such as dictionaries, sculptures, machines and paintings. We reason by analogy that similar effects also have intelligent causes. For example, after looking up to see “BUY FORD” spelled out in smoke across the sky we infer the presence of a skywriter even if we heard or saw no airplane. We would similarly conclude the presence of intelligent activity were we to come upon and elephant-shaped topiary [The practice or art of training, cutting, and trimming trees or shrubs into odd or ornamental shapes] in a cedar forest.

In like manner an intelligible communication via radio signal from some distant galaxy would be widely hailed as evidence of an intelligent source. Why then doesn't the message sequence on the DNA molecule also constitute *prima facie* [at first view: on the first appearance] evidence for an intelligent source? After all, DNA information is not just analogous to a message sequence such as Morse code, it is such a message sequence. The so-called Shannon information laws apply equally to the genetic code and to the Morse code. True, our knowledge of intelligence has been restricted to biology-based advanced organisms, but it is currently argued by some that intelligence exists in complex non-biological computer circuitry. If our minds are capable of imagining intelligence freed from biology in this sense, then why not in the sense of an intelligent being before biological life existed?

We believe that if this question is considered, it will be seen that most often it is answered in the negative simply because it is thought to be inappropriate to bring a Creator into science. **The above discussion is not meant as a scientific proof of a Creator, but is merely a line of reasoning to show that Special Creation by a Creator beyond the cosmos is a plausible view of Origin science.**⁵¹ (Emphasis mine)

Richard Dawkins (b. 1941), one of the world's best-known atheists, frankly admits that the information in “one cell” is massive. Yet, in spite of his confession, he believes all of this information came about through “blind chance.” In the face of his atheism, he has allowed his atheistic bias to impact his denial of what he admits staggers the imagination. He observes in his own words:

As I mentioned at the end of Chapter 1 [page 18], there is enough information capacity in a single human cell to store the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, all 30 volumes of it, three or four times over. I

⁵⁰David E. Green and Robert F. Goldberger, *Molecular Insights into the Living Process* (New York: Academic Press, 1967), 406-407.

⁵¹Charles B. Thaxton, Walter L. Bradley, and Roger L. Olsen, *The Mystery of Life's Origin: Reassessing Current Theories* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1984, 1986), 211, 212.

don't know the comparable figure for a willow seed or an ant, but it will be of the same order of staggeringness. There is enough storage capacity in the DNA of a single lily seed or a single salamander sperm to store the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* 60 times over. Some species of the unjustly called 'primitive' amoebas has as much information in their DNA as 1,000 *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.⁵²

Even though his remarks are astounding as to the complexity of the cell, nevertheless, he still underestimates the complexity of the genetic code. Dr. Werner Gitt's, retired professor and Head of the Department of Information Technology at the German Federal Institute of Physics and Technology, remarks call attention to the amount of information found in one cell:

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 a pile of paperback books spanning the distance from earth to the moon 500 times—each book being unique from the others!**⁵³ (Emphasis mine)

Dr. Bert Thompson, Ph.D. degrees in microbiology from Texas A & M University, and Wayne Jackson, founder and editor of the Christian Courier and President emeritus of Apologetics Press, also call attention to the complexity of the nucleus of the cell, which nucleus is the control center of the cell. Their remarks exhibit how infinitesimally small the data are in the nucleus of the cell:

The nucleus is the control center of the cell, and is separated from the cytoplasm by a nuclear membrane. Within the nucleus is the genetic machinery of the cell (chromosomes and genes containing deoxyribonucleic acid—DNA). The DNA is a super molecule that carries the coded information for the replication of the cell. If the DNA from a single human cell were removed from the nucleus and unraveled (it is found in the cell in a spiral configuration), it would be approximately six feet long, and would contain over a billion biochemical steps. **It has been estimated that if all the DNA in an adult human were placed end-to-end, it would reach to the Sun and back (186 million miles) 400 times.**⁵⁴ (Emphasis mine)

The cell is a factory working day and night. John Pfeiffer (b. 1915) demonstrates the complex chemical aggregates as he explains the intricacy of the cell:

The "factory district" of every cell also lies in the cytoplasm, in the form of numerous ribosomes, spheroids a little less than a millionth of an inch in diameter. Ribosomes are the site of the manufacture of the protein compounds which form a major part to every organism. Proteins, various combinations of carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen, oxygen and usually sulphur, exist everywhere—in cells

⁵²Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker: Why the Evidence of Evolution Reveals a Universe Without Design* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1986), 115, 116.

⁵³Werner Gitt, "Dazzling Design in Miniature," *Creation Ex Nihilo* 20, no. 1 (December 1997—February 1998): 6, cited in Joe White and Nicholas Comninellis, *Darwin's Demise: Why Evolution Can't Take the Heat* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2001), 25.

⁵⁴Bert Thompson and Wayne Jackson, *The Case for the Existence of God* (Montgomery, AL: Apologetics Press, 1996), 25.

which make up tissues and organs, in membranes and muscle fibers and skin and bone and cartilage. (Among the most important proteins are substances called enzymes, which keep the wheels of life spinning by speeding vital biochemical processes.) To manufacture the many forms of protein it needs, a cell may utilize thousands of ribosomes, some floating in the cytoplasm and others attached to the ER like berries on a vine....

The microscopic blob of jelly called the cell is a remarkable entity. The most remarkable thing about it is the very fact that it is alive—not with murky primordial glow, but as fully and vibrantly alive as a tiger or an oak tree. In a remarkable miniaturization of life's functions, the cell moves, grows, reacts, protects itself and even reproduces. To sustain this varied existence, it utilizes a tightly organized system of parts that is much like a tiny industrial complex. It has a central control point, power plants, internal communications, construction and manufacturing elements.⁵⁵ (Emphasis mine)

Darrel Kautz, too, goes right to the heart of the marvelous machinery of the DNA. He demonstrates that there must be an **Intelligent Designer**, which is God. Even though the following quote from his book is lengthy, nevertheless, it unfolds the need to assign God, not evolution, as the author of the DNA:

When a person excludes God—an intelligent Being *external* to our time/mass/space dimension of reality—as the Creator of the genetic code, his only alternative is to believe that code information arose *within* matter spontaneously. However, there is no scientific evidence whatever that matter, in and of itself, can generate coded information....

The supposition that coded information arises spontaneously from matter under the influence of the laws of nature runs counter to the Second Law of Thermodynamics—the law of energy decay....

It is interesting to note that much of the terminology used in speaking of the functions of DNA resembles that associated with language. We speak of the genetic *code*. DNA is *transcribed* into RNA. RNA is *translated* into protein. By way of analogy, one can say that the genetic code is composed of four *letters*. (the nucleotides A, T, G, C). These letters are arranged into sixty-four *words* (triplets or codons) of three letters each. They, in turn, are arranged in sequences to produce *sentences* (genes). Several sentences constitute *paragraphs* (operons). Many paragraphs form *chapters* (chromosomes), and a number of chapters make up a *book* (an organism).

Human beings, over the centuries, have stored information in a variety of ways: on clay tablets, stone, papyrus, paper, film, cassettes, microchips, etc. **However, human technology has not yet advanced to the point of storing information chemically as it is in the DNA molecule.** “A chemical solution to the problem of information storage has, of course, been solved in living things by exploiting the properties of the long chain-like DNA polymers in which cells store their hereditary information. It is a superbly economical solution. The capacity of DNA to store information vastly exceeds that of any other known system; it is so efficient that all the information needed to specify an organism as complex as man weighs less than a few thousand millionths of a gram. The information necessary to specify the design of all the species of organisms which have ever existed on the planet, a number according to G. G. Simpson [an evolutionist] of approximately one thousand million, could be held in a teaspoon and there would still be room left for all the information in very book ever written.”⁵⁶ (Emphasis mine)

⁵⁵John Pfeiffer and the Editor of Life, *The Cell*, Life Science Library (New York: Time Incorporated, 1964), 13, 14, 16. See also Stephen C. Meyer, *Signature in the Cell: DNA and the Evidence for Intelligent Design* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2009).

⁵⁶Darrel Kautz, *The Origin of Living Things* (Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Darrel Kautz, 1988), 44, 45.

It is the complexity of the cell that helped to persuade Antony Flew, one of the most notorious atheists in the world, to change from atheism to theism. During a symposium at the New York University conducted by Gerald Schroeder and John Haldane, he was asked if recent work on the origin of life pointed to “creative intelligence.” He responded with remarks about the DNA. Listen to him as he reveals his own astonishment concerning the complexity of the DNA as one of the motives behind his change from atheism to theism:

Yes, I now think it does ... almost entirely because of the DNA investigations. What I think the DNA material has done is that it has shown, by the almost unbelievable complexity of the arrangements which are needed to produce (life), that intelligence must have been involved in getting these extraordinarily diverse elements to work together. It's the enormous complexity of the number of elements and the enormous subtlety of the ways they work together. The meeting of these two parts at the right time by chance is simply minute. It is all a matter of the enormous complexity by which the results were achieved, which looked to me like the work of intelligence.⁵⁷

Remember, the DNA is contained within the nucleus of the cell. The size of body cells staggers the imagination as to how small cells are in their dimensions, or measurements. Cells come in a variety of sizes and shapes. There is nothing in the universe that men and women have developed that can compare or equal to that of the complexity of the living cell. Bert Thomson's and Wayne Jackson's comments are eye-opening remarks about the complexity of the cell:

These cells come in a variety of sizes and shapes, with different functions and life expectancies. For example, some cells (e.g., male spermatozoa) are so small that 20,000 would fit inside a capital “O” from a standard typewriter, each being only 0.05 mm long. Some cells, placed end-to-end, would make only one inch if 6,000 were assembled together. Yet all the cells of the human body, if set end-to-end, would encircle the Earth over 200 times. Even the largest cell of the human body, the female ovum, is unbelievably small, being only 0.01 of an inch in diameter.⁵⁸

In order for the cell to survive, it must be able to protect itself. Did evolution design this intricacy or did this design come about through **Intelligent Design** or accident? Ernest Borek's, an evolutionist, comments about the membrane that guards the integrity of the cell is nothing short of astounding, which comments demands a Creator, not evolution. Listen to him as he explains this marvel of protection:

All cells, whether of plant, animal, or bacterial origin, are completely enclosed by a membrane which guards the physical integrity of the cell, maintaining it as an inviolate, semiautonomous unit. Not only does the membrane guard the cell by physical containment, but it also mounts an unceasing guard over the ports of entry on the frontiers of the cell. The membrane recognizes with its uncanny molecular memory the hundreds of compounds swimming around it and permits or denies passage according to the cell's requirements. Unknown compounds which fail some

⁵⁷Antony Flew, *There Is A God: How the World's most Notorious Atheist Changed His Mind* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2007), 75.

⁵⁸Bert Thompson and Wayne Jackson, *The Case for the Existence of God* (Montgomery, AL: Apologetics Press, 1996), 24.

subtle test for recognition on the molecular ramparts are usually excluded, and the cell is thus guarded against their possibly harmful presence.⁵⁹ (Emphasis mine)

This study has focused upon the complexity of the cell, which intricacies demands an outside source for its enormous amount of information and arrangement. Just the DNA code alone requires an **I**ntelligent **D**esigner outside of space and time.

⁵⁹Ernest Borek, *The Sculpture of Life* (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1973), 5.