



Our Father's Identity

And there oue shall serve mighty ones, the work of men's hands, wood and stone, which neither see, nor hear, nor eat, nor smell.
DEBARIM (DEUTERONOMY) 29:4

Evolution Vs. Intelligent Design

Mankind has always questioned the origins of their existence. Ancient cultures all over the world have fanciful tales of how everything came into being. People in our generation believe in the Theory of Evolution authored by Charles Darwin. Even though Darwin authored his theory in the late 1800's, Scripture illustrates that this has been a common misconception in our ancestors as well as illustrated by the Prophet Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) in 2:27-28. However, there is a growing movement of scientists and researchers who are moving away from this theory and these beliefs. With the discovery of DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid), it has become clear that the Theory of Evolution is statistically improbable meaning that it has a probability higher than 10^{-50} as we discussed in our previous study. With these kinds of odds, this is the question any logical person may ask:

Do we really need to examine any other evidence?

In my mind, the matter is settled. However, there are extremely intelligent people who still choose to believe this theory is valid despite the statistical evidence. Why would people

continue to believe something that has been proven false? The Prophet Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) says people have turned their back towards the Intelligent Designer of the Hebrew people.

Saying to a stump, You are my father; and to a stone, you have brought me forth: for they have turned their back unto me, and not their face: but in the time of their trouble they will say, Arise, and save us. But where are your mighty ones that you have made yourself? let them arise, if they can save you in the time of your trouble: for according to the number of your cities are your mighty ones, O Yahudah. (*Yirmeyahu/Jeremiah 2:27-28*)

This testimony illustrates a resistance existing between people and the Intelligent Designer of the Hebrew people. They chose to deny His Existence and claim that they originated from a tree and a stone. Is it this resistance that causes people to cling onto theories with impossible odds? Based on the evidence spoken by this Prophet, the issue is not statistics and probability but hearts resistant to our Father in Heaven. They do not want to acknowledge His Existence.

Facts are facts. People cannot argue against facts. Jim Frost wrote an excellent article titled, *Statistics Uses Numerical Evidence to Draw Valid Conclusions*, discussing the value of statistics in research (emphasis added).

In this post, I cover two main reasons why studying the field of statistics is crucial in modern society. First, statisticians are guides for learning from data and navigating common problems that can lead you to incorrect conclusions. Second, given the growing importance of decisions and opinions based on data, it's crucial that you can critically assess the quality of analyses that others present to you.

<https://statisticsbyjim.com/basics/importance-statistics/>

Statistics aid researchers, helping them avoid "incorrect conclusions". If someone told me that the Theory of Evolution had a probability of 10^{-50} of occurring, I would be hesitant to teach this theory to other people, especially children. This probability reveals that it is extremely unlikely that mankind's existence originated with this theory. This probability has led me to correct conclusions. One of my core values is honesty. If I am going to live according to this core value, I could not teach the Theory of Evolution as a viable explanation for the origins of mankind. Mathematics is absolute. They do not lie. Mr. Frost continues in the following excerpt:

Statistics are not just numbers and facts. You know, things like 4 out of 5 dentists prefer a specific toothpaste. Instead, it's an array of knowledge and procedures that allow you to learn from data reliably. Statistics allow you to evaluate claims based on quantitative evidence and help you differentiate between reasonable and dubious conclusions. That aspect is particularly vital these days because data are so plentiful along with interpretations presented by people with unknown motivations.

<https://statisticsbyjim.com/basics/importance-statistics/>

All of these steps are chemically and thermodynamically unstable in the proposed early earth environment and all defy the Second Law of Thermodynamics.

<https://answersingenesis.org/evidence-against-evolution/probability/applying-probabilities-to-evolution/>

Mr. Olsen does include statistics and probability in his article but it is very complex and difficult for the average person to comprehend. The link to his article is provided for those who would like to read his conclusions.

Let's consider an example. Three items are placed on a table in close proximity: bread, peanut butter and jam. What is the probability that these three ingredients would randomly come together and make a peanut butter and jelly sandwich on their own without intervention from anyone? If these ingredients were left on the table for a year, would they eventually make a peanut butter and jelly sandwich on their own? After a year, the bread would be hard and moldy. The peanut butter would harden and the jam would also become covered in mold.



This is the second Law of Thermodynamics. Ordered things lead to disorder. The bread, peanut butter and jam would not improve over the next year. They would decay and no longer be fit for consumption. What would happen after ten years? People who believe in evolution say it takes millions of years for evolutionary changes to occur. Well, what would happen to the bread, peanut butter and jam after a million years? It would be nonexistent and it certainly would not have made itself into a peanut butter and jelly sandwich.

Mr. Olsen listed far more than three ingredients. The likelihood that these ingredients would make themselves into a complex lifeform without outside intervention is extremely improbable.

The Second Law of Thermodynamics mentioned in his article, is a natural Law of the Universe that cannot be changed or deleted. It essentially states that ordered systems lead to disorder. Evolution proposes that disorder leads to ordered systems which is a feature not observed in nature... ever. The bread, peanut butter and jam would decay after one year and would not be fit for consumption. There is no evidence in the natural environment that supports a conclusion that disorder leads to order. Mike Riddle wrote the following article titled: *Does Evolution Have a ...Chance?* He states:

The expression 10^{150} is the number 10 with 150 zeros. Based on this statement, the statistic $10^{40,000}$ is statistically impossible. Dr. Mastopaolo states that the only remaining possibility for the presence of life is that it occurred by design.

Someone created life.

Dr. Mastropaolo continues in his article:

Now to return to the probability of evolving one molecule of one protein as one chance in 10^{75} , we see that it does not satisfy Dembski's criterion of one chance in 10^{150} . The simultaneous availability of two molecules of one protein may satisfy the criterion, but they would be far from the necessary complement to create a living cell. For a minimal cell, 60,000 proteins of 100 different configurations would be needed.^{5,10} If these raw materials could be evolved at the same time, and if they were not more complex on average to evolve than the iso-1-cytochrome c molecule, and if these proteins were stacked at the cell's construction site, then we may make a gross underestimation of what the chances would be to evolve that first cell. That probability is one chance in more than $10^{4,478,296}$, a number that numbs the mind because it has 4,478,296 zeros. If we consider one chance in 10^{150} as the standard for impossible, then the evolution of the first cell is more than $10^{4,478,146}$ times more impossible in probability than that standard.

Mr. Mastropaolo is also talking about the formation of proteins and not the entire DNA molecule itself. The statistical odds for this would even be more impossible if that were a measure. From his perspective, the Theory of Evolution is also statistically impossible. Let's take a look at this number mentioned in his article. This is mind-boggling!

$10^{4,478,146}$

This number represents a chance of 1 in 10 with 4,478,146 zeros behind it! We do not need to consider any more evidence than this. We can see this with our own eyes. We don't need to listen to the jargon of a scientist who hopelessly promotes the Theory of Evolution as a viable explanation for the origins of life. Here is the truth!

The Theory of Evolution is impossible!

Our bread, peanut butter and jam will never spontaneously make themselves into a peanut butter and jelly sandwich on their own without intervention; not even after a million years. Mike Riddle also said the following in his article titled: *Does Evolution Have a ...Chance?*

Both creationists and evolutionists agree that DNA is essential for linking the correct amino acids in a chain to form a protein. The unanswered question is, “Where and how did DNA acquire the enormous amount of information (instructions) to form a protein?” There is no known natural explanation that can adequately explain the origin of life, or even a single protein. The evolutionists are then left to rely on the odds (chance) that such a tremendous, improbable event occurred. Molecular biologist Michel Denton puts the event in perspective:

Is it really credible that random processes could have constructed a reality, the smallest element of which—a functional protein or gene—is complex beyond our own creative capacities, a reality which is the very antithesis of chance, which excels in every sense anything produced by the intelligence of man?¹⁴
Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, p. 342.

The Theory of Evolution is statistically impossible. Life did not come into existence through a primordial soup. It is impossible based on our understanding of DNA and protein synthesis. Statistics have allowed us to differentiate between conclusions that are reasonable and those that are dubious. The evidence presented comes from reliable, qualified sources who understand statistical analysis. There is only one conclusion that can be reached based on this evidence. Life in heaven and on earth has been generated by an Intelligent Designer who implanted the DNA in all life with the instructions to form everything we see, hear and feel.

Everyone has bias. I have bias. Scholars have bias. It is impossible to be impervious to the influence of our respective belief systems. The beliefs of a translator influence the way that he or she translates their version of our Father’s Word. The beliefs of a scholar, scientist or researcher influence the way they interpret data and evidence. This is why it is important for people to take their belief systems into consideration. If a theory is mathematically impossible, why do highly educated people still promote it? The only logical conclusion is that the theory itself has become their religious belief system because it really does require blind faith to believe that something with a probability of $10^{-40,000}$ is possible.

The only logical conclusion that can be reached based on solid evidence is that an Intelligent Designer brought life into being. The rest of this series will be focused on examining evidence that proves the identity of our Intelligent Designer.