

Which is more Scientific: Creation + Creator, Or Matter, Time & ??????

The following are examples of why the *Theory of Evolution*, or *Creation w/o a Creator*, should be open to discussion rather than touted as if no Intelligent Designer, Selector, and/or Creator were necessary to create all sorts of living things: including intelligent beings like us. For example, did you know that ...

1. **Almost any monkey could be taught** to press a button or flip a switch: including one that turns on a TV, or computer, or that launches a rocket. This does NOT (in any way) indicate, nor support the assertion, that a monkey or team of them could – given enough T-I-M-E – design and build a TV, or computer, or rocket ship: even in *Trillions* of years.
2. **Water hydrolyzes (or dissolves) DNA, proteins**, and their building blocks: unless they are surrounded by a protective membrane that strictly regulates what goes in and out of the cell: via a program stored in DNA.¹
3. **Not even one homochiralic, or highly-ordered / life-based, protein has been observed to form by itself:** apart from a pre-existing / living organism. How living things came to be is still a complete mystery: even though some scientists assert that what *they believe* is based on *science*: as opposed to *religion*.
4. A mycoplasma is one of the *simplest* bacteria known to man. It consists of 40,000 proteins, of 600 different types, along with DNA, RNA, ribosomes and a membrane. It's also a parasite that requires a more complex host organism to survive. To suppose that nature made it is speculation based on *a belief* that a *miraculous* protein, or ordered RNA molecule, would not decay back to the elements from which it came but survive the *destructive forces water, oxygen, and the elements and eventually become a tadpole, then a frog-man*.
5. Cell phones are extremely complicated and took teams of engineers years to *Design*, yet they can't divide or mate so as to produce baby cell phones, nor could nature by itself have created them. The same thing could be said of all sorts of complex things that were made by intelligent beings: i.e. mankind.
6. It has been said that the odds of higher life forms resulting from the forces of nature alone are about the same as if a tornado swept through a junk yard and assembled a functional Boeing 747.
7. The ability of living things to reproduce has the markings of *Design*. In fact, the self-replication process is so complicated that man cannot (as yet) duplicate it, much less *Design* and *Create* a synthetic ant.
8. Except for fireworks that are *designed* to blow up in specific ways, and disintegrate, **explosions are not known to produce order**, and those who *believe* that we are the result of a Big Bang + Time are simply touting their *faith* in the *Big Bang religion*: a belief that something came from nothing, or that the universe was once the size of a golf ball that exploded and somehow produced all sorts of order and complexity.
9. Useful languages require a method of making sounds, hearing, and/or storing a message and a means to understand or decode what is being communicated. Human languages involve thinking, speaking, hearing, and understanding. Computer languages – along with the machinery to store and read them – are written by intelligent programmers. *Not one was the result of random natural processes*. To suppose that the three-dimensional DNA language of life did not have an Author and Creator, but simply arose by itself is not based on logic, common sense, or 'science' but rather speculation, imagination, and LOTS of *faith*.

References:

1. www.earthage.org/is_water_the_solution.htm.