In 1966 *Time* magazine ran a cover story asking: Is God Dead? Many have accepted the cultural narrative that he’s obsolete—that as science progresses, there is less need for a “God” to explain the universe. Yet it turns out that the rumors of God’s death were premature. More amazing is that the relatively recent case for his existence comes from a surprising place—science itself.

READ MORE INSIDE ....
Here's the story: The same year *Time* featured the now-famous headline, the astronomer Carl Sagan announced that there were two important criteria for a planet to support life: The right kind of star, and a planet the right distance from that star. Given the roughly octillion—1 followed by 27 zeros—planets in the universe, there should have been about septillion—1 followed by 24 zeros—planets capable of supporting life.

With such spectacular odds, the Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence, a large, expensive collection of private and publicly funded projects launched in the 1960s, was sure to turn up something soon. Scientists listened with a vast radio telescopic network for signals that resembled coded intelligence and were not merely random. But as years passed, the silence from the rest of the universe was deafening. Congress defunded SETI in 1993, but the search continues with private funds. As of 2014, researchers have discovered precisely bubkis—0 followed by nothing.

What happened? As our knowledge of the universe increased, it became clear that there were far more factors necessary for life than Sagan supposed. His two parameters grew to 10 and then 20 and then 50, and so the number of potentially life-supporting planets decreased accordingly. The number dropped to a few thousand planets and kept on plummeting.

Even SETI proponents acknowledged the problem. Peter Schenkel wrote in a 2006 piece for *Skeptical Inquirer* magazine: “In light of new findings and insights, it seems appropriate to put excessive euphoria to rest ....We should quietly admit that the early estimates...may no longer be tenable.”

As factors continued to be discovered, the number of possible planets hit zero, and kept going. In other words, the odds turned against any planet in the universe supporting life, including this one. Probability said that even we shouldn’t be here.

Today there are more than 200 known parameters necessary for a planet to support life—every single one of which must be perfectly met, or the whole thing falls apart. Without a massive planet like Jupiter nearby, whose gravity will draw away asteroids, a thousand times as many would hit Earth’s surface. The odds against life in the universe are simply astonishing.

Yet here we are, not only existing, but talking about existing. What can account for it? Can every one of those many parameters have been perfect by accident? At what
point is it fair to admit that science suggests that we cannot be the result of random forces? Doesn't assuming that an intelligence created these perfect conditions require far less faith than believing that a life-sustaining Earth just happened to beat the inconceivable odds to come into being?

There's more. The fine-tuning necessary for life to exist on a planet is nothing compared with the fine-tuning required for the universe to exist at all. For example, astrophysicists now know that the values of the four fundamental forces--gravity, the electromagnetic force, and the “strong” and “weak” nuclear forces--were determined less than one millionth of a second after the big bang. Alter any one value and the universe could not exist. For instance, if the ratio between the nuclear strong force and the electromagnetic force had been off by the tiniest fraction of the tiniest fraction--by even one part in 100,000,000,000,000,000--then no stars could have ever formed at all. Feel free to gulp.

Multiply that single parameter by all the other necessary conditions, and the odds against the universe existing are so heart-stopping astronomical that the notion that it all “just happened” defies common sense. It would be like tossing a coin and having it come up heads 10 quintillion times in a row. Really?

Fred Hoyle, the astronomer who coined the term “big bang,” said that his atheism was “greatly shaken” at these developments. He later wrote that “a common-sense interpretation of the facts suggests that a super-intellect has monkeyed with the physics, as well as with chemistry and biology....The numbers one calculates from the facts seem to me so overwhelming as to put this conclusion almost beyond question.”

Theoretical physicist Paul Davies has said that “the appearance of design is overwhelming” and Oxford professor Dr. John Lennox has said “the more we get to know about our universe, the more the hypothesis that there is a Creator...gains in credibility as the best explanation of why we are here.”

The greatest miracle of all time, without any close seconds, is the universe. It is the miracle of all miracles, one that ineluctably points with the combined brightness of every star to something--or Someone--beyond itself.

--Eric Metaxas, “Science Increasingly Makes the Case for God.”
Dr. A. Cressy Morrison, considered the marvels of design and order in the universe. Though more than half a century has past, his comments have never been discredited. As a firm believer in God, he wrote:

So many essential conditions are necessary for life to exist on our earth that it is mathematically impossible that all of them could exist in proper relationship by chance on any one earth at one time. There must be in nature some form of intelligent direction. If this is true, then there must be a purpose.

The earth rotates on its axis in twenty-four hours or at the rate of about 1,000 miles an hour. Suppose it turned at the rate of a hundred miles an hour. Why not? Our days and nights would then be ten times as long as now. The hot sun of summer would then burn up our vegetation each long day and every sprout would freeze in such a night. If the temperature on earth had changed so much as fifty degrees on the average for a single year, all vegetation would be dead and man with it, roasted or frozen. The earth travels around the sun at the rate of eighteen miles each second. If the rate of revolution had been, say, six miles or forty miles each second, we would be too far from or too close to the sun for our form of life to exist. If our sun gave off only one-half of its present radiation, we would freeze, and if it gave half as much more, we would have been reduced to dust long ago.

The earth is tilted at an angle of twenty-three degrees. This gives us our seasons. If it had not been tilted, the poles would be in eternal twilight. The water vapor from the ocean would move north and south, piling up continents of ice and leaving possibly a desert between the equator and the ice. The weight of the unbelievably vast mass of ice would depress the poles, causing our equator to bulge or erupt.

If our moon was, say, 50,000 miles away instead of its present respectable distance, our tides would be so enormous that twice a day all the lowland of all the continents would be submerged by a rush of water. The earth would crack with the turmoil and the tides in the air would cause daily hurricanes.

Out of a chaotic mixture of the elements has come our solar system. To chaos has come order so exact that the place any part will occupy at any time can be predicted to the second. The balance is perfect.

---Dr. A. Cressy Morrison (1888–1951) was president of the New York Academy of Science. His book, “Man Does Not Stand Alone,” is described as “a believing scientist’s challenge to Julian Huxley’s famous work “Man Stands Alone.”
In the novel *Contact*, by Carl Sagan, Eleanor Arroway, a radio astronomer, searches for evidence of intelligent life in other star systems. She discovers a radio signal which consists of the first 26 prime numbers repeated over and over. She realizes immediately that this is convincing evidence of intelligent life near the star.

A good question to ask is why did Eleanor reach the conclusion that she had found evidence of intelligent alien life? Whether it is a message scratched in the sand saying “John loves Mary”, the tapping in a repeated pattern beneath the rubble of a collapsed building, the rapid finger motions of a translator for the deaf, the binary code of ones and zeros used by computers, or smoke signals used by Indians to send messages, they all have something in common: *the source of the information transmitted is an intelligent mind*. The medium used to transmit information might be sand, ink, radio waves, electronic bits or sound waves, but the source of information conveying a meaningful message is always *an intelligent mind*.

The most efficient mechanism ever discovered for storing information resides in every cell of your body in the DNA molecule. The human DNA molecule contains about 6 billion nucleotides (A, C, G, and T), and is responsible for the construction of every complex molecule and organ in your body. To quote Bill Gates, the founder of Microsoft, “DNA is like a computer program but far, far, more advanced than any software ever created.” (Gates, *The Road Ahead*, 1996, page 228)

To give a simple example, the construction of a protein requires that the exact sequence of the 20 different amino acids used in forming that protein must be stored in the DNA. Most proteins are composed of several hundred amino acids attached together in a long chain which must be folded to the proper shape in order to function correctly. Just a tiny error of placing the wrong amino acid in the lengthy chain might be fatal to the organism. Sickle cell anemia is caused by one incorrect amino acid in the hemoglobin molecule which contains over 500 amino acids. The number of different proteins in the human body is approximately 20,000, and each one must have its own separate set of coded instructions in the DNA. No wonder a long set of instructions is needed!

---

--- Continued on page 6 ---
The greatest unsolved puzzle is this: *where did the information needed to construct the first living cell come from?* Information in the form of sophisticated programming found in the DNA of the simplest living cell could only have originated in the mind of an *intelligent being*. When you want a new feature on your computer you need new software. You can’t just scramble the code that’s already there to produce new capabilities. In order for an organism to obtain new features there must be new information in the DNA containing the instructions for the assembly of this new feature. You need a programmer. If the simple phrase in the sand saying “John Loves Mary” implies an intelligent mind composed it, then how much more does the most advanced programming ever known require as its source an intelligent mind?

In 1859 Darwin published his theory that all living things trace their origin back to a single living cell in the distant past, and that this organism changed over millions of years into the marvelous kaleidoscope of living organisms we see today by a process of random mutations and natural selection. In his day the cell was considered to be just a simple blob of protoplasm. Its origin was considered to be a lucky combination of simple chemicals in a “warm little pond” in Darwin’s words. It is estimated that the simplest living organism would require several hundred proteins. The chances of assembling even one functional protein by random combinations of amino acids is a daunting task. Imagine you are trying to guess the combination to a lock. Each number in the combination must be from 1-20 (corresponding to the 20 amino acids) and the combination consists of 300 different numbers (common length of a protein chain). Then you have at least two or three hundred more proteins to go to get your first cell. Not gonna happen by chance.

It appears that matter and energy alone are not enough to explain our origins. The missing ingredient needed is *information*, but *information has only one known source - a mind.* The materialistic explanation of our origins fails to consider the need for a mind to produce all the exquisite information in living things.

The Apostle Paul wrote, “God’s invisible qualities-His eternal power and divine nature- have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that people are without excuse.” The signature of God is there in the programming of the DNA in every living cell.

— Jim Hopper, Elder
Church of Christ, Danbury, Connecticut
SKEPTICISM IS DESTRUCTIVE

In the last days scoffers will say, “Where is this 'coming' he promised? Ever since our fathers died, everything goes on as it has since the beginning of creation.” But they deliberately forget that long ago by God's word the heavens existed and the earth was formed out of water and by water....By the same word the present heavens and earth are reserved for fire, being kept for the day of judgment and destruction of ungodly men” (2 Peter 3:3-7).

For many generations there was a general knowledge of Jesus and respect for God. Modernism took root early in the last century with a skepticism of anything supernatural. Faith was put on the same shelf as mythology. Classical liberalism sought to explain away the miracles of the Bible. We were told that by happy coincidences, adverse winds let the Israelites cross the Red Sea, and Biblical prophecies were written after predicted events had happened.

Recently, postmodernism has advocated that absolute truth does not exist. Since everything is relative each person creates his own standard of right and wrong. A disturbing conclusion follows: there can be no way to determine right from wrong, things that are ethical from things that are unethical, things that are moral from what is immoral. The flood of mis-information convincing many that every viewpoint is equally valid is producing cynicism and loss of purpose for life. The result is a breakdown in values and a loss of respect for authority. Without faith in God and respect for His word society collapses!

Skepticism is inflamed by arrogant claims that evolution has unlocked all of the mysteries of the universe. Yet evolution cannot explain why the Wollemi Pine and coelacanth fish, both thought to be extinct, have been rediscovered un-evolved from the fossil record. The cases for Creation is strong and deserves to be heard before one surrenders to the voices of doubt.

Jesus said that unless we believe that He is God we will die in our sins (John 8:24). When skeptics recognize that faith is the life-preserver, they may grab on and find the reward that God gives those who earnestly seek Him. Without faith it is impossible to please God (Hebrews 11:6). After death, separation from God for all eternity is a tragic consequence for loss of faith.

— Douglas Kashorek, Minister
Church of Christ, Plattsburgh, NY
THE MORAL LAW WITHIN

Let’s assume for a moment that God doesn’t exist, but we do. If God doesn’t exist, then the only explanation for the existence of life is evolution. And if evolution is how we came to be, then we are logically no more than very organized rocks and minerals—the dust and minerals left after the body dies and decays. And if we are nothing more than highly organized rocks, could there be such a thing as right and wrong, good and evil, or morality? Let’s think about it.

Rocks and what they do are completely without morality, amoral. If a rock does nothing for a million years, it’s inaction is neither good nor bad—it’s just following the laws of physics. And if a rock, perched on a hillside, rolls or falls down that hill crushing smaller rocks to smithereens along the way, it’s neither right nor wrong—it’s just a rock obeying the law of gravity. Meteors crashing into a planet are only atoms and molecules doing what atoms and molecules naturally do.

And if we are only highly organized rocks, then morality doesn’t exist for us either. Murder, theft, rape, cheating, lying, injustice, and violence lose their meaning, becoming only like gravity, chemical reaction, or fusion—without moral value.

But we all know better—pagans, philosophers, agnostics, atheists, and even children. We know that there’s an objective, world-wide standard of good and evil behavior—a right and a wrong. The apostle Paul put it this way, “For when Gentiles who do not have the Law do instinctively the things of the Law…they show the work of the Law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness…” (Romans 2:14, 15).

And it is this certainty of the existence of an objective moral code, that evidences God. Without Him there is no moral standard. He is the origin of this standard that men everywhere recognize and live by. And He will hold us accountable.

With God, murder is heinous; without God, it is “meh”. With God, kindness, loyalty, and courage are valuable and good; without God, they are as insignificant as a meteor falling helplessly into the sun (who knows and who cares?). With God, good and bad have great meaning and value; without God, good and bad do not even exist.

— Continued on page 9
Bottom line, the existence of God and the existence of morality are irrevocably and logically linked. To say that there is no God is to recognize no right and wrong. But to say that there is such a thing as morality is to also recognize that there is a God. To confess one is to confess the other; to deny one is to deny the other, as well.

Of course, there are many more layers and questions related to this proof than this brief article can address, nevertheless, the moral argument for God’s existence is a strong one and should be carefully considered by the honest seeker.

— Park Linscomb, Minister
Church of Christ, Manchester, New Hampshire

90 PERCENT OF NOBEL LAUREATES ARE RELIGIOUS

"Far from always conflicting with science, under the right circumstances religious belief may positively promote scientific creativity and insight," according to Tony Jack, associate professor of philosophy, Case Western Reserve University. "Many of history's most famous scientists were spiritual or religious. Those noted individuals were intellectually sophisticated enough to see that there is no need for religion and science to come into conflict."

Baruch Aba Shalev's book 100 years of Nobel Prizes, states that from 1901 to 2000, 654 Nobel laureates, or nearly 90 percent, belonged to one of 28 religions. Only 10.5 percent were atheists, agnostics or freethinkers.

Tony Jack concluded: "You can be religious and be a very good scientist."

—Adapted from “The Conflict Between Science and Religion Lies In Our Brains”, Scientific Blogging” March 26, 2016
“In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth”

― Genesis 1:1

Why God Created the World

“God did this (made the world) so men would seek Him and perhaps reach out for Him and find Him though He is not far from each one of us.”

― Acts 17:24-27

Spiritual New Creation Matters Most!

“What counts is a new creation.”

― Galatians 6:15

The New Creation Is “in Christ”

“If anyone is in Christ, he is a new creation; the old has gone, the new has come!”

― 2 Corinthians 5:17

We Enter “into” Christ at Baptism

“All of you who were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ.”

― Galatians 3:27

Start your spiritual journey back to God. Request a free copy of the booklet

“Fundamental Questions for Starting a Spiritual Journey”
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A SCIENTIST CAN BE A BELIEVER

I think there’s a common assumption that you cannot both be a rigorous, show-me-the-data scientist and a person who believes in a personal God. I would like to say that from my perspective that assumption is incorrect. I have no reason to see a discordance between what I know as a scientist who spends all day studying the genome of humans and what I believe as somebody who pays a lot of attention to what the Bible has taught me about God and about Jesus Christ. Those are entirely compatible views. Science is the way — a powerful way, indeed — to study the natural world. Science is not particularly effective — in fact, it’s rather ineffective — in making commentary about the supernatural world. Both worlds are quite real and quite important. The notion that you have to sort of choose one or the other is a terrible myth that has been put forward, and which many people have bought into without really having a chance to examine the evidence.

— Dr. Francis Collins is an American physician-geneticist noted for his discoveries of disease genes and his leadership of the Human Genome Project. He is director of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) in Bethesda, Maryland.
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