

Gunner Q

Christian MGTOW

The Evolutionist Snake In The Church

NOVEMBER 17, 2019 / GUNNER Q

Boxer's blog is running hot as Derek expounds on his beliefs combining evolution and Christianity. (Links below.) I don't believe I'll get a good chance to say what needs to be said there, hence this post. But history first, a history of arguably the greatest heresy and apostasy to ever be allowed inside the Church.

Back in the day, the day Charles Darwin went public, the biological cell was known to be a soap bubble full of water and a little black dot called the nucleus. Darwin's idea that that came into existence through trial and error was therefore plausible, and science had not yet advanced enough to refute him.

At the same time, many Church leaders were enamored of science, believing that science spoke to the careful design of a Creator. That was appropriate; I myself am Christian in large part because reason and Nature speak to His existence and glory. Science had even been invented by Christians; no other religion suggested that reality was based on natural laws given by a deity. Either there was no God or Nature was itself God or Zeus did as he wished.

So, when the idea came along that science might explain how God isn't needed to explain the existence of life, Christian leaders in the Enlightenment faced a dilemma. Should they follow where the science led, and doubt God's claim to be our Creator? Or should they resort to faith that given time, as we learned more, Darwinism would be debunked?

They chose to be faithless.

They—pastors, writers, theologians and preachers—deliberately let the lie of evolution into the Church because of fear that science would prove them wrong instead of trusting that science would prove God correct. They twisted God's authorship into the preposterous idea that God intentionally made quadrillions of mistakes when bringing life into existence in order to validate the unbelief of the Godless. Their own unbelief in many cases, as things turned out.

"Darwin made it possible to be an intellectually fulfilled atheist." -
Richard Dawkins

Now that science has advanced to the point where we know the cell is not a "soap bubble full of water" but a factory complex to the subatomic level, science ought to have swiftly and quietly expelled the theory of evolution.

"If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down. But I can find no such case." -Darwin

Atheists recognized the debunking of Darwinism as the greatest, most horrible achievement of science: the proof by counterexample that a Creator God is real and did indeed create life on Earth. They promptly began twisting evolution into a religion. They were assisted by many so-called defenders of the faith, who loved the idea of human Enlightenment more than the God they preached on Sunday morning.

"The strength of atheism is not its arguments, but its alternatives." -
GunnerQ

The theory of evolution has not advanced beyond Darwin's finches, which we now recognize as microevolution—genetic variation within a species. Macroevolution, variation between species, has never been observed, demonstrated or proven to have occurred... in fact, no *possible* path between *any* two species has ever been suggested.

Instead, evolution became evolutionary psychology. Atheists have grown weary and worried against the swelling tide of objective evidence and thus, have seen fit to lower their burden of proof from observation & repeatable experimentation to fairy tales for adults.

May God damn those faithless, humanist clergy who allowed this failed theory and linchpin of apostasy to take root in the Church.

Which brings me to Derek. I realize my opinions often come across bluntly and I generally mean them that way, but here I honestly wish Derek the best. He's trapped in the lie of evolutionary psychology and I would see him freed to have the faith in God the Creator that the clergy he trusts obviously don't. My comments are in quotes, his not.

Alpha, Beta, and Reproduction

(<https://web.archive.org/web/20220122143448/https://v5k2c2.com/2019/11/13/alpha-beta-and-reproduction/#comment-7593>).

"God claims to be our Creator"

Evolution is not an origin-of-life theory: it is unrelated to creation. Christian claims about God do not conflict with natural selection and "random" mutation.

Come on, now. Darwin did not pull the book title *The Origin Of Species* out of a hat. Evolution is an origin-of-life story that makes God unnecessary. That's the only reason it is still believed by anybody at all... as Richard Dawkins admitted.

It is not possible to be both Christian and evolutionist. They are competing, mutually exclusive, mutually hostile religions.

"...nowhere in Scripture does God behave randomly..."

Nature is full of chance events. Randomness is everywhere, from the quantum to astronomical level. I suspect you are unintentionally equivocating.

Randomness is everywhere but underneath it is a well-ordered reality of natural laws. Those natural laws are completely incapable of explaining a materialist origin of life as we know it. The probabilities, as even the evolutionists admit, are incredibly small. I see they've given up on the Multiverse hand-wave in favor of the it's-not-actually-random-at-all handwave, whereas a real scientist would notice that the probability of the alternative hypothesis—God the Creator—is near-unity as a direct consequence.

God does not behave indiscriminately, unconsciously, or unintentionally (randomly), but intentionally and consciously (non-randomly) uses randomness and chance.

That's just stupid. The Almighty does not commit nonrandom acts of randomness... certainly not in order to give atheists valid reason to deny Him. The debunking of evolution actually leads us closer to His original claim of six-day Creation, not farther.

It is my sincere, honest belief that the chicken came first, not the egg, because God created the chicken in one single action and chicken eggs don't incubate themselves. Not only did God not blunder through epochs of failures to make the chicken, but the fossil record proves that the Almighty did not behave so incompetently.

Thus, science glorifies God. It does not give us excuses with which to deny Him. Have faith, Derek. Have faith that a hundred million professional evolutionists are wrong and Christ Jesus is right, lest you repeat the Church's faithlessness that let the evolutionist snake inside the Church in the first place.

"Is there any argument one could possibly make that would convince you that women are not evolved to value reproduction?"

Of course! Scientific inquiry only works if we can fully pursue an hypothesis and also be willing to accept its negation. Anyone can publish their own competing analysis.

God already has: Original Sin. Women rebelling against male authority is a microcosm of humanity rebelling against God. God even says as much in Scripture. Any well-read Christian ought to recognize the incompatibility between the Fall and "human nature perfected via natural selection".

Evolution predicts that if there's one single thing that women will naturally get right, it's breeding and raising healthy children. One look at tabloid headlines, not to mention the existence and popularity of contraception, is sufficient to debunk that.

But because atheists NEED evolution to be true, they persist in hand-waving away even the most blatant of counterexamples.

Mouse Utopia

(<https://web.archive.org/web/20220122143448/https://v5k2c2.com/2019/11/14/mouse-utopia/#comment-7595>)

It's a matter of established science that mutations occur as a normal course of life and that these are passed to children during reproduction.

"No, and the term "matter of established science" is the giveaway. Any science that is not permitted to be questioned can be safely presumed faulty. You know... you have to know, if you are trying to straddle creation and evolution simultaneously... that the science of evolution is not settled at all."

When I say "matter of established science" I mean "earth is round" level of established. I'm not talking about the "Everyone agrees with us!! No, don't look over there! [points gun at your head]" level of established. If you

deny that mutations occur and are passed on to children, that's "earth is flat" level of denial.

This is disingenuous. Atheists have begun using the term "matter of established science" as a way to circle the wagons and prevent deserters from wandering off the atheist plantation. Hence my taking exception to Derek's usage of the term.

Do genetic defects happen? Of course. Do potentially beneficial mutations happen? No. Humanity is not evolving. Neither is any other species. Fossil record for those wanting an example but let's be honest, either of us could be holding smoking-gun evidence and the other would not be convinced.

That's because this is a religious debate, not a science debate. Science cannot directly prove anything about the supernatural because its purpose is unearthing natural laws. If it could then most scientists would quit and become witch doctors but happily, what cannot be observed is indisputably beyond the boundaries of observation & experimentation, the scientific method. (Science can, and has, proven that life is impossibly unlikely without a supernatural cause.)

If no evidence will convince either of us then why am I writing this? To point out that evolution is the atheist excuse for unbelief in God, which is poison to faith in God... even though many in the Church claim the two can coexist, so they can have a convenient backdoor in case of apostasy.

"You know... you have to know, if you are trying to straddle creation and evolution simultaneously... that the science of evolution is not settled at all."

Of course I know. I'm a proponent of intelligent design and have written a number of articles on the topic. I appreciate your take on it on your blog as well. You won't see me arguing for evolution at the very macro levels. It is often useful to accept it for sake of argument.

Wish granted. Pick a team, Derek. Are humans flawed by Original Sin or paragons of Natural Selection? It can't be both because modern woman, the most liberated-to-follow-her-natural-instincts woman since the fall of the Roman Empire, is toxic, dysgenic trash.

I understand how r/K theory and related evopsych lies can be attractive. We live in a materialist world saturated and indoctrinated by militant atheists who think the Bible is at long last, only a couple nudges away from the dustbin of history.

Are there specific topics in evolutionary psychology I can address, that would strengthen your faith? I'll address them. I retired from debating evolution in frustration that this Godless generation always wants another sign but I'll do it for a Christian brother.

I'll even teach you mysticism, if it would help you see the lies for what they are.

Have faith. God is true, His claim of Creation has been tested and proven, and it will be proven time and again until His return, when evolutionists will stop with their lies, cover their ears to drown out His voice and rush, screaming, to kill God again before He claims copyright upon humanity.

Uncategorized

18 thoughts on “The Evolutionist Snake In The Church”

1. *BSF*

NOVEMBER 17, 2019 AT 10:49 PM

What's interesting about your post (and Derek's as well) is that it has absolutely nothing to do with how to walk with God and everything to do with mortal man and “who is right”. What a waste of time; it won't help you live an eternal life with God. It's just about who has the bigger dick.

2. *h0neyc0mb*

NOVEMBER 18, 2019 AT 12:39 AM

I know it's behind a pay wall .. I had a paper copy that I left at the hotel ..

<https://www.google.com/amp/s/www.wsj.com/amp/articles/can-religion-still-speak-to-younger-americans-11573747161>

<https://www.wsj.com/articles/religion-is-on-the-decline-as-more-adults-check-none-11571320801>

3. *Derek Ramsey*

NOVEMBER 18, 2019 AT 12:45 AM

“What’s interesting about your post (and Derek’s as well) is that it has absolutely nothing to do with how to walk with God and everything to do with mortal man and “who is right”. What a waste of time;”

BSF, you are wrong. This is one of the genuinely nicest public criticisms of my viewpoints that I have ever received. GQ views me as a wayward brother and is trying to bring me back to the fold. It is a call to faith. There is nothing more essential one’s personal walk with God than to do this, as Jesus instructed.

4. *Derek Ramsey*

NOVEMBER 18, 2019 AT 3:07 AM

@Gunner Q

Darwinism **is** the choice atheist religion, but it’s a genetic fallacy to reject it because atheists like it. Atheists didn’t learn when the Big Bang falsified atheism and proved Christianity, and yet they still persist. The more science discovers about origins (universe, life), the more it points to God. Like all real science, the scientifically certain components of evolution disprove atheism, yet they still persist.

“Darwin did not pull the book title The Origin Of Species out of a hat.”

He wrote about a **process for speciation of *existing* life**. He thought life came from non-life, but didn’t have a concrete idea how. Scientists today don’t have a scientifically workable theory. Accordingly...

“Evolution is an origin-of-life story that makes God unnecessary.”

...is a fallacious appeal to consequences. Evolution as an origin-of-life story is essentially begging-the-question: an inference that presupposes itself. A logical fallacy can’t make God unnecessary. Haters will hate, atheists will deny God exists, and the sun will rise each morning. Ho hum.

“Randomness is everywhere but underneath it is a well-ordered reality of natural laws...”

I absolutely agree, because I am not a materialist. I said that God does not behave randomly but uses randomness. If God is Creator, then he created both randomness and order (e.g. probability of a baby being a boy is 50%). So...

“The Almighty does not commit nonrandom acts of randomness...”

...just because the Almighty uses randomness does not mean that he didn't order it to be so. I have no idea why you think this is a problem. If you think that randomness in nature is really just an illusion and that God has predetermined all the dice rolls, then how is that any different from Atheist Determinism or Calvinism?

"Do genetic defects happen? Of course. Do potentially beneficial mutations happen? No. Humanity is not evolving."

While an oversimplification, this is more or less correct. The thesis of my series is that we are devolving through a process of dysgenics, which incidentally is why this is the case:

"Evolution predicts that if there's one single thing that women will naturally get right, it's breeding and raising healthy children. One look at tabloid headlines, not to mention the existence and popularity of contraception, is sufficient to debunk that."

I'm curious how you would explain the past civilizations where breeding and raising healthy children was a focus of women. I explain it by noting that humanity is no longer a Darwinian-selected population and it has rejected God. These go hand-in-hand. My series will show this.

"Atheists have begun using the term "matter of established science" as a way to circle the wagons and prevent deserters from wandering off the atheist plantation. Hence my taking exception to Derek's usage of the term."

Now you sound like the thought police. If I say "matter of established science", I mean "matter of established science". Just because atheists and leftists like to dishonestly redefine anything doesn't mean I have to go along with it. I'll use whatever terms I wish to use.

"Pick a team, Derek. Are humans flawed by Original Sin or paragons of Natural Selection?"

It's a false dilemma. Selection, natural or artificial, is scientifically and historically (but limited to a point) demonstrable, with both positive and negative effects, more or less microevolution. I've **never** claimed that evolution can produce new body types (roughly, new species that cross Family boundaries), that is, macroevolution.

"Are there specific topics in evolutionary psychology I can address"

I've wondered how you can support physiognomy, the validity of which is essentially evolutionary psychology and genetics.

Bottom line is that I deeply appreciate what you are doing here. It is not something I have ever experienced on the internet. But you have not refuted anything I've said. To be fair, I have not really finished presenting my view, so it would be best if you just waited. If my views are wrong, it shouldn't be hard to refute them. I only ask for time. When I am done, let's see where we disagree. I'm not sure what else to suggest at this point.

"I'll even teach you mysticism"

Believe it or not, I am attracted to mysticism. Perhaps it is my Anabaptist roots.

5. ***Boxer***

NOVEMBER 18, 2019 AT 6:00 AM

Boxer's blog is running hot as Derek expounds on his beliefs combining evolution and Christianity. (Links below.) I don't believe I'll get a good chance to say what needs to be said there, hence this post.

Boxer's blog is not Dalrock's blog. You are absolutely welcome to argue in my comments section — though this is a much more efficient way to present a rebuttal.

6. ***Heidi***

NOVEMBER 18, 2019 AT 6:05 PM

This is perhaps a side issue, but I know of no subscribers to evolutionary theory—not atheist ones, anyway—who claim that evolution is perfect; all that they claim is that it's "good enough" to allow species to continue to exist, at least until they go extinct. Indeed, they like to point out that humans have a very high "wastage" rate—something like 20% of miscarriages, and without modern medicine roughly a 50% child mortality rate. I don't remember what the lifetime odds of maternal mortality are, but they aren't good, either. They then state that various design flaws in human beings show that we are not created by an omniscient, omnipotent deity, but are the product of random mutations, natural selection, genetic drift, genetic bottlenecks, and other accidents of nature.

7. ***Askeladd***

NOVEMBER 18, 2019 AT 6:29 PM

GunnerQ is right that the various species (created according to their respective kinds from the beginning) are devolving. Professor John Sanford demonstrates this conclusively in his "Genetic Entropy".

But this supports aspects of Derek's case in his latest (re: mouse utopia). The accretion of dysgenic individuals within a population will tend to weaken the whole. While "natural selection" does not function according to Darwin's theory – I.e. it does not adapt a lower species into a higher one over time – it can and does serve to weed out the most egregious genetic errors before they get wider distribution in the gene pool.

An affluent society will tend to have an abundance of resources. For humanitarian reasons, it will often use them to care for those who are a net drain on resources – those who in a non-affluent society would be phased out due to scarcity. This abrogation of "natural selection" has the effect of increasing the dysgenic load of the society, until the burden becomes too great and collapses the society back to a scarcity situation where, once again, only the fittest (lowest mutational load) survive.

In sum: higher selective pressures tend to preserve only the genotypes that have the highest level of fitness. Lower selective pressures preserve genotypes with lower levels of fitness, in addition.

It's really just a biomechanical version of the old saw: hard times create strong men, strong men create good times, good times create weak men, weak men create hard times.

8. *Gunner Q*

NOVEMBER 19, 2019 AT 12:03 AM

"I'm curious how you would explain the past civilizations where breeding and raising healthy children was a focus of women. I explain it by noting that humanity is no longer a Darwinian-selected population and it has rejected God. These go hand-in-hand. My series will show this."

Then I should wait to see the entire series. Thought about waiting anyway but the time for objecting to opening principles is before rather than after.

My personal theory is that the level of patriarchy/matriarchy used in a society is the most controlling factor in its overall success—reproductive, financial and otherwise. Systems that come close to God's ideal, even if they do not acknowledge God, still get the patriarchal benefit. This explains how the Middle East was the source of at least two great empires, the Egyptian and Persian, yet today they're little more than barely-literate monkeys. They're still the same race(s) but trapped in a cycle of severely flawed beliefs rather than inbreeding.

I see where our views might overlap, and if so then my concerns are reassured, but if so than the language of evolutionary psychology is unnecessary. Feminism is a consequence of poor

religion, not poor genetics, as an example.

"...is a fallacious appeal to consequences."

You are correct but us both being Christians makes it an acceptable debate tactic. We assume upfront that God is real so Him using a creation method that ends up validating unbelief in Him is a valid objection. It is not a choice He is likely to make. Forgive my reluctance to talk science but past efforts have burned me out.

...

@Boxer,

"You are absolutely welcome to argue in my comments section — though this is a much more efficient way to present a rebuttal."

Thank you for the offer. My thoughts was lengthy and wayward from the opening topics there, that's all. Besides, I need blog material too.

...

Welcome, Askeladd!

"But this supports aspects of Derek's case in his latest (re: mouse utopia). The accretion of dysgenic individuals within a population will tend to weaken the whole."

You're arguing nature over nurture here, which is the big issue I have with evopsych in Christian thinking. Evolution in every form teaches survival of the fittest, culling the weak so the strong can succeed. There's no way to reconcile that with Christian notions of justice and mercy.

In fact, Christianity thrived specifically because we're kind to those who aren't winners, genetic or otherwise. As Christ put it, "it's the sick that need a doctor, not the healthy".

Evopsych also frequently leads to behavior determinism. Example from the mouse utopia post, feminists aren't women with high mutational loads, they're women who chose Original Sin. One you start blaming external factors for the choices people make, concepts of good vs evil get diluted to helpful vs harmful.

Genetics do play a part in human behavior but evo-psych tends heavily towards "I was born this way" thinking. God allows no such excuse.

"It's really just a biomechanical version of the old saw: hard times create strong men, strong men create good times, good times create weak men, weak men create hard times."

I would quote "Righteousness exalts a nation, but sin condemns any people." for my alternative explanation of religion being the primary driver of a society's success/failure. Proverbs 14:34.

Again, there can be overlap if "strong men" means "righteous men" but righteousness is not evolution's definition of strong.

9. Pingback: [My Blog Lives On... - v5k2c2.com](#)

10. ***Askeladd***

NOVEMBER 19, 2019 AT 3:41 AM

I'm in agreement with you, GunnerQ, that striving for virtue and repudiating bad conduct is the major deciding factor in a nation's course. That said, there are more axes in play than good vs. evil.

If you'll humor a geeky reference point, I think the D&D alignment system is instructive. In addition to good/evil, you also have a lawful/chaotic axis. So, someone could be overall virtuous ("good") but still temperamentally insane ("chaotic").

As the dysgenic cohort of a society increases, mental illness and instability increase with it. In such a scenario, you will have what Derek has termed "maladaptive" behaviors proliferating, not because of lack of virtue, but because of mentation issues given rise by too many busted genes.

I've known some very, very "good" (by which I mean well-intentioned) people that I would never, ever hire as an employee, simply because their phenome was not up to the task. This phenome reflects a genome more broken down than others – sad, but true. If I hired them, for all their good intentions they would make a mess of things. Surely you've seen the same. Now extend that to a more macro level in society and you can see how the proliferation of such people would cause problems with e.g. the trains running on time.

What this means for Christian charity is a worthy, and necessary, subject of discussion. But it's unavoidable that the chaotic-good subset of the population has challenges we have to grapple with.

11. ***h0neyc0mb***

NOVEMBER 19, 2019 AT 4:17 AM

As the toilet bowl swirls ..

<https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2019/11/18/report-teacher-defends-drag-queen-at-school-condemns-bigoted-parents/>

I'll be pool-side with an adult beverage.

12. *Derek Ramsey*

NOVEMBER 20, 2019 AT 2:54 AM

"My personal theory is that the level of patriarchy/matriarchy used in a society is the most controlling factor in its overall success—reproductive, financial and otherwise."

I will be making almost exactly this point in the part of the series after the next one.

"You're arguing nature over nurture here, which is the big issue I have with evopsych in Christian thinking. Evolution in every form teaches survival of the fittest, culling the weak so the strong can succeed. There's no way to reconcile that with Christian notions of justice and mercy."

Atheists will do what atheists do: find any excuse to disbelieve God. On one hand they'll argue that some trait is "born that way" and then claim that it justifies behavior. On the other hand they'll promote pseudo-scientific blank-slatism and say that everyone is exactly equal and saying anything different is racist, classist, sexist, hateful, etc. I've seen them argue for both nature and nurture on the same issue! It doesn't matter. Whether something is 100% nature, 100% nurture, or 50/50, Christian notions of justice and mercy are just as valid. Avoid the slippery slope fallacy and promote scientific reality where it leads.

"In fact, Christianity thrived specifically because we're kind to those who aren't winners, genetic or otherwise. As Christ put it, "it's the sick that need a doctor, not the healthy"."

I've got a gifted child (IQ \geq 130) and a disabled child (IQ \sim 70). I've got three children with significant physically manifested genetic abnormalities. Despite my stance on nature, I still consistently do what I am commanded to do by God. It's simply a falsehood that acknowledging nature/genetics necessitates godless eugenics. I think I'll discuss this issue in more detail in last part of my series, as I've only mentioned it in a footnote so far.

13. Pingback: [Gunner Q is no monkey | Laughing at Feminism](#)

14. Pingback: [Analyzing the Sexual Revolution – v5k2c2.com](#)

15. Pingback: [Beyond Nature vs Nurture – v5k2c2.com](#)

16. *ikr*

DECEMBER 20, 2019 AT 6:05 AM

Bless your heart, GQ, for making this effort. I come here daily as I recognize you are a man whose discernment and intellect rival my own, yet resourcefulness clearly exceeds. I take more than I give here, for this I am thankful. Perhaps my soliloquy offers something of value. If not, blog content. A win either way.

I have seen in Derek several behaviors that denote a lack of understanding in the fundamentals of Creation, namely: why was man created, why was woman created. I have made a handful of comments on how parenting should be reflective of this understanding, and apparently the shoe fit quite snug when the comments were made. This is not meant for character assassination, but to establish a separate data point. Being a scientist myself: 'one data point is an occurrence, two data points is a trend'
(Derek, you are mentioned by name as a matter of observation, not of character attack.)

I am not without significant intellectual gifts. I can argue the case for anything in the Bible using only economics, or empirical data, or historical relevance- often allowing my audience to choose which avenue is most comfortable for their own database of knowledge. Without fail, discussions will conclude always the same way: cognitive dissonance, conclusions based on emotion, refusal/inability to acknowledge being wrong. As our National Hero Sam Clemens eloquently quipped: 'it is easier to fool someone than to convince them they have been fooled.'

I recognize more each day the futility of the effort. The gifts do not matter: the avenue does. Just as God can swear by no authority higher than Himself (He 6:13), I have ceased to argue Creation using anything but Scripture.

James Watson demonstrated for years through hard scientific method the correlation between race and intellect, receiving the highest of awards, only to be stripped of them. The 'authority' changed on the matters. However right he was/is, he went about it assuming the ground would not shift under his feet.

The second I explain to a woman her intellectually capabilities are stunted compared to man, and cite the repeated maximum scoring according to Lawrence Kohlberg's Stages of Development was a 3 out of 6, I now open the door to refute that 'those studies were biased' 'have since been disproven' etc. Now, I just cite 1 Co 14:35. If God tells women their understanding must be based on a man's teaching, why should I try to use further justification to enhance not her understanding, but ACCEPTANCE of this fact? Furthermore, this method serves to expose them as either an adherent, or a charlatan.

In fact, I have ceased to argue most any topic using anything but Scripture. Economics, ethnic importance, historical events, the topic no longer matters. 'What does the Bible say about that, and where can we read about it for context?' is the only question I ask anymore. I have never found any topic for which the Bible has a direct commandment, or gives clear guidance based on several points/examples and a drumbeat.

Regarding evolution, micro/macro there is no such thing. God formed each of us (Je 1:5). Adam was first, then me, and soon after the End comes. God does not make mistakes, and He is not random. We may perceive patterns we do not understand as being random, but that does not make them random. That statement- assertion- alone is indicative of a mind that places itself above knowledge. What a haughty concept.

God, Creation, the 'natural law', the Law... these are fixed, and the Bible tells me so.

Trying to weasel and make delineations between what is, and what isn't, is wasted effort. It matters not, it opens the door, it brings forth no fruit. And the man who tries, as you have stated, does not trust God.

The more I live, the more I realize that none of it matters. Intelligence scores do not get you into Heaven. Bank accounts do not get you into Heaven. Attending church does not get you into Heaven. While stewardship is important (because it is commanded), I find the only fruitful endeavour is to continue reading the Word and living out my Faith. I cannot force understanding to my own siblings, I cannot manifest Faith in an unbeliever online. I have a hard enough struggle with myself.

This topic is arguing the effects of Faith, or rather- a lack of Faith. We are not addressing the issue.

Perhaps my brand of intellect is conditioned to always see the endstate. Call me jaded. You are still in this fight. I pray you remain hopeful. Bless you, GQ.

17. *ikr*

DECEMBER 20, 2019 AT 6:14 AM

GQ, also, I understand what is at work here is Pr 27:17. I should have mentioned that in my closing sentence.

18. *Paul*

JANUARY 20, 2020 AT 9:49 AM

First of all, atheists KNOW neo(!)-Darwinism is incapable of explaining the origin of life, such that they carefully try to EXCLUDE the origin of life from that hypothesis.

Second, by having a non-falsifiable, hence non-scientific, but religious (!) hypothesis of the multiverse to “explain” the fine-tuning of the Creation, further shows the atheist’ dis-ingenuity.

Nonetheless, even while “officially” atheists deny neo-Darwinism is capable of explaining the origin of life, ALL scientific articles are FULL of the evolutionary equivalent of fairy-tales, doing their best to always include at least a paragraph how such-and-such a mechanism came to be according to evolutionary story-telling. These are presented in peer-reviewed journals as science-fact, whereas these “just-so” stories are nothing but science-fiction, of the non-plausible kind.

Just look at the amazing ATP Synthase macro-molecule: it’s a complex molecule that is actually a miniature electrical (!) motor, with moving (!) parts, including a rotor and stator, and which is present in ALL living cells of ALL organisms. It acts like the energy supplier of the cell, without it, cells cannot function. But ATP Synthase itself has to be constructed by that same cell for the cell to function. To that end several different complex proteins have to be constructed, and actually be actively assembled and constructed into the final ATP Synthase molecule. Both the parts of ATP Synthase, as well as the other complex molecules that construct ATP Synthase out of these parts, are encoded on DNA, and need a FUNCTIONING cell to be constructed themselves. If you try to work out the probabilities of such complex mechanism to form by pure chance, it’s totally clear it is just impossible.

[BLOG AT WORDPRESS.COM](http://BLOG.AT.WORDPRESS.COM)