

PROVING GOD—CHAPTER I  
EVOLUTION

Tom Kinney  
October 10, 1999

Believe or be damned!

I always wanted to stand in a pulpit and do that.

Believe or be damned! It just didn't offer a persuasive argument for me.

God—Almighty God, All-Seeing God, All-Controlling God, Redeeming God, Jealous God, Vengeful God, Loving God, All Powerful God—

A God like that has just got to leave tracks.

After all, the existence of the planet, Pluto, was a matter of faith before it could be proven. Scientific philosophers proposed the existence of atoms and then research scientists proved their existence—theory, faith, followed by proof. Ditto with neutrons, quarks, brain functions, viruses, DNA, underground oil supplies, pre-historic birds, massive meteor strikes, black holes, a round world, and the big bang. I think we've got the round world theory on pretty sound footing, but the big bang issue is still a bit shaky around the edges.

God as a being—God that influences—God of substance—a God that is more than a whimsical feeling through the ether.

Yes, a God like that has just got to leave tracks.

And the existence of such a God should be provable!!

The phrase "I know God exists because..." leads to most fascinating conversations among folks who have thought deeply about this issue. And I have looked at a few of these reasons in search of a sounder foundation for myself. This morning, let's look at "I know God exists because we could not have evolved without Supreme Being guidance." This may be the first, or, depending on your response, the last in a series of Proving God.

This has nothing to do with the Kansas State Board of Education decision not to include evolution on their Standard of Learning tests. They don't include deep sea siltation and meme theory either. But the media sensationalized the action and the reactionaries move into full cry—so much for teaching tolerance. Hopefully, no one here will be offended by what follows.

The hypothesis is, evolution could not have happened without Him, with a capital H.

Big debate among some heavy hitting philosophers. Phillip E. Johnson illustrates the debate in his August 16 Wall Street Journal article, “Darwin on Trial”, by quoting first Richard Dawkins exults that Darwin “made it possible to be an intellectually fulfilled atheist”.

Followed by Carl Sagan who had nothing but contempt for those who deny that humans and all other species “arose by blind physical and chemical forces over eons of slime”.

Then Stephen Jay Gould condescendingly offering to allow religious people to express their subjective opinions about morals, provided they don’t interfere with the authority of scientists to determine the “facts”—one of the facts being that God is merely a comforting myth.

The really important claim of the theory—that the Darwinian mechanism does away with the need to presuppose a creator—is protected by semantic defense-in-depth.

Now, this morning we will dispose of the semantic defense-in-depth and try for the heart of the issue—is it possible that natural selection alone has brought us the here and now—step by step—occasionally a giant step? But hurdling that giant step by use of a crane for the heavy lifting, not a skyhook—cranes are big-time helpers grounded in face, skyhooks are, borrowing from a familiar old book, miracles.

Paleoanthropology has offered an ever-growing understanding of the origin of *homo sapiens*—new tools such as DNA analysis has increased that pace immensely. What we perceived thirty years ago is as obsolete as the vacuum tube radio. What we perceived five years ago is as threatened as mailing letters to your kid in college as opposed to e-mail. Journals and technical magazines are trying to keep pace with new developments—books are too slow.

Archaeology Magazine, July/August, 1999, contained an excerpt by Ian Tattersall, curator of anthropology at the American Museum of Natural History and author of the recently released “Becoming Human”.

Over the past fifty years, the sheer number of human fossils known and the variety of species these fossils represent have expanded enormously. What all of these discoveries have made clear is that, far from having been a single-minded linear struggle, a matter of constantly perfecting adaptation, the history of the hominid family has been one of repeated evolutionary trial and error: of new hominid species spawned, competing, and becoming extinct. Today, we take it for granted that *homo sapiens* is the lone hominid on Earth, but this is probably unusual. In the past, coexistence and competition among hominid species have quite likely been much more typical. This realization is salutary, for, whereas our egotistical species likes to think of itself as the pinnacle of evolution, an accurate view of ourselves requires recognizing *homo sapiens* as merely one more twig on a great branching bush of evolutionary experimentation.

Last week it was Andy in the trees,--this week it’s me in the bushes.

Paleoanthropologist Erik Trinkaus of Washington University in St. Louis reports the discovery of the 25,000 year old skeletal remains of a four-year-old child in the Lapedo Valley north of Lisbon, Portugal. The prominent chin, tooth size, and pelvic measurements marks the boy as a Cro-Magnon, or fully modern human, but his stocky body and short legs indicate a “dead-ringer” for Neanderthal skeletons. While Neanderthals are thought to have been extinct 3000 years before the boy was born, he appears to be a descendant of Neanderthal—Cro-Magnon hybrids. Interbreeding would suggest that Neanderthals belonged to our species and contributed genes to European ancestry.

It is no longer a chain in which new finds can be set, one link after another. It is now a puzzle of many species, a complex bush, most of whose branches became extinct.

The work of Vince Sarich and Allan Wilson of the University of California, Berkeley, on molecular evidence reinforced years later through DNA studies show that chimpanzees and gorillas are much more closely related to humans than they are to orangutans. In fact, chimpanzees share more than 99 percent of their genetic material with humans, even though it is packaged in their chromosomes in a different way. In 1992, the discovery by Tim White of *Ardipithecus ramidus* in Ethiopia added to the fossil record. This species, which seems to be very close to the point of divergence between chimpanzees and human ancestors, dates to 4.4 million years ago, perhaps confirming the genetic evidence.

The paleontological evidence currently suggests that some 2.5 million years ago or so, probably in relation to increasing aridity, *australoithecines* gave birth to several lineages. One, *Paranthropus*, adopted a new vegetarian diet requiring intensive chewing. Another, the *Homo* lineage, developed some degree of meat-eating. This behavior, associated with the ability to hunt small mammals, also exists, to a lesser extent, in chimpanzees. It is probably not a coincidence that the first stone tools were produced at this time.

*Homo erectus* was shown to encompass a huge span of time, from 1.8 million to 300,000 years ago, and a vast territory covering most of the Old World. This led some anthropologists to reconsider the status of this species and the emergence of *Homo sapiens*. In 1996, Carl Swisher of the Berkeley Geochronological Center dated *Homo erectus* on Java to fewer than 50,000 years ago. If confirmed, this controversial dating would support the concept of a conservative Asian lineage that was not part of the origins of *Homo sapiens* and survived even after the emergence of fully modern humans.

In mitochondrial DNA studies, African populations demonstrate the largest genetic variation, while all other modern populations are rooted within the African variation. The common ancestor of all modern people is 200,000 to 100,000 years old, and modern humans spread around the globe after a recent exodus from Africa. Nowadays, this has become a new orthodoxy and most discussion focuses on the possibility of some hybridization between modern invaders out of Africa and local archaic populations, including Neanderthals in Europe and possibly *Homo erectus* in Asia.

Contrarily, the best documented of the archaic populations, the Neanderthals, have been shown to have developed in Europe and expanded toward the Middle East and Central Asia. Neanderthal lineage could be identified at least 450,000 years ago. In 1997, for the first time, the structure of a small fragment of mitochondrial DNA extracted from a bone found in the Neander Valley in 1856 was analyzed. On average, it proved to differ more from any similar piece of modern mitochondrial DNA than two modern similar pieces differ from one another, indicating a separation of Neanderthal lineage of several hundred thousand years old.

Our family tree is no longer a linear series of species, but a dense bush with many dead branches. The quest for the famous "missing link" has become vain, simply because we no longer deal with a simple chain.

Another reference you will hear from this morning is Daniel C. Dennett's Darwin's Dangerous Idea—Evolution and the Meanings of Life. I will loan it to our library if anyone is interested.

“Has it ever occurred to you how lucky you are to be alive? More than 99 percent of all the creatures that have ever lived have died without progeny, but not a single one of your ancestors, from the earliest amoebae to your immediate parents, falls into that group! What a royal lineage of winners you come from! (Of course, the same thing is true of every barnacle, every blade of grass, every housefly.) But it's even eerier than that. We have learned, have we not, that evolution works by weeding out the unfit? Thanks to their design defects, these losers have a 'pathetic but praiseworthy tendency to die before reproducing their kind'. This is the very engine of Darwinian evolution. If, however, we look back with tunnel vision at your family tree, we will find many different organisms, with a wide variety of strengths and weaknesses, but, curiously enough, THEIR weaknesses never led a single one of them to a premature demise! So it looks from this angle as if evolution can't explain even a SINGLE FEATURE that you inherited from your ancestors! Notice first that eventually it stops fanning out and begins to double up, you share MULTIPLE ancestors with everybody else alive today, and are multiply related to many of your own ancestors. When we look at the whole family tree over time, we see that the later, more recent ancestors have improvements that the earlier ones lacked, but all the crucial events—all the selection events—happen offstage: not a single one of your ancestors, all the way back to the bacteria, succumbed to predation before reproducing, or lost out to the competition for a mate.”

“Cooperation and the other virtues are, in genera, rare and special properties that can only emerge under very particular and complex R- and D- circumstances. We might contrast this with the Pollyannian Paradigm, which cheerfully assumes, with Pollyanna, that Mother Nature is Nice. In general, she isn't—but that isn't the end of the world. Even in the present case, we can see that there are other perspectives to adopt. Aren't we really rather fortunate, for instance, that trees are so insuperably selfish? The beautiful forest—to say nothing of the beautiful wooden sailing ships and the clean white paper on which we write our poetry—could not exist if trees weren't selfish in their quest for sunshine.

Can you imagine a commune of short trees all agreeing to share the sun and not compete?"

"Mother Nature has no reason to avoid high-risk gambits in genetic variations; she takes them all, and shrugs when most of them lose.

"The physics and chemistry of life are now understood in dazzling detail, so that much more can be deduced about the necessary and (perhaps) sufficient conditions for life....There would be no point any more in trying to pursue Darwin's policy of reticence; of not stepping on the toes to old beliefs, too many very interesting cats are already out of the bag. We may not yet know exactly HOW to take all these ideas seriously, but thanks to Darwin's secure beachhead in biology, we know that we CAN and MUST.

"Even today people complain, saying that by treating the hypothesis of God as just one more scientific hypothesis, to be evaluated by the standards of science in particular and rational thought in general,...(we)...are ignoring the very widespread claim by believers in God that their faith is quite beyond reason, not a matter to which such mundane methods of testing applies. It is not just unsympathetic,...but strictly unwarranted for me simply to assume that the scientific method continues to apply with full force in this domain of faith."

Applying the scientific method to God may be considered nonsense or worse by others. But I'm not a person of letters, an artist, a theologian, a social philosopher (although I do dabble a bit) and everyone knows I'm certainly not a diplomat. For me, more technologically and scientifically oriented, I'm researching God tracks and am not concerned if she know it.

The philosopher Ronald de Sousa once memorably described philosophical theology as "intellectual tennis without a net", and we have been assuming that net of rational judgment was up. But we can lower it if you really want to. It's your serve. Whatever you serve, suppose I return service rudely as follows: "What you say implies that God is a ham sandwich wrapped in tinfoil. That's not much of a God to worship!"

If you then volley back, demanding to know how I can logically justify my claim that your serve has such a preposterous implication, I will reply: "Oh, do you want the net up for my returns, but not for your serves? Either the net stays up, or it stays down. If the net is down, there are no rules and anybody can say anything, a mug's game if there ever was one."

Now, if you want to reason about faith, and offer a reasoned (and reason-responsive) defense of faith as an extra category of belief worthy of special consideration, I'm eager to play. I certainly grant the existence of the phenomenon of faith; what I want to see is a reasoned ground for taking faith seriously as a way of getting to the truth, and not, say, just as a way people comfort themselves and each other (a worthy function that I do take seriously).

So, here we go—the net is up.

“Once upon a time, there was no mind, and no meaning, and no error, and no function, and no reasons, and no life. Now, all these wonderful things exist. It has to be possible to tell the story of how they all came to exist, and that story must pass, by subtle increments, from elements that manifestly LACK the marvelous properties to elements that manifestly HAVE them. There will have to be isthmuses of dubious or controversial or just plain unclassifiable intermediates. All these wonderful properties must have come into existence gradually, by steps that are barely discernible even in retrospect.”

“One of the standard marks of species difference, as Darwin fully recognized, is reproductive isolation—there is no interbreeding. It is interbreeding that reunites the splitting groups, mixing their genes and ‘frustrating’ the process of speciation. It is not that anything wants speciation to happen, of course, but if the irreversible divorce that marks speciation is to happen, it must be preceded by a sort of trial separation period in which interbreeding ceases for one reason or another, so that the parting groups can move further apart. The criterion of reproductive isolation is vague at the edges. Wolves and coyotes and dogs are considered to be different species, and yet interbreeding does occur, and—unlike mules, the offspring of horse and donkey—their offspring are not in general sterile. Dachshunds and Irish wolfhounds are deemed to be of the same species, but unless their owners provide some distinctly unnatural arrangements, they are about as reproductively isolated as bats are from dolphins.

“A classic example of the ‘well-defined’ blurring issue is that of the herring gull. As we look at the herring gull, moving westwards from Great Britain to North America, we see gulls that are recognizably herring gulls, although they are a little different from the British form. We can follow them, as their appearance gradually changes, as far as Siberia. At about this point in the continuum, the gull looks more like the form that in Great Britain is called the lesser black-backed gull. From Siberia, across Russia, to northern Europe, the gull gradually changes to look more and more like the British lesser black-backed gull. Finally, in Europe, the ring is complete; the two geographically extreme forms meet, to form two perfectly good species; the herring and the lesser black-backed gull can be both distinguished by their appearance and do not naturally interbreed.

“Of course, evolution DOES explain all the features that you inherited from your ancestors, but not be explaining why YOU are lucky enough to have them. It explains why today’s winners have the features they do, but not way THESE INDIVIDUALS have the features they do.”

The following is from God Is in the Details by Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, 1959.

“How long did it take Johann Sebastian Bach to create the St. Matthew Passion? An early version was performed in 1727 or 1729, but the version we listen to today dates from ten years later, and incorporates many revisions. How long did it take to create Johann Sebastian Bach? He had the benefit of forty-two years of living when the first version was heard, and more than half a century when the later version was completed.

How long did it take to create the Christianity without which the St. Matthew Passion would have been literally inconceivable by Bach or anyone else? Roughly two millennia. How long did it take to create the social and cultural context in which Christianity could be born? Somewhere between a hundred million and three million years—depending on when we decide to date the birth of human culture. And how long did it take to create *Homo sapiens*? Between three and four billion years, roughly the same length of time it took to create daisies and snail darters, blue whales and spotted owls. Billions of years of IRREPLACEABLE design work.”

“We correctly intuit a kinship between the finest productions of art and science and the glories of the biosphere. William Paley was right about one thing: our need to explain how it can be that the universe contains many wonderful designed things. Darwin’s dangerous idea is that they ALL exist as fruits of a single tree, the Tree of Life, and the processes that have produced each and every one of them are, at bottom, the same. The genius exhibited by Mother Nature can be disassembled into many acts of micro-genius—myopic or blind, purposeless but capable of the most minimal sort of recognition of a good (a better) thing. The genius of Bach can likewise be disassembled into many acts of micro-genius, tiny mechanical transitions between brain states generating and testing, discarding and revising, and testing again. Then, is Bach’s brain like the proverbial monkeys at the typewriters? No, because instead of generating a vast number of alternatives, Bach’s brain generated only a vanishingly small subset of all the possibilities. His genius can be measured, if you want to measure genius, in the excellence of his particular subset of generated candidates.”

If speciation is indeed a random, unguided process, how about God the Lawgiver, establishing the Laws of Nature and the Constants of the Universe and then turning everything loose to see what happens? Is there an alternative?

“As more and more has been learned about the development of the universe since the Big Bang, about the conditions that permitted the formation of galaxies and stars and the heavy elements from which planets can be formed, physicist and cosmologists have been more and more struck by the exquisite sensitivity of the laws of nature....The fundamental constants of physics—the speed of light, the constant of gravitational attraction, the weak and strong forces of subatomic interaction, Planck’s constant—have values that of course permit the actual development of the universe as we know it to have happened....So isn’t it a wonderful fact that the laws are just right for us to exist? Indeed, one might want to add, we almost didn’t make it!”

(From the Laws of Nature) ...”Thank God for those laws! Well? Shouldn’t we? If the laws were any different, the Tree of Life might never have sprung up. We may have figured out a way of excusing God from the task of designing the replication-machinery system (which can design itself automatically if any of the theories discussed in the previous section are right, or on the right track) but even if we concede that this is so, we still have the stupendous fact that the laws do permit this wonderful unfolding to happen, and that has been quite enough to inspire many people to surmise that the Intelligence of the Creator is the Wisdom of the Lawgiver, instead of the Ingenuity of the Engineer.

“When Darwin entertains the idea that the laws of nature are designed by God, he has distinguished company, past and present. Newton insisted that the original arrangement of the universe was inexplicable by ‘mere natural cause’ and could only be ascribed to ‘the Counsel and Contrivance of a Voluntary Agent’. Einstein spoke of the laws of nature as the ‘secrets of the Old One’ and famously expressed his disbelief in the role of chance in quantum mechanics by proclaiming ‘Gott Wurfelt nicht’—God does not play dice. More recently, the astronomer Fred Hoyle has said, ‘I do not believe that any scientist who examined the evidence would fail to draw the inference that the laws of nuclear physics have been deliberately designed with regard to the consequences they produce inside the stars’...the physicist and cosmologist Freeman Dyson puts the point much more cautiously: ‘I do not claim that the architecture of the universe proves the existence of God. I claim only that the architecture of the universe is consistent with the hypothesis that mind plays an essential role in its functioning’. Darwin himself was prepared to propose an honorable truce at this point, but Darwinian thinking carries on, with a momentum created by the success of its earlier applications to the same issue in other contexts.”

“Should we then make the statement “Since these things are necessary for conscious creatures to exist, and since we are conscious, the world MUST contain such elements”. But notice that there is a loose cannon on the deck in the previous sentence: the wandering “must”. Rules of logic say the only valid conclusion is that the world does contain such elements for us to exist, not that it had to contain such elements....Similarly, Darwin deduces that human beings must have evolved from a common ancestor of the chimpanzee, or that all life must have arisen from a single beginning, and some people, unaccountably, take these deductions as claims that human beings are somehow a necessary PRODUCT of evolution, or that is a necessary FEATURE of our planet, but nothing of the kind follows from Darwin’s deductions properly construed.”

“Nothing happens in the Life world that isn’t strictly implied—logically deducible by straightforward theorem-proving—by the physics and the initial configuration of cells. Some of the things in the Life world are just more marvelous and unanticipated (by us, with our puny intellects) than others....What if we set in motion a huge herd of these self-reproducers, and let them compete for resources? And suppose they then evolved—that is, their descendants were not exact duplicates of them. Would these descendants have a greater claim to having been designed? Perhaps, but there is no line to be drawn between merely ordered things and designed things. The engineer starts with some *objets trouves*, found objects with properties that can be harnessed in larger constructions, but the differences between designed and manufactured nail, a sawn plank, and a naturally occurring slab of slate are not ‘principled’. Sea gull wings are great lifters, hemoglobin macromolecules are superb transporting machines, glucose molecules are nifty energy-packets, and carbon atoms are outstanding all-purpose stickum-binders.”

“...we can extrapolate a positive Darwinian alternative to the hypothesis that our laws are a gift from God. What would the Darwinian alternative have to be? That there has been



an evolution of worlds (in the sense of whole universes), and the world we find ourselves in is simply one among countless others that have existed through eternity.”

Might it be that there has been some sort of differential reproduction of universes, with some varieties having more “offspring” than others? Hume’s Philo toyed with this idea....:

“And what surprise must we entertain, when we find HIM a stupid mechanic, who imitated others, and copied an art, which, through a long succession of ages, after multiplied trials, mistakes, corrections, deliberations, and controversies, had been gradually improving? Many worlds might have been botched and bungled, throughout eternity, ere this system was struck out: Much labor lost: Many fruitless trials made: And a slow, but continued improvement carried on during infinite ages of world-making.”

“Hume imputes the ‘continued improvement’ to the minimal selective bias of a ‘stupid mechanic’, but we can replace the stupid mechanic with something even stupider without dissipating the lifting power, a purely algorithmic Darwinian process of world-trying...The basic idea is that the singularities known as black holes are in effect the birthplaces of offspring universes, in which the fundamental physical constants would differ slightly, in random ways, from the physical constants in the parent universe. So, according to Smolin’s hypothesis, we have both differential reproduction and mutation, the two essential features of any Darwinian selection algorithm.”

“This idea exploits no version of selection at all, but simply draws attention to the fact that we have eternity to play with. There is no five-billion-year deadline in this instance, the way there is for the evolution of life on Earth....Several versions of this speculation have been seriously considered by physicists and cosmologists in recent years. John Archibal Wheeler, for instance, has proposed that the universe oscillates back and forth for eternity: a Big Bang is followed by expansion, which is followed by contraction into a Big Crunch, which is followed by another Big Bang, and so forth forever, with random variations in the constants and other crucial parameters occurring in each oscillation. Each possible setting is tried an infinity of times, and so every variation on every theme, both those that ‘make sense’ and those that are absurd, spins itself out, not once but an infinity of times.”

It is hard to believe that this idea is empirically testable in any meaningful way, but we should reserve judgment. Variations or elaborations on the theme just might have implications that could be confirmed or disconfirmed. In the meantime, it is worth noting that this family of hypotheses does have the virtue of extending the principles of explanation that work so well in testable domains all the way out. Consistency and simplicity are in its favor.

Is it so impossible that, with an infinite time to play with—AND each organism not quite an exact copy of its parent—that simple natural selection could not create the world we live in?

Maybe our “gut feel” of the odds of this happening is what makes it difficult to comprehend. What do you think the odds are of someone in this room winning FOUR straight of four coin tosses? 20% 50% 70% What if I told you 100% positive sure?

Let’s try. Pair off, with each loser standing aside for the next coin toss.

“Anybody who won a coin-tossing tournament would be tempted to think he was blessed with magical powers, especially if he had no direct knowledge of the other players. Suppose you were to create a ten-round coin-tossing tournament without letting each of the 1,024 “contestants” realize he was entered in a tournament. You say to each one as you recruit him, “Congratulations, my friend. I am Mephistopheles, and I am going to bestow great powers on you. With me at your side, you are going to win ten consecutive coin tosses without a loss!” You then arrange for your dupes to meet, pairwise, until you have a final winner. (You never let the contestants discuss your relation to them, and you kiss off the 1,023 losers along the way with some sotto voce gibe to the effect that they were pretty gullible to believe your claim about being Mephistopheles!) The winner—and there must be one—will certainly have been given evidence of being a Chosen One....The inner doesn’t see that the situation was structure so that somebody simply had to be the lucky one—and he just happened to be it.”

“Now if the universe were structured in such a way that an infinity of different ‘laws of physics’ got tried out in the fullness of time, we would be succumbing to the same temptation were we to draw any conclusions about the laws of nature being prepared especially for us. This is not an argument for the conclusion that the universe is, or must be, so structured, but just for the more modest conclusion that no feature of the observable ‘laws of nature’ could be invulnerable to this alternative, deflationary interpretation.”

“It is time to turn the burden of proof around, the way Darwin did when he challenged his critics to describe some OTHER way—other than natural selection—in which all the wonders of nature could have arisen. Those who think the human mind is nonalgorithmic should consider the hubris presupposed by that conviction. If Darwin’s dangerous idea is right, an algorithmic process is powerful enough to design a nightingale and a tree. Should it be that much harder for an algorithmic process to write an ode to a nightingale or a poem as lovely as a tree? Surely Orgel’s Second Rule is correct: Evolution is cleverer than you are.”

“...quoted the physicist Paul Davies proclaiming that the reflective power of human minds can be ‘no trivial detail, no minor byproduct of mindless purposeless forces’, and suggested that being a byproduct of mindless purposeless forces was no disqualification for importance. And I have argued that Darwin has shown us how, in fact, EVERYTHING of importance is just such a product. Spinoza called his highest being God or Nature, expressing a sort of pantheism. There have been many varieties of pantheism, but they usually lack a convincing EXPLANATION about just how God is distributed in the whole of nature....Darwin offers us one: it is in the distribution of

Design through nature, creating an actual pattern in the immeasurable reaches of Design Space that could never be exactly duplicated in its many details. What is design work? It is that wonderful wedding of chance and necessity, happening in a trillion places at once, at a trillion different levels. And what miracle caused it? None. It just happened to happen, in the fullness of time. You could even say, in a way, that the Tree of Life created itself. Not in a miraculous, instantaneous whoosh, but slowly, slowly, over billions of years.”

Is this Tree of Life a God one could worship? Pray to? Fear? Probably not. But it DID make the ivy twine and the sky so blue, so perhaps the song tells a truth after all. The Tree of Life is neither perfect nor infinite in space or time, but it is actual, and if it is not Anselm’s “Being greater than which nothing can conceive”, it is surely a being that is greater than anything any of us will ever conceive of in detail worthy of its detail. Is something sacred? Yes. I could not pray to it, but I can stand in affirmation of its magnificence.

Is there a viable alternative to a God Being or a God Force having a hand in evolution? It appears so.

Then I must look elsewhere for my proof of God.