

Creation Vs. Evolution? No Contest!

By Dr. David H. Stone

Copyright 2011 by David H. Stone

This material cannot be reprinted or copied onto electronic media without the expressed written permission of the author.

Self-Published by

Dr. David H. Stone

who can be contacted via:

<http://truthreallymatters.com>
drdave@truthreallymatters.com

All Scripture quotations are from the King James Version of the Bible.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Preface	3
Introduction – My personal journey to find Truth	5
0. Make up your mind. Only wimps compromise!	8
1. Probabilities vs. Impossibilities	23
2. The Incredible Cell	34
3. Mutations & natural selection destroy information.	43
4. Genetically, there is no time for evolution.	52
5. The fossil evidence refutes evolution.	60
6. Life is irreducibly complex.	71
7. Mindboggling Organs and Organisms	79
8. It's not science if it's not falsifiable.	88
9. Come on, give me your best shot!	96
10. The universe is younger than you think.	106
11. How does all this fit into your life?	114
Appendices:	
1. How I know with certainty that the Bible is true	117
2. A short biographical sketch of the author	127

Preface

Why another book on the subject of creation vs. evolution? Since 1961 and the publication of Whitcomb and Morris' *The Genesis Flood*, there has been a renaissance of creationist literature. A library of apologetics literature is readily available for every relevant scientific discipline, including astronomy, geology, paleontology, biology, and genetics. The serious Christian can find a wealth of scientific support associated with every aspect of a Biblical worldview. The open-minded skeptic who actually investigates the subject will quickly find an abysmal lack of evidence to support his evolutionary faith and will be amazed at how clear the connections are between observational evidence and a Biblical model for origins.

I enthusiastically recommend my three favorite creationist ministries, outside of my own at truthreallymatters.com, located online at answersingenesis.org, icr.org, and creation.com. They each provide enormous free archives of articles and blogs to get answers on almost any question imaginable – if an answer is Scripturally or scientifically possible. They also offer books, seminars, and magazines for sale which will stimulate the imagination of anyone who grapples with the big questions of the existence of man and the universe. (Is there anyone (sentient) who doesn't care about the big issues?)

On truthreallymatters.com I have provided cogent essays on many of the subjects in this book. There is a good bit of overlap between web site and book, but each contains much that you won't find in the other. Also, note the web essays on evangelism, including "Tracts – Choosing and Using." In that article you will find a number of tracts I have designed specifically for atheists / evolutionists that I use on college campuses.

So why this book? In part because I love the subject passionately, I feel compelled to take my own crack at distilling the key arguments and offering practical applications for evangelism and discipleship. In fact, one shortcoming of much creationist literature is the lack of distillation for practical use. A typical Christian who wants to learn the subject reads books, attends seminars, and ingests a large volume of facts, interpretation, and evidence. Perhaps too much, unless a deliberate effort is made to condense the vital topics into bite-sized, cogent, and hard-hitting punch lines.

For the Christian, knowledge and skill in the subject pays off in two significant ways. First, the believer's faith must be founded on Biblical truth, with a complete confidence that God has given us historical truth with the intent that we can understand it directly. We don't need the help of atheists to warp our understanding of simple Biblical language, in order that we may conform more to an atheistic model of origins. Faith is never blind, but built on a sure foundation. In every single circumstance in which I can correlate the Biblical record with science, archeology, and history, I find perfect sync. In part, because of this, whenever the Bible tells me something that I cannot independently verify, I find it easy to trust God at His word. Too many Christians are too weak in knowledge and too low in confidence to defend the historical record of Genesis, which is foundational to the Gospel. Christians: Don't cower in fear! Man up! All of the evidence is on your side!! The evolutionist has nothing but stories to support his irrational beliefs!!!

The second payoff for education in origins is in the context of evangelism. For the unbeliever or compromiser, the Genesis record may be the intellectual stumbling block that hinders him from repenting and trusting Christ. I was in that situation myself, as I describe in the next chapter. Granted, it is the addiction to willful sins that keeps any sinner from Christ. Nevertheless, there are those who will not listen to the Gospel, including a message of judgment and repentance, unless their evolutionary

foundation stones are broken asunder. Christians who care for the lost (excuse my redundancy – if you *are* a Christian then you *must* care) will be prepared to give answers when required (1 Peter 3:15).

I've also written this book for you, if you are an evolutionist . . . namely, not a Christian. Certainly, all atheists are evolutionists. The atheistic explanation for origins is essentially that nothing produced everything, including matter and the physical laws, which then proceeded to naturally produce the wonderful complexity of the present order. I realize that there are many who profess to be Christians of a sort, but imagine that God used the Big Bang and evolutionary processes to get us here. I have no patience for theistic evolutionists. The whole point of evolutionary philosophy has been to murder all consideration of a Creator God. All of the historical architects of evolutionism, along with the materialistic zealots of today, promote evolution in order to buttress atheism. The theistic evolutionist imagines that he can get along with both camps, somehow. In fact, he gets no respect from the atheists and none from me. My intent is focused on convincing him that his unbelief is compelling evidence of a lost condition and repentance unto salvation is the remedy.

If you are an atheist with some remnant of an open mind, you will find in this book both a philosophical framework to examine the subject, plus a vault of specific evidentiary data and arguments that will turn you around. Don't think so? Test me. If you finish the book still holding onto evolutionary fantasies, then please provide *specific* data and counterarguments. I can recognize assertions, blustering, and elephant hurling . . . surely the committed atheist has similar discernment.

I began to compile the material for this book many years ago in order to teach a college-age group. If you, O Christian, don't think this issue is vital, please reconsider. Christians have too little instruction in this area and so are easily intimidated by the pseudo-intellectuals in academia and the media who preach evolutionism. There is no reason to be faint-hearted in the defense of the Biblical creation record! All the data and logic are on our side!

Also, if you do any personal evangelism on college campuses, you had better be equipped in this area. Not just to avoid embarrassment, but rather so you can be a help to the lost sinner who has a real stumbling block due to evolutionary propaganda. If you can dent his foundation a bit, he may just be willing to open his ears to the truth of the Gospel. If the Christian insists on remaining uneducated on the issues that prevent consideration of the Gospel, he will be a poor servant.

Dr. David H. Stone

drdave@truthreallymatters.com

<http://truthreallymatters.com>

Introduction

My personal journey to find Truth

I wasn't "born into" a Biblical worldview. I was raised in a very traditional Roman Catholic family, detoured into atheism as a teenager, was challenged by *reasonable* arguments to consider the truth of the Gospel, became a Christian, and finally settled on a solid Biblical foundation. Over the years I have come to recognize and validate that the word of God is fully trustworthy, consistent, and perfect – both theologically and scientifically.

As I grew up in the RC Church on the south side of Chicago I was fully engaged in religious activities, but had never carefully examined the foundations of my beliefs. In short, I was an eager churchgoer and would have professed to be a loyal Catholic youth. I certainly wasn't a born again Christian, however. I trusted that some combination of canned prayers, active service within "The Church," and avoidance of 'big' sins would earn me a berth in Heaven. I didn't realize that ALL sins are "big" (mortal) enough to earn Hell: "*For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.*" (James 2:10)

There were two powerful forces working against my belief system. Even though all in my extended family were religious churchgoers, my dad was a skeptic. He took delight in pointing out inconsistencies in church doctrine and in the bloody history of what has often purported to be Christianity — most notably the Inquisition. What I didn't realize was that true Christians were always on the receiving end of persecutions.

Aside: I recommend the book, *History of the Churches*, by David Cloud (wayoflife.org), for a faithful summary of the history of genuine Christianity over the last two thousand years. If you have studied the subject at all, you are aware of competing versions of history. The RCC claims to be the founder and keeper of the Christian faith, claiming a line of papal succession back to the apostle Peter. These claims are easily found to be specious, but you'll have to decide which historians are telling you the truth. (It's not hard to figure out.) For a short review of who the Christians were and how they fared since New Testament times, you should access *The Trail of Blood*, by J.M. Carroll, which can be found online. Validating history will help you discern among the ridiculous variety of present-day branches of Christendom, so you can avoid teaming up with the wrong (unbiblical) crowd. (I also encourage you to review the essays on my web site, truthreallymatters.com, including my article, "The 10 Most Deadly Heresies . . .".) **End Aside.**

The second force was the culture of evolutionism in which I was immersed. I spent considerable time in the museums in Chicago, which have always been completely saturated with evolution as the naturalistic explanation for life. Additionally, everything I was exposed to in literature and the media that touched the subject of origins was evolutionary. I didn't know then that I'd been sold a "story," but that all the scientific evidence pointed overwhelmingly to Biblical creation, as recorded in Genesis. In the 1960s there were a very few books on creation out there, but I certainly hadn't noticed any.

As a precocious 13-year-old, and at the insistence of my mother, I brought a flock of questions to the smartest priest my family could find. We spent an hour together one Saturday afternoon discussing the origin and meaning of life and the universe. I had even prepared a "white paper," four single-spaced typed pages that laid out my version of a mechanistic universe, void of free will. After all, if physics and chemistry explain everything, then wither free will? He couldn't give me an answer for any of my

concerns. That unsatisfying meeting confirmed my decision to be an atheist. Who needed God? “The Church” didn’t make sense, especially in lieu of its bloody history, and everything in the universe could be explained by atheistic evolution — it seemed.

I was a miserable atheist for the next three years. No one in my life was even aware of my agony. I was a “straight-A” student and enjoyed playing varsity sports. I had it made in the shade. Inside, the story was very different. What point is there to life if we are just animals and death means the end of it all? At the depths of my depression, God had mercy on me and sent me a friend who was a Christian. He and his family embraced me and answered my arrogant questions with kindness. They gave me some books to read that convinced me that I didn’t “know it all.” Importantly, I saw the love of Jesus in their lives and a purpose lacking in mine. That gave them high marks for credibility in my eyes, so that I was encouraged to grapple with the issues. Their consistent Christian behavior and testimony was not capable of converting me, of course. My mind had to change. But this family’s care opened the door for me to look critically at the evidence. Which worldview made more sense of life and the universe?

It took me about four months to realize that the Bible is absolutely true – scientifically, logically, historically, prophetically, and above all . . . personally. Namely, God’s word convicted me of my sinful life and my need for the Savior. In a flash I realized that if the Bible is true, I’d be crazy to defy God. It’s not enough to “know” the truth. I had to repent from the specific sins of my daily life and the arrogant attitudes of my mind and heart, trusting Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior. As Paul describes in 2 Corinthians 5:17, old things passed away and I became a new creature. I was born again and haven’t been the same since.

I didn’t entirely understand how to reconcile evolution with my new faith . . . the scientific culture that I so admired was completely saturated with naturalism . . . but I had great determination to do so. I knew that the evolutionary paradigm and the historical record of Genesis chapters 1 to 11 are implacable enemies. So I began to study the subject over the next few years. Finally I concluded that true science is perfectly consistent with the Bible. I could accept the truth of Genesis — most notably a six-day creation and a literal worldwide flood — without compromise. I figured out that hybrid positions like theistic evolution were offenses both to God and to scientific reason. Theistic evolutionists attempt to peacefully coexist with atheists. But there is no communion between light and darkness (2 Corinthians 6:14). God reveals Himself in the Bible as the source of life and goodness. Man brought sin into the world (Genesis 3, Romans 5:12, 1 Corinthians 15:21). That’s why we need the Savior (1 Corinthians 15:21-22, Romans 6:23). When God pronounced his creation “good” (Gen 1:31), He meant it!

Evolution would be a sickening and destructive method of creation for a loving God. Bloody competition, extinction of millions of species of animals and plants — survival of the fittest and destruction of the unfit. That’s not the God of the Bible who provides for the birds of the air (Matthew 6:26) and praises those who are kind to animals (Proverbs 12:10)! Is the world filled with disease, death, and destruction? Indeed. But it’s our fault, not God’s. When we went our own way (and still continue to do so), following Satan’s advice, God withdrew *some* of His sustaining care.

One particular quote from an evolutionist affirms the conflict between the two views. Evolutionist Jacques Monod wrote:

[Natural] selection is the blindest, and most cruel way of evolving new species, and more and more complex and refined organisms . . . The struggle for life and elimination of the weakest is a horrible process, against which our whole modern ethics revolts. [An] ideal society is a non-selective society, one

where the weak is protected; which is exactly the reverse of the so-called natural law. I am surprised that a Christian would defend the idea that this is the process which God more or less set up in order to have evolution.

As I studied the literature on origins I was impressed that there were fatal weaknesses in the arguments for evolution. These discoveries excited me because my spirit (and the Holy Spirit inside me) seemed to cry out for a simple trust in the word of God. I became convinced that evolution as an explanation for life and the universe itself is impossible. The rest of this book contains a sampling of the evidence that would lead any rational seeker of truth to the same conclusion.

Everyone embraces a worldview through which he filters observations and ideas. In talking one-to-one with thousands of individuals over many years, I have discovered that everyone believes that he has the world essentially figured out. No one is walking around with a truly open mind, trying to collect data and *then* formulate a systematic theology / philosophy of life / worldview. Someone's worldview may change over the course of his life, but at any given moment, he has some high level of confidence in the "rightness" of his position. The rare case is the individual who is willing to examine his own worldview with respect to new observations and ideas. Even more exceptional is the individual who will compare the predictive and explanatory power of his worldview with respect to another.

As an ex-religious-Catholic, an ex-atheist, and for the last forty plus years a Bible-believing Christian – on the battlefield of ideas and contending against the world's varied philosophies – I am happy to face-off my Biblical worldview against all-comers. There is only one system that works consistently to explain observational science, history, politics, the multiplicity of religions, and the nature of man . . . and that is the revelation of the Creator, Jesus Christ, through His word. All other man-made systems are rife with mysteries and contradictions.

I praise God that my faith continues to grow stronger as He teaches me more and more. The glorious truth of the Bible seems more vibrant every year. The glories of God's creation speak volumes toward the truth of God's design and handiwork. The bottom line is: *"The Heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth His handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge."* (Psalm 19:1-2). If you do not know the Creator, the Lord Jesus Christ, as Savior, God, and Friend, I implore you to repent from your sins, call upon Him for salvation, and live for Him every day that He gives you on this Earth.

Chapter 0

Make up your mind. Only wimps compromise!

This chapter will set the historical and philosophical perspective for the rest of the book. The following ten chapters comprise a “Top 10” list of reasons to discredit evolution in favor of creation / intelligent design from a science-based point of view. If you, O reader, are an evolutionist, this chapter will not be as important to you as the ten to follow. Nevertheless, I encourage you to read it thoughtfully. After all, you should at least understand the mindset of such an odd duck as a Biblical creationist! This chapter is intended more particularly for the professing Christian who is unsettled about the importance of the creation / evolution issue or, indeed, on which side he stands. Before we get into the details, however, we have some foundations to build. Let’s start with a little history.

The 19th Century saw the birth of a mechanized industrial revolution and the beginnings of telecommunications. I believe that Satan — being an extremely smart entity — anticipated much of the technological, societal, and political upheavals of the 20th Century. So he laid some groundwork to oppress multitudes of people politically, hindering the spread of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. He also established the foundations of scientific and educational methodologies designed to indoctrinate each new generation with an atheistic worldview. Children, from kindergarten through graduate school, are to be taught that matter is everything, life is meaningless, morality is senseless, and Bible believers are both fools and bigots. Furthermore, God doesn’t exist, man is captain of his fate (which is simply the grave), and the soulless human being is no different in essence from any other animal. Nothing has changed over the last 2,000 years. As the Lord wrote (through Paul) in Romans 1:25,

“Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever.”

Satan has worked relentlessly to undermine the faith of Christians by attacking God’s word. Three avenues of attack are tied to three dates of infamy in the mid to late 1800s:

1848 — Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels published *The Communist Manifesto*. Marxism / Socialism is still alive and well in China, Europe, Latin America . . . indeed, all over the world, most notably in the USA, with our federal government being taken over completely by Marxists in the election of 2008. As it thrives, it destroys liberty and wealth, and hinders the spread of the Gospel. Marxism will certainly be the form of government embraced by the antichrist when he takes power.

1859 — Charles Darwin published *The Origin of Species*. We’ll deal with Darwinism and the modern variants extensively in the chapters to follow.

1881 — The English Revised Version of the Bible was published. Fenton Hort and Brooke Westcott — both unbelievers — were instrumental in deceiving the British government and the Anglican Church by producing a new version of the Bible. This revision project promised to “modernize” the English of the 1611 / 1769 King James Version. Hort and Westcott took over the committee, though, and the result was something quite different. They rejected the Old Testament Hebrew manuscripts preserved through the ages by the Jews and discarded the Received Text of the New Testament preserved by the churches through the centuries. They replaced these historically preserved texts with recently discovered (19th century) corrupted texts. Hort and Westcott introduced tens of thousands of real changes in the Bible, setting a precedent which continues to this day, wherein we have a hundred

versions of the Bible — each different in significant ways. The result is watered down doctrine, destruction of confidence in the inerrancy of Scripture, and lack of power in the lives of Christians. I encourage you to check out my discussion of this issue in section #8 of my article, “The 10 Most Deadly Heresies . . .” on truthreallymatters.com.

The triple threat of Marxism, Darwinism, and the corruption of Christianity has led to the mess we find the world in today. Global government and central economic control are featured frequently in Biblical prophecies regarding the coming reign of a world dictator, the antichrist. He will be partnered with a new global religion, focused on man and nature, and antagonistic to the God revealed in the Bible. Interestingly, this global religion will be more pantheistic than atheistic. Worldwide, men and women are already turning to the “god within,” and tuning into “forces,” so they can create their own destiny by exercising their own will. Satan greatly desires worship, and so he will not be promoting worldwide atheism. Rather, he will promote the worship of the highly evolved god-man, his antichrist. Energizing that god-man, Satan will eagerly receive man’s worship throughout the world.

These three elements are interrelated, of course. Marxism is the vehicle for the control of the nations. Marxist countries have always mandated evolution as the state “religion.” America, more socialist than ever before, mandates evolution as the foundation of science education. Darwinian evolution keeps every man and woman, boy and girl, in his place – just an animal hoping to experience sensual pleasure, controlled by the strong, with no God to tell him what to do . . . or to suggest that someone else is doing wrong – that would be intolerant and judgmental!

Christians, who have lost interest in the Bible, and are not sure that you can believe it from Genesis to Revelation, are intimidated by so-called intellectuals and run in fear from the creation / evolution controversy. Worse, most so-called Christian denominations have embraced forms of theistic evolution or progressive creation. They are more willing to believe atheistic scientists, who have a materialistic bias and an anti-Christian agenda, than the word of God. After all, which Bible can you trust? It changes all the time with new versions every year! And the scholars can’t make their minds up whether they even have a solid text yet.

The new versions of the Bible minimize the doctrine of the deity of Jesus Christ, reduce the temperature of Hell, and attempt to turn the historical foundations of Genesis and the history of Israel (the lineage of the Messiah, in particular) into fairy tales. The “love of Jesus” is emphasized by the proponents of modern versions. The Lord Jesus Christ as Judge can be found in modern versions, as can the final judgments, the commandments, sin, repentance, etc., but these doctrines are never preached from the pulpits of those who use the modern versions. The proliferation of Bible versions destroys motivation among novice Christians to study and memorize Scripture. Modern “worship” services are designed to discourage church members from even bringing Bibles to church. All these factors work together to attack truth and destroy faith before it germinates in the hearts and minds of people in this generation.

I like the way a preacher I know once put it: “I don’t just believe the Bible from cover to cover. I believe the cover! My cover says ‘Holy Bible.’ ‘Holy’ means sanctified — set apart. The Bible is set apart by God from all other books.” It was delivered and written down over a period of about 4,000 years, given by God through at least 50 different men (and women, including Bathsheba – see Proverbs 31). It is startlingly consistent in its historical record, in the way God deals with man through the ages, in the promise of the coming Messiah and His perfect fulfillment in the person of Jesus Christ, in its predictions about world conditions far into the future, and in its perfect moral precepts. The more I study it, the more I am amazed. The skeptic usually bases his rejection of the Bible on what he has heard from his

favorite ideologue in the classroom, and occasionally on a quick reading of a few passages, under the malevolent guidance of his favorite anti-Christian web site. Pitiful.

What is your foundation? The Christian's foundation is the Bible. He believes it because he has tested it and validated its teachings in every significant area of life. The Bible explains the existence of good and evil in this world, especially within the heart of the individual. Is murder wrong? Is rape wrong? How about molesting children? Is it OK if someone lies to you or steals from you? The God-given conscience is perfectly consistent with the expressed laws of God – the commandments – and is a total mystery to the materialist who must explain everything in terms of electromagnetic and nuclear forces, protons, neutrons, and electrons. When the lost sinner decides to test God's call to repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, he finds that forgiveness is real, life now has purpose, and his assured hope produces a joy as inexplicable to a skeptic as sky-blue is to a blind man. The new Christian goes on to find that following Jesus Christ by simple obedience to Scriptural truths produces happiness in marriage, sound guidance for raising children, clarity in business, and a perspective that makes sense of an increasingly crazy world system.

I am hereby defining **presuppositional apologetics**. Having tested and validated Scriptural truth, the Christian stands on this foundation for the rest of his life. As new controversies arise, whether in science or politics or entertainment, his "presupposition" is that Biblical truth is the basis for making decisions. A new fossil is discovered, accompanied by much hype that a "missing link" has at last been found. The Christian doesn't get worried. He knows that when more research is conducted and more details come out, this fossil will much more firmly support a creation model for origins than an evolutionary model. Indeed, the pattern above recurs time and time again.

Back to the Biblical worldview . . . Imagine purchasing a complex suite of appliances for your home. You use a wonderfully detailed instruction manual to set up your systems. To your great joy, after you follow all of the instructions, the systems operate perfectly the first time. Over the next few months, as you read deeper into the manual, you find ways to improve the performance of your systems for the benefit of your family. Everything the manual says . . . works! As time goes by, components break and you undertake repairs. The manual tells you clearly what is wrong and what you must do to restore operation. Without fail the manual proves to be the perfect guide. After all of this experience, you read something in the manual that you don't understand, but it is clear that the author insists that you follow his directions to insure continued safe operation. Would you rebel? Of course not. You have acquired faith in the author of the manual and trust him enough to obey. Your faith is founded on facts and experience.

When I became a Christian I had already acquired some measures of evidence to support my trust in God and His word. As I grew in my Christian faith I discovered that every time I obeyed the Author of the Manual – the Bible – life worked far better. When I ignored the instructions I suffered adverse consequences. Indeed, there are parts of the Manual that I don't fully understand, including some details related to events still in the future. The Manual also doesn't provide details about stellar physics or photosynthesis. But I have learned that in everything the Manual addresses I can have perfect faith. The Author never lets me down.

Another example: Politicians argue for more taxes to support government-run public schools and more restrictions against private schools and home schools. They argue for supposed societal benefits from public education and the "dangers" of unsupervised (by socialist bureaucrats) home schools. The Christian knows that God has given children to their parents for instruction. There is therefore no

question about which system is superior. As the years go by, the Christian's position is validated as his children grow up to live successful and godly lives. Alternatively, he sees public school students – statistically speaking – suffer reduced literacy, increasing STD rates, and the inability to think clearly about topics such as global warming, abortion, deficit spending, and constitutional freedoms quickly slipping away.

The materialist / evolutionist also lives on the basis of presuppositions. His foundation for origins is Big Bang cosmology and Darwinian evolution. He will make whatever argument is necessary to fit the newest fossil into his tree of life. He is never discouraged to learn that the new fossil just begs even more questions because it doesn't seem to connect closely to any other known creature. Not only did it fail to be a missing link, it demands a new search for a whole new line of alleged ancestors. The evolutionist constructs an "escape device" to justify the mystery of new data. Typically, with missing fossil links, the "escape device" is to assert that the links will be found as more fossils are discovered. Also, perhaps, that fossils are formed only under special conditions, and so it is not surprising that many fossils are missing. But these are just wishful explanations to justify *lack of evidence*.

In politics, the serious evolutionist is typically a rabid socialist, happy to herd children together under the wise guidance of the most evolved educators. Individual freedom in such matters is of no use to him. Society is better off if everyone thinks alike. Those who don't conform – like Biblical creationists – should be coerced to toe the line, or pay a big price. There is no God . . . the most competitive, most successful, most brilliant – that's the god to take charge. Survival of the fittest works for him in every area. Let the strongest thrive and take charge, telling everyone else what to do and what to think. Consider how in public schools, teachers are fired for even discussing clear scientific weaknesses in the "theory of evolution." It's not just that discussion of creation is suppressed. You can't even question the religious supremacy of evolution.

To summarize the paragraphs above, it should be clear that anyone that thinks about life, meaning, origins, and what it's all about has formed a specific worldview – a pair of philosophical "glasses" – through which to view and filter what he sees and what he learns. The question is, "Which worldview makes the most sense?" Or, "Which worldview explains new data better, without requiring extensive revisions?"

Regarding the two worldviews under discussion here, Christian / Biblical creation vs. Atheistic evolution, it is easy to see which makes better sense of astronomy, geology, paleontology, molecular biology, and other related disciplines. Not to mention the practice of one's life. The thoughtful atheist works hard for his position, but to what end? His end is pointlessness, hopelessness, and death – nothingness . . . that is, that's the best he can hope for, if he is right about no Heaven, no Hell, no judgment, no sin, and no personal accountability for everything he has done, spoken, and thought throughout his life. Given the utter depression of the atheist's position, you would think that he would at least check out the possibility that there is more to existence than molecules in motion. Even if there is a one in a million chance that God is real and he has an immortal soul / consciousness, that would be worth investigating!

(I'm not advocating Pascal's wager here, as a skeptic once accused. You can't become a believing Christian just because you don't like the consequences of atheism / nothingness. To believe, you must really **believe**. What I am asserting is that the divergences of consequences makes it rational to investigate the subject!)

I have observed something extremely interesting over the years regarding the most vocal advocates of socialism, evolution, and modern Bible versions. They have much in common regarding tactics and discourse! In each area, the advocates work hard to suppress dissent. They avoid debate as much as possible. When they must engage in debate, or choose to speak against their opposition, they often resort to name-calling and insults. Their opponents are characterized as uneducated, bigoted, unenlightened, anti-scientific, uncaring, etc. This is easiest to observe in the political realm. Socialists (liberals) are much nastier than their opponents. (I am not defending any supposed virtues of so-called “conservatives” – there aren’t so many real ones, anyway.) The Marxist sees lying as a legitimate tactic. Therefore, he has no compunctions about it.

I have observed and participated in debates and discussions with evolutionists. The parallels are striking and pervasive. They see creationists as uneducated, but are unwilling to sit down and politely enlighten us. If we are so unscientific in our knowledge and interpretation of data, should they not be happy to straighten us out? In the 1970s and 1980s there were hundreds of public debates in America between notable evolutionists and creationists. By the admission of evolutionists involved, creationists invariably “won” these debates. Such debates are much more rare over the last couple of decades. It’s much easier to suppress than to defend the indefensible. (For an analysis of the 2014 debate between Ken Ham and Bill Nye, see my essay, “EN9: Debating Creation vs. Evolution.”)

Similarly, advocates of modern Bible versions are outspoken with their disdain for the so-called “King James Only” camp. Note the unfair pejorative. I am not “King James Only.” I take God at His word that He preserved it without error in the original languages, which have been faithfully translated into English via the King James Version. There are many other languages (Russian, Spanish, French, . . .) that enjoy a version faithfully translated from the same historically preserved manuscripts. The modern English versions use a small handful (5-10) of more recently discovered texts, with thousands of mutual inconsistencies, to construct a very different New Testament in Greek. They go on to make a much more interpretive translation in English, based on the presuppositions of the scholars involved – many of whom are demonstrably *not* born again Christians.

Modern version advocates are usually uninterested in discussion or debate on the textual issues. Suppression is far easier. Even most of the conservative seminaries have been taken over by faculty that despise the doctrine of preservation. Now, I understand that there are Christians who are opposed very strongly to evolution, yet subscribe to modern Bible versions. I have dealt with several who are in the forefront of creation ministries. When discussing creation / evolution they happily employ logic, evidence, and polite discourse. But when the subject turns to the true foundation of the subject of origins – whether you can trust perfectly the preserved word of God – they can quickly turn antagonistic, using specious arguments and condescension. If you don’t believe me, try it. Engage in a discussion with a notable creationist who also prefers modern versions. You will see the Jekyll / Hyde effect very quickly.

My conclusion must be that the battle is spiritual at its core. We see the Satanic philosophies at work in socialism, in evolution, and in undermining trust in the word of God. Satan has been about this work on Earth since he offered the simple question, “Yea, hath God said . . .”. Regardless of the particular battlefield, we see the Adversary employing similar tactics. In Babylon, the despot Nebuchadnezzar demanded worship from each subject, threatening capital punishment to any who refused. Precisely the same scenario will be employed by the antichrist when he reigns. Today, known creationists are denied tenure or refused entry to Ph.D. programs. That’s better than capital punishment, but the enemy is patient, working one step at a time.

The Christian, within his Biblical worldview, will often be confronted with new data and new life situations requiring a decision on his part. Like the “Surprising new fossil discovery!” the news will often seem to challenge my foundations. At my age (62 in the year 2014) I can easily proclaim that such confrontations present no fear. The Bible stands firm in every worldview conflict. Its message need never be adjusted. It is more than a mere “scientific theory” or “model.” Its truth is validated without fail.

If there are details you want to investigate that go beyond the information within — details of creation, for example — then go ahead and investigate. The “Book” will never let you down. This is pre-suppositional apologetics. Once you know that you can stand on the foundation of the word of God, you can apply it to life and your analysis of everything in this world system. The Bible makes sense of *everything* of any importance. Every other worldview results in contradictions and hopeless mysteries. In chapters 1-10 we will see this hopelessness attached to evolution in its every aspect.

Grab your King James version and read Colossians, chapter 1. There is a marvelous principle here that I discovered long ago. The chapter is filled with nuggets on the wonderful subjects of grace, truth, love, prayer, wisdom, fruitful living, joy, redemption, the blood of Jesus, the Creator, Satanic forces, the church, and others. The passage used to irritate me a bit, however, because these “nuggets” resist being pulled out of the passage’s granite.

Here’s what I mean. Look at how many of the verses begin with a “connective” — a word that demands that you look to the previous verse for clarification. These “first words” include the following:

Since

For – several times

Which

As

Who – several times

That

In Whom

And — several times

Why did the Author do this? I believe it was to emphasize that all of these nuggets — these doctrines — are inextricably intertwined! You can’t have fruitful living without salvation. You can’t have salvation without a Savior. You can’t call on the Savior without knowing that He is Jesus and that Jesus is the Creator, “*and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist.*” You don’t get to pick one doctrine to believe without embracing all. You can’t choose to believe Paul’s epistles on grace without believing Moses’ account of Genesis.

It’s all or nothing. Accept it or reject it — God doesn’t leave room for compromise.

When I first put together some of this material as a “Sunday School course” for college students, the year was 2000 and the presidential primary campaigns were underway. The controversy between creation and evolution continued to make news. Presidential candidate Al Gore positioned himself as a strong advocate of science education. But he tried to walk the fence for political purposes. His campaign’s official position was that he favored teaching evolution, but believed that local authorities had the right to teach creation as well.

In response to this, Eugenie Scott, the executive director of the National Center for Science Education (a tiny pro-evolution, anti-creation advocacy group), said: “My God, that’s appalling! I understand politicians like to compromise and that faced with one group who say that two plus two equals four and another group that says two plus two equals six, will tend to arrive at a position that says two plus two equals five. Unfortunately, sometimes the answer has to be four and this is one of those times.”

It’s interesting that she appealed to God for help to support her anti-God position. More interesting is that she saw the issue as one that is equivalent to mathematical analysis. Well, so be it. If evolution can survive rigorous logic, scientific methodology, and quantitative analysis, then it should be considered to be part of the universe’s “truth.” But evolution cannot survive a serious analysis. It is the evolutionist who claims that two plus two equals six. Actually, as we’ll see, her claim is closer to “two plus two equals a trillion.”

The Christian has a firm foundation – the word of God. We humans can foolishly choose to judge God’s word or wisely let God’s word judge us and guide our lives. The Bible is unambiguous regarding creation as a special series of acts of the Almighty. God didn’t *use* evolution as his method. He spoke and the worlds came into being. God’s word also says that we can see the evidence of that by simple observation.

“The Heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard.” — Psalm 19:1-3

Even primitive cultures know that the marvelous works of nature are the handiwork of a Creator. Throughout most of the history of science, the profession has centered on revealing the mysteries of God’s creation. Modern astronomy was founded on the work of creationists – Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, and Newton.

The scope of “science” has been warped in the last century, however. An arbitrary constraint has been levied – science must now be divorced from any consideration of a Creator. To be “scientific,” one must be entirely “materialistic,” and everything under the sun MUST be explainable by purely natural processes. If natural processes aren’t sufficient to explain the facts, well then . . . there is no Plan B. Truth is subjugated to a naturalistic dogma. The “supernatural” is rejected as heresy against the dogma of “science.” Opposition is to be squashed by political maneuvering, name-calling, and pseudo-intellectual intimidation.

Many Christians try to find a middle road on this issue, called “theistic evolution.” They would like to keep their faith in God, but choose to bow to conventional “wisdom” by saying that God must have “used evolution” as His method. These compromisers are trying to stay on the good side of the scientific establishment and the “educated elite.” But they don’t succeed. Serious evolutionists have nothing but disrespect for Christians. Christians get the same disrespect from the political left. For example — Jesse Ventura, when governor of Minnesota, once opined that religion is a crutch for the weak-minded.

The theistic evolutionist insults God and acquires no credit from the atheists. Consider the perspective of committed and renowned evolutionists from a (small) sampling of quotes, gleaned from Gish’s book, *Creation Scientists Answer Their Critics*:

“Darwinism removed the whole idea of God as the creator of organisms from the sphere of rational discussion . . . we can dismiss entirely all ideas of a supernatural overriding mind being responsible for the evolutionary process.” — Julian Huxley

“A religion is essentially an attitude to the world as a whole. Thus evolution, for example, may prove as powerful a principle to coordinate man’s beliefs and hopes as God was in the past.” — Julian Huxley & Jacob Bronowski

“Suddenly the study of evolution was in all the schools. The culture of the dominant class had triumphed, and traditional religious values, the only vestige of control that rural people had over their own lives and the lives of their families, had been taken from them.” — Richard Lewontin

“Meantime, let me say that the conclusion I have come to is this: the law of Christ is incompatible with the law of evolution — as far as the law of evolution has worked hitherto. Nay, the two laws are at war with each other; the law of Christ can never prevail until the law of evolution is destroyed.” — Sir Arthur Keith

“Christianity has fought, still fights, and will fight science to the desperate end over evolution, because evolution destroys utterly and finally the very reason Jesus’ earthly life was supposedly made necessary. Destroy Adam and Eve and the original sin, and in the rubble you will find the sorry remains of the son of God. If Jesus was not the redeemer who died for our sins, and this is what evolution means, then Christianity is nothing.” — G. Richard Bozarth

“(Natural) selection is the blindest, and most cruel way of evolving new species, and more and more complex and refined organisms . . . The struggle for life and elimination of the weakest is a horrible process, against which our whole modern ethics revolts. An ideal society is a non-selective society, one where the weak is protected; which is exactly the reverse of the so-called natural law. I am surprised that a Christian would defend the idea that this is the process which God more or less set up in order to have evolution.” — Jacques Monod

“I am convinced that the battle for humankind’s future must be waged and won in the public school classroom by teachers who correctly perceive their role as the proselytizers of a new faith: a religion of humanity that recognizes and respects what theologians call divinity in every human being. These teachers must embody the same selfless dedication as the most rabid fundamentalist preachers, for they will be ministers of another sort, utilizing a classroom instead of a pulpit to convey humanist values in whatever subject they teach, regardless of the educational level — preschool day care center or large state university. The classroom must and will become an arena of conflict between the old and the new — the rotting corpse of Christianity, together with all its adjacent evils and misery, and the new faith of humanism . . . It will undoubtedly be a long, arduous, painful struggle replete with much sorrow and many tears, but humanism will emerge triumphant. It must if the family of humankind is to survive.” — John Dunphy

One reason education undoes belief is its teaching of evolution; Darwin’s own drift from orthodoxy to agnosticism was symptomatic. Martin Lings is probably right in saying that “more cases of loss of religious faith are to be traced to the theory of evolution . . . than to anything else.” — Huston Smith

So . . . If you're a Christian, is this the crowd that you want to run with — the crowd you want some morsels of respect from? *GET OVER IT!!*

Furthermore, there is no reason — scientifically — to compromise with evolution. The evidence against it is overwhelming. I can't respect theistic evolutionists at all. However, I marvel at evolutionists in one thing — they stick to their fantasy in the face of ridiculous improbability, lack of affirmative evidence, and mountains of countervailing facts. As a Christian and a scientist with an earned Ph.D., I have plenty of spiritual, faith-based, cultural, and scientific reasons to discount evolution. Evolutionists, however, love the assumption, admire the assertion, and are singularly devoted to name-calling. I despise their tactics. Shouldn't evolutionists be eager to examine their "theory" according to principles of logic, mathematics, and scientific methodologies? Shouldn't they be honest about the implications of their worldview for the conduct of one's life? How about implications for society, politics, education, commerce, and morality? Also, what's the point of life if death ends it all? At least face up to the implications if you're going to believe the impossible!

Evolution does not warrant the term "theory." American school children used to be taught (at least I was) that the scientific method includes at least the following key elements:

1. *Observation* — What phenomena are occurring in nature?
2. *Analysis* — Are there patterns and can they be quantified?
3. *Hypothesis* — A preliminary explanation fitting the facts is constructed and can be tested. Alternative hypotheses are desirable, just as alternative designs in engineering are useful for comparison.
4. *Testing and Experiment* — Experiments must be constructed that can validate the hypothesis. The experiments also must allow for data to show that the hypothesis is false. A hypothesis that is not "falsifiable" has no scientific predictive value.
5. *Theory* — A hypothesis that stands up to experiments under a multitude of conditions can attain the status of "theory."

Even evolutionists admit that the subject of origins is not subject to real-time observation and analysis. At best, the topic is akin to detective work — which includes techniques of forensic science to attempt interpretation of whatever residual effects are left behind from previous events.

Evolutionists are wholly devoted to materialism — insisting that all of nature and its history are entirely explainable through natural forces, operating on natural resources, that can be observed in the universe today. They are not devoted to *truth* regarding origins. You see . . . truth might just require some supernatural component. Evolutionists define "science" to be totally divorced from God and the supernatural. This would be a shocking point of view to the God-fearing scientists of previous centuries who were eager to learn more of the Creator's works. But the last century has seen a perversion of man's views on nature.

Regarding origins as "detective work": Imagine a pair of police detectives who are committed to a philosophy of "accidentalism." Joe Bob and Bubba cannot conceive that a death could be caused willfully by an acting, intelligent human being. They are confident that all sudden deaths can be explained by accidental or natural causes.

One day, our intrepid pair is called in to investigate a particularly vexing case. A young man is found dead in his kitchen. Evidently, in the opinion of the unskilled neighbors who discovered the body, death was caused by several gunshot and knife wounds, with bullet entries at several different angles. A

novice policeman at the scene suggests to our heroes that someone must have brutally murdered the victim. But Joe Bob and Bubba scoff at such a suggestion. They quickly develop a “theory” as follows:

“A loaded handgun must have been precariously perched atop a kitchen cabinet. An Earth tremor caused the gun to fall to a counter top, resulting in the first gunshot, with the victim unluckily in the line of fire. The recoil kicked the gun against a dish drainer, causing several knives to fly (unfortunately) in the direction of the victim’s abdomen. The gun continued to bounce around the counter and to the floor due to the mechanical energy imparted by the recoil, with gunshots resulting from each collision with a new surface. Unluckily, most of the shots found their way into the victim. It is undetermined what became of the gun and knives — that is a bit of a mystery — but we are confident that further research will settle that issue.”

If these detectives are committed to accidentalism, they will not fail to generate “theories,” no matter how unreasonable. Similarly, those committed to materialism will never be deterred by reason or data from developing naturalistic explanations for origins, no matter how far-fetched. Real-life detectives and the forensic scientists on their teams do not hesitate to recognize evidence that points to man’s handiwork as opposed to purely natural processes. Any CSI-like TV show that featured characters like Joe Bob and Bubba would be destroyed by poor ratings . . . the plots would be implausible to even the least educated and most unthinking TV audiences. Yet evolutionary fantasies thrive.

Archeology is akin to forensic science. Consider an archeologist on a dig in the Southwestern United States. He is excited to find a colorful piece of pottery in the shape of a bowl. How much effort does he expend to devise naturalistic hypotheses for its origin? The smoothness of the surface, the colorful and symmetric markings, the functional shape – just these simple elements scream, “DESIGN!” One could estimate the information content associated with the bowl. A computer file containing diagrams and instructions for its fabrication would consist of perhaps 100,000 bits (give or take an order of magnitude). The archeologist doesn’t think in these terms, but his experience gives him skill in pattern recognition to make a definitive conclusion regarding its manmade origin. Yet the same archeologist may be an evolutionist who imagines that the native American who designed and created the bowl was a product of random chemical processes. Wow.

A University of California (Irvine) geneticist, Francisco Ayala, said that the continued debate about creation and evolution was making the United States a laughing stock in the world. “If we don’t teach our kids good science, they will be handicapped later in a world that depends on science and technology. I am disturbed at this political trend. It is potentially terribly damaging to our children,” he proclaimed.

But is evolution really a science akin to physics and chemistry? Is it a science that forms the basis of significant fields useful to society like Electrical Engineering? If it is a science then it must be subject to rigid mathematical analysis and painstaking reviews of evidence and logic. Evolution fails miserably, however, in any honest attempt to equate itself to the established sciences. Many biologists like to say that evolution is the foundation of their science. But thousands of research papers on the form, function, biochemistry, physiology, reproduction, and other characteristics of living creatures are published with no consideration of evolution.

In fact, many evolutionary speculations have set back biological science time and again. Modern biologists have thoroughly discredited the silly notion of “embryological recapitulation” — an idea that held sway for the first half of the 20th century. The idea was that the development of an embryo

parallels the evolutionary development of its species. The notion was promoted in the 19th Century by a German evolutionist named Ernst Haeckel, who was exposed and kicked out of his university when it was discovered that he falsified evidence and created fictitious drawings to support his ideas. Amazingly, this ridiculous idea is still found in some high school and college texts on biology.

Evolution falls far short of “theory” status because it is not subject to meaningful experiments. Evolutionists typically insult their critics by comparing their faith with the theory of gravity. Creationists that dispute the “fact” of evolution may as well fight against Newtonian or Einsteinian gravity, or quantum theory, or relativity. And our precious little school children – if they dare to entertain doubts about the wonderful, unifying, all-encompassing theory of evolution – how can they possibly learn science and engineering and compete in the global marketplace?!?

If someone disputes accepted gravitational theory, though, experiments can be quickly designed and executed to check it out. More compellingly, zillions of experiments have already been done and documented. I recall performing a few, myself, in both high school and college!

So – if not a legitimate “theory,” does evolution merit the status of “hypothesis”? Alas, it is an “explanation” that doesn’t fit the facts. Worse, it travails against a myriad of contradicting facts. Not only is evidence lacking, but application of simple mathematics demonstrates the impossibility of evolution’s foundations. It’s not just a matter of *not finding* compelling evidence to support their “theory.” Evolutionists cannot even *imagine* how to overcome the barriers in their beliefs. If this were about writing fiction, we could not plausibly award the category of “science fiction” to evolutionary dramatizations. When science fact and mathematical plausibility are vacant and the difficulties are brushed aside, the fictional category is termed “fantasy.” The most fitting term for the construct of evolution, therefore, is “fantasy” — akin to tales of wizards and elves and centaurs.

The origin of life is an enormous subject. More dangerously, it is an emotional and politically charged battleground. The discussion in the chapters to follow is intended primarily to equip a novice creationist with a few facts and points of logic to engage in a heart-to-heart discussion with someone who has bet his eternity on the evolutionary fantasy. Excluding that small cadre of professional evolutionary biologists, most people who accept evolution don’t know why they believe it. Ask someone. Be polite. Try to get someone to explain the foundation of his evolutionary faith. You’ll have to work at being exceptionally polite, because most folks – in frustration – will get angry to cover up the realization that they *don’t know* why they believe it. I’m not going to give professional biologists a pass, of course. I’d love to hear one address the “Top 10” points in the rest of this book head-on.

A few years ago, while I served on the engineering faculty of a major university, I was walking through a park and observed an elderly man whose car had broken down. I offered him assistance, spending much of the next hour with him. He turned out to be an Emeritus Professor of Biology, recently retired from the university. I explained to him that I was a “simple physicist” by training and hoped that he could enlighten me about evolution. He replied that he had taught the subject for 44 years and would be glad to help me.

I asked him for his best evidence, as if I were an open-minded scientist who didn’t already have a position, but simply wanted to reach an honest conclusion. Namely, don’t tell me the “story of evolution,” but give me evidence that convinced me that such positions as “special creation” were not viable in comparison. He thought about it for a bit, and then suggested that I simply look at the physiological differences between himself and myself as an example of biological change. He was tall

and I wasn't, etc. I replied that this was just variation within an existing genome. The question is where did the human genome arise, which is clearly radically different from any animal. He quickly admitted my point, but then failed to offer any additional evidence. After 44 years of teaching the story of evolution, he actually couldn't think of any evidence that would stand up to serious questioning.

Now I am sure that he could have argued as well as any of the college students I have encountered, who bring up examples such as peppered moths, antibiotic resistance, insecticide resistance, similarities in bone structure among different mammals, and others. But I believe that he was simply honest enough to know that these examples offer no evidence whatsoever for "macro-evolution" – namely, progression from molecules to man, via drastically different intermediate types. For example, in the much worn peppered moth example, even if the textbook story represented data acquired through careful scientific means (it doesn't), the story starts with two varieties of moths and ends with the same two varieties of moths, albeit with different relative populations. A skeptical, open-minded scientist might be underwhelmed!

My wife and I once attended a lecture by Phillip Johnson, one of the proponents of the Intelligent Design movement in the last two decades. Afterwards, we struck up a conversation with a freshman biology student who had been sitting near us. The conversation went something like this:

DD (Dr. Dave): "So what do you think about Johnson's arguments?"

YB (Young Biologist): "Oh, I think he's completely wrong. Evolution is well-established scientifically."

DD: "That's very interesting. Maybe you could help us out. In your study of the subject, what is the most compelling piece of evidence that you know would stand up to investigation?"

YB: "Oh, there are tons of evidence! There is evidence everywhere."

DD: "Right, I understand that is your position. But would you give me a solid, single example that would convince an open-minded person that it must be true."

YB: "It's not just about a single piece of evidence. There is overwhelming evidence."

DD: "OK, if it's overwhelming and abundant, then give me your Top 5 pieces of evidence, if you can't give me one."

That seemed to get through, because he was apparently struck dumb, not able to think of anything specific. I am sure that he could have talked all day about the story of evolution, what evolved from what, when the dinosaurs went extinct, how cute the first little mammals were, and so on. But I don't think it had ever occurred to him to examine and study the subject as if he would have to defend it to an unbelieving heretic like myself. Such is the case with many "educated" people who use evolution as the foundation of their worldview.

Allow me to summarize the Biblical position on the origin of life, the Earth, and the universe. (This will be very brief! Entire books have been written simply on the theological issues touched so lightly in the next few paragraphs.) The book of Genesis was clearly written as a historical record. Taking it at face value leads to the conclusion that life, the Earth, and everything else was created about 6,000 years ago. Genesis chapter 1 is clear about the creation, noting for example:

In the beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth. And the Earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning were the first day. Genesis 1:1-5

... And the evening and the morning were the second day. Genesis 1:8

... And the evening and the morning were the third day. Genesis 1:13

... And the evening and the morning were the fourth day. Genesis 1:19

... And the evening and the morning were the fifth day. Genesis 1:23

And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day. Genesis 1:31

And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. Genesis 2:2

The word “day” simply means a 24-hour day, including an evening and a morning. God created light before He made the sun and stars on the fourth day, so the 24-hour cycle was enabled on the first day. The repetition in the verses above should make it clear what the Author’s intent was, namely, that all of creation was spoken into existence by God in a single week. It’s as if God knew how compromisers would attempt to pervert the passage’s simple meaning, attempting to expand days into billions of years.

When God gave Moses the 10 commandments on Mount Sinai, He explicitly affirmed the history of Genesis 1:

For in six days the LORD made Heaven and Earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it. Exodus 20:11

Where does the “week” come from? The “day” is determined by the rotation of the Earth about its axis. The “month” is given by the orbit of the moon around the Earth. The “year” is fixed by Earth’s orbit around the sun. The “week” by which humanity has always lived is clearly derived from the creation record. The Sabbath day of rest has been a part of human cultures for thousands of years. Even atheists like to take at least a day off from work each week.

The New Testament authors all affirmed the Genesis record. The Lord Jesus Christ did so explicitly on several occasions. For example:

But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female. Mark 10:6

The context is marriage, starting with the first one – Adam and Eve. This first marriage didn’t occur billions of years after some “Big Bang beginning,” but rather “in the beginning” cited in Genesis 1 and 2. The “Christian” – the follower of Jesus Christ – clearly cannot call his Savior and Lord ignorant or deceitful on the subject. Scripture affirms that the Lord Jesus Christ was the person of the Godhead who created everything! He should know. If He doesn’t, then the Bible has no credibility, Jesus is not the Savior, and our end is the grave with no hope. Indeed, the apostle Paul makes the same argument regarding the resurrection of Jesus Christ in 1 Corinthians 15. If Jesus did not rise from the dead, then we are dead in our sins and have no hope of resurrection ourselves.

The fall of man recorded in Genesis 3 was due to Adam's willful sin. Paul's letter to the Romans explains the consequences. Death and disease came into the world due to man's sin. We started literally in Paradise and kicked ourselves out through rebellion. The theistic evolutionist would imagine that God used evolution to "create" the biosphere of present times. No, the Biblical position is that man is responsible for death. God gave us life and Paradise and now offers us the opportunity for redemption and restoration despite our rebellion.

Every man in every generation since Adam has also sinned willfully. The wage for our sins is death and Hell. Only the sacrifice of the perfect Lamb of God, the incarnate Son of God, satisfies the justice – the condemnation – that each of us deserves. The promise of the Savior was first given by God in Genesis 3 and then repeatedly throughout the Old Testament. The family lineage of Jesus Christ is tied perfectly to the historical Old Testament record. Prophets foretold where He would be born, when He would be born, and what His ministry would entail.

The entire Bible, the Christian worldview, and life's purpose and hope for every individual Christian are inexorably linked to the validity of the Genesis record. The atheistic skepticism of modern times was foretold by the apostle Peter, pointing out that those who scoffed at the Second Coming of Christ would be willfully ignorant of the Genesis record of the flood of Noah's time. They deny that God brought judgment once so that they can deny that He will ever bring judgment.

Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, And saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation. For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the Heavens were of old, and the Earth standing out of the water and in the water: Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished: But the Heavens and the Earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. 2 Peter 3:3-7

Let's back up to the "big picture." There are many reasons to address this subject. One simple one is this: Since the evolutionary fantasy has acquired a monopoly on our public education, literal and functional atheism (including New Age (old-fashioned) pagan pantheism) has multiplied. There is little respect for the Bible and, consequently, morality has disintegrated. Christians are weak in defense of their faith because they have been intimidated by the "consensus of brilliant scientists" who proclaim the "fact of evolution." America spirals downward and the doctrine of evolution is a significant contributing factor. In short, if we're all a bunch of animals, what's the point of morality and why restrain yourself or anyone from hedonism? Natural selection certainly seems to favor self-centeredness and cowardice. Abortion is just removal of inconvenient tissue. What is the meaning of life if even our thought patterns and our drives and aspirations are just the result of random chemical processes? *On the other hand*, why should I believe the pronouncements of Ph.D. evolutionists, if their utterings are merely the result of brain chemistry?

Consider the rich man in the parable below. If he were an evolutionist, his lifestyle would make perfect sense. But he was a fool. No matter how much he was determined to ignore God, judgment awaits. It matters which worldview is right.

"And he spake a parable unto them saying, The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully: And he thought within himself, saying, What shall I do, because I have no room where to bestow my fruits? And he said, This will I do: I will pull down my barns, and build greater; and there will I bestow all

my fruits and my goods. And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast must goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry. But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee: then whose shall those things be, which thou hast provided? So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God.” – Luke 12:16-21

References:

Duane T. Gish, *Creation Scientists Answer Their Critics*, Institute for Creation Research, 1993.

Chapter 1

Probabilities vs. Impossibilities

We make decisions in life every day based on probabilities – our perception of what is likely and what is not. We get into the car to go grocery shopping, knowing that tens of thousands of Americans die every year in car wrecks close to their home. But the probability is high that we will survive so we take the risk. The day after a major plane crash, we will happily take a cross country flight. Knowing that people die every year from prescription drugs that are counterfeit, or merely mistakenly placed in the wrong bottle, we trust the odds to favor us in any particular instance. Thus we accept even lethal risk, as long as the odds are favorable enough. Judges and juries will make life or death decisions based on quite modest probabilities associated with human testimony and circumstantial evidence.

When the cost is low, we will risk loss even when the probabilities are stacked against us. People still buy lottery tickets against odds of millions to one, but the cost of each ticket is small. Many of us vote in national elections, although it is unlikely that throughout your lifetime your vote will actually affect the result. When we make such decisions, at least we understand that the odds are not “astronomical.”

So how do we make decisions regarding scenarios involving astronomical – truly ridiculous – odds? For example, when you walk outdoors, do you consistently watch the sky lest a falling meteor end your life? Of course not – the probability of danger is so low that we don’t even think about it. Another example: an undergraduate student studying statistical physics can easily calculate the odds against all of the air in your living room randomly occupying one corner, leaving the rest a near vacuum. If this actually happened and persisted for just a few moments, the effect would be lethal. As you watch Monday night football and snack on popcorn – even if you are a physicist – do you worry about this? The odds are truly astronomical in your favor, so don’t sweat it.

The odds against the evolution of living organisms are far more – ridiculously – astronomical than those attached to even the last scenario. The word “impossible” is legitimately associated with many practical day-to-day situations. Everyone would agree that it is “impossible” to walk a mile through a rainstorm and not get wet, although the odds are merely astronomical against it. In a fair game of poker, it is “impossible” to draw a straight flush in several consecutive hands. Indeed, in the Old West, somebody so “lucky” would likely get shot by a serious gambler who understands how impossible the odds are.

Some aspects of the topic of origins are susceptible to calculations of probability. The rabid, dogmatic evolutionist may retreat to a declaration such as, “Well, it’s possible! Anything is possible!” But we don’t make serious decisions and certainly do not conduct rational scientific explorations based on such dreams and hopes . . . especially if the odds against are astronomical. How can we apply probability to life and its origin? Any theory of the origin of life must explain the structure of the nano-machines essential to its existence. There is no theory of evolution, unless it explains the origin and reproduction of life at the molecular level. Genetics happens at the molecular level. Life is based on cellular machines that must be built and sustained at the molecular level.

Let me explain briefly why life is so much different than other aggregations of matter. Consider a simple tool like an all metal hammer. You can rearrange the metal – at the molecular level – in many different ways and it will still perform its function as a tool quite well. In particular, you can melt and reheat the metal many times, and as long as you allow it to solidify in a shape close to its original design, you really

haven't changed anything that counts. This type of analysis applies to chairs, tables, and automobiles, although the details vary, of course.

Now consider a single-celled creature, like a paramecium, or a many-celled creature, like you. What happens if you heat, melt, deconstruct, and re-solidify? Are you good to go? Once you break the nano-machines into pieces, life is done. A dead man can look very much like he was when alive just a few minutes before. Changes at the molecular level make all the difference. For life to exist, reproduce, and persevere, all of the nano-machines must work correctly and in sync with each other continuously.

It can be great fun for paleontologists to defend evolution on the basis of similarities in the bone structure of fossil specimens. (Don't worry. We will devote a chapter to the subject.) But if evolution is to warrant the status of "theory," it must explain "life." Life operates at the molecular level. You can't understand how automobiles work merely by looking at the exterior body and paint job. Automotive engineers must understand combustion, fluid flow, materials science, mechanical linkages, etc. Computer engineers are not awarded the degree unless they can understand, design, build, and test processors, power supplies, and a wide variety of components and circuits. If evolution is a well-established fact, let it be established where life operates – at the molecular level.

The molecules crucial to life are so enormously complex that it is impossible for them to arise by chance. A single "simple" protein molecule could not have formed even in the "billions of years" evolutionists claim are available.

Atoms, themselves, are wonderfully designed objects. I'm not going to make a case for design at the atomic level, although it's easy to do. Here's a key point that is often neglected in origin of life discussions: The design of atoms is such that wonderful versatility is allowed in the formation of molecules. The periodic table is not infinitely large, but provides a near-infinite set of molecular building blocks for the construction of stars, planets, and life. The chemistry of molecular interactions is very well understood. The frontiers of physical understanding are inside the atom's nucleus and within the constituent particles themselves. We already "know enough" about chemistry to evaluate whether evolutionary processes are possible.

What's important is that life's complex molecules of specific functionality do not and cannot arise by chance. There are too many non-functional options and too many ways for molecules to break down to bridge the gap between naturally occurring compounds and the molecular machinery of life. The Bible is consistent with this observation. Consider the creation of Adam.

"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." – Genesis 2:7

The thought here is that man was formed *from* the raw materials that God had already created. He created wonderful building blocks, but nowhere are we given the sense that the building blocks – the "dust" – have the intrinsic powers to be able to form incredibly complex and multi-functional creatures. The whole point of "building blocks" such as Legos is that an intelligent designer has the privilege to create whatever design he likes. The blocks don't adhere to each other in just one possible way. Similarly, there is nothing in the physics and chemistry of paper and ink that determine the information content of this book. The information begins with thought. The thoughts are no more determined by the laws of chemistry in the brain than the words in this chapter are determined by the laws describing

the adhesion of ink to paper. (Additionally, nowhere in Scripture is the idea that God intervened from time to time during a billions-of-years “natural” process.)

In 1874 Charles Hodge, a Presbyterian theologian, asked and answered the question, “What is Darwinism?” His conclusion was simple: “It is atheism.” Atheistic scientists committed philosophically to evolution have no confusion about this. They insist that everything we see is the result of inexorable natural forces. Who needs God if that is true?

Let’s get to the heart of the matter . . .

Amino acids are components of proteins – which are nano-machines essential to life. The amino acid alanine, for example, consists of 13 atoms of carbon, oxygen, hydrogen, and nitrogen arranged in a particular 3-D structure. Tyrosine is somewhat larger with 20 atoms arranged in a different structure. Experiments or conditions that allow the right elements to mix and provide the requisite energy to initiate reactions can produce such molecules. Some of these experiments – like the famous ones of Miller and Urey – are touted as evidence that the “molecules of life” are easily formed. That’s not strictly true. Such experiments require careful oversight, pristine conditions, the right mix of reactants, and special design to extract desired products before they dissociate. Even evolutionists have come to admit that these experiments represent conditions very different from those on an early Earth. For example, the ultraviolet light that aids in the initial phases of the reactions will also dissociate the products, unless those products are trapped out in the absence of the UV. But for this analysis I’m willing to overlook such difficulties, which serve only to damage the case of the materialist.

Amino acids are merely the building blocks which must be combined carefully into proteins to allow functionality in living organisms. As an example, consider just one solitary type of protein molecule consisting of a particular sequence of 400 amino acids. This particular protein might well be absolutely critical to metabolism or reproduction, and a cell just can’t get by without several thousand copies of it, all located in just the right places. There are 20 amino acids to choose from for every unit in the sequence. Now let’s consider the following fanciful conditions, all chosen to make it possible to form a single chain of just the right collection of amino acids. At every step we’ll make it as easy as possible for the evolution of the first life to occur.

1. A water-filled vat or sea of only the 20 left-handed amino acids useful to life is prepared at just the right concentration, temperature, and other physical conditions. (This would be impossible under natural conditions which would produce other amino acids, including the right-handed variety, plus toxic chemicals. Also, natural concentrations in a pre-biotic world would be hopelessly low.)

2. A chain of 400 amino acids is somehow formed. Then it is somehow folded into the right 3-D shape to serve its critical enzymatic function, without which a cell cannot live. (Note the use of passive voice in the previous two sentences. Evolutionists often use passive voice because it avoids explaining how it happened or who could have done it. At any rate, both “somehows” are impossible thermodynamically, without the “factory” of a cell working to manufacture this protein. Each peptide bond requires energy and the presence of water destroys bonds much more quickly than they can be formed under natural conditions. Assuming the linear chain, folding does not occur without other nano-machines to enable the process.)

3. This single “protein” of 400 amino acids is stable enough to hang around and wait for a gazillion other such proteins, plus sugars, plus nucleic acids, plus large structures of these constituents, etc., in order to

be useful at all. Also, they must all be precisely positioned in three dimensions, just like the components of a sophisticated machine.

Let's focus in on step 2 above, imagining that everything else happens "somehow." Given the above fanciful conditions, what are the odds against this one protein molecule getting the amino acid order correct? The odds against getting the first one in the chain right are 1 in 20. The odds against the second one are also 1 in 20. Therefore the odds against getting both the first and the second right are 1 in 400. Accordingly, the odds against getting the right order (permutation) for the entire chain are 1 in 20^{400} (that's 20 raised to the 400th power). How big a number is this? If you just wait enough billions of years with the "right conditions" will it likely happen?

Let's put this in context. Consider your chances of tossing 100 pennies on the floor and having them all turn up heads. Is it "possible" that you will do this? The odds against it are 1 in 2^{100} . That's worse than 1 in 10^{30} , which is a thousand billion billion billion. Note that the alleged evolutionary age of the universe is about 10 billion years, or about 3×10^{17} seconds. Let's say that you tossed the pennies once per second. And that you got almost everyone on the planet – 5 billion people – to join you and toss a hundred pennies of their own once per second. In the ten billion years of the "experiment", you and your friends could toss the coins a little over 10^{27} times. The odds would still be a *thousand to one* against anyone *ever* seeing all heads. When the probabilities are so infinitesimally miniscule it is fair to say the following . . . When YOU, individually, toss your pennies on the floor, it is IMPOSSIBLE that you will see 100 out of 100 heads turn up. Go ahead. Try it. Let me know what happens.

Back to our lonely protein molecule. Observe that the known universe has "only" about 10^{80} particles – all of the protons, neutrons, and electrons in all the billions of stars in each of the billions of galaxies. Imagine an experiment in which the entire universe of particles was replaced by an imaginary sea of 400×10^{80} amino acids. Alternatively, imagine that we replace each of the 10^{80} particles with a little test tube that has exactly the right combination of 400 amino acids in a watery solvent. Now let the amino acids in each test tube "chain up" a trillion times per second (10^{12}), hoping to get the order right. (That's faster than physically / chemically possible.) Continue this experiment for 10^{18} seconds (2 to 3 times the alleged evolutionary age of the universe). That gives you *only* 10^{110} attempts to get the order right. But to get even "half a chance," you have to make 20^{400} attempts. In powers of 10, that's about 10^{520} attempts, incomprehensibly beyond 10^{110} .

You can't get there from here! The debate about a natural or an evolutionary origin for life should be done. Only a simpleton or a liar would hang on to evolution in light of this analysis. (And we've just scratched the surface.) But you can already glimpse the enormity of faith demanded by the high priests of evolution.

These mathematical impossibilities regarding a chance chemical origin of life are well known, but do not show up in museum displays, biology textbooks, or TV propaganda about evolution. There was a famous conference at the Wistar Institute in Philadelphia in 1966 where a number of physical scientists and engineers challenged evolutionary biologists on just these issues. (See Meyer's book, Chapter 9.) The only "reasonable" counter-argument that was made was a speculation that perhaps a fairly large number of different amino acid sequences could still fold into a given functional protein, or perhaps into some other functional protein.

Experiments in the 1980s by MIT biochemist Robert Sauer and in the 1990s by Cambridge researcher Douglas Axe laid this desperate speculation to rest. While a given protein may indeed allow some amino

substitutions and still function, and while additional substitutions might serve some other useful protein function, the ratio of useful to non-useful permutations is still hopeless. Axe determined for a particular 150-amino acid protein that only about 1 in 10^{74} permutations would be able to fold into a stable 3-dimensional shape. Only some unknown fraction of these might actually serve some biological function.

It looks like Sauer and Axe have made the random chance job at least somewhat easier. After all, 1 in 10^{74} is a “lot more likely” than 1 in 20^{150} . (Our nominal protein above, containing 400 amino acids is very average in size. Some proteins contain well over 1,000 amino acids. Evolutionists would rather play games with the smallest varieties.) But let’s back up and incorporate a couple of essential issues. Naturally produced mixtures of amino acids come equally in two mirror image forms: L and D. (Levorotatory and Dextrorotatory, left-handed and right-handed.) Only the “L” works in life. The odds of getting a 150-amino chain of strictly L-form are 1 in 2^{150} , or about 1 in 10^{45} . Also, even assuming we are working with only the right set of 20 useful amino acids, the chain must be a peptide-bond chain. Two aminos can hook together in different ways. The odds for / against the peptide bond are roughly 1 in 2 for each member of the chain. Thus we have another 1 in 10^{45} difficulty.

If we combine the above 1 in 10^{74} sequencing improbability for a small protein with just these two other “difficulties,” the resulting odds are 1 in 10^{164} . Even the smallest and simplest possible single-celled organism has been estimated to require at least 250 unique proteins (more on this in the next chapter). Assuming they are all “small” at 150 amino acids, the multiplied improbability is 1 in $10^{41,000}$. Now, you can quibble with any particular aspect of such estimates. But if you quibble with the conclusion, I suspect you of ulterior motives. Please, come up with your own numbers and stand up and defend how reasonable you think it is for life to form from chemistry.

The biochemistry of protein synthesis is well known. Amino acids do not naturally form chains. In the cell, RNA molecules use the ribosomes (enzymatic structures) to lock amino acids in place while their neighbors are brought in and bonded. Once the protein is released, additional enzymes assist in folding the protein into the special 3-D structure required for its functionality.

About 120 different macro-molecules are involved in the synthesis of proteins, translating the messenger RNA sequence of bases into the proper amino acid sequence. Each of these macro-molecules is a precisely fashioned 3-D tool — far more intricate than any you would find in a master craftsman’s workshop. Defects in these tools — from mutations, for example — are the source of debilitating and tragic diseases.

The machinery of protein formation is magnificently complex. “Natural conditions” do not allow the formation of proteins, no matter how many millions, billions, or trillions of years you care to fantasize. An additional impossibility arises in the challenge of finding a randomly ordered polypeptide sequence that will fold into any biologically relevant 3-D shape. Royal Truman (see references) has surveyed the current literature and concluded the odds are astronomically small.

Experiments have shown that random chains can clump together as a sheet of paper may be crumpled. But such clumps are distinct in significant ways from the types of folding associated with functional proteins. Truman explains: “Native-like globular proteins fold into a precise *discrete topology* relying on secondary structures and other precise chemical interactions.” Analysis indicates that for an average-sized 300 amino-acid protein, randomly sequenced, the odds of getting a properly folded topology are less than 1 in 10^{35} . Furthermore, it is clear that there are an astronomical number of properly folded

topologies in comparison with any particular biologically functional protein, ie., even if you get the chain to fold, it is extremely unlikely that it will serve any useful purpose.

Recent discoveries have revealed the utility of proteins or complexes of proteins that are not completely folded, but in ways that clearly increase the complexity of the design and function. A recent *Scientific American* article describes this genius in flexible protein design, although the authors religiously credit the randomness of evolution. Not rigid in a single 3-D shape, some proteins can morph into different shapes depending on the required functions. About 600 of the 100,000 proteins coded by the human genome have been discovered to be flexible. Some suspect that as many as 1/3 of life's proteins have multi-function flexibility. Don't just think "Swiss Army knife." Think "Transformers." One example the authors use is colloquially termed a "monorail transporter." Two copies of the protein kinesin "walk" along microtubules to drag molecular cargo to different cellular locations. ATP-powered "feet" twist, lift, and reconnect to the "monorail" to make the journey one "step" at a time. Another protein complex (four copies of p53) uses an "unstructured" section of its body to wrap around the DNA molecule to initiate repair processes when the DNA suffers damage. In fact, this protein can interact with more than 100 other types of proteins, plus RNA. Such complexity and wizardry in design goes way beyond the most fanciful imaginations of the creators of "Transformers."

The authors of this article, who are researchers in the field, are committed evolutionists. Like other evolutionary authors, they can't seem to help themselves when describing form and function. They repeatedly use "design" language. Here are some words and phrases from the article: "optimized for functions," "signaling and regulation," "the messages are encoded," "signaling pathways," "lock and key." They can't help it because such systems are obviously designed, with analogues we recognize from our own efforts in engineering. Even though human-engineered systems are far simpler than those of life's nanoscale, the committed evolutionist cannot see design even while he describes it!

Also typical of such articles, is the use of passive voice when weaving evolutionary stories to associate with their here-and-now discoveries. For example: "If these ideas on the evolution of the genetic code are correct, then the first proteins on Earth folded poorly or not at all. The amino acids that arose later evidently enabled proteins to form structure, providing the basis for the formation of lock-and-key enzyme active sites and enabling proteins, over millions of years, to replace RNA as the catalytic powerhouse in all living cells."

Let's take a minute to parse the above quote. "If" certifies that the authors speculate – no hard science in this paragraph. ". . . folded poorly or not at all." – Of course there is no evidence whatsoever that proteins ever existed that didn't fold. How could they arise, thrive, and reproduce? But some speculation is required to leap from zero useful proteins to the wonder of life. "The amino acids that arose later . . ." – The word "arose" is a passive voice verb, begging the questions of who did it or how did it happen? Passive devices are often used in the evolutionary literature, because they have no clue *how* it could happen naturally, and they certainly abhor the *who* question. ". . . enabled proteins to form structure," – But proteins do not form structure on their own. "Enabled" by whom or how? ". . . providing the basis" – But provision is the act of a willful provider! "Enabling" occurs yet again, begging the same questions. ". . . millions of years" – The supposed magic of deep time is invoked, ignoring the thermodynamic relentlessness of time to degrade, destroy, and equilibrate. ". . . to replace RNA as the catalytic powerhouse . . ." But RNA molecules are not catalytic powerhouses. Their occasional, modest ability to catalyze sparingly under rare circumstances does not allow for the biochemistry of life. But the evolutionist knows that proteins cannot start from scratch, so they hope that RNA might serve at the genesis of life . . . too bad that it can't.

You may run into textbooks that assert that the “proto-cells” that preceded the first cell used RNA for genetic coding, translation, and enzymatic (protein) function. This so-called “RNA world” speaks to the desperation of materialists. RNA has been shown to have a bit of catalytic function to join two amino acids in a peptide bond or to latch onto amino acids, but has nothing like the power and versatility demonstrated by proteins for the essential functions of life. In order for RNA-life to exist, the single-helix RNA molecule must function with all the power of DNA (with its double-helix), execute the usual RNA functions, plus operate with the diversity and effectiveness of full-fledged proteins. All this, of course, RNA cannot do. The only living cells ever observed have enormous complexity, requiring the entire array of functioning nano-machines. Furthermore, laboratory experiments conducted by Robert Shapiro, a New York University DNA chemist, have demonstrated that RNA simply cannot form under plausible environmental conditions (see Overman). Indeed, RNA is incredibly difficult to synthesize in the laboratory, even with all the power of modern technology and the active participation of intelligent chemists! Textbooks typically tell such stories as the “RNA-world,” but neglect to mention the experimental results that have already refuted the idea.

When you read such articles asserting evolution on the web, in magazines, or at museum displays, do your own analysis. Without realizing it, the evolutionists surrender the intellectual field. Once they transition from laboratory, hands-on experiments to evolutionary speculations, they reveal the utter baselessness of their philosophy.

The bottom line: Evolution is mathematically and physically / chemically impossible at its very foundation, namely, in the existence of the fundamental nano-machines essential to life. There is NO theory of evolution to explain life. Let me emphasize that again. It’s not that I’m arguing against the “theory of evolution” at the molecular level. There is no theory of evolution at the molecular level, which is where life operates and reproduces.

Astronomer Fred Hoyle (not a Christian) commented about the desperate hope of “astrobiologists” and other evolutionists who yearn to discover evidence of a naturalistic origin for life:

I don't know how long it is going to be before astronomers generally recognize that the combinatorial arrangement of not even one among the many thousands of biopolymers on which life depends could have been arrived at by natural processes here on the Earth. Astronomers will have a little difficulty at understanding this because they will be assured by biologists that it is not so, the biologists having been assured in their turn by others that it is not so. The “others” are a group of persons who believe, quite openly, in mathematical miracles. They advocate the belief that tucked away in nature, outside of normal physics, there is a law which performs miracles. New Scientist, November, 1981, p. 526.

Nothing has changed in the last thirty years. It is difficult for chemists to get funding for experimental programs associated with biogenesis. It is no coincidence that the Miller / Urey experiments from the 1950s serve as the poster child. There hasn’t been much of any note since then.

The above arguments against naturalistic protein genesis could certainly be used for the DNA which codes for the proteins. It should be noted that the physical / chemical conditions for DNA nucleotide synthesis are very different from those associated with protein synthesis. For example, the UV light which would supposedly have helped to generate a few crude amino acids, would certainly dissociate any DNA lying around. But then DNA doesn’t form naturally at all and then lie around. DNA is a product of cellular life, but is entirely useless without the machinery of the complete cell to embrace it. In

particular, DNA's existence (and utility) requires a large system of functional proteins. But proteins can't exist unless coded by DNA and fabricated using the machinery of an existing cell. I could go on with regard to quantitative arguments regarding the numerical impossibility of biochemistry apart from cellular life, but I'd like to shift the argument and discuss the issue from the viewpoint of information.

We all intuitively understand what we mean by "information." When I tell my wife that I am going for a walk and expect to return in thirty minutes, I use spoken language to communicate the message. My desire is for the thoughts in my mind to be replicated in hers. I turn the thoughts into electro-chemical commands to my lungs, voice-box, lips, etc., to produce sound which propagates through the air. My wife's ears contain a sensor system that responds to the compression waves, translating them into electrical signals conveyed to her brain. Her brain interprets the signals as speech – in the English language, in particular. Her mind understands, interprets, and responds to the content of the message embedded in the speech.

Could I have conveyed the same message – the same information – by a handwritten note? Of course, although the medium and sensor systems are now different. How about by a text message? I could even pantomime the message successfully, since we know each other so well. The information is quite different from the medium used to convey the message. Information is ultimately generated by thought and, to be useful, produces specific thoughts in the recipient. Automated systems (computers / sensors / robots) can produce information, of course, but such systems are *designed* by thoughtful engineers for specific purposes. Wiring diagrams, blueprints, software, and construction and maintenance manuals comprise sets of information enabling the fabrication and operation of such systems.

The complexity of life far exceeds the most sophisticated constructs of human engineers. The DNA molecules at the core of living cells provide the information required for the physical development, operation, maintenance, and reproduction of all organisms. We'll discuss the details more in chapter 3, but for now, the essential point is that DNA contains the vital information to enable the machinery of life. In every realm of human experience we observe that information starts with thought. Living organisms display the most complex and brilliantly designed sets of information ever observed. Living machinery thus is overwhelmingly affirmative evidence for the existence of a brilliant mind. The Creator God of the Bible fits our expectations.

Oxford professor John Lennox argues that "information and intelligence are fundamental to the existence of the universe and life and, far from being the end products of an unguided natural process starting with energy and matter, they are involved from the very beginning." When a reasonable person concludes that the presence of information is a decisive indicator of intelligence as its source, Lennox insists that "we are not arguing from analogy, but we are making an inference to the best explanation." Such is the basis of inductive reasoning, which is ubiquitous in human experience, and certainly essential with respect to the debate over origins. Nobody was there to see the origins of life and the universe, unless you take the word of the Creator as revealed in the Bible. If you don't take His word, and claim to start without a presuppositional foundation, then you simply must make inferences based on observations.

Let's camp for a while on the significance of information. It is usually not difficult to recognize the difference between observables generated by information, as opposed to natural processes. A ripple pattern on a beach may be caused by the action of waves. But if we see carved into wet sand . . . "HOT DOGS FOR SALE 100 YARDS AHEAD" . . . we don't look for naturalistic explanations. No one, having visited Mount Rushmore, would be so obtuse as to credit erosion for the famous display of American

Presidents. The da Vinci painting, “The Last Supper,” has never been mistaken for an accidental splash of paint on canvas. Your own driver’s license photo is a reliable representation of “you.” Yet all of these cases represent a minuscule amount of information compared with that coded into the genome of any living creature.

How much information is conveyed in a simple black and white photo? A “bit” of information is equivalent to knowing whether a switch is on or off. Inside the computer, electronic circuits represent each bit by whether the voltage output is at one level or another, or whether current flows or doesn’t. A simple black and white photo of your face could be rendered into a grid of 100 x 100 pixels. Each pixel may be distinguished by a gray scale of perhaps 16 gradations from white to black. If each pixel were either perfectly white or perfectly black, then we would need at least 1 bit for each of the 10,000 pixels, thus 10,000 bits of information to develop the picture. (We won’t worry about the ancillary systems needed to produce the photo in this simplistic analysis.) For a 16-level gray scale, we would need 160,000 bits.

For comparison, we note that the King James Version of the Bible, with 3,566,480 letters, can be represented digitally by 34.7 million bits. How much information is represented in the genome of the human body represented by that crude black and white photo? The answer is approximately 12 billion bits. (See Gitt’s book for a wonderful treatment of this subject.) And this counts only the linear message encoded in the human cell’s DNA. There are three-dimensional aspects of information essential to cellular life that are more difficult to account for numerically, but are, nonetheless, quite considerable.

Just how efficient and brilliantly designed is the DNA information storage medium used by each of your cells? A modern CD stores about 1 Gigabit per square inch. DVDs are about twice as densely packed. HD DVDs and Blu-ray disks have achieved about 10 Gbit / sq in. The top hard drive technology approaches 1 Tbit / sq in. That’s 10^{12} bits per square inch. (Data thanks to Wikipedia, “Memory Storage Density.”) DVDs and hard drive disks are only a few square inches at best, and although the data is recorded in a comfortably flat 2-D array, making use of the data requires a considerable quantity of 3-D hardware surrounding the disk.

DNA’s packing density can be estimated at over 10^{22} bits per cubic inch (Gitt). Although the comparison with electronic storage media produces a slightly apples / oranges issue because of the 2-D / 3-D differences, it is clear that DNA is enormously more efficient. Furthermore, as we’ll see, the 3-D reading / writing equipment integrated with the DNA in each cell is astronomically more complex and microscopically more compact than manmade information systems.

As Gitt opines (p. 192) . . .

This comparison makes it patently clear that the evolutionary view requires us to believe things which are totally unreasonable. Thousands of man-years of research as well as unprecedented technological developments were required to produce a Megabit chip. But we are expected to believe that the storage principles embodied in DNA, with their much higher degree of integration, developed spontaneously in matter which was left to itself. Such a “theory” is, to say the least, absurd in the highest degree!

Are evolutionists aware of the “impossibilities” of deriving massive amounts of information by natural processes? Of course. How do they respond? For the most part, they ignore the issue and pretend it doesn’t exist. When they do address it, you can count on distortion, obfuscation, and even outright

lying. A particularly imaginative “bait and switch” story is found in Richard Dawkins’ book, *Climbing Mount Improbable*. He devised a simple computer program to illustrate the “power” of mutations and natural selection to generate new information. His program generates little stick figures that he calls “biomorphs,” and gushes, “it is truly startling what can evolve before your eyes in a few hundred generations of selective breeding.”

I won’t spend much time quibbling with Dawkins just how *unnatural* his biomorphs are . . . generated by a *designed* piece of software running on a *designed* computer, producing visual patterns on a *designed* computer monitor, for *intelligent* human interaction via *unnatural selection* of generations of biomorphs that start to look like the outlines of living creatures – which, of course, are *not designed* in Dawkins’ view. Specifically, his program generates stick figures with an algorithm to “mutate” their shapes from one generation to the next. The programmer can “select” those biomorphs that seem to be trending in a useful direction. Through this process Dawkins generates little stick figures that he draws in his book on a page below stick figures of real trees. The reader is intended to marvel at how much the biomorphs resemble the “real” trees.

Amazingly, Dawkins has the gall to draw a tight correlation between biomorphs and real life: “Biomorph genes are not made of DNA but this difference is trivial for our purposes.” Get that: “*trivial*.” He goes on: “DNA is digitally coded information just like numbers in a computer, and numerical ‘genes’ pass down the generations of biomorphs in the same kind of way as DNA passes down generations of plants or animals.” To make the visual case of the similarity between his biomorphs and animals, he plays with the program to generate stick figures reminiscent of insects, birds, and fish. He then writes, “A few minutes of playing with this program on a modern, fast computer gives you a hands-on, vivid feeling for how Darwinian selection works.”

If you’re not angry yet, let me remind you that this fellow holds a Ph.D. in biology, occupies a prestigious Chair at Oxford University, and makes millions through books on “evolutionary science.”

So in addition to the obvious fallacies, what is the really big lie in his biomorph game? Each of his stick figures contains less than the information described earlier for a 100 x 100 pixel photograph. The biomorph doesn’t even use a gray scale, but renders each pixel as black or white. Thus 100 x 100 x 1 bit per pixel gives 10,000 bits. The figures of “real trees” are also rendered in his book in about 10,000 bits. But the *genomes* that represent “real trees” and real animals contain roughly a trillion bits (a thousand billion), equal to about 100 million pages of the Encyclopaedia Britannica – according to arch-evolutionist Carl Sagan, among many others). This trillion bits is just in the linear DNA information, neglecting additional information in the 3-dimensional structure (to be discussed shortly).

His biomorphs are as good a representation of the creatures he displays as much as a black and white photograph is a *complete and sufficient representation of you* – including your brain, heart, lungs, immune system, skeletal structure, nervous system, ability to learn and love and play music, etc.

Is that the best that the world’s premier apologist for evolution can do? He admits that *information* is the key to a fundamental understanding of life. So he “baits” his students with cute drawings of “evolving” biomorphs and then “switches” by claiming that life is essentially the same.

Dawkins’ deceitful game is played in all of the kids’ textbooks and in the natural history museums around the world. Imaginative but simple diagrams are displayed in sequence to suggest how apes once “morphed” into “hominids” which “morphed” into humans. Or how fish supposedly developed limbs,

morphing into amphibians and then to reptiles. With just a few pixels to play with the changes don't look so drastic, do they? But the actual differences between fish and amphibians, if you walk down to the waterfront and examine them closely . . . and then under a microscope . . . are millions of times more dramatic. These differences are coded in their vastly different genomes.

Michael J. Denton (not a creationist) has written a wonderful book entitled, *Nature's Destiny – How the Laws of Biology Reveal Purpose in the Universe*. While discussing the many obviously *designed* aspects of DNA and its double helix he marvels at the 3-D aspects that go far beyond the 1-D level of information commonly cited in discussions of information content. The human genome would stretch out 1 meter in length, but in the cell is “compacted into a tiny ball less than 5-thousandths of a millimeter in diameter.” The cell twists its DNA into super-helices of helices, bending and packaging the genetic information far more efficiently than man has ever dreamed for one of his own crude technological triumphs. Despite the compaction, every gene is accessible to just the right tools to read it, unwind it, transcribe it, reproduce it, and even wind it back up for another use. The locations of genes in 3-D space, and with respect to each other, are perfectly prescribed for the efficient operation of each cell, with thousands of critical chemical processes underway during each second of life. The issues, therefore, go way beyond even the linearly encoded information in the DNA.

We'll get into more of this in the next chapter. For now, we ought to more humbly appreciate the awesome brilliance of our Creator, and determine what He wants us to do with the life He has given us.

For the reader who was wondering whether evolution is founded on a solid scientific foundation, the arguments within this short chapter should settle the matter. It is not just that the evolutionary story of life is impossible, but also that *there is no theory of evolution* – namely, no scientific evidence, or experiments, or theory, or even a rational speculation to explain life in its material essence: the information essential to its origin, operation, sustenance, maintenance, and reproduction. This information is vastly superior in both quantity and quality to that generated technologically by rational, intelligent, thinking man. Thus it is affirmative evidence for a rational, brilliant Creator.

References:

- Royal Truman, “The Proportion of Polypeptide Chains which Generate Native Folds – Part 1: Analysis of Reduced Codon Set Experiments,” *Journal of Creation* 25(1), 2011.
- A. Dunker and R. Kriwacki, “The Orderly Chaos of Proteins,” *Scientific American*, April, 2011.
- Stephen C. Meyer, *Signature in the Cell – DNA and the evidence for intelligent design*, HarperOne, 2009.
- Werner Gitt, *In the Beginning was Information*, Christliche Literatur-Verbreitung e.V., 1997.
- Richard Dawkins, *Climbing Mount Improbable*, W. W. Norton, 1997.
- Michael J. Denton, *Nature's Destiny – How the Laws of Biology Reveal Purpose in the Universe*, The Free Press, 1998.

Chapter 2

The Incredible Cell

The last chapter focused on proteins and DNA, vital components of life. In this chapter we move on to the smallest possible *system* which defines life: the cell. The simplest conceivable cell – the smallest possible self-replicating organism – is immeasurably more complex than the most sophisticated designs of human science and engineering. To the high school student, looking at a cell through a microscope may not be very awe-inspiring. At modest magnifications, the cell looks like an ill-shaped blob containing blobby structures. That was the impression that Charles Darwin got. He expressed doubts of his own ideas based on what was known about the complexity of the eye in his time, knowledge which was superficial compared with today. If he had today's understanding of the eye, or even of the "simple cell," I doubt that he would have proposed his crude naturalistic philosophy. At the higher magnifications of modern instruments, the cell's machinery and processes are seen to be so complex that even today, in the second decade of the 21st century, there are many mysteries despite the continued efforts of the top research scientists in the world, equipped with billions of dollars in resources.

For example, the July 2011 issue of *Popular Science* includes an image of a cell in the process of division, featuring *newly discovered* filaments apparently key to the process. The image was developed from data acquired through multiple electron beam images. One of the researchers involved says that his "next goal is to clarify the chemical composition of the mysterious filaments and the process by which they form." Interesting . . . unknown chemical composition and admission of a mystery – why do the filaments exist and how did they arise? My point is that scientists still have much to unravel about the *operations* and even the *components* of cells. They are therefore so much *farther* from any legitimate claim to understanding a naturalistic origin for cells. One might as well demand of a young child, introduced to a computer for the first time and just learning how to operate it, to explain in detail how the computer was manufactured – both hardware and software.

How do evolutionists suppose the first cell arose from the molecular soup assumed to exist on the early planet Earth? Oparin's 1924 book, *The Origin of Life*, painted a picture of oily droplets acting like cell walls, and accumulation of complex molecules inside, until there was just the right amount and type of compounds to allow self-sustainment and replication. The details were fuzzy, of course. Clearly, Oparin wasn't aware of the structure of DNA or of the level of complexity involved in cellular function that was discovered later in the century.

According to evolutionary physicist Freeman Dyson (see reference below): "The Oparin picture was generally accepted by biologists for half a century. It was popular not because there was any evidence to support it, but rather because it seemed to be the only alternative to biblical creationism." What an amazing admission! This is science? We must embrace a theory apart from evidence, simply because we cannot stomach the possibility of a non-materialistic answer!

Complexity abounds at the molecular level – a complexity not seen in any non-living structure in the universe. Consider the functional operation and working components of a typical cell. Then extrapolate logically from the probability arguments outlined in the previous chapter. (The paragraph below is paraphrased from Denton's book, p. 328-9.)

“The cell wall is a wonderfully robust and complex structure with millions of openings to allow the flow of materials in and out – and restrict the flow of inappropriate materials. Countless conduits and corridors are organized between cellular structures that include the central memory bank in the nucleus and various assembly and processing plants. The nucleus is a geodesic dome containing orderly arrays of the most complex molecules in the universe – DNA. A huge collection of raw materials and products moves along the corridors within and to the extremities of the cell. Complex molecular machinery – proteins – consist typically of 3,000 atoms arranged in precise 3-D topology. Any given protein is well beyond man’s capacity to manufacture. Materials and products flow in perfectly regulated timing. Control systems are based on artificial languages and decoding systems that are just now starting to reveal some of their mysteries to herculean efforts in genetic science. Assembly of cellular components and tools is performed with amazing precision. Errors occur at the rate of far less than 1 in a billion replications and corrective systems are in place to fix the problems.”

There is an enormous body of scientific literature that documents the complexity of a “simple” cell. Any summary is woefully inadequate, but I’ll devote just a few words to it. The cell’s membrane is designed to be selective — allowing nutrients to enter and waste to exit. The membrane encloses a vast array of structures and molecules. Chemically, the cell contains water, inorganic ions (sodium, potassium, magnesium, calcium, chlorine, etc.), metabolites, proteins, DNA, RNA, phospholipids, and polysaccharides. There are about 500 carefully regulated chemical reactions that constitute the metabolic system. Much research has been done just to sort out the metabolic chemical pathways.

Specific chemical reactions are restricted to specific regions (organelles) within the cell so they don’t interfere with each other. These subcompartments have their own membranes to allow isolation. For example, the mitochondrion is a structure that contains all of the enzymes needed to produce the cell’s ATP — the principal molecular energy carrier. The ribosomes are the manufacturing centers for proteins. Intricate chemical “decision processes” dictate the flow of materials in and out of the organelles.

How many parts does a cell need in order to “live”? Michael Behe, in his book, *Darwin’s Black Box*, has popularized the notion of “irreducible complexity.” We will devote Chapter 6 to this topic, but for now we will simply define the concept by pointing out that a cell is such a complex machine, with a myriad of inter-dependent parts, that it cannot survive dismemberment – reduction. The entire machine must be present for any of it to work.

Thomas Heinze, in his book *How Life Began*, summarizes a clever set of experiments designed to determine just how irreducible a living cell can be. *Mycoplasma genitalium* is a bacterium smaller than others because it is a parasite – it makes use of the machinery of the living creatures that it infests. Scientists “knocked out” one gene at a time to determine just how many of its 480 protein-encoding genes were absolutely critical to survival. They determined that the simplest conceivable cell requires 265 to 350 genes. And that is for a parasite. The minimum number of genes for organisms that live more independently would be in the thousands. As noted in the previous chapter, it is *impossible* for undirected chemical processes to create the information resident in a single gene. Furthermore, for a cell to be alive, it takes more than the mere existence of the DNA “blueprints.” The DNA must be arranged into chromosomes (for eukaryotes), with accompanying RNA, membranes, cell structures, and protein machinery all in the right places doing the right things. The “blueprint” for an automobile for example, does not transport you to work in the morning. The entire automobile is required.

In light of these *elementary* facts, Ph.D. evolutionists will publish propaganda for the general public on the origin of life like the following (from *Rare Earth – Why Complex Life is Uncommon in the Universe*, by Ward and Brownlee): “We start with a cell membrane enclosing DNA – and then evolve . . .” The rational mind boggles – not just at the foolishness of such statements, but at determining whether the authors are stupid or lying. I know that sounds harsh. Please suggest another option.

I remember as a high school freshman learning about the 19th century mythology of spontaneous generation. Maggots showing up on rotting meat led people to believe that life could arise spontaneously. In 1860 Louis Pasteur conducted experiments to show that in all of the suspicious cases, life was always produced as offspring from life of the same kind. This principle of “biogenesis” has never been refuted. Bananas come from bananas, worms from worms, crocodiles from crocodiles, and humans from humans. If science is based on validated observations, it would be difficult to think of any principle / law / theory more thoroughly established than biogenesis. Yet evolution is based on spontaneous generation. “From goo to you via the zoo,” as someone once quipped. Spontaneous generation is necessitated not only for the alleged first living cell, but also for the genetic content of the tens of millions of creatures distinguished from one another by vast quantities of unique genetic information.

Where would the first cell have come into existence? School kids are taught that life arose in the ocean, from a chemical soup, including amino acids created in thunderstorms. Given the mathematical impossibilities already discussed, it is clear that if the entire universe were an ocean rich with the right constituents, the first functional protein would never arise. But evolutionists have only the Earth’s ocean to work with. Problems include the following:

1. Amino acids, even if generated in the atmosphere, would include many nonfunctional types, plus “sludge” that would prevent polypeptide (protein precursor) formation.
2. Amino acid concentrations would be many orders of magnitude too small to form even small chains. In short, even if you start with the right building blocks, the blocks are scattered far and wide and cannot find each other.
3. The presence of water breaks peptide bonds. Namely, amino chains are more likely to break apart than to form chains in water. Nucleotide chains are also broken by water. DNA quickly “unzips” when placed in water. Inside the cell, there are systems to prevent unzipping, but not in any natural environment. This point alone should end the argument. You need water to serve as the medium of life and yet the presence of water will decisively prevent the formation of its building blocks.
4. Ultraviolet light breaks protein, DNA, and RNA bonds. Without oxygen and ozone in the atmosphere, sunlight contains too much UV to allow “first life.” So you must have oxygen in the atmosphere.
5. Atmospheric oxygen is so reactive that it disrupts the formation of biomolecules. So you cannot have oxygen in the atmosphere. That’s why evolutionists long ago proposed an early atmosphere without oxygen. But geologists have discovered that the “most ancient rocks” show evidence of even higher concentrations of oxygen than we observe today.
6. To avoid the UV problems, some resort to imagining life starting in hot deep sea vents. Has it ever occurred to you how much of a desperation tactic this is? What a hostile environment! But the rest of the “early Earth” is clearly impossible. However, in those nasty deep sea vents, you must wait for brilliantly designed genes to arise to enable survival at boiling temperatures. Creatures with these ultra-specialized genes can thrive, but the genetic material and the rest of the cell’s constituents cannot survive in hot water *outside* of existing cells. So life has to happen *and* be designed specifically for the extreme undersea environment before life can arise. That’s a serious chicken vs. egg problem.

7. DNA and RNA do not form spontaneously in natural environments. Neither do folded protein molecules, of course. The existence of a few naturally forming amino acids is analogous to discovering a few bricks in the desert and then exclaiming, “Aha! Now I understand completely how the structure of the Pentagon, including its walls, hallways, windows, plumbing, electrical wiring, lighting, and heating systems could have formed from natural processes!!”

8. You could place a cell in a test tube, kill it, and stir up the chemicals. At that point, the test tube would still contain everything required for cellular life. How long would you have to wait for that cell to come back together and spring back to life? Even the most ardent evolutionist wouldn't expect it to happen in a billion years. In fact, if you did the experiment with a billion cells in a billion test tubes, no biochemist would expect to find a single cell alive at the end of one year. More poignantly, you could do the experiment with proteins dissociated into amino acids or DNA broken into nucleotides. Impossibility is guaranteed. So why are evolutionists so fervent? Apparently, it's not about science, is it?

I could develop an entire book to add to the points above. Others have done so already. If you're interested, the references are readily available through archived articles and books you can obtain via the referenced web sites at the end of the chapter. But since this is a survey, let's move on.

The impossibilities associated with the origin of life are never exposed to school kids or to the public on the Discovery Channel, but serious researchers understand them too well. Nobel Prize winner (co-discoverer of DNA's double helix) Francis Crick (an atheist) confessed:

“What is so frustrating for our present purpose is that it seems almost impossible to give any numerical value to the probability of what seems a rather unlikely sequence of events . . . An honest man, armed with all the knowledge available to us now, could only state that in some sense, the origin of life appears at the moment to be almost a miracle, so many are the conditions which would have had to have been satisfied to get it going . . . Every time I write a paper on the origin of life, I determine I will never write another one, because there is too much speculation running after too few facts.”

So how does Crick support his atheism in this area? He calls it “directed panspermia.” Intelligent aliens directed (seeded) life on Earth. So how did the aliens get started? If the early Earth of the evolutionist's imagination isn't a suitable environment, what imaginary alien planet would be? We have already established that the universe is not big enough nor old enough in anyone's imagination for life to get started naturally. That's not just a problem with a specific environment, but rather with physics and chemistry . . . the foundations of all of the science that is known.

A living cell cannot operate without a specialized class of proteins called “enzymes.” Enzymes serve as catalysts for the chemical reactions vital to life. A catalyst serves to speed up a chemical reaction without being consumed in the process. The biochemical reactions that transform food and energy for the cell's use simply do not work at body temperature without the use of a catalyst. Each reaction is facilitated by a particular enzyme, which typically serves to lock onto the reactants so that they can be transformed into the product molecules required.

I have on my wall a chart entitled “Metabolic Pathways,” the 22nd edition, produced by Sigma-Aldrich. The chart displays an incredibly detailed and complex network of interdependent chemical reactions vital to cellular metabolism. Each reaction is made possible by a particular enzyme. About 550 such enzymes are listed on the back of the chart. It has taken decades of painstaking research to acquire the knowledge to build this chart. Below is a description of the chart from sigma-aldrich.com/pathways:

“The 22nd (2003) edition of the IUBMB-Sigma-Nicholson Metabolic Pathways Chart contains updated pathways involved in ATP metabolism in the mitochondria and chloroplast. The “backbone” of the map is the Glycolytic Pathway followed by the TCA (Krebs) Cycle and the Respiratory Chain which together lead to the synthesis of ATP by ATP Synthase. ATP is the source of most of the energy required for all life. Many biosynthetic and breakdown pathways of metabolism such as carbohydrates, amino acids, lipids are associated with this backbone and are differentiated by the use of color. Human metabolism is distinguished where possible by the use of black arrows. Some 550 reactions are identified by their IUBMB Enzyme Commission (EC) numbers which are then indexed . . . Features glycolysis, carbohydrate, amino acid, lipid, nucleotide, steroid, vitamin metabolism and much more.”

Sarfati provides a couple of dramatic examples of enzymatic utility. Enzymes often speed up reaction times by a factor of 100,000 or 1,000,000. One reaction essential to the construction of DNA building blocks in the cell, left to itself, would take up to 78 million years in water, but its specialized enzyme speeds it up by a factor of 10^{18} . . . that’s a billion billion. An even more powerful enzyme enables the splitting of phosphate bonds by a speed factor of 10^{21} . . . a thousand times faster than the previous example. Without such catalysts, life would not exist at all. Yet for a cell to live, hundreds and even thousands of reactions, requiring their own specialized catalysts, must already be in place and working at incredible efficiencies.

An article in the March, 2010 issue of the magazine *Creation* reports that the brilliant coloring of parrot feathers is due to a set of enzymes unique to parrots. Many birds use carotenoid pigments for coloring, which can be obtained by eating the right plants. Researchers analyzed the red feathers of 44 species of parrots to determine that they all use the same set of five *psittacofulvins* to generate color. The researchers, who are evolutionists, marvel at this “pretty important evolutionary novelty,” but offer no explanation how such evolution could have occurred. Indeed! Even 1 enzyme is beyond hope for the universe to produce through undirected chemical processes. But in parrots we have 5 interacting, yet unique enzymes which must all be in place and operating for function to follow. Furthermore, these enzymes are “found only in the feathers and nowhere else in the body.” Thus they don’t come from diet, but are part of the creature’s genetic design. Additionally, consider the uniqueness of this set of enzymes to parrots. How did parrots accidentally develop their own miraculously unique system, while other birds use a different design? In fact, *design* and *creation* are the key. Biochemical systems far more complex than the most sophisticated manmade chemical plant clearly require a brilliant Creator. If you insist otherwise, please provide an appropriate example.

Geoffrey Cooper has written a textbook for medical students on molecular biology entitled, *The Cell*. The text is beautifully illustrated with colorful diagrams and microphotographs. Cooper is most emphatically an evolutionist, but I would recommend his textbook to convince any open-minded student that special creation, and not evolution, is the only possible explanation for the cell’s marvelous design.

In the first chapter the author apparently feels obliged to bow before evolution as the creator of the first cell. He begins with an interesting admission: “How life originated and how the first cell came into being are matters of speculation, since these events cannot be reproduced in the laboratory.” So the idea that life arose naturally is not a fact, but still only a speculation. And since the event cannot be reproduced in a laboratory, it is a stretch to even call it “science,” much less established science.

Cooper goes on to discuss the Miller-Urey experiments, but then glosses over the impossibilities of naturalistic protein formation. He notes the criticality of DNA and RNA, but avoids even a suggestion of

how such molecules arose in the environment. He includes a discussion of how “cells needed to evolve their own mechanisms for generating energy and synthesizing the molecules necessary for their replication.” But he doesn’t cite any quantitative theory for how this could have occurred. No such theories exist.

He discusses the vast differences in design between prokaryotes (bacteria with no nuclei) and eukaryotes (nuclei plus other special structures . . . humans are eukaryotes, by the way), but offers only the conventional word story about endosymbiosis. The idea is that different types of bacteria lived close to each other and ate each other. Somehow, the ingestion of a different creature with different structures and functions enabled the eater and the eaten to combine to be a more complex creature. I’m not kidding. But this “theory” glosses over the incredibly detailed biochemistry that would be required for a legitimate theory in any other scientific discipline.

A specific example of “glossing over” is, I think, instructive. “A critical step in the evolution of eukaryotic cells was the acquisition of membrane-enclosed subcellular organelles, allowing the development of the complexity characteristic of these cells. The organelles are thought to have been acquired as a result of the association of prokaryotic cells with the ancestor of eukaryotes.” Note the squishy, equivocal language. Evolutionists make much use of passive voice in their sentence structures to avoid explaining “who did it” or “how it got done.” “Acquisition” glosses over many vital processes, including the new control systems that integrate the operation of the acquired organelle with the existing organism. It’s nice that the two creatures have combined and now live happily ever after, but as a scientist I would like to see some equations and experimental data! “Development” glosses boldly. The word should be used only in the context of design. Who is the developer / designer and what are the design details? “Thought to have been acquired” illustrates how uncertain and desperately hopeful are the priests of the evolutionary religion.

Why do I recommend a book by an evolutionist to convince you that creation is the rock solid paradigm? The rest of Cooper’s textbook is a spectacular exposition of the nanotechnology of the cell’s design. He does a great job detailing the structures, processes, networks, and systems of cellular biology. I also noticed that after his introductory chapter, he dispenses with any thought of evolution and treats his subject as if he was a molecular engineer describing the machinery designed by a much more brilliant molecular engineer. I just now turned to a random page in the text (p. 144). After mentioning that “the mechanism by which prokaryotic DNAs are packaged in the cell appears different from that of eukaryotes and is not well understood,” he goes on to discuss aspects of eukaryotic DNA packaging. But note already use of words normally associated with engineering and design: “mechanism” and “packaged.” I’ll copy the next paragraph verbatim:

“The complexes between eukaryotic DNA and proteins are called **chromatin**, which typically contains about twice as much protein as DNA. The major proteins of chromatin are **histones** – small proteins containing a high proportion of basic amino acids (arginine and lysine) that facilitate binding to the negatively charged DNA molecule. There are five major types of histones – called H1, H2A, H2B, H3, and H4 – which are very similar among different species of eukaryotes. The histones are extremely abundant proteins in eukaryotic cells; together, their mass is approximately equal to that of the cell’s DNA. In addition, chromatin contains an approximately equal mass of a wide variety of nonhistone chromosomal proteins. There are more than a thousand different types of these proteins, which are involved in a range of activities, including DNA replication and gene expression. The DNA of prokaryotes is similarly associated with proteins, some of which presumably function as histones do, packaging the

DNA within the bacterial cell. Histones, however, are a unique feature of eukaryotic cells and are responsible for the distinct structural organization of eukaryotic chromatin.”

Although this paragraph represents the merest introduction to the subject of chromosome structure, the implied complexity belies the simple word games alleging an evolutionary origin for the first cell or the alleged transition from prokaryotes to eukaryotes. As the reader or, even more so, the researcher digs deeper into the subject to discover the wondrous complexity of the operation of these nano-machines, the thought of attempting even evolutionary word games becomes intimidating. The author, even at this point in the text, talks of specific processes and functions, sure at every point that there is meaningful intent associated with every aspect of cellular life. The author has no doubt that the “thousand different types of proteins” are critical to the activities that sustain life. “Structural organization” is the language of design and intent.

Consider also that these thousands of interdependent processes and machines all operate without external guidance . . . in other words, automatically. How difficult would it be to design and build a chemical processing plant, like a refinery, without the active intervention of human operators and maintenance staff? How brilliant would such a design have to be? And that’s not all. You must package the entire plant inside a microscopic package. Your contract demands that this microscopic chemical plant endure efficiently for years, repairing itself as necessary, and converting food into the parts for all of its structures. After a few years, it must be able to replicate or, if damaged too severely, it must dismember itself (a process called “apoptosis”) so it can be scavenged by other chemical factories nearby.

Where are the digitally encoded instructions to be stored for this amazing micro-factory? This data set is encoded into the cell’s DNA within its nucleus. Do you still suppose that both the instructions and the factory arose by chance? Chance would also have to “create” the reading, writing, and translation devices to make continual use of the right portions of the DNA (genes) at the right times to regulate the enormous network of biochemical processes underway every second of the factory’s existence. Evolutionist Caryl Haskins wondered about this as he wrote in *American Scientist* (taken from *Tornado in a Junkyard*):

“Did the code and the means of translating it appear simultaneously in evolution? It seems almost incredible that any such coincidence could have occurred, given the extraordinary complexities of both sides and the requirement that they be coordinated accurately for survival.”

The logic is simple. If DNA came first (and no one has a theory for how DNA could form naturally) then there was nothing to translate it. Yet how could specially designed translation equipment arise first in the absence of anything to read and use? James Perloff cites theistic evolutionists Robert Augros and George Stanciu in their book *The New Biology* (1987):

“What cause is responsible for the origin of the genetic code and directs it to produce animal and plant species? It cannot be matter because of itself matter has no inclination to these forms, any more than it has to the form Poseidon or to the form of a microchip or any other artifact. There must be a cause apart from matter that is able to shape and direct matter. Is there anything in our experience like this? Yes, there is: our own minds. The statue’s form originates in the mind of the artist, who then subsequently shapes matter, in the appropriate way . . . For the same reasons there must be a mind that directs and shapes matter in organic forms . . . This artist is God and nature is God’s handiwork.

Indeed, the skill Michelangelo required to shape statues or the skill required to design and fabricate microchips is trivial compared to that necessary for the construction of the nano-machines of life and their integration into living forms. No human scientist, engineer, or corporate or government laboratory can come close to fabricating life. The most admired statue of a human being is nothing compared to the beauty and function of the living human. Yet life, the absolute pinnacle of design engineering, is believed by many to arise by luck . . . rocks luckily turned into just the right sludge which luckily turned into functioning nanotechnology. I am awestruck by the leap of faith required.

How much more is a book than the paper and ink? If you discovered a textbook on biochemistry on a deserted island, would you waste time trying to sort out naturalistic processes that would explain the origin of the book? When you read this sentence, can you explain it by such an argument as this . . . The “W” was a lucky ink spill, and there must be some unknown principle that attracted ink nearby into the form of “h.” The apparent letter “h”, of course, produces a force to bring ink to its right in the form of “e” . . . A small child wouldn’t buy it. Similarly, amino acids and nucleotides can bind into chains in any order whatsoever, just as letters can be sequenced randomly; for example: sijrhlp. Just as only specific letter sequences have meaning to produce intended thoughts, only specific sequences of amino acids and DNA base pairs have meaning which translates into functional machinery.

Astrophysicists Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe are evolutionists, but have faced up to some of the mathematical difficulties underpinning their faith (see Overman). Making very hopeful assumptions about the probability of enzymes forming in natural environments, they calculated that the probability of the formation of a *very simple* enzyme was one in 10^{20} . They also assumed that the simplest possible cell would be comparable to living bacteria and therefore that about 2,000 different enzymes were needed. Their final estimate was that to get every molecular machine from scratch and in the right place at the right time was one chance in $10^{40,000}$. Recall that there are only 10^{80} atoms in the universe. Any mathematician facing such odds would cry, “Impossible!”

The committed evolutionist works hard to ignore such arguments as discussed in this chapter. No matter how impossible or ridiculous his position, he prefers it to any admission of the existence of a Creator, God almighty. If God exists, He just might make some demands on His creatures. He might prohibit murder and restrict sex to marriage, for example. Worse, He might establish a moral equivalence between hatred and murder and between lust and adultery (as He did in the Sermon on the Mount). If God exists, He might actually bring justice to lawbreakers. If God turns out to be the One described in the Bible, then we are all lawbreakers, thousands of times over. The Biblical God brings everyone to judgment and no one escapes . . . unless . . . he has met God’s conditions for forgiveness and justification.

The Lord Jesus Christ, Who claimed repeatedly to be God-in-the-flesh, led a life that even the most hardened anti-Biblical skeptics purport to admire. He lived 33 years on this Earth and was blameless even in the eyes of his enemies, who tried to kill Him on at least ten different occasions *before* Jesus walked into Jerusalem, *knowing* that a cross awaited Him. What made these enemies so angry . . . *so mad* . . . at Him? He preached repentance. The rebels that occupy this God-created planet would rather embrace their addictive, destructive, and selfish sins. Nobody is going to tell us what to do! Worse, He commanded that we follow Him, believing what He said, acting on it, and following an entirely different path through life.

Even selfish rebels might logically obey God’s commands. Sex constrained to marriage prevents STDs, sexual addiction, and is well-documented to be far more satisfying than promiscuous sex outside of

marriage. Honesty is statistically well-rewarded by others, and keeps the conscience clear. (Even the existence of a conscience, certain convictions of right vs. wrong, cries out for the existence of a spiritual realm and a lawgiver God.) Anger and murder only destroy self and others. Drunkenness destroys health, finances, and families. Obedience to and respect for parents tends to promote children to responsible adulthood. Loving and obeying the God of the Bible correlates with stable families and peaceful communities.

You see, sin is always destructive to self and others. The Bible makes sense of morality, while atheistic evolution can only promote self-destructive and mutually destructive behaviors and cultures. More importantly, the issue really remains . . . What is true? If you haven't figured it out by now, don't delay any longer.

On this chapter's subject, the wonder of the cell, I don't want to go further in this description. I'm not even touching the surface. Please just go to your favorite encyclopedia and read about cellular biology. The deeper you get into it, the more amazed you will be at the complexity. Acquire and read some of the references below. For the moment, however, consider the faith of the individual who has no evidence whatsoever that living cells arose from inanimate matter and can't even fantasize how that might have occurred. That is truly a faith without foundations and with no hopeful application for life . . . or death.

References:

- Freeman Dyson, *Origins of Life*, Cambridge University Press, 1988.
Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, Adler & Adler, 1986.
Michael Behe, *Darwin's Black Box – The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*, Touchstone, 1996.
Thomas F. Heinze, *How Life Began*, Chick Publications, 2002.
Jonathan Sarfati, *By Design: Evidence for Nature's Intelligent Designer – the God of the Bible*, Creation Book Publishers, 2008.
Geoffrey M. Cooper, *The Cell: A Molecular Approach*, Sinauer Associates, 1997.
James Perloff, *Tornado in a Junkyard*, Refuge Books, 2000.
Dean L. Overman, *A Case Against Accident and Self-Organization*, 1997.

Also, search the archives and the bookstores on the following web sites:

truthreallymatters.com

answersingenesis.org

icr.org

cmi.org

Chapter 3

Mutations & natural selection destroy information.

Mutations destroy genetic information. Natural selection destroys genetic information. There is no evidence that the opposite occurs – which must happen for evolution to graduate from fantasy to speculation.

“And God made the beast of the Earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the Earth after his kind: and God saw that it was good.” Genesis 1:25

The “kinds” in Genesis are not “species,” of course. The term “species” is a modern one with some arbitrariness. We observe an awesome and distinctive variety among the flora and fauna of the planet. The distinctiveness derives from genetics, whose foundation is the DNA molecule. Interestingly, evolutionary fantasy was established as “fact” before the molecular foundations of genetics were discovered in the 1950s. If DNA had been understood first, and then someone came up with the idea of Darwinian evolution, it is possible that the fantasy wouldn’t have gotten off the ground.

The genetic information in a cell is contained in structures called “chromosomes.” The key elements of the chromosome carrying the codes for replication, physical structures, metabolic and regulatory processes, and all the biochemistry of life are the DNA molecules. DNA consists of specific sequences of nucleotides – fairly complex molecules in their own right. The order of the nucleotides determines the structure of the proteins manufactured by the cell for its sustenance. Each nucleotide can be thought of as a symbol, and yet has just the right physical structure to allow its purposeful message to be read. A gene is a large functional piece of a DNA molecule.

The genes encode the proteins. Proteins are used as enzymes to catalyze the reactions of life that wouldn’t otherwise be possible at body temperature. Proteins also serve as structural materials, they help control vital cell functions, they facilitate transport of key small molecules, and in muscles they convert chemical into mechanical energy. Proteins are also used for information transfer between cells, for processing nerve impulses, and for work in the immune system. Any organism requires thousands and thousands of different kinds of proteins, which are encoded by a somewhat different number of genes. A human has about 30,000 genes – a number far smaller than biologists once expected, because there are about 100,000 distinct proteins in human cells. A given gene can code for multiple proteins and processes, and a given physical trait may require the combination of several genes. The genius of such a coding system goes far beyond any human construct.

The genome consists of all of the DNA in all of the chromosomes of the cell. The genome of a single-celled creature, like a bacterium, represents a few million symbols. The genome of a large creature, like a mammal, contains a few billion symbols. Think of the genome as a book – free of typographical errors – that describes the creature and how to make the creature work in all of its molecular, chemical, structural, and mechanical detail. In these terms, the “book” for a bacterium would be about a thousand pages in length. The “manual” for a mammal would be about 1,000 volumes of 500 pages each! That’s an enormous amount of information. Enormous research efforts are underway just to decode or “read” the genomes of various creatures.

In order for evolution to be plausible, there must be evidence that mutations and natural selection, over the course of merely a few billion years, can build the required level of information necessary to go from

particles to people! The human (or any mammal) has so much more complexity than the bacterium, of course, which is reflected in the information content of the genome. But even the bacterium is incredibly complex in comparison with naturally occurring chemicals – analogous perhaps to the complexity of the works of Shakespeare compared to the gibberish a monkey might type if left alone with a keyboard. Occasionally, the monkey will hit on an English word. It would be incredibly rare for even a very short meaningful sentence to arise. The odds against a monkey producing a work of literature are so astronomical as to be equivalent to impossible.

Most DNA sequences are polyfunctional and therefore polyconstrained. Imagine writing a book or a computer code with a very specific message or set of instructions when you read left to right, but an entirely different and yet functional message when you read right to left. And yet another message by skipping certain sections and combining them with sections chosen from another sequence. Any misspellings would not only damage the first set of instructions, but could damage all of them. There also appears to be 3-dimensional organization within chromosomes and within the whole nucleus that is optimally balanced for the control of cellular processes, including replication. Such multi-level complexity makes evolution – based on mutations / natural selection – utterly ridiculous. What we see in the genome is data compression combined with incredibly overlapping and nested control schemes – many of which have yet to be understood by microbiologists.

Recent research (references – Misteli) displays both the complexity of the spatial arrangements of our genetic material and the crudity of our understanding. Chromosome positions are different in different cell types, and the spatial relationships change during development and during disease – mess up the spatial configuration and you get sick or die. Within the nucleus, where a chromosome is found influences to what degree the genes turn on and off. Misteli admits that “cell biologists have not yet learned all the rules governing the activity of genes in different parts of the nucleus.”

As herculean a task as was the reading of the human genome – the linear sequence of the DNA molecules – “genome cell biologists . . . are *just beginning* to uncover the ways genomes behave in their natural habitat of the cell . . . it will likely occupy biologists far longer than it took to sequence the human genome in the first place.” The human genome project took ten years and consumed billions of dollars. The 3-D information is viewed as a larger and yet equally significant problem.

We previously discussed at some length the impossibilities associated with particular linear sequential patterns of amino acids in proteins, which correspond to analogous sequences of nucleotides in the DNA. The required 3-dimensional organization of genes and chromosomes, along with the machinery to translate the information, adds another huge realm of mathematical impossibility, albeit somewhat harder to quantify. A simpler analogy to consider might be the 3-D layout of the components in your television. Even if the engineer gets all the right components in just the right quantity, do the layout and wiring matter? The power supply, analog to digital converters, audio and video amplifiers, LED matrix, user interface hardware and software, etc. . . . does it matter how or whether they are hooked together, and whether the right circuits are in the right locations with respect to input and output ports?

In fact, the TV engineer has *a lot more margin for error* than the Architect of the cell. The cell has a wide variety of conduits for information flow and the spatial configuration of its components is optimally designed so that the right materials get to the right locations and specific processes are turned on and turned off through multiple control systems often determined simply by chemical diffusion of key reactants and products. When your information flow is dependent on diffusion rates, the 3-D

configuration must be incredibly precise. A TV's wiring and chassis systems are trivial in comparison. The relative margins for error are often the difference between nanometers and millimeters.

How does evolution supposedly happen? You allegedly have an existing, functional, happily reproducing organism, but somehow this genetically coded and precision-wired system must be transformed into an entirely new system by millions of mutations over the course of thousands of generations. The most fundamental type of mutation is a copying error, where one nucleotide is copied incorrectly, resulting in a gene that encodes a protein with a different amino acid somewhere in its structure. This usually makes a minor and inconsequential change in a protein's functionality. But sometimes this can cause a disease such as sickle-cell anemia. There are other types of mutations that involve swapping or reversing short sections of nucleotides.

As we'll continue to discuss, such mutations are the only available source of the changes that evolutionists hope are the basis of life's diversity. Note that these 1-D mutations in the genetic code *have nothing to do with the 3-D layout of the genes, chromosomes, nucleus, molecular transport conduits, cell membrane, etc.* Yet the 3-D character of microscopic life is critical to its very existence. There is no "theory of evolution" that addresses this problem. So let's go back to the 1-D problem and see whether the atheist has any hope in that realm . . . *just pretending* that a 1-D solution might be sufficient!

The cell has "proof-reading" capability to reduce the rate of point mutations. In the 1950s and 1960s, geneticists calculated that a mutation rate of even 0.5 per individual (that means an average of one mutation for every 2 children in the human race) would produce "error catastrophe" for the human race. Namely, that the mutational load would eventually increase without limit until the extinction of the human race. In the meantime, diseases, reduced fertility, deformities, and early death would be on the increase. For organisms to survive from generation to generation, it has been shown that a rate much higher than that would lead to all kinds of degenerative health problems – which have been observed more and more in recent decades. "Mutational load" or "genetic load" are terms invented to describe the damaging burden to the gene pool. In addition to radioactive sources we come into contact with every day (including cosmic rays which are unavoidable), modern technology has introduced a huge variety of mutagenic chemicals which make our lives easier, but may serve to shorten them.

More recent results indicate that the average increase in the mutational load per child is at least 200! (See Sanford for references and extended discussion.) The implications are staggering, provoking such comments in the literature as . . .

"It is something like the population bomb, but with a much longer fuse."

" . . . deleterious mutation rates appear to be so high in humans and our close relations that it is doubtful that such species could survive."

"We find that the accumulation of new mildly deleterious mutations fundamentally alters the scaling of extinction time . . . causing the extinction of populations that would be deemed safe on the basis of demography alone."

If the human race has been around for an alleged one million years, there have been at least 30,000 generations. With each generation adding hundreds of mutational errors to the genome, it is clearly

impossible that we exist! Even this assumes that the first humans, recently evolved from ape-like ancestors, started with a genetically clean slate. How that could be possible is never addressed, especially since that evolutionary step must have included millions of functional mutations, implying the presence of far more harmful mutations. Furthermore, whatever ape-like species were around for many millions of years prior to humanity, would certainly have suffered mutation-generated extinction. And so on. So evolution turns reality upside down.

If we take a Biblical view of history, in the roughly 6,000 years since Adam, there may have been about 200 generations. Note that Biblical history records immense life spans for early humans, which began to drop off severely after the flood of Noah's time. At that point in history, the global environment deteriorated severely. Also, radiation-induced mutations accumulate from generation to generation. We keep extracting minerals from the Earth and incorporating them into products, unable to separate out trace radioactive elements. Cosmic rays have also increased the carbon 14 concentration in the atmosphere. Before the flood, more vegetation plus more animal life with a lower concentration of atmospheric ^{14}C would produce fewer mutations. Post-flood, fewer creatures plus an ever-increasing ^{14}C presence means more damage. (More on this in a later chapter.) It is no mystery that the mutational load has been increasing, with modern humans suffering a plethora of new diseases, of which many are genetic in nature. We do not live in a "Star Trek" universe, where humanity is evolving ever upward, hoping to ascend to some higher level of physical and mental prowess, like so many advanced aliens of science fiction.

The bottom line is that the human race is already in error catastrophe, even after just a few thousand years. It is headed toward extinction. We die of "old age" as individuals because of errors in somatic (body) cells that hinder maintenance and replication. The entire race is dying because of errors in the genome, which increase in each generation. Natural selection cannot weed out enough of the errors because it *operates at the organism level*, while multiple, insidious errors continue to arise at the genetic level. Thus, mutations and natural selection result in the destruction of species, just the opposite of the evolutionist's hope of creating new and improved species. (Sanford goes into great detail on these issues.)

I'm sure that the reader understands that *natural selection* can be described simply as *differential reproduction*. The idea, of course, is that some individuals within a species are more fit than others, allowing them to reproduce more. Their descendants supposedly come to dominate the population after many generations. Note that for natural selection to have any effect at all in the long term, the "more fit" individuals must reproduce more . . . and sufficiently more from generation to generation so that their numbers dwarf those who are "less fit." Furthermore, this difference of fitness must be reflected in the DNA. If all of this occurs, you can see that the genetic diversity of the species has actually decreased over time. The less fit DNA has disappeared. As an exercise for the reader, I will let you consider any species of your choice: human, rabbit, lizard, banana, etc. Generally, both the strong and the weak within any species tend to reproduce prolifically, unless the weakness is severe. Indeed, mutations do produce physical weaknesses that inhibit reproduction, including by premature death. In this case natural selection serves to weed out severely deleterious mutations. For evolution to work, from goo to you, mutations must produce a significant advantage in producing children, no matter how many millions of mutations are required to actually produce a noticeably different species.

Regarding humans, you might consider the genetically more fit to include the best athletes and most gorgeous Hollywood actresses. Certainly such humans have a wider choice of mates and have the physical capacity to reproduce prolifically. Over the course of many generations do you expect the

human race to become more beautiful and athletic? Or have you noticed that plain and ordinary people make a lot of kids? It is *very difficult* mathematically for any segment of a population to rise up to dominate the entire genome. Furthermore, you would have to wait a long time for a given mutation to lock in across the entire population – many generations. So, remember the “trillionth of a second” I offered the evolutionist to try on a new amino acid sequence as he waits to produce a functional protein by luck? Now, to develop new DNA and proteins by mutation and natural selection evolution must wait years or even hundreds of years to make each and every single attempt! Billions, trillions, or quadrillions of years simply don’t help.

The evolutionist supposes that a mutation occurs that will *increase* information content and make the resultant organism more survivable than the rest of the population. First of all – there is no example given in the evolutionary literature – *no, not one* – of this ever happening. (See Spetner.) Shouldn’t there be some laboratory evidence of this? Furthermore, any “useful” mutation will be swamped by a much larger number of deleterious mutations.

Besides, just what is a “useful” mutation? To build new genes, and thus new biological structures, requires the integrated complexity of thousands of new nucleotides, arranged in just the right sequence. Impossibility upon impossibility.

Even if the “right” mutation happens, though, the organism must survive to reproduce. Then natural selection must operate. The typical thought is that an environmental change is so severe that only the mutated offspring’s descendants survive. Alternatively, it’s postulated that the population grows exponentially so that a mutant’s higher reproductive capacity eventually dominates the population.

But this is all wishful thinking. Calculations can be done to show that a given mutant’s genome has a good chance of randomly disappearing. One also has to imagine gazillions of continually changing environmental conditions necessary for natural selection to pressure the old genome out of existence. Where is the quantitative discussion of all of these environmental miracles that are so finely tuned to favor a mutant genome over the rest of the population? With rare exceptions, mutations just don’t have anything to do with environmental pressures. The descriptions in the evolutionary literature are wonderfully vague and qualitative – and written for popular consumption. They don’t attempt to approach the scientific and mathematical rigor that you see in ANY other field. Additionally, populations don’t typically expand exponentially. They run into barriers that limit growth. Yet populations of the millions of species on this planet do survive – for the thousands of years since creation. Any complex genome will experience error catastrophe and extinction if given the millions of years of alleged evolutionary history.

As far as *legitimate observable scientific evidence* is concerned, mutations decrease an organism’s viability. No parent wants a mutated child, despite the apparent opportunity to initiate a more advanced species! Natural selection, to the degree it operates, works to cull out variety in a population’s collective genome. If some members of the population are more adaptive when the environment worsens, then the genetic variety of the rest of the population would tend to be destroyed. Natural selection cannot add to the complexity of the genome.

Natural selection is simply not-so-random death. There is nothing about it that speaks to the construction of ever-increasing complexity. For those that say it does – where’s the beef?

The fossil evidence is dominated by finds of tremendous numbers of fossils buried by some type of catastrophe. (The flood of Genesis? Yes, but that's not our focus in this chapter.) There is no fossil evidence that supports that species became extinct through the competition that Darwin insists is necessary for the emergence of new and improved species. You see, to "create" new species by evolution, the older species must become extinct or at least separated geographically. So evolution is also a concept of extinction of species. But there is no fossil evidence supporting extinction of any species by competition with the new and improved creature. Fossils are typically created when buried catastrophically by water-borne mud or volcanic ash. Evolutionists know this. They would suggest that such fossil beds are caused by local catastrophes, but even if they were occasionally right, such fossils say nothing about nuanced environmental pressures of temperature, humidity, etc.

As early as 1959 geneticists understood perfectly that mutations produce only degradation. James Crow, a geneticist at the University of Wisconsin concluded:

"There can be little doubt that man would be better off if he had a lower mutation rate. I would argue, in our present ignorance, that the ideal rate for the foreseeable future would be zero."

Too bad it isn't. I should note that Crow's faith in evolution forced him to opine that some mutations, coupled with natural selection, must be useful for evolution:

"Of all the natural selection that occurs, only a small fraction leads to any progressive or directional change. Most selection is devoted to maintaining the status quo, to eliminating recurrent harmful mutations, or to adjusting to transitory changes in the environment. Thus much of the theory of natural selection must be a theory of statics rather than dynamics."

Crow exhibits a common tactic in the paragraph above. The list in the sentence "Most selection . . ." includes legitimate scientific observations. The first sentence, however, begs for examples of progressive or directional change. That is what must be observed or demonstrated to establish a scientific theory. The evolutionist is convinced that there is such a "small fraction," but he can't find any real examples. Nothing has changed in the last 50 years.

Frederick Hulse was refreshingly honest in his comparison of mutations in living systems to random defects in *designed* mechanical systems:

"Mutations occur at random, not because it would be convenient to have one. Any chance alteration in the composition and properties of a highly complex operating system is not likely to improve its manner of operation, and most mutations are disadvantageous for this reason. There is a delicate balance between an organism and its environment which a mutation can easily upset. One could as well expect that altering the position of the foot brake or the gas pedal at random would improve the operation of an automobile."

And yet mutations are the *only available source* for evolutionary change. One of the most famous evolutionists of the 20th century, Ernst Mayr, admitted:

"It must not be forgotten that mutation is the ultimate source of all genetic variation found in natural populations and the only new material available for natural selection to work on."

Michael Behe (*The Edge of Evolution*) has examined the practical limits of the power of mutations to effect evolutionary changes. The 3-D shape of a protein is what enables its service as an enzyme for the key reactions of life's biochemistry. Binding sites are the surface areas that produce a lock / key fit for reactants to join first to the protein and then to each other. In effect, the protein grabs and holds onto two reactant molecules in just the right positions so that they react, produce product, and then disconnect.

Out of the several hundred amino acids in a given protein, a new binding site could arise if perhaps five or six were changed in just the right way to enable a new, evolutionary enzymatic function. The problem is that precisely the right five or six must change correctly, while the rest of the protein's amino acids do not in any significant way. Behe compares this problem with a case history of mankind's fight against malaria, and the parasite's ability over the years to develop resistance to chloroquine, a drug that initially enjoyed much success. The mutations enabling malarial resistance required the change of two amino acids. Behe calculates that such a double mutation could occur about 1 in every 10^{20} reproductions. Although bacteria can reproduce globally in such quantities, such a number far exceeds the number of mammals that ever existed on the Earth. (That's why it's easier to study genetics in bacteria than in mammals. The generation time is much shorter, too!)

The generic binding site problem for the evolution of higher organisms (5 or 6 amino acids) is at least twice as unlikely to be solved mutationally. Therefore it would take 10^{40} births to produce one new and useful binding site. But 10^{40} far exceeds the *number of cells* that ever existed on the Earth. The real-life problem is much worse. A large majority of proteins in cells work in complexes of *six or more* to execute key life processes. Therefore a new process of evolutionary utility requires just the right mutations to produce specialized binding sites in six or more different proteins, coded by different genes. Evolution is obviously dead in the water. As impossible as is the naturalistic origin of the first cell, generating new kinds of cells, organs, and organisms necessitates higher orders of impossibility.

There are mutations that produce survival advantages for a particular environment. For example, there are species of wingless, but once-winged beetles that live on small windswept islands. The destructive mutation that removes the creature's wings may help him avoid being tossed by the wind into the sea. As long as the now ground-hugging beetle can forage for food, he may survive and reproduce more efficiently. The issue for the evolutionist is to explain the mutational development of wings in the first place. There are zero evolutionary theories (not counting stories) for the origin of wings, whether for insects, bats, birds, or flying reptiles. The Biblical model of a fallen creation is perfectly consistent with both the intelligent design of wings, and the subsequent corruption by mutations.

Similarly, there are cave-dwelling creatures who have suffered mutations that render their species blind. In the dark there are no survival advantages for eyes, which would have the disadvantage of consuming metabolic energy and neural activities. An eyeless creature most probably uses more of its brain to efficiently analyze other sensory inputs. Both the evolutionist and the creationist understand how the organ can lose functionality and even its shape through mutations. The evolutionist who cites these cases as *evidence*, however, is oblivious to its *wrong direction!* Losing organs is de-volution.

A strain of nylon-eating bacteria, *Pseudomonas*, has been isolated by scientists who claim that the mutation that allows digestion of plastic represents evolutionary change. So what's going on? Multitudes of bacteria were confined to an environment with no other nutritional source than nylon products. Some small fraction of the bacteria had a mutation that disabled a "genetic switch" in their metabolic system, thus preventing them from enjoying normal food sources, but allowed digestion of

nylon. In the specialized environment the mutated strain reproduces and the “normal” strain doesn’t. The “broken switch” is permanent, but allows the new strain to thrive as long as nylon is provided. But placed back into a normal environment the mutated strain does not compete well with the original variety. Therefore we have another example of de-evolution. The organism has lost metabolic processes. These types of examples are often cited as the “best” examples of evolution known. Sad.

The advantage of studying bacteria is that they reproduce rapidly enough that a scientist can track thousands of generations before he has to retire. Therefore bacteria are the organisms that are most studied with regard to mutations and genetic variation. Nevertheless, despite many decades of experimentation and observation, no single bacterium has ever been observed to develop even the rudiments of a nucleus. Of course. You might just as easily expect that “a tornado sweeping through a junkyard might assemble a Boeing 747 from the materials therein.” That quotation is from astronomer Sir Fred Hoyle, who was similarly evaluating the odds of life emerging from naturalistic processes.

French zoologist and evolutionist Pierre-Paul Grasse analyzed the study of mutations in bacteria accordingly:

“What is the use of their unceasing mutations if they do not change? In sum, the mutations of bacteria and viruses are merely hereditary fluctuations around a median position; a swing to the right, a swing to the left, but no final evolutionary effect.”

The situation becomes more difficult for evolutionists when considering multicellular creatures. Life spans increase and so the intervals between generations lengthen. Evolution cannot, therefore, “experiment” with mutations and natural selection nearly as often. As discussed in *The Natural Limits to Biological Change* (see references), the poor little fruit fly *Drosophila* has been abused in genetics research for the last 80 years. With a generation time of three weeks, thirty-some generations can be studied over a two-year laboratory program. The flies are subjected to selective breeding, chemical mutagens, and radiation. Mutated flies are mated with other mutants to see how far the changes can go. Multitudes of dysfunctional flies are produced that cannot see or cannot fly, etc. Many are born dead because the mutations disrupt too many critical life systems. Some have more bristles, some have less. But the bottom line is well-put by Francis Hitching: “Fruit flies refuse to become anything but fruit flies under any circumstance yet devised.”

The evolutionary faithful would point out that eighty years is trivial in comparison with evolutionary time. I agree. Yet these devotees of Darwin spent much time, money, effort, and brain power expecting to demonstrate at least the possibility of evolution. Since they didn’t, they cannot claim that evolution has been established on any scientific basis. This conclusion should not be controversial. You can be sure that if a major change in a fly’s DNA produced a notable increase in function or complexity, the results would be trumpeted by every media outlet and featured in every textbook and museum display. The silence is deafening. Once again, I agree that such failures do not *disprove* evolution to its worshippers. But how about a little humility from these guys instead of arrogant disdain for those of us who would like to see some *science* in action?

Varieties *within a genome* are the norm in biology. Even though human beings seem to come in a wide variety of skin / hair / eye colors, heights, etc., the DNA of any two of us will have at least 99.8% similarity. The differences may combine in quite a variety of ways through reproduction. We all know that there are hundreds of breeds of dogs, yet both creationists and evolutionists agree that they all descended from a creature much like a wolf. There are many varieties of apples and bananas, and a

million varieties of rice. Selective breeding can produce great variety, yet there are clear limits. The results of breeding are limited by the original genetic information. When dogs are bred into specialty types like chihuahas or basset hounds, they have lost much of the genetic information present in the original dog kind. Special breeds are often subject to genetic diseases and cannot survive in difficult environments. My point in this discussion of *varieties* is that mutations and natural selection, or selective breeding, have nothing to do with the diversity we observe within any species. Mutations will only work to destroy genetic info and natural selection will work to cull out the non-competitive, additionally reducing genetic diversity.

Theodosius Dobzhansky who opined that “Nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of evolution,” was sensible enough to admit:

“An accident, a random change, in any delicate mechanism can hardly be expected to improve it. Poking a stick into the machinery of one’s watch or one’s radio set will seldom make it work better.”

Seldom? So why do evolutionists hang on so desperately to the hope that mutations and natural selection have produced the entire panoply of life? Frankly, there is no other game in town. *They can’t even imagine* any other mechanism. Even though their only conceivable model is hopelessly inadequate, they will believe in it for their entire careers and for their entire lives. The only alternative is horribly unthinkable to them . . . namely, that brilliantly designed biological systems owe their existence to a Brilliant Designer.

References:

- Tom Misteli, “The Inner Life of the Genome,” *Scientific American*, February, 2011.
Lee Spetner, *Not By Chance*, Judaica Press, 1998.
J. C. Sanford, *Genetic Entropy & the Mystery of the Genome*, FMS Publications, 2008.
James Crow, “Ionizing Radiation and Evolution,” *Scientific American*, September, 1959.
Frederick Hulse, *The Human Species*, Random House, 1971.
Michael J. Behe, *The Edge of Evolution: The Search for the Limits of Darwinism*, Free Press, 2007.
Bruce Malone, “Search for the Truth,” Spring 2011.
Lane P. Lester and Raymond G. Bohlin, *The Natural Limits to Biological Change*, Probe Books, 1989.

Chapter 4

Genetically, there is no time for evolution.

The genetic differences between species are so immense that there isn't enough time for them to occur, according to evolutionists' calculations – even if evolution's foundations were valid.

It's hard to quantify the differences between living creatures simply by looking at them. The human arm may "look" a lot more complex than a fish's fin, but how do you measure the difference numerically? The answer is by looking at the information content in the genes – or in the protein molecules encoded by the genes, along with the RNA to regulate transcription. We won't do an in-depth look in this short chapter, but we will give you a feel for the numbers that should make an evolutionist lose sleep at night.

Recall that there are twenty different useful amino acids. Let's let a given protein be represented by a simple sequence of amino acids and let the aminos be represented by letters of the alphabet. Consider 3 different proteins, pretending that these proteins are only 10 amino acids in length, instead of the usual several hundred.

Protein 1:	A	D	C	D	E	F	B	H	I	J
Protein 2:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Protein 3:	A	B	B	D	E	F	G	H	I	H

How can we quantify the differences among these proteins? Here's a simple way. Protein 1 differs from Protein 2 in two locations. We can say that they are 20% divergent. Protein 2 differs from Protein 3 in two locations. So they are also 20% divergent. Protein 1 and Protein 3, however, are 40% divergent.

If these proteins provide similar functions in 3 different species, the evolutionist might postulate that the gene for Protein 2 (let's call it "Gene 2") mutated into the other two proteins and so there might be some evolutionary lineage. He might also postulate that Gene 1 mutated into Gene 2 which later mutated into Gene 3. Thus Gene 2 could be postulated as a link between Genes 1 and 3.

This type of analysis on a much larger scale for real animals has produced some nasty surprises. Not surprising, typically, is the size of the divergences. The hemoglobin molecules for man and dog diverge by 20%. Between man and carp the difference is 50%. What's interesting is that identifiable sequences are *isolated* and *distinct* from one another. There are *no intermediate* sequences or groups of sequences, such as we saw in our simplistic example above.

For example, insects and vertebrates differ in their cytochrome C protein by typically 20-30%. There are no vertebrate groups that can serve as any type of a link intermediate between the two. The "percent distances" are fairly uniform. This pattern of evidence occurs throughout biology. A classification system of organisms based on these ideas would not show a hierarchy, but rather a collection of separate islands – reminiscent of separate Biblical "kinds"!

The genetic differences between organisms are mathematical show-stoppers for evolution. A simplistic comparison of human and chimpanzee DNA shows that the genetic divergence is at least 4%. (The *real* difference is certainly much larger than this number which was derived from a technique not as precise as lining up sequences as in our example above. This "4% difference" does not take into account the different number of chromosomes in the two genomes, the different arrangement of genes among the

chromosomes, and a lot of non-coding, but regulatory DNA that show significant variations.) In effect the 4% is a scam. It's taken from lining up as advantageously as possible the most similar genes. If a gene is missing in either creature, it simply isn't counted.

But let's assume the measly 4% often quoted. How big is 4% in the DNA? It doesn't sound big, does it? But the human genome has the information content of about one thousand 500-page books. A 4% change would be about 40 large books, equivalent to about 12,000,000 words. We are expected to believe that random mutation plus natural selection (*somehow* driven by the right combinations of zillions of environmental changes) can generate 12 million words in a precisely meaningful sequence – just to get the “little” divergence between chimps and people.

The evolutionist always says that “given enough time – millions and millions of years,” such miracles can happen. But evolutionists claim that human evolution would have taken place over the last 10 million years, with creatures like humans and apes sharing a common ancestor. Is that long enough? Note that a human generation is about 20 years. You have to hope very optimistically for rapid mutation and natural selection and rapid takeover of the entire population each time. In fact, detailed population genetics calculations have shown that only about 1700 mutations could arise in a population over a 10 million year period, making wonderfully favorable assumptions. That's only a “page or two” out of the required 40 large books.

Researchers recently completed sequencing of the chimpanzee Y chromosome and were shocked to discover that it is “horrendously different” from the human Y chromosome (see references – Catchpoole). (Oops! There goes your 4% right there!) Why shocked? An evolutionary presupposition expects dramatic similarities, not differences. The evolutionary worldview is routinely shocked by new discoveries.

Specifically, the chimp Y has only about two-thirds as many distinct genes as the human chromosome, and only 47% as many protein-coding elements. Also, about 30% of the chimp Y does not align with any part of the human Y. The evolutionary author (L. Buchen, “The fickle Y chromosome,” *Nature*, 14 January, 2010) admits . . . “the relationship between the human and chimp Y chromosomes has been blown to pieces.” Rather than admit to no evolutionary connection between chimps and humans, they suppose that some type of naturalistic miracle must have occurred: “It looks like there's been a dramatic renovation or reinvention of the Y chromosome in the chimpanzee and human lineages.” Didn't the author or the reviewers associated with the intensely evolutionistic journal *Nature* notice that the words “renovation” and “reinvention” denote Intelligent Design?!? They ought to be ashamed.

Furthermore, it should be clear that simple mutations, like an accidental substitution of one nucleotide for another, cannot explain gross rearrangements of working, functional genes within their chromosomes. (Other mutation types include *insertions* and *deletions* of sections of DNA.) The 3-D nature of the arrangement of genes within chromosomes and the chromosomes within the nucleus has no direct tie to the 1-D nature of a given gene's DNA sequence. This is yet another area where *there is no theory of evolution*.

If evolutionistic philosophy were truly founded on the scientific method, the long-trumpeted assertion about common descent for humans and chimps would have been coupled to definite, quantitative predictions concerning close similarities between human and chimp *chromosome arrangements*, in addition to *specifying linear DNA sequences* within selected genes. Then these “shocking” sequences would be properly viewed as evidence refuting the hypothesized human / chimp relationship. Rather,

the evolutionary worldview is impervious to evidence, even to the extent of supposing naturalistic miracles of “renovation” and “reinvention.” Note that such words make it clear that the researchers cannot even speculate about a naturalistic explanation, or they would certainly do so. In other words, they want to invoke an “escape device,” even if they can’t imagine what it could be.

Regarding chimps and humans, the alleged “4% difference” also neglects the fact that the chimp genome is about 10% larger than the human (Harrub & Thompson). (Oops again!) So in addition to the hundreds of millions of DNA base pairs that are different between the two species, plus the “horrendous” differences in the arrangement of the genes within the chromosomes, there are an additional hundreds of millions of base pairs that chimps have that we do not. It sounds like the two species are quite a bit different.

We should note that measuring “percent difference” is an extremely crude measure at best! What the differences produce can clearly be more significant than their mere existence. As an example (see Ham), the FOXP2 protein is associated with the language function in the brain. Yet out of 700 amino acids, only two are different between chimps and humans. That’s 99.7% similarity! But this 0.3% difference results in significantly different functionality and regulation. Namely, it works differently and gets called upon to do its work in a very different way. A proper analysis would necessarily invoke methods far beyond measuring percent differences in the nucleotide order. It has also been demonstrated that single amino acid substitutions are responsible for severe genetic diseases, including sickle cell anemia.

Let’s talk about the idea of *homology* – similarities in form supposedly denote common origin. Textbooks promoting evolution often sketch diagrams showing the similarity in structures among different creatures. For example, the *pentadactyl* (five-bone) pattern for limbs is found in a man’s arm, a bird’s wing, and a whale’s flipper. Ergo, these creatures must share a common ancestor and therefore trace an evolutionary lineage! Given enough time, environmental changes, and lucky mutations, we observe diversity in such structures, but their similarities must support an evolutionary model! Unfortunately for the children who read the textbooks, some facts have been left out. It is typically observed that *totally different gene complexes* produce the homologous structures in the different organisms. In embryological development, a large number of genes are involved in the growth of any particular organ or limb. Since an entirely different set of genes is involved with each species, it is impossible that incremental mutations and natural selection could be responsible.

Design, on the other hand, is a logical inference. The wheels of bicycles, motorcycles, automobiles, and jet aircraft have similarities. These *homologous structures* are obviously not evolved from a common ancestor. In fact, they don’t even share common designers, but it is elementary that common *design principles* are involved, associated with shape, tolerances, materials (metal rims, rubber tires), and function.

In this example, the wheels are but components of the vehicle. The evolutionary idea of homology would necessitate that bicycles eventually evolved into jet aircraft. To extend the analogy, one would visit a bicycle plant and an aerospace company manufacturing jet aircraft. You would certainly find dramatically different manufacturing processes, equipment, software, and even logistical systems. For the wheels to denote lineage, the bicycle manufacturing plant would have to incrementally evolve into an aircraft factory. And at each incremental step, a competitively useful vehicle must be produced or else the “family lineage” goes out of business – out of existence. You can envision that it’s not just

about the impossibility of getting the right changes over time – there has to be a path that works successfully at every step, no matter how much time is available.

Let's get back to temporal issues. Another thought, considering our discussion in chapters 1 and 2 of this series . . . as *impossible* as it is to go from raw materials to the first functional proteins, and as impossible as it is to go from at least hundreds of functional proteins to the wonderfully integrated system of a single cell, *the impossibilities are yet unimaginably greater to generate the information content of multicellular creatures, like "simple" invertebrates.* And from there to fish, to amphibians, to reptiles, etc., the NEW INFORMATION CONTENT is ridiculously great, but must be generated by mutations and natural selection. Furthermore, it takes a full generation time for evolution to even test a given mutation, and then many generations to hopefully establish it. Wow . . . what blind faith! Let's talk a bit more about the implications of *generation time*.

In Chapter 1 we noted that a universe filled with amino acids could not generate a functional protein even if the *generation time* was equal to the *collision time* between molecules, namely about a trillionth of a second. At least in that fanciful scenario, the reacting molecules had lots of "generations" to attempt some useful result. But when you demand that equal or greater impossibilities in genetic information arise from mutation and natural selection, you are constrained by the generation times of life. From bacteria to mammals, generation times may vary from minutes to years. You have to wait an entire generation time in order to let mutations "experiment" to even possibly generate new and useful information. But then you have to wait many generations, hoping that the mutations get wonderfully lucky, the environment changes in just the right way to enable the new gene to help its organism reproduce more effectively, and then observe that the population gets dominated by the new gene, while the old one dies out. I'll leave this as an exercise for the reader just how many assumptions are involved in this scenario.

For this discussion it is sufficient to point out that there just aren't enough generation times in the millions of years claimed for mutations and natural selection to "construct" the genetic content of any organism, not to mention the entire biosphere. Evolution is mathematically impossible right at the start, even if you magically start with some single-celled creatures.

Evolutionists *believe* (Science doesn't support millions or billions of years of Earth history – see Chapter 10) that the amount of time available for life to develop on the Earth and evolve into the observed phyla after it allegedly cooled down, was only about 130 million years (Overman). Using their timescale, they have boxed themselves into a small sliver of time between 3.98 billion years ago when surface temperatures supposedly dropped below 100 degrees Celsius, and 3.85 billion years ago when the first life formed. Thus the impossibilities for the origins of proteins, DNA molecules, and cells discussed previously, don't even have "billions of years" available. (Even if they did, we have shown that it wouldn't matter.)

An even larger time issue is associated with the "Cambrian Explosion," the sudden appearance in the fossil record, allegedly about 530 million years ago, of most of the invertebrate body types (or phyla) ever discovered in the fossil record. The problem is this: if you buy into the evolutionary time scale, this abundance of new types of creatures had to arise within a "mere" twenty million years, with no evidence of multi-celled creatures to serve as their ancestors. We'll discuss fossil issues in the next chapter, but of note now is that this sliver of time is quite a mystery to the evolutionist.

Yet again, note that evolution – to qualify as a *science* – must provide evidence that these events *have actually occurred!* Not only is the evidence lacking, but any mathematical analysis shows that these transformations of species are *impossible!* This is analogous to a district attorney hoping to convict someone, not only with no evidence, but with overwhelming data that *proves* that the suspect could not *possibly* be responsible.

Information destruction produced by mutations can happen in one generation. Birth defects and other genetic diseases can be tragic and lethal. We mentioned before about cave dwelling creatures who lose their vision over the course of many generations. A more subtle case (see Spetner) arises in the differences between wildcats and tabby (house) cats. The tabby has only about 2/3 of the brain cells of the wildcat from which it likely descended. The number of nerve cells in the optic nerve is similarly deficient. Furthermore, the tabby has about half the ganglion cells and about 40% of the retinal cones.

De-volution has produced a loss in complexity and function. It has been discovered that the embryos of the two cat species have comparable numbers of cells, but in the tabby many of the cells die off during development. It is likely that mutations produced this developmental cell death. You can call this “evolution,” but it should be obvious that mutational cell death has nothing to do with the development of wildcat brains and optic systems in the first place. Random effects like mutations are wonderfully effective at destroying or degrading delicate living systems. The burden of proof is on the evolutionist to cite clear examples of information upgrades through mutations. Hoping that more time allows such miracles, even if you invoke millions of years, is illogical. More time produces more random defects, whether you are looking at multiple generations of an original Xerox copy or multiple generations of an organism and its descendants.

“Mitochondrial Eve” has been an evolutionary celebrity since 1987 when she was proposed as the woman who was the ancestor of all modern human beings. (See Harrub for an extended discussion.) From extensive experiments analyzing the DNA of the mitochondria of women all over the world, the original “scientific” analysis proclaimed that all humans derive from a single woman who lived 200,000 years ago in Africa. Mitochondria are organelles within each cell that generate energy and manufacture their own proteins for specialized functions. Thus they contain their own DNA (about 37 genes), apart from the DNA within the nucleus (30,000 plus genes). The limited number of mitochondrial genes makes analysis easier. Additionally, a key assumption was made that mitochondrial DNA (mt-DNA) is passed down only through the mother, whereas nuclear DNA is derived from both father and mother.

The conceptual idea is that as this original woman produced descendants, which eventually split into various people groups which spread all over the world, mutations would creep in to generate diversity in the mt-DNA among these groups. In fact, from a genetic point of view, Asians have similarities with Asians, Europeans with Europeans, etc. Working backward from the DNA of modern women, with samples from all over the world, and making assumptions about mutation rates, would allow a calculation regarding the age of the human race, at least back to a single woman.

A key element of this analysis is to determine the mutation rate. Dividing by the mutation rate produces a “molecular clock.” For example, if one mutation occurs every 1,000 years on average in a particular gene, and two different people groups diverge by ten mutations, then you could estimate that the two groups shared a common ancestor about 10,000 years ago.

One key assumption to determine the mutation rate was to compare the human and chimp genomes. Given a “2-4% difference,” and the evolutionary assertion that humans and chimps diverged from a

common ancestor within the last few million years, a range of mutation rates could be used. Additional guesswork was taken from paleontology, anthropology, and archeology to estimate when people groups diverged geographically. Admitting that I'm oversimplifying a good bit, these analyses resulted in the 200,000 year estimate.

In the years following, some nasty surprises developed. The big assumptions were that mt-DNA passed only through the female and that the molecular clock ticked at a constant rate in the relevant genes – namely, that the mutation rate was constant. Both assumptions turned out to be drastically wrong. Various experiments have shown that the sperm's mitochondria can enter the egg during fertilization and contribute male mt-DNA. Regarding the second assumption, one study published in 1997 indicated that mt-DNA mutation rates were 18 times higher than previous estimates. A University of Texas geneticist suggested that molecular clocks had been treated as if they were as precise as stopwatches, but were more likely like sundials. He additionally concluded that the more recent experiments indicated such a high mutation rate that Mitochondrial Eve would have lived a mere 6,000 years ago. Hmm. Interesting . . . 6,000 years? Maybe there is something to the concept after all. That researcher asserted emphatically, however, that “no one thinks that's the case.” Of course not. That would blow the religion of evolution completely out of the water and open the door to the Biblical time scale!

More generally, researchers have come to realize that the assumptions behind such molecular clocks (which are also applied to many other species besides humans) are deeply flawed. Worse, many of the early research papers proved to be wrong in their presentation of the foundational sequencing data. Multiple researchers have discovered that many of the mt-DNA databases are deeply flawed. Yes, it is a good thing that science can be “self-correcting.” But the textbooks for young people, from grade school through college, still trumpet the “solid evidence” for evolution found in molecular clock studies. By the way, there is also an argument proposed based on Y-chromosome studies that we are all descended from a single man. Hmm.

Microbiologists have uncovered plenty of evidence to destroy the molecular clock concept and the reasonableness of evolution, itself (Kleiss). The DNA sequences of bacteria found in salt deposits were compared for samples “dated” at 10 million, 100 million, and 500 million years old. The researchers took enormous care to insure that the samples were not contaminated with “modern” bacteria. Results showed that the sequences were nearly identical, thereby exhibiting no evolution for about 500 million years. Yet bacteria, which reproduce rapidly in large populations, should exhibit more evolution due to mutations than any creature on Earth! Of course, the creationist understands that these salt deposits are all just thousands of years old, dating back to the flood of Genesis.

The genetic differences between distinct kinds of organisms are clearly on the order of millions of DNA nucleotides, just considering the linear DNA sequences, and not taking into account the 3-D aspects of chromosome arrangements and the organization of each cell's nucleus. As we have seen, even a few percent difference in the genomes of apes and humans, means that millions of changes are observable among their respective billions of DNA nucleotides. The differences between markedly different creatures like fish and amphibians are even more extreme. Yet we are to believe that mutations and time produced amphibians from fish, all the while generating successful, highly reproducing creatures in between, *linking* the amphibian descendants from their alleged ancestors. (All while generating no fossil links.)

Henry Morris (see references) suggests a simple scenario to evaluate such possibilities, making assumptions that only favor the hope of the evolutionist. Let's imagine that the genetic differences

between the ancestor kind and the more highly evolved descendant require just 200 successful and complexity-increasing mutations. We'll ignore any mutations that serve to degrade and kill. Note evolution-producing mutations must increase complexity for any step up the ladder. Amphibians clearly enjoy organs with functions that fish simply do not have. Their reproductive systems are quite different, as are their musculature and neural systems that control movement . . . and so on.

Now, any biologist understands that there are at least thousands of possible mutations that are either destructive or neutral, at best, for any one that might be advantageous. And, as Spetner documents, there has yet to be discovered *any mutation* that produces new information resulting in new organic function. (If you read of any, please do examine the details carefully before you bother to write to me. There are silly claims around.) But let's be optimistic and assume that 1 of every 2 mutations are "favorable" rather than 1 of every (several) thousand. Then the evolutionary leap requires a 1 in 2 coin flip that must produce "heads" consecutively for 200 trials. (Any "tails" and we go backwards, de-evolving, or dying.) One-half raised to the 200th power is about equal to 1 in 10⁶⁰.

Those odds look tough, so let's invoke the billions of years argument. Instead of a 4.65 billion year old Earth, we'll assume 30 billion years, so we can round up to 10¹⁸ seconds of evolutionary time. (This also neglects that embarrassing problem of the Cambrian explosion.) Now, optimistically, let's suppose that each of the 10¹⁴ square feet on the surface of the Earth harbors a billion (10⁹) mutating organisms of our ancestor kind. Outrageously, we'll allow such a short generation time (one-half second) that two favorable mutations will occur in each organism every second as it reproduces, allowing the required 200 mutations to be generated every 100 seconds by the parents and offspring of every one of those billion creatures on each square foot.

Are you still with me? We're almost there. How many "evolutionary attempts" will be made on this imaginary Earth in its 30 billion year history? Multiply the numbers together: 10¹⁴ square feet x 10⁹ organisms per square foot x 10¹⁸ seconds, then divide by the 100 seconds it takes to get the right 200 mutations. The result is 10³⁹ attempts. Now recall the odds we optimistically estimated as merely 1 in 10⁶⁰. Dividing the number of attempts by the number of attempts required to get it right means that we are still far short of an even chance. Or in other words, you would need 10²¹ such "Earths" to get an even chance of one such evolutionary transition. That number is not far from the total number of stars in the entire universe.

If you don't like Morris' numbers, use your own. And then let me nitpick your assumptions – note how wonderfully benign are the assumptions above. In real life, destructive mutations produce a "genetic load" that destroys life well before any imaginary favorable mutations may produce an entirely new kind. And real differences between kinds are to be counted in the millions, not just the 200 in the example above. Run with realistic numbers if your calculator can handle it. The bottom line is that mutations destroy. They don't create. And even if you have the blind faith to believe that they create, there is no time to do so within the billions of years of the evolutionary universe, not to mention the restricted slivers of time over the last few hundreds of millions of years proposed by evolutionary geologists . . . but we'll see in a later chapter that the Earth is far younger than that, namely about 6,000 years old.

I'll close this chapter with a quote from evolutionist T. S. Kemp (cited in Gish, 1995) regarding *some* of the differences between reptiles and mammals that must be produced by mutations if evolution were true:

“ . . . the fine control mechanisms of temperature regulation are necessary, so that neither alterations in the rate of metabolic heat output during different levels of activity, nor variations in ambient temperature are allowed to cause a change in body temperature. Thus hair, sweat glands, and specialized skin blood vessels must evolve. More indirectly, but equally important in the function of endothermy, are several other aspects of the biology of mammals. The locomotory apparatus must become capable of carrying the animal about in search of its some tenfold increase in food requirements. The feeding apparatus has to ingest at this greater rate and also assist in the breakdown of the food, a process which would be far too slow if left solely to the intestinal processes. The diaphragm is needed for the greater rate of external gas exchange that occurs. The potential increase in water loss that would result from the higher temperature and greater breathing rate must be combated by the kidney, and finally the sense organs and central nervous system must be designed to organize and control these activities.”

Hmm. “ . . . designed to organize and control . . .” Even the most devout evolutionist can’t help himself. He *knows* at some level that such a wealth of interlocking, optimized systems cannot spring from luck.

References:

- Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, Adler & Adler, 1985.
David Catchpoole, “Y Chromosome Shock,” *Creation*, April – June, 2011.
Brad Harrub and Bert Thompson, *The Truth about Human Origins*, Apologetics Press, 2003.
Ken Ham, ed., *The New Answers Book 3*, Master Books, 2010.
Jonathan Sarfati, *Refuting Evolution*, Master Books, 1999.
Dean L. Overman, *A Case Against Accident and Self-Organization*, 1997.
Lee Spetner, *Not By Chance! Shattering the Modern Theory of Evolution*, Judaica Press, 1998.
Richard & Tina Kleiss, *A Closer Look at the Evidence*, Search for the Truth Publications, 2004.
Henry M. Morris, *For Time and Forever*, Master Books, 2004.

Chapter 5

The fossil evidence refutes evolution.

The gaps in the fossil record are huge and systematic. This is evidence against incremental evolution via mutation and natural selection. There is no postulated mechanism for creatures to evolve over these chasms. Really, truly — there is no scientific theory at all to account for the hopeless gaps of a naturalistic worldview.

An honest assessment of evolution would lead one to the conclusion that fossils should show a near-infinite series of creatures with just incremental differences from simple to complex. If fossils are abundant in nature, then there should be no problem in finding a multitude of transitional forms for all of the animal and plant life on the Earth today. In fact, many evolutionists admit the abundance — the enormous wealth — of fossils of creatures that once lived. If the fossil record actually showed a continuous variation between simple and complex organisms, and especially if the record were entombed in real, physical geological columns of sedimentary rock, then there would be no debate at all. Despite the mathematical impossibilities we have summarized in previous chapters, if the Earth displayed *nothing but transitional forms*, then a lack of quantitative theory would not be so distressing. You see, if evolution is true, we should not have to be discussing the presence of distinct fossil species and genera with vast gaps between. There should be hundreds of *kinds* of finely tuned creatures between invertebrates and vertebrates, between amphibians and reptiles, between reptiles and mammals, etc. There are literally trillions of fossils in the Earth's crust. Gaps should be the exception!

What is embarrassing is that the *rule* — not the exception — is that between the various species / genera / types / kinds of animals, both living and dead, are huge gaps. The transitional forms are absent. We regularly see the latest news story describing the latest potential “missing link” in the enigma of human evolution, for example. But nothing ever gets settled. The advocates of human evolution can't agree among themselves, not to mention presenting a case that would be compelling at all to a dispassionate observer.

The famous evolutionary paleontologist, Niles Eldridge, has admitted, “We paleontologists have said that the history of life supports (the idea of gradual evolutionary change), all the while knowing it does not.” Namely, they *know* that the fossil record is not at all consistent with the philosophy of evolution. Nevertheless, true believers in goo-to-you evolution must conform! Eldridge observes that those paleontologists who report that the data are inconsistent with the “theory” are relegated to the lunatic fringe of the community.

We mentioned the Cambrian explosion in the previous chapter. Let's see what the world's most ardent evolutionist and anti-creationist has to say about it in his book *The Blind Watchmaker*:

“ . . . the Cambrian strata of rocks, vintage about 600 million years, are the oldest in which we find most of the invertebrate groups. And we find many of them already in an advanced state of evolution, the very first time they appear. It is as though they were just planted there, without any evolutionary history. Needless to say, this appearance of sudden planting has delighted creationists.”

Why are evolutionists so tenacious in the face of an unsupportable “theory”? Frankly, they are committed to naturalistic materialism. They won't accept the possibility that God exists or that *anything* cannot be explained by natural physical processes.

Some evolutionists have given up on the idea of a gradualistic random mutation / natural selection neo-Darwinian “theory” and suggested the idea of “punctuated equilibrium” in a desperate attempt to explain the fossil gaps. The idea is that when evolution occurred, lots of genes mutated very quickly and within a very few generations a new creature was “born.” The mathematics of this approach are so frightening, however, that some traditional evolutionists suspect that “punctuated equilibrium” was actually a joke when it was first introduced.

The subject of fossil evidence is huge, as are the rest of the topics covered in this short book. You’ll have to dig deeper on your own if you want to get into the details. The summary statements I’ll make are ultimately derived from evolutionary literature. I’m happy to let their own research testify against them.

So where are these “gaps”? They’re everywhere. The most ancient fossil-bearing rocks on planet Earth are blessed with an abundance of multi-cellular marine invertebrates. (Evolution demands an ancient Earth and postulates dating mechanisms for various rock layers – but the dates are often benchmarked on fossils, themselves. That is a wonderful example of circular reasoning!) The forerunners to these creatures are nowhere to be found. The gap between single-celled and more complex creatures is genetically huge. Evolution should produce an abundant variety of transitional forms.

Evolution assumes that vertebrates evolved from invertebrates. At various times, almost every invertebrate group has been proposed as the ancestor of the vertebrates. This is an example of the non-falsifiability of evolutionary philosophy. It doesn’t matter what aspect of the “theory” is disproven – the fantasy is indestructible to evidence. Biologists can reason that a simple “chordate” creature must be intermediate. But the fossil evidence does not support this assumption. Evolutionists are embarrassed because they have a gap of “100 million years” where transitional creatures should lead to fish – and they can’t fill the gap.

Major works on paleontology show that all the major fish classes are distinctly set apart from each other (in gross physiology) with no transitional creatures linking them. One group of ancient fish fossils so perplexes researchers that one said, “It would have simplified the situation if they had never existed!”

Other gaps: A major disappointment to the evolutionary faithful is the absence of a transitional series of fossils to link fish to amphibians. There should be thousands of *kinds* of such specimens. The handful of fossil types that have been suggested as transitions show either distinct fins or distinct feet. There is also no credible explanation how the transitioning fish / amphibian hybrid will get along on feet-like fins or fin-like feet. How would you like to run from a predator on fin-like feet?

There are huge gaps between amphibians and reptiles and between reptiles and mammals. The jaw structure is entirely different between reptiles and mammals. There are no transitional fossils that bridge this gap. Not only are there no data or theories, it’s hard to even imagine how such missing links would eat while their jaw is being rewired, anyway. But then this is the foundational problem for major genetic and physical *design* changes while creatures are still expected to live and reproduce.

The origin of flight and the alleged transition between reptiles and birds present awesome problems. I think I’ll deal with this issue later on. For now, I’m sure you remember seeing the drawings of *Archeopteryx*, the poster-child transitional form alleged to link reptiles with birds. But detailed analysis of this and a scant handful of similar creatures shows that these are fully and completely *birds!* The

wings and feathers are fully developed and the body is finely tuned to work as a flying system. Just because a bird goes extinct does not demonstrate that it is a missing link.

Alleged discoveries illuminating the origin of man seem to hit the popular press several times per year. We are continually presented with the latest “missing link” that supposedly contradicts all previous discoveries and resets the evolutionary timeline to make all textbooks obsolete. But these claims – in attempting to undo the previous work of others – are invariably controversial within the evolutionary community. Consider: if the evolution of man is such a completely settled *science*, then how can the story be re-invented every few years?

What about the gaps? The fossil record shows huge gaps between the primates and their supposed ancestors. There are no transitional fossils. Ancient “ape” fossils are beset with controversy. Those that say that some of them may be ancestral to man are contradicted by those that are sure that they were fully apes.

There has been lots of discussion over the last century with respect to various candidates for our great-great- . . . -grandpa. Ramapithecus, Australopithecus (“A.”), A. africanus, A. robustus, Homo habilis, Java man, Peking man, Neanderthals, Cromagnons, Homo Erectus – there is a huge and controversial list, and quite a variety of guesses at the evolutionary tree.

But here’s the problem: Fossils that are indistinguishable from modern humans have been dated up to 4.5 million years. (These are evolutionary dates – there are big problems with dating methods, and that’s a whole subject unto itself. Here we’re just going to play within the evolutionary sandbox and use their own evidence against them.) These ancient dates go well beyond the dates corresponding to our ancestors! Oops! Furthermore, there are lots of fossils that “belong” in different parts of the “tree” that have been found in the same geographic and geological layers. This is conclusive evidence against the “theory.”

Below is an extremely short list of embarrassing discoveries made by evolutionists regarding their supposed origin of man:

- Modern apes have simply “sprung out of nowhere.” There are no evolutionary precursors.
- Ancient fossil apes show fascinating variety and uniqueness that have no counterparts among living apes.
- Most alleged ancestors to man consist of just a few fossil teeth or bits of skull. The pictures you see in textbooks are imaginary.
- The alleged missing link Ramapithecus was judged to be manlike due to dental characteristics, but a study indicates that the teeth are well within the natural range of measurements of living chimpanzees.
- Australopithecus is considered by some scientists to be uniquely different from both man and ape and was probably alive when man was alive. Its physiology is *further* from the physiologies of man and chimpanzee than the differences between chimp and man; ie., it’s an extinct ape.
- Sinanthropus (Peking Man) is now considered by many to be an ape (perhaps a baboon) and there is suspicion that fraud was involved in the “discovery.” Most of the physical material disappeared during World War II.
- Java Man, from early in the 20th Century, also involved fraud. The discoverer admitted late in life that it was probably a giant gibbon.
- Neanderthals are not essentially different from anyone you might see walking down the street. An early specimen’s oddities were likely due to disease. Modern DNA analysis shows that they are just part

of the human race. Archeological evidence proves that they lived alongside of and interbred with “modern” man.

- Homo erectus is indistinguishable from modern man, especially considering the variability anyone can observe among men and women across the planet.
- Several of the above “creatures” turn up in the same fossil time period, including an apparent 1 million year overlap between Australopithecus and Homo Erectus.
- Modern man, “Homo sapiens,” arrives in the fossil record in quantity and “suddenly.”

Niles Eldridge must have concerns about how the gaps affect the very foundations of evolutionary paleontology. In *Reinventing Darwin* he says, “When we do see the introduction of evolutionary novelty, it usually shows up with a bang, and often with no firm evidence that the fossils did not evolve elsewhere! Evolution cannot forever be going on somewhere else. Yet that’s how the fossil record has struck many a forlorn paleontologist looking to learn something about evolution.”

To summarize up to this point: The fossil evidence does not support evolution. An honest person would make predictions about fossil data that are opposite to what is actually observed. Evolutionists are not being very scientific here! The bottom line: Fossil evidence shows that a tremendous variety of life erupted in distinct forms – this sounds like creation to me!

By the way, just what is the fossil record? First of all, it’s a record of extinction, not a record of the origin of life forms. The only explanation that makes sense for the very existence of over 99% of the fossils is the worldwide flood recorded in Genesis. If there were such a flood that inundated the entire Earth and lasted for more than a year, what would you expect? You would expect to see “billions of dead things, buried in rock layers, laid down by water, all over the Earth.” (As Ken Ham of AnswersInGenesis.org likes to point out.) And that’s exactly what you find.

An outstanding treatise on the subject of geology from a Biblical and scientific perspective is Snelling’s 2-volume work below. The next few paragraphs summarize a few points he makes about clear evidences around the globe that point to a worldwide flood catastrophe, and against the evolutionary, uniformitarian approach to the geologic record. If it becomes clear to you that virtually all of the fossil record was produced during the single year of the Genesis flood, then you will throw evolution overboard, since that story supposes that the fossils were laid down over a period of 600 million years, representing a record of life’s history. In short, if Genesis is true, evolution is a lie.

Sedimentary processes observed today are invariably local in scale. But worldwide we see abundant sedimentary strata with fossils embedded, up to miles in thickness, and continental in scale – sometimes inter-continental. The depth and nature of these sediments indicate that deep and fast-flowing water was involved. Layers were obviously laid down smoothly and rapidly in succession. Marine fossils are found on mountain tops, indicating that terrain was once under water. (The mountains would have been uplifted at the end of the flood.) Evolutionists often propose that specific fossil beds resulted from flooding in streams or river beds. But this could account at best for only very small deposits. Current processes laying down sediments in river deltas or stream beds are clearly not representative in any way of what we see on a global scale, although such poor explanations are offered by evolutionists.

Within the sometimes mile-thick sedimentary beds, we find specific layers that are extremely non-local. For example, there exists a 30-meter-thick sedimentary rock unit in western Canada that covers about 470,000 square kilometers. A thin layer only one meter thick has been found all over the Alpine chain in Europe. The Dakota Formation is a 30-meter average thickness sandstone layer that covers 815,000

square kilometers in the western US. Western Australia contains bands just 2 centimeters thick that are correlated over 52,000 square kilometers. Are you starting to think globally yet? Do these sound like river bed deposits?!?

More spectacularly, the famous chalk beds of Northwest Europe (containing their characteristic fossils) are found, of course, along the coast of England, but also Northern Ireland, France, Germany, Scandinavia, Poland, Bulgaria, and Georgia (south of Russia). Identical chalk beds are found in Turkey, Israel, Egypt, and even across the Atlantic in Texas and other states. There are distinctive strata sequences of other rock types that have been correlated across England, Spain, and Bulgaria. The strata of the Newark Group along the U.S. east coast matches strata in England, Germany, and the U.S. Southwest. How about now . . . global flood?

In many cases it's clear to geologists that the source materials for the sedimentary rocks of many regions had to be transported up to hundreds or even thousands of kilometers to get to their far-flung locations. It should be clear to anyone that global catastrophic processes were at work to fashion the Earth's surface that we observe today.

The very presence of massive fossil graveyards indicates large scale, catastrophic, and rapid burial. For example, the dinosaur graveyard in the Morrison Formation covers an area of 1.5 million square kilometers in 13 U.S. states and 3 Canadian provinces. Such graveyards typically show much evidence of water transport, with mostly disarticulated bones of all sizes, and mixing of many different species, plus mixing of flora and fauna from very different types of habitats. A worldwide flood would explain such data. Nothing else can.

A German formation (Grube Messel) mixes bones of fish, salamanders, frogs, turtles, lizards, crocodiles, birds, a variety of mammals, and hundreds of types of insects and plants. In the German lignite beds of Geiseltal are found wonderfully preserved plants and insects, plus thousands of vertebrates, insects, and mollusks. The preservation of soft parts, plant chlorophyll, hair, and other fragile parts make it clear that rapid catastrophic burial occurred, as opposed to the gradual processes observed in normal life, which lead to decay and disappearance.

Another point – the evolutionary geologist must often postulate that millions of years transpired between deposition of certain strata, in order to explain a given sequence of fossils in the layers. This is the rule, not the exception. If Darwin had been right, there should be many regions with strata containing continually changing fossil types as the ages passed by. The reality is that markedly different fossil kinds are found in sequential strata. But many strata boundaries are flat and show knife-like edges, showing little or no erosion at all – over thousands of square kilometers. There could not possibly be gaps of millions of years in such cases. Where evidence of erosion is observed, it can be shown that it was either catastrophically rapid or else miniscule, compared to a typical present-day land surface. The flat, continental sized layering speaks clearly to a massive flood event.

Many large scale sedimentary rock formations show dramatic curves from folding under tectonic uplift, but without the fracturing and buckling that must occur if the rocks were dried out and the buckling stresses acted over thousands or millions of years. Such rock layers must have been still wet throughout in order to allow for such smooth folding. Also, there are many instances of polystrate (“many layer”) tree fossils, extending through layers that are often alleged to have been deposited over millions of years. (Exposed dead trees don't persist through millions of years, waiting for dust to settle and accumulate into new strata.)

There are many other fascinating issues to explore in geology – it’s a huge subject. If you’re interested, I encourage you to acquire Snelling’s book and check out the archived articles at icr.org and AnswersInGenesis.org.

I would like to develop for you a simple probability argument, using the fossil record to show that evolution couldn’t have possibly been responsible for the living creatures we see on this Earth. I’m sure that you have seen evolutionary “trees of life” in textbooks, documentaries, and museums. Darwin’s only diagram in his *Origin of Species* included just the branches diverging up from some hypothetical life form at the root. He wasn’t so bold as to include named species at specific branch points or branch tips. Modern diagrams are much bolder. I recommend Benton’s book on *Vertebrate Paleontology* for a wonderful set of proposed evolutionary trees for the various vertebrate species. Unwittingly, he makes a strong case for special creation, despite his firm commitment to naturalistic explanations. (Also see the Educational Notes, “EN” series, in the “Short Course” on my web site.)

I’ll list below the entire set of eight phylogenetic trees in his book:

- Paleozoic fish evolution
- Basal tetrapod evolution
- Basal amniote evolution
- Post-Paleozoic fish evolution
- Amniote evolution
- Bird evolution
- Mammal evolution
- Human evolution

Now, I could spend several chapters of this book analyzing Benton’s treatise from a creationistic perspective, but I’ll just focus on the fact that these charts on “evolution” don’t even claim to show any evolution at all. Each chart’s vertical axis represents deep geologic time, from perhaps hundreds of millions of years ago at the bottom to more recent ages at the top. The horizontal axis is a qualitative measure of diversity within the group. For example, in the “Mammal evolution” chart, we see about 30 different mammalian types represented, from marsupials to rodents to primates to monotremes. At the bottom left of the chart a dashed line curves upward representing the alleged evolutionary ancestor of all mammals. As the dashed line curves up and to the right, it starts to branch. Any given branch proceeds directly upward and becomes a *solid line*, representing an *actual* mammalian type.

Mammals like bats and dolphins enjoy a line all the way up to the present because they are found in the world today. The lines of some types, especially in the other charts, terminate before reaching the top due to extinction. So where does the evolution happen? It must be represented at the *branching points*, where an ancestral type gives way to a more advanced type. But in every chart all the branch points show dashed lines, not solid lines. Benton reserves solid lines only for types that can be definitely found in the fossil record and / or can be found in a zoo today.

What’s the problem? These charts purport to *show evolution*, but they only show fanciful branch points with no actual examples of creatures ancestral to others. All eight charts show the same pattern. And this book was written by a paleontologist committed to showing evolution in the best possible light! If all of the *dashed lines* were removed and only the *solid lines* were left, you would have charts that show

the sudden appearance and long term persistence of distinct kinds of creatures . . . just like the Bible records.

Leading 20th century anti-creationist and paleontologist Steven J. Gould summarizes the situation after a century and a half of fossil digging:

“The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology. The evolutionary trees that adorn our textbooks have data only at the tips and nodes of their branches; the rest is inference, however reasonable, not the evidence of fossils.”

Evolutionary geologist David Kitts (Gish 1995) affirms:

“Despite the bright promise that paleontology provides a means of ‘seeing’ evolution, it has presented some nasty difficulties for evolutionists, the most notorious of which is the presence of ‘gaps’ in the fossil record. Evolution requires intermediate forms between species and paleontology does not provide them . . .”

Now let’s attach a modest probabilistic analysis to all of the missing links – the missing branch points – in the fossil record. In the previous chapter we considered the unlikelihood of successive favorable mutations producing newly evolved descendants. Now we will consider the unlikelihood of always failing to find the transitional forms in the fossil record.

Consider an ancestral amphibian we’ll name A0 (“A – zero”) which has deposited a multitude of fossils in the record. Let’s also imagine the original small reptile R0 which is supposed to be the descendant of A0. R0 fossils are also abundant in this scenario. From the millions of functional, useful, advantageous genetic changes necessary to transform A0 into R0, we’ll optimistically suppose that merely nine distinct intermediate creatures existed along the evolutionary path: A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, A6, A7, A8, and A9. Similarly between R0 and M0 (“proto-mammal,” the first real mammal) are just nine intermediates: R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6, R7, R8, and R9. Between proto-mammal and modern jackrabbits (or cats or lemurs or some other more “advanced” mammal) we would expect another nine intermediates, M1, M2, etc. Clearly to survive, thrive, reproduce, and eventually dominate the population, all of these intermediates must be very successful and so are equally likely to produce fossils for modern Ph.D. professors and their graduate students to discover. (University and museum store rooms are filled with literally millions of fossils worldwide.)

Let’s suppose that fossil hunters are going out to the field around the world for the first time to dig up such fossils. Let’s see which ones they dig up. The order of discovery may go something like this:

M0, A0, R0, R0, R0, A0, M0, R0, M0, M0, A0, A0, A0, M0, R0, A0, M0, A0, R0, R0, . . .

Do you see a pattern? No intermediate fossils are ever found. Yet in this simplistic scenario, the intermediates should show up just as often as what we might deem the “index fossils.” Indeed “index fossils” represent creatures that are supposed to have lived strictly within a given geologic period. If evolution produced (as it should have) incrementally different fossils, they should heavily populate the layers between those of the “index fossils.”

An expected pattern, based on evolutionary ideas might be:

M0, A4, R6, R3, M2, A9, M8, A2, A1, M7, R5, R0, A5, M1, A4, R2, M9, R4, R6, A0, . . .

The “actual, observed, scientific” pattern was really “lucky,” wasn’t it? What are the odds that we always find type “0” instead of one of the intermediates? The first fossil we find has a 1 in 10 chance of being a type 0. The second fossil again has a 1 in 10 chance. The odds against the first two coming up “0” are 1 in 100. Let’s say that over time we dig up just 100 fossils, all of types A0, R0, and M0. The odds against us finding just these fossils, when CLEARLY there have to be multitudes of intermediate fossils, are 1 in 10^{100} . Once again, as we have seen in the previous chapters, we have proven evolution to be impossible.

Please don’t miss this point! *The reality is far worse for the evolutionist than our simple example, of course. There are millions of species that have lived on Earth, some extinct, many still living. Benton’s charts are representative of the distinct character of living types, with dramatic gaps in between. Where are the fossils? The intermediates are never found: ergo, they never existed. The probability of 1 in 10^{100} above in reality should be more like 1 in $10^{1,000,000}$ or worse. That is the probability that intermediate species evolved, competed, thrived, etc., yet their fossils are never found – although the index fossils are found again and again and again. What bad luck!*

In his day, Darwin was aware of the problem of the gaps in the fossil record, but supposed that discoveries would fill it all in. Modern paleontologists admit the wealth of today’s fossil record, making the problem even worse. Discoveries of new kinds of creatures simply demand an explanation for their missing ancestors. For example, a new dinosaur fossil was discovered in Argentina a few years ago, dramatically different from other types. Rather than *shed light* on reptilian evolution, a new mystery exists. What were the ancestors for this entirely different type of creature?

Many modern evolutionary paleontologists admit what you will never find in children’s textbooks or in museum displays. T. S. Kemp, for example:

“Gaps at a lower taxonomic level, species and genera, are practically universal in the fossil record of the mammal-like reptiles. In no single adequately documented case is it possible to trace a transition, species by species, from one genus to another.”

“ . . . no single adequately documented case . . . ” Condemned by their own testimony.

Living fossils are powerful arguments against the evolutionary faith. These fossils represent creatures who died ostensibly millions of years ago, but are essentially identical to present-day life forms. There are many examples, some of which have been quite embarrassing to paleontologists who use certain index fossils to date the rocks . . . *knowing* that these species went extinct “x” millions of years ago. The coelacanth fish, for example, supposedly an ancestor to amphibians, went extinct 80 million years ago. That is, until several hundred were caught by fishermen, beginning in 1938.

Bats have allegedly been around for tens of millions of years. Yet Carroll admits (from Gish 1995):

“Bats are among the most specialized of modern mammals. All are accomplished flyers, and the insectivorous microchiropterans have a highly developed sonar that enables them to hunt insects in the dark. Like the pterosaurs, the flight structure of bats was already highly evolved when they first appeared in the fossil record. The oldest skeleton of a bat, Icaronycteris, from the early Eocene, appears almost indistinguishable from living bats.”

Carl and Debbie Werner have traveled all over the world searching in dinosaur rock layers to see how often the fossils of still-living creatures are found. If evolution *did not occur*, one would expect to see many types of creatures buried together in various places, as opposed to finding dinosaurs in one set of sedimentary rock layers, and mammals strictly in higher levels. Carl Werner summarizes his finds among the dinosaur beds:

“We found fossilized examples from every major invertebrate animal phylum living today including: arthropods (insects, crustaceans, etc.), shellfish, echinoderms (starfish, crinoids, brittle stars, etc.), corals, sponges, and segmented worms. The vertebrates – animals with backbones such as fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals – show this same pattern. Cartilaginous fish (sharks and rays), boney fish, (such as sturgeon, paddlefish, salmon, herring, flounder, and bowfin), and jawless fish (hagfish and lamprey) have been found in the dinosaur layers and they look the same as modern forms. Modern-looking frogs and salamanders have been found in dinosaur dig sites.”

Werner goes on to list many other species found alongside dinosaur bones including parrots, owls, penguins, squirrels, beavers, ducks, snakes, and box turtles. Over the years scientists have found at least 432 species of mammals in the dinosaur layers, which is about the total number of dinosaur species. *Yet museums never display such fossils in connection with their dinosaur fossils.* Could it be that they are trying to sell a particular story?

I haven't addressed the alleged evolution of plant fossils and the fossil record of plants. The story is much the same as for animals: nothing but mysteries regarding the origin of plant species and the presence in the fossil record of all types. For example, Werner states:

“In the dinosaur rock layers, we found fossils from every major plant division living today including: flowering plants, ginkgos, cone trees, moss, vascular mosses, cycads, and ferns. Again, if you look at these fossils and compare them to modern forms you will quickly conclude that the plants have not changed. Fossil sequoias, magnolias, dogwoods, poplars and redwoods, lily pads, cycads, ferns, horsetails, etc. have been found at the dinosaur digs.”

It is clear to an honest, open-minded observer that the fossil record is consistent with the Biblical record. Animals and plants of all types shared various habitats and were buried en-masse in a global flood. Creatures appear suddenly and fully formed in the fossil record and persist with little change (other than normal genetic variations) until the present day or until they go extinct. “Living fossils” are everywhere and demonstrate that evolution doesn't happen, even if you believe that these creatures have been around for tens of millions of years. Furthermore, the evolutionary establishment makes a deliberate practice of ignoring or even covering up inconvenient data. Liars.

I heartily encourage every reader to acquire Gish's 1995 work below. By the time you're through reading it, you will be amazed that *anyone* would dabble with evolution. Holding on to an evolutionary faith in origins produces nothing but mysteries. As Gish documents (I'll just cite a *very few* quotes from evolutionists who are experts in the fields they refer to):

“The origin of birds is largely a matter of deduction. There is no fossil evidence of the stages through which the remarkable change from reptile to bird was achieved.” -- Swinton

“The origin of rodents is obscure . . . no transitional forms are known.” -- Romer

“ . . . the beavers are presumably derived from some primitive sciurormorph stock, but there are no annectant types between such forms and the oldest Oligocene castoroids to prove direct relationship.” – Romer

“At the higher level of evolutionary transition between basic morphological designs (designs!), gradualism has always been in trouble though it remains the ‘official’ position of most Western evolutionists. Smooth intermediates between Bauplane (body types) are almost impossible to construct, even in thought experiments; there is certainly no evidence for them in the fossil record (curious mosaics like Archaeopteryx do not count).” – Gould and Eldridge

“Unfortunately, the fossil history of the snakes is very fragmentary, so that it is necessary to infer much of their evolution from the comparative anatomy of modern fossils.” -- Colbert and Morales

“It is considered likely that all the animal phyla became distinct before or during the Cambrian, for they all appear fully formed, without intermediates connecting one form to another.” -- Futuyma

“The emergence of Metazoa (multi-cellular organisms) remains the salient mystery in the history of life.” -- Morris

“ . . . the lungfishes, like every other major group of fishes that I know, have their origins firmly based in nothing . . .” -- White

“ . . . all the Triassic pterosaurs were highly specialized for flight . . . They provide little evidence of their specific ancestry and no evidence of earlier stages in the origin of flight.” -- Carroll

The July 2011 issue of National Geographic reports a new pterosaur fossil find, including an egg. What’s interesting is the admission of how little is known and how sparse the fossil inventory is:

“The University of Leicester’s David Unwin and colleagues say the latter find (egg) bolsters a hypothesis that pterosaurs were sexually distinct: Females had wider hips, and only males had head crests. Other experts agree, but Kevin Padian of the University of California, Berkeley, argues that we don’t yet know enough about pterosaur maturation to say whether age or gender accounts for physical differences among fossils. More scrutiny may resolve that flap – and help decipher other abiding pterosaur enigmas.”

Note the admission that paleontologists struggle over such an elementary issue as whether size differences are age or gender related. It is fascinating to me that in every sub-specialty of evolution, the experts will admit that they are clueless regarding the evolutionary lineage of their favorite creature under study. Yet they firmly hold onto their faith, perhaps trusting that other paleontologists have proof in their area. Those paleontologists who survey the entire field and find no satisfaction perhaps trust the geologists who assure them that the Earth is billions of years old and life has been around all of that time, evolving from simple to complex. When the geologists find themselves in trouble, they lean on the astronomers. The astronomers, who have their own troubles, *know* that the biologists have settled the “facts of evolution.” And around the merry-go-round they go.

The most important kinds of creatures in the evolutionist’s arsenal to promote evolution to the public – and especially to children – are the dinosaurs. Somehow the mere existence of dinosaur fossils is

trumpeted as proof of evolution. You would suppose that paleontologists must have locked down the origin of these creatures over a hundred years ago, from the overpreening confidence they exude. Nevertheless, the “beef” is simply missing. Here is a quote from perhaps the most prestigious scientific journal on the planet, *Science* (331:134), just this year, 2011, in an article by Michael Balter:

“But paleontologists are equally concerned with puzzling out how these mighty beasts got their start. Who were their ancestors? . . . Tracing the origins of the earliest dinosaurs has been a major challenge for paleontologists because there are no uncontested fossils from their earliest days on Earth.”

References:

- Duane T. Gish, *Evolution: The Fossils Say No!*, Creation-Life Publishers, 1977.
Duane T. Gish, *Evolution: The Fossils Still Say No!*, Institute for Creation Research, 1995.
Marvin L. Lubenow, *Bones of Contention – A Creationist Assessment of Human Fossils*, Baker Books, 1992.
Niles Eldridge, *Time Frames*, Simon & Schuster, 1985.
Niles Eldridge, *Reinventing Darwin*, John Wiley & Sons, 1995.
Andrew Snelling, *Earth’s Catastrophic Past – Geology, Creation, & the Flood*, Volumes 1 & 2, Institute for Creation Research, 2009.
Michael J. Benton, *Vertebrate Paleontology*, Blackwell Science Ltd., 2000.
Don Batten interview with Carl Werner, *Creation*, April – June, 2011.
Carl Werner, *Living Fossils (Evolution: the Grand Experiment vol. 2)*, New Leaf Press, 2008.

Chapter 6

Life is Irreducibly Complex

Life exhibits an abundance of irreducibly complex systems. The scientific literature is *empty* of any quantitative model that allows for an evolutionary origin for any living system or subsystem.

Evolution thrives as a philosophy and as a political sacred cow in the educational establishment – regardless of evidence or logic. Richard Lewontin is a Harvard professor of genetics and an ardent Marxist and evolutionist. Here's his point of view (from Johnson):

"We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, in spite of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a prior commitment, a commitment to materialism. It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our a priori adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counterintuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door."

The evolutionist is fully committed to materialism. There is no evidence that will allow him to consider supernatural design and creation. The resulting blindness is reminiscent of Romans 1:25, in that he "served the creature more than the Creator."

Michael Behe has written a marvelous book entitled *Darwin's Black Box — The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*. He defines the concept of irreducible complexity as follows:

"A single system composed of several well-matched, interacting parts that contribute to the basic function, wherein the removal of any one of the parts causes the system to effectively cease functioning."

An irreducibly complex system cannot — in principle — be produced by numerous, successive small steps. If biological systems exhibit irreducible complexity, then Darwinism is, frankly, sunk without a trace.

Behe used a simple mousetrap as an elementary illustration of such a system. A mousetrap includes a base to hold all the parts, a hammer to smash the little critter, a spring, a catch, a holding bar, and everything fastened neatly together and in the right proportion. Take away any component and it just doesn't work — *at all!* The mouse gets away.

You can also consider a bicycle, an automobile, and a jet aircraft as irreducibly complex systems, regarding their principal / critical components. For an automobile, critical components include the engine and the transmission system. Yes, you could strip the paint off and even remove the windshield and rear view mirrors, but it is clear that a functional automobile has quite a number of components critical to functionality.

Furthermore, you could also arrange these three vehicles on a chart showing increasing complexity. But it should be clear that such an arrangement does not at all imply an evolutionary sequence due to

successive incremental modifications. Especially since any such “commercial product” would have to be fully functional at every step to survive in the marketplace. For example, in a series of transitions from a bicycle to an automobile, the additional mass of bench seats and a metallic enclosed vehicle, but without the addition of a well-engineered gasoline engine, would not be appealing at all. Even with the engine, absence of an integrated transmission system would only add much weight and noise, reducing functionality.

At your typical fast food restaurant, your plastic utensils may include a knife, a spoon, a spork, and a fork. You may imagine an evolutionary sequence here, but design is obvious, isn't it?

Biological systems are incredibly complex — and irreducibly so — when looked at in the proper light: namely, the electron microscope's “light,” revealing the incredible nano-machines that make living things work. Behe considers the cilium as a “simple” example. A cilium is the hair-like “whip” attached to certain cells to allow locomotion. A sperm cell has a cilium that allows it to swim. Stationary cells in the respiratory tract use cilia to move mucus, enabling the expulsion of foreign matter. Cilia in the Fallopian tubes move in coordinated waves to enable the fertilized egg to implant in the uterus. No cilia — no life — the human race doesn't even get started.

A microscopic look at the structure of the cilium reveals a wonderfully complex machine that can continue beating after it is forcibly removed from a cell. It is enclosed by a membrane that is continuous with the cell membrane. Inside the membrane is a fused double-ring structure of microtubules which form a firm outer cylindrical shell. One of these rings is formed by 13 individual strands of protein. The other is formed by 10 strands. The center of the cilium contains two single microtubule rods (of fused multiple strands) and connecting proteins. Special protein “arms” reside on the outside and inside of the outer microtubule shell. These arms produce motor action when chemical energy is supplied by ATP molecules. The overall structure is beautiful and the performance is reliable and . . . frankly . . . awesome.

The cilium includes the use of *over 200 different types of protein molecules* for its structure and operation. Without any of these components, it simply wouldn't work.

Behe has examined the literature on the cilium over the last couple of decades. In over a thousand scientific papers on the subject, he has found zero — zilch, nada, none — that provide any quantitative analysis on how the cilium structure could have possibly evolved. No scientist has even conceived, speculated, or fantasized how the cilium might have developed through mutation and natural selection which, of course, involves successive improvements that must work effectively as a system at every step and be selected by environmental forces to dominate the population.

Yet biologists continue to insist that evolution is the very essential foundation of their discipline. Nevertheless, a thousand papers have been written on the subject, elucidating the form, function, and performance of these nano-machines without anyone conceiving of an evolutionary origin for cilia.

Behe also describes in detail the bacterial flagellum, another “simple” system. Much different from a cilium, the flagellum provides locomotion for bacteria. The motor mechanism for the flagellum is rotary and resides inside the cell membrane. This rotary motor is so complex that it still is a subject of active research just to figure out how it works.

About 50 *different proteins* are involved in its structure and function. Some are used to control the turn-on and turn-off of the motor. Some are used in the complex and robust structures that connect the flagellum through the cell wall to the interior. Some proteins control the formation — the initial building — of the structures themselves as the cell grows. A number of proteins still mystify researchers regarding their functions. Nevertheless such researchers keep investigating, convinced that these proteins must have functions, revealing their underlying faith in the concept of *design*, that *purpose* infuses these wonderful devices.

Thousands of scientific papers have been written on the flagellum, also. Yet again, evolutionary explanations are nonexistent. No scientist has ever published a model to explain how this structure could even possibly have evolved naturally. Once again, the evolutionary paradigm is not in the realm of science, or even qualifies for the genres of science fiction or fantasy. Even if someone could imagine a mutation / natural selection scheme for the development of cilia or flagella, he would be a long way from validating his hypothesis experimentally – and only then are we in the realm of science. Once again, *there is no theory of evolution*.

In Behe's second major book on the subject of irreducible complexity, he reports what microbiologists have learned about the construction of machines like cilia. He describes IFT, *intraflagellar transport*, as the system of machines that construct the cilium within a cell. Electron microscopes have revealed a system of "rafts" – molecular machines with a function like that of train cars – that carry cargo up to the top of a cilium being constructed. These containers deposit their cargo and return empty to a staging area near the base. It takes about an hour to construct a cilium that has been damaged or removed.

The cilium being built exhibits many of the characteristics of a building under construction. Consider what goes on during the construction of a tall building. The proper materials are gathered and organized at the site. Sentient workers have ordered just the right materials, recognize them when they arrive, organize them for use, and use technology to integrate them with the structure. The cell has no "sentient workers," so everything must be done *automatically*.

Just imagine for a moment how brilliant you would have to be to build an automated system that constructs skyscrapers without the use of intelligent workers, while noting that building functional nanostructures is far more challenging!

Research indicates that within the cell, machines called "transition fibers" serve as filters to keep out materials unwanted for the construction process. Exactly how this is done is not yet known, but it is certain to involve considerable sophistication. Also, if the construction process is interrupted (by an interfering experimentalist, perhaps), the half-built cilium doesn't just clog up the cell. It *deconstructs* itself, disappearing shortly.

The IFT construction system has a wide variety of clever control mechanisms. For example, the rafts or freight cars run continuously up and down the structure, but as the cilium grows, more are empty because not as many components are needed at the tip compared to the base. Thus there is a control system to turn freight cars "off" when certain materials are not needed.

The IFT machinery contains at least sixteen different types of proteins, each of which is very complex, akin to the size and sophistication of hemoglobin. Mutations can easily gum up the works, just like accidents can derail freight trains. There are motor proteins to drive the cars up and down the structure – one kind of motor for "up" and another for "down." Another complex is responsible to release the

cargo at just the right spot. How these machines “know” what / where / when / how will be a marvelous subject of research for decades to come.

Please do acquire Behe’s books to get his full treatment. He likes to call IFT “irreducible complexity squared.” Going back to the mousetrap example, which stretches credulity to imagine an incremental process for its development, we now must face up to the problem of the origin of the *automated mousetrap factory*, that acquires the right materials, constructs the trap, places it where it will serve its function, and then sets and resets it whenever appropriate. More appropriate would be to face up to the development of an automated F-22 fighter factory with all of the relevant logistical systems.

Evolution must explain the origin of the cilium and its automated construction system via mutations and natural selection. Biologists don’t even attempt a model to explain the cilium. They don’t even understand yet how the automated construction system works in all its gory molecular detail. Furthermore, evolution must go on to explain every other cellular component, cell type, tissue, organ, and organism – not just the “thing” itself, but the automated construction system that takes you, for example, from fertilized egg to embryo to fetus, to newborn, to adolescent, to reproducing adult. Since there is no theory of evolution to explain any of this, it is obvious that . . .

There is no theory of evolution.

On the same subject of *systems*, as opposed to individual complex machines, blood clotting is something we take for granted. But what if our blood didn’t clot? Our blood system is pressurized. A cut might bleed us to death. A clotting system must work every time — on autopilot. It must turn on quickly, must stop the flow, must turn off so that the whole blood supply doesn’t solidify (that would be bad news, too), and must transition into a healing process after the right amount of time to allow for skin regrowth — yet another brilliantly designed system.

The clotting system includes at least *30 different proteins and 100 different processes*, operating in a multi-cellular environment through a fascinatingly complex system of nested control loops. Everything must work perfectly, every time, or we’re in deep trouble. A detailed analysis shows that this system is irreducibly complex.

The literature on blood clotting is immense, due to its medical significance. Yet no scientist has even attempted a quantitative model to describe how an evolutionary precursor might exist and work — and be “naturally selected.” But a plausible story must include a quantitative analysis of how thousands — or hundreds of thousands — of gradually more complex precursor systems could have come into being and thrived through evolutionary processes.

It’s not just that evolutionists haven’t figured out yet what the story is. It’s not even that they haven’t figured out what the story “might be.” They can’t even begin to construct a quantitative story. Not to mention — *no theory*. This is characteristic of the entire field of biology. Whenever a particular organ or organism is examined at the biochemical level — where the action is — there is no scientific theory for its evolution. Don’t miss this point:

No theory of evolution can be found to explain anything in biology.

Why not? With our present knowledge of biology at the molecular level, we can now observe life’s nano-machines in action. And like any machine that you find in a factory — it should be obvious to an

honest person that optimum form and function don't just fall randomly into place. Machines are designed and built by intelligence. But in the case of biological machines, the evolutionary community dare not let "a Divine Foot in the door."

Any attempt at a naturalistic theory is doomed to failure. You won't even find attempts in the scientific literature, because it isn't possible to construct a scientific theory of origins based on natural processes. We know a lot about the physics and chemistry of life. The frontiers of physics have been explored well beyond the realm of chemical reactions. Physics and chemistry simply preclude the possibility of the spontaneous organization of complexity at the level we see in living creatures!

The clotting system is just one aspect associated with the blood that keeps us alive. As Hodge summarizes in the reference below, blood cells are optimally designed to maintain the life of a large, multicellular creature . . . like you and me. Blood regulates tissue acidity / alkalinity (pH), provides oxygen and removes carbon dioxide, transports food for all other cells to live on and removes waste, and carries regulatory messages via hormones to keep the entire body functioning. For example, your blood interacts with the pancreas to stimulate insulin production to regulate sugar levels. The brain relies heavily on glucose – if the level drops too much, you will lose consciousness. There are 15 organs that produce hormones carried by your blood.

Comprising about one quarter of all of the cells in our bodies, blood cells are uniquely specialized. In mammals they have no nucleus and lack the energy-producing structures found in other cells. They are smaller than other cells, about 6-8 microns in diameter. The absence of a nucleus and the red blood cell's biconcave shape and flexibility (it deforms when necessary!) allows it to squeeze through tiny capillaries and flow efficiently through veins and arteries. The flattened shape also enables efficient onloading and offloading of oxygen for transport. Each cell contains about 270 million of the oxygen-carrying protein hemoglobin, which includes the iron atoms that make blood appear red. What a workhorse! And all within a tiny nano-technology package designed for optimal performance, which must work first time, every time.

White blood cells (neutrophils) exhibit even more startling design characteristics. Walt Brown's book (see references) displays a dramatic photograph of a neutrophil stalking a bacterium. Our health is critically and continually dependent on the success of such "search and destroy missions." Brown writes:

*"Consider the capabilities and associated equipment the white blood cell must have to do its job. It must identify friend and foe. Once a foe is identified, the white blood cell must rapidly seek and overtake the invader. Then the white blood cell must engulf the bacterium, destroy it, and have the endurance to repeat this many times. Miniaturization, fuel efficiency, and compatibility with other members of the body are also key requirements. The equipment for each function requires careful design. Unless all this worked well from the beginning of life, **a requirement that rules out evolution**, bacteria and other agents of disease would have won, and we would not be here to marvel at these hidden abilities in our bodies."*

Let's talk about turtles for a moment, loggerheads in particular (see Catchpoole). A pre-eminent evolutionist, J.B.S. Haldane wrote in 1949 that evolution could never produce "various mechanisms such as the wheel and magnet, which would be useless till fairly perfect." Hmmm. If Haldane had known about loggerheads, he wouldn't have been so honest. Some of these turtles nest on beaches in Japan,

travel to the California coast to feed, and then return to Japan. Others migrate across other vast stretches of the Pacific and Atlantic oceans. How do they navigate?

It has been known for many years that they sense the Earth's magnetic field to distinguish north from south and steer along a given latitude. More recent discoveries, however, reveal that their magnetic navigation system can distinguish *longitude*, which was supposedly impossible because of the tiny variations in magnetic field strength east and west. The strength of Earth's field varies significantly as you move away from the poles. But when traveling simply east or west, it is only the *angle* of the field that has any noticeable variation, and that just slightly. One evolutionary biologist in 2008 was amazed enough to say, "A skeptic could reasonably believe that the latitudinal cue is magnetic, but that determining east-west position depends on magic."

The loggerhead navigation system apparently detects and processes the vector magnetic field: both magnitude and direction. It should be noted that human navigators have struggled for millennia to measure longitude during long sea voyages. The invention of precise chronometers in the 18th century finally overcame the barriers. Yet the loggerhead does far more within his tiny skull.

What about the supposed evolutionary ancestors of loggerheads? With turtles the fossil record is just like that of many other creatures, summarized by the word *stasis*. There are no transitional fossils that allow even speculation for the ancestors of turtles. One evolutionary paper on the fossil record is humorously entitled, "Turtles all the way down: loggerheads at the root of the chelonian tree." Within this paper the authors admit that the most "ancient" fossil discovered simply "produces more questions than it answers, reopening questions of turtle origins, shell evolution, and original paleoecology."

Let's talk about eyes for a bit from the viewpoint of irreducible complexity. Of course, there are evolutionary *stories* about the gradual development of eyes but, as usual, nothing quantitative to back up the stories. The 6/30/11 online issue of *Science Daily* reports a fossil discovery through an article with an intriguing title: "New Fossils Demonstrate that Powerful Eyes Evolved in a Twinkling." The fossil eyes are alleged to be 515 million years old, not "very long" in the evolutionary story after the so-called Cambrian explosion of life that supposedly began 540 million years ago. The researchers are amazed that such primitive animals had such excellent vision as evident by these compound eyes, containing over 3000 lenses. Clearly, such vision systems must have evolved very rapidly! (Or were created very rapidly.)

The fossil eyes were found without attached bodies and the speculation is that they belonged to a large shrimp-like sea dwelling creature. How or why did this creature develop such a complex vision system? The article offers this: "Given the tremendous adaptive advantage conferred by sharp vision for avoiding predators and locating food and shelter, there must have been tremendous evolutionary pressure to elaborate and refine visual organs."

Let's rephrase that quote to state more baldly what these evolutionists mean: "Some primitive, nearly-blind shrimp were being hunted out of existence by predators. Before they died out completely, tens of millions of random mutations occurred over many millions of generations. Each mutation produced a slightly better vision system in a mutant offspring which enabled that particular shrimp mutant to out-reproduce all the rest of the shrimp population so that its descendants survived while the non-mutants died out. Each mutation was clever enough to do the following: (1) it must produce a serious improvement in some aspect of the vision system including the lenses, optic nerve bundle, or the brain's visual processing system; (2) the change in any component of the system must always be compatible

with the rest of the system (for example, extra lenses without the appropriate processing system just makes vision worse); (3) each incremental improvement must not only work wonderfully, but also lie on the design path to a 3000 lens system with a very different skull, circulation system, and neurological system. (A big eye on a small skull is a big problem!) The cycle above must continue for millions of sequential mutations, each of which must take over the population because it is just perfectly refined enough to make the difference for survival.”

If you find such speculation to be reasonable, you should not consider a career in science. Consider that the “predator pressure” must always be working to annihilate the entire shrimp population, but just failing to extinguish the new mutant strain . . . again and again and again millions of times. Also consider that a creature’s vision system is a precisely tuned machine, far more complex than any human construct. The most expensive cameras are woefully primitive in comparison. In any camera, and even more so in any eye, every component must be functional and perfectly integrated with the rest of the system. Mutations will be just as destructive as any random changes to the design of a camera. Imagine converting a modern camera system’s design blueprints to digital files and then randomly flipping the bits in the file. After flipping some bits, manufacture some cameras from the changed design files and measure the performance. What do you expect? Even if you did this experiment a million times, would you ever expect a camera that is not only better, but has a much more sophisticated design?

Sarfati (below) provides a relatively simple example of the necessity of “works 1st time, every time.” When a bird flaps its wings in order to fly, it uses a pulley system to lift the wings before each downstroke:

“The supracoracoideus muscle pulls on its tendon, which winds around a pulley comprising the coracoid and clavicle bones, then inserts into the humerus or upper arm / wing bone. Birds can still fly with the tendon cut, but takeoff is badly hindered.”

The development of winged flight requires this pulley system to be fully functional. There is no evidence of transitional “half-pulley systems,” (whatever that would mean) in the fossil record. Consider a population of nonflying “birds” that produce a mutation just one step along the way to a pulley system. That poor bird is not going to suddenly be able to reproduce far better than his peers. Rather, he has a problem that may well keep prospective mates far away! This simple form of reasoning can be applied across the entire realm of biology. Of how much use is a fractional arm, a partial blood clotting system, half of a new protein, etc.

Sarfati also discusses the evolutionary claim that lobster’s eyes, which focus light via *reflection* using square facets and square tubes, evolved from a *refracting* compound eye employing round facets and hexagonal tubes. Here is his assessment:

“The lobster eye seems to illustrate ‘irreducible complexity’, that is, unless all the right parts were in the right arrangement, light rays would not focus. Also, the mirror arrangement produces an upright image, while a lens produces an inverted one, so the brain would also need to be reprogrammed to interpret this major change. Hypothetical intermediate steps between a refractive and reflective eye, e.g. a halfway stage between a hexagonal and square tube, or between a mirror and a lens, would produce a much worse image. An organism with such an eye for life would have a serious disadvantage, so natural selection would work against such intermediates.”

It is also evident that eyes of all kinds do not inhibit survival and reproduction. Animals reproduce quite happily whether they have a more simple or a more complex eye. Do remember that evolution would require that any lucky mutational improvements must produce dramatic reproductive success for the mutant in comparison with a large population that was likely doing just fine for many generations. And if one generation suffers great affliction via environmental changes, it's too late to start along a path requiring just the right millions of sequential mutations.

References:

Phillip E. Johnson, *Objections Sustained*, InterVarsity Press, 1998.

Michael Behe, *Darwin's Black Box – The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*, Simon & Schuster, 1998.

Michael Behe, *The Edge of Evolution: The Search for the Limits of Darwinism*, Simon & Schuster, 2007.

Andrew Hodge, "Life is in the Blood," *Creation* 33(3), 2011.

Walt Brown, *In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood*, Center for Scientific Creation, 1996.

David Catchpoole, "Turtles at Loggerheads with Evolution," *Creation* 33(3), 2011.

Jonathan Sarfati, *By Design: Evidence for Nature's Intelligent Designer – the God of the Bible*, Creation Book Publishers, 2008.

Chapter 7

Mindboggling Organs and Organisms

Have you ever just marveled at the sophistication of living design at the organ and at the organism levels? A detailed look at specialized organs and optimally designed creatures boggles the mind at the brilliance of the Creator – which is a smaller leap of faith than assuming “design” by random mutation and natural selection.

In 1802 an English archdeacon named William Paley wrote a book entitled, *Natural Theology, or Evidences of the Existence and Attributes of the Deity, Collected from the Appearances of Nature*. He superbly presented the argument from design, despite having only the rudimentary knowledge of biological form and function possible at that time in history. In the last century, many evolutionists make fun of Paley, especially his arguments on the complexity of the human eye. But none of these evolutionists have ever answered his argument!

A modern (but still cursory!) description of the evolutionary priest’s problem is given by Wysong:

“To form the eye, a constellation of beneficial mutations would have to occur. These mutations would not involve simple rearrangements of a few bases in DNA, but would first of all have to form sufficient DNA to work with, then mutations of this DNA would have to be integrated with other segments of DNA controlling the nervous, vascular, skeletal, muscular, and endocrine systems.

Two bony orbits must be “mutated” to house the globe of the eye. The bone must have appropriate holes (foramina) to allow the appropriate “mutated” blood vessels and nerves to feed the eye. The various layers of the globe, the fibrous capsule, the sclera and chorioid must be formed, along with the inner light sensitive retina layer. The retina, containing the special rod and cone neurons, bipolar neurons, and ganglion neurons, must be appropriately hooked with the “mutated” sight center in the brain, which in turn must be appropriately hooked with the grey matter, brain stem and spinal chord for conscious awareness and lifesaving reflexes.

Random rearrangements in DNA must also form the lens, vitreous humor, aqueous humor, iris, ciliary body, canal of Schlemm, suspensory ligament, cornea, the lacrimal glands and ducts draining to the nose, the rectus and oblique muscles for eye movement, the eyelids, lashes and eyebrows.

All of these newly mutated structures must be perfectly integrated and balanced with all other systems and functioning near perfection before the vision we depend upon would result. Deficiencies in any category would make vision not possible and make the whole mutated endeavor a useless waste.”

This description is but the most superficial overview of the problem, however. For example, the biochemistry of sight is an immensely complex process involving many genes to code many specialized proteins to enable conversion of a photon of light into a carefully crafted electrical pulse. Even if all of the gross physical structures associated with eyeballs were in place, the electro-biochemistry is an impossibility outside deliberate design.

Michael Behe (see references) has a cursory explanation of the biochemistry of sight, which I will attempt to simplify even more. My intent is simply to give you a crumb of appreciation for the complexity associated with the conversion of a photon of light into information useful to the brain. Such

biochemistry would be required even for the “simple creatures” with “simple light-sensitive spots” that evolutionists claim as prototypical eyes.

So here goes: Inside the retina a photon strikes a molecule called “11-cis-retinal,” which we will call “A” (and use other simple letters in place of other complicated names). In a few trillionths of a second, “A” rearranges itself to form “A1,” which forces a change in protein “B.” “B” now lets go of “C” so that “D” can bind itself to “B,” and the new compound molecule gloms onto “E,” so that this new conglomeration can cut “F.” The concentration of “F” gets reduced by this process, which closes an ion channel, thereby causing a reduction in the number of positively charged sodium ions near the cell membrane. This imbalance in charge produces a current that travels along the optic nerve toward the brain. The brain is clever enough to make sense of these current changes from 120 million rods and 5 million cones.

Now there also exists quite a variety of other molecular machines and systems to support the process above. The transformation and production of the molecules mentioned above must be controlled and reversed to reset retinal cells for new photons. I won’t try to summarize these processes – if you don’t have Behe’s two books, repent and buy them!

For evolution to qualify as science, it must provide explanations for the origin of all of these specialized molecules and structures and processes. Vision, just like the rest of the processes that keep organisms alive, operates at the molecular level. The machines that make life work are nano-machines. Hey, evolutionist: Don’t just spew out childish little stories. Show me systems of chemical reactions and the relevant genetic code, backed up by experimental data. Until you do, be humble enough to admit that you have yet to engage in science.

I encourage any of the high priests of evolution to publish an analytical scientific paper that suggests how the incremental processes of mutation and natural selection could construct such a vision system – even in one’s imagination. They must also explain how the embryology works. Recall that a fertilized egg cell is a long way from an adult human. An embryo goes through many stages, maintaining life and function at every point, along the way to maturity. There are 200 different types of tissues in a typical mammal, and organs like eyeballs find their final form after much differentiation. An evolutionary explanation of vision systems must include quantitative descriptions of how mutations and natural selection produce the embryological development processes in addition to the final adult eyeballs.

If they achieve this impossible goal, then they merely have to provide evidence that history actually unfolded that way. If this is too hard . . . *then admit that a scientific theory of evolution does not exist!*

You may think that I’m being a bit harsh in claiming that evolutionists’ best efforts amount to word games, void of science. I will take a bit of your time to describe some of the best evolutionary thinking on the subject of the amazing eyeball. Let’s review the article, “Evolution of the Eye,” *Scientific American*, July 2011. The authors, who make a living from conducting government funded research in this area, make the claim that they and their peers have produced “findings (that) put the nail in the coffin of irreducible complexity and beautifully support Darwin’s idea.”

After reading this claim at the beginning of the article I was excited to see what *science* they would report. After the article briefly reviews the differences between compound and camera eyes, the authors report that they “teamed up to try to figure out how these different types of photoreceptors could have evolved. What we found went beyond answering that question to provide a compelling scenario for the origin of the vertebrate eye.” Hmmm . . . “could have evolved” . . . “scenario.” Ok, it’s

clear that they are not going to present physical evidence for what actually happened, but rather are constructing a scenario. So they have already refuted their initial claim of putting “the nail in the coffin of irreducible complexity.” But let’s see just how “compelling” their scenario is.

The authors point out similarities between the eyes of modern vertebrates and “primitive” jawless vertebrates, like lampreys. They have determined that the genes associated with such vision systems are similar when the vision systems are similar. Now, that should simply NOT be shocking to anyone. Here is their first big conclusion: “These striking similarities to the eyes of jawed vertebrates are far too numerous to have arisen independently. Instead an eye essentially identical to our own must have been present in the common ancestor of the jawless and jawed vertebrates 500 million years ago.”

Even a non-scientist should recognize bald assertions. The creationist position is that similar machines should have similar blueprints. Similar eyes have similar genes. The Creator clearly used some vision systems again and again across very diverse kinds of creatures. It is obvious that the authors’ *presupposition* that evolution is true leads them to the “startling” conclusion that the eyes of vertebrates all arose from the genes of a common ancestor. Phrases like “must have” simply attempt to paper over lack of evidence. In a summary footnote, the authors admit, “These findings suggest that our camera-style eye has surprisingly ancient roots and that prior to acquiring the elements necessary to operate as a visual organ it functioned to detect light for modulating our long-ago ancestors’ circadian rhythms.” “Suggest” does not hammer any nails. And once again we see childish stories without either fossil evidence connecting different designs or mathematical models to detail the genetic changes required for massive redesign.

Here’s another assertion: “The hagfish shares a common ancestor with the lamprey, and this ancestor presumably had a camera-style eye like the lamprey’s. The hagfish eye must therefore have degenerated from that more advanced form.” Amazingly, the authors use embryological recapitulation as an argument . . . an argument that has long been refuted and even ridiculed by highly respected evolutionists: “The human eye, too, recalls the hagfish eye during development, passing through a stage in which the retina has just two layers before a third layer of cells emerges. Aspects of the embryonic development of an individual are known to reflect events that occurred during the evolution of its lineage.”

The argument of embryological recapitulation was invented by Ernst Haeckel in the 19th century, who faked drawings of the embryos of a fish, salamander, tortoise, chicken, hog, calf, rabbit, and human in order to claim that the similarities in the structure of embryos indicates we all (in the list above) share a common ancestor. In effect, because a human embryo looks like a fish embryo, we just represent a more advanced development in the adult form. The first problem is that Haeckel faked his drawings. The differences in even the sketched physical appearances are dramatic. (Even though Haeckel was exposed as a fraud *within his lifetime*, his sketches still show up in children’s textbooks to support evolution.)

Another problem relates to the enormous differences in genetic content, despite any superficial similarities. Recall our earlier discussion of the real differences in information content between your body and a photograph of your body. Clearly, any superficial similarity, even under a microscope, is irrelevant if the genetic differences number in the tens of millions or more and, furthermore, will be expressed in the adult form in dramatically different ways. There is much more that could be said about Haeckel and the modern evolutionists who still make use of such discredited ideas, but I would rather recommend Jonathan Wells’ book below. He has a full chapter on the subject.

Back to my review of “Evolution of the Eye.” The authors’ speculation continues: “Perhaps, then, the ancestral eye of proto-vertebrates living between 550 million and 500 million years ago first served as a nonvisual organ and only later evolved the neural processing power and optical and motor components needed for spatial vision.” PLEASE TELL ME HOW!! Show me some genetics, some possible mutations, and above all some intermediates in the fossil record! Nope, just stories for kids. Later, they slip into the language of intelligent design (which they have already nailed into the coffin) when they describe an “early, simple state of development” as representing a “holdover from a period in evolution before the invention of bipolar cell circuitry in the retina and before the invention of the lens, cornea, and supporting muscles.” “Invention” – twice! Since they clearly do not understand the origin of these systems, they must have been invented! I agree.

The authors go on to weave possible stories about the evolution of different kinds of eyes, using such “compelling” language as, “We wondered, though, what kinds of environmental pressures might have pushed those cells to take on those new roles.” We have discussed before how “environmental pressures” cannot create and how such language covers up enormous ignorance. They can’t stay away from such tactics as, for example: “. . . would have created selective pressures favoring the emergence of improved signal processing in the retina . . .” Wow, how simple to create signal processing systems far more complex than those of the brightest engineers – just add pressure! Also, “Thus, there would have been considerable selective pressure for the evolution of muscles to move the eye. Such muscles must have been present by 500 million years ago . . .” Assert enough and you have apparently proven your case. Fortunately, other areas of science demand evidence.

I hope that I have sensitized you by this point so you can be alert and analytical the next time you read an article that “nails” intelligent design. Let’s move on to other examples.

Michael Denton (see references) summarizes neatly the amazing complexity of the human brain. As complex as any individual cell is, nothing in the universe compares in sophistication with the brain. We have about 10 billion neurons (nerve cells), with each one extending between 10,000 and 100,000 communication fibers to its neighbors. Communication junctions include both chemical and electrical synapses, for slower and faster signal flow, respectively. Researchers at Stanford have recently been stunned to discover that a single synapse contains about 1,000 molecular switches of its own. The total number of interconnections is about 10^{15} (not counting that last factor of 1,000 molecular switches). To attempt to imagine such a number, Denton suggests that you pretend that the eastern half of the United States is completely covered with a forest of trees at ten thousand per square mile. If each tree has 100,000 leaves then the total number of leaves in this national forest would be 10^{15} . Another way to look at this, if we add in the individual molecular switches that have been only recently discovered, is that a single human brain has more switches than all the computers and routers and internet connections on the Earth.

Yet this incredible web is not a chaotic tangle, but rather a highly organized network enabling thought, speech, visual pattern recognition, mathematical computations, poetry, musical composition; maintenance of autonomous bodily functions including respiration, blood flow, heart beats, and digestion; and appreciation of such abstract concepts as love, justice, truth, mercy, and logic. The current scientific understanding of how the brain operates, both at the macroscopic and microscopic levels, is crude indeed. Much less understood is how the entire brain develops in embryology from the DNA instructions of the initial fertilized egg cell. Yet evolutionists remain smug in their certainty that their fantasies are well-established facts.

As I write this chapter, our daughter suffers from a particularly virulent form of brain cancer, from which no one has ever recovered. The most modern diagnostic techniques and treatments run the medical bills to over \$100,000, yet it is clear that the preeminent oncologists in this field are clueless with regard to both causes and cures. They disagree with each other about what the residual MRI shadows represent, not to mention what to do next, other than to simply cut away more brain tissue. The reason the medical science is so primitive and void of remedies is because the top researchers do not even understand how the cell operates at a fundamental level, and so are even more mystified when it behaves in atypical, cancerous modes. They don't understand the cell. They don't understand the brain. They are still discovering *structures* previously unknown. Yet they claim that it is certain that all of these mystifyingly complex nano-machines arose from random chemical processes.

A July 2011 article in *Scientific American*, "The Limits of Intelligence," illustrates the cluelessness of evolutionists and their utter lack of any *scientific theory* regarding the origin of mammalian brains. Here's a sample:

"As you go from a mouse brain to a cow brain with 100 times as many neurons, it is impossible for neurons to expand quickly enough to stay just as well connected. Brains solve this problem by segregating like-functioned neurons into highly interconnected modules, with far fewer long-distance connections between modules. The specialization between right and left hemispheres solves a similar problem . . . All of these seemingly complex things about bigger brains are just the backbends that the brain has to do to satisfy the connectivity problem as it gets larger."

But brains cannot solve the problem of their own design. Here again we see evolutionists using creation and design language to cover over the absence of any theory on their part. The word specialization also assumes design, along with the phrase has to do. When the author writes,

"But evolution has also achieved impressive workarounds . . ."

he reveals that the architecture of the brain is a product of brilliant engineering. The word workarounds has nothing to do with random mutations, differential reproduction, and population shifts.

Despite the author's complete commitment to evolution, the article emphasizes such design concepts as "The Trade-off Problem," discussing how large brains optimize neuron number, size and density; axon (connecting fiber) number size, and density; and space, heat, and energy requirements. He continually relates the topic to engineering design as, for example:

"This fundamental compromise between information, energy, and noise is not unique to biology. It applies to everything from optical-fiber communications to ham radios and computer chips. Transistors act as gatekeepers of electrical signals, just like ion channels do. For five decades engineers have shrunk transistors steadily, cramming more and more onto chips to produce ever faster computers . . . Perhaps, then, life has arrived at an optimal neural blueprint. That blueprint is wired up through a step-by-step choreography in which cells in the growing embryo interact through signaling molecules and physical nudging, and it is evolutionarily entrenched."

Interesting. After all that optimal design language, he leaps back into his evolutionary core values, without offering any theory, hypothesis, speculation, or fantasy – not to mention, evidence – to support such blind faith.

Additional examples of mindboggling, evolution-defying nano-machines abound at the organ level. Bats have wonderfully designed sonar systems (see Sarfati). Fishing bats can detect a minnow's fin when extended only 2 millimeters above the surface of the water. Wait – think about that! If you were staring at a body of water would you notice a minnow's fin protruding for a fraction of a second? This resolution is possible because the bat can separate ultra-sound return echoes only 2 microseconds apart. The best man-made sonar systems, devised by the brightest engineers at the most successful defense contractors, struggle to get under a 10-microsecond resolution. Shall we conclude that the best designs of scientists and engineers fall woefully short of random chemical processes?

The sonar system of dolphins beats those of the U.S. Navy by a wide margin. A dolphin can detect a fish the size of a golf ball 70 meters away – underwater, in the dark. A recent discovery based on chaos theory has shown that the apparently random click pattern the dolphin uses is mathematically designed for reconstruction of maximum information from the sonar “scene.”

The dolphin and other sonar-using cetaceans employ a “melon” — a fatty protrusion on the forehead. This turns out to be a sophisticated structure that focuses the transmitted sound into a directional beam. This lens depends on multiple lipids — complex fat molecules — that have different indices of refraction. (The index of refraction of a transparent substance determines how much a wave bends as it passes through.) Multiple enzymes are required to construct the necessary variety of lipids and many genes are necessary to control the melon's detailed structure and development as the creature grows.

Let's go back to bats . . . from the viewpoint of one of the insects that bats want to eat. CreationMoments.com (3/22/2011) reports that a cricket that flies at night has been designed to have a fighting chance for survival while bats are about. The Creator could have designed the cricket to hide out, but then it wouldn't be a night-flying insect. And even if he could hear the bat's radar, that wouldn't prevent him from being gobbled up. Instead, the cricket has a specialized cell wired into its nervous system that is triggered by the ultrasonic frequency that bats use for navigation. This cell fires impulses at up to 500 per second into the insect's nervous system, which causes the cricket to alter its flight pattern to steer away from the bat's beacon. This defense system only works if the cricket is in flight and rests when the cricket is resting or otherwise engaged.

Michael Behe describes the one-half inch long bombardier beetle which has a unique defense system, squirting a boiling-hot chemical stream at a foolish predator. The beetle has special structures which manufacture and concentrate two chemicals, hydrogen peroxide and hydroquinone. The mixture is then kept in a storage chamber until battle is engaged. Under threat, the beetle exercises muscles which squeeze the storage chamber, while he also relaxes a sphincter muscle, allowing the mixture to enter the “explosion chamber.” Enzymes act on the chemical mix producing an irritating chemical called quinone. Additionally, the reactions produce water plus much heat, turning the water into steam. The sphincter muscle is now closed, the mixture is boiling hot, and the only way out is a channel which the beetle aims via additional muscles directly at its enemy. This enemy (it could be you if you get too curious about this beetle) is scalded by the steaming, boiling quinone.

It should be obvious that this defense system is a highly integrated . . . well, system! Which portion of the mechanical structures, or chemical factories, or neuro-muscular subsystems, or channels, etc., would you like to “evolve” first? And then hope the rest of the system follows, piece by piece. All the while, waiting for just the right mutations, each of which produces such a strong advantage in reproduction that only the mutant's descendants survive. Even though there is nothing advantageous

about any of the components until the entire system is operational. Richard Dawkins, ardent anti-creationist, asserts that the various components were “used for other purposes in body chemistry. The bombardier beetle’s ancestors simply pressed into different service chemicals that already happened to be around. That’s how evolution works.”

Really? He publishes that as if it’s a strong argument? Let’s see the details for the origin of the tens of millions of lines of DNA base code, along with descriptions of the proteins and processes and functions of all the thousands or millions of ancestral beetle types that allegedly led up to the modern beetle with its sophisticated directed energy weapon. Keep in mind how unlikely is the origin of any single functional protein.

Much taxpayer money is spent to fund NASA’s quest to find life on other planets or their moons. One of the problems is that Earth’s environment is so wonderfully suited for life as opposed to what is known of other planets. Only sketchy information has been developed over the last decade about planets that have been discovered orbiting other stars. The enormous distances involved tend to limit our information to the basics of mass and orbital period. Even at that, indications are that many extra-solar planets are Jupiter-plus in size and often orbiting far too close to their star for comfort for any life forms.

So “exo-biologists” (a field with nothing to study) get excited when they find unusual bacteria here on the Earth. A *New Scientist* article (10/9/08), “Goldmine bug DNA may be key to alien life,” reports the discovery of bacteria living in water-filled cracks, two miles underground in a South African gold mine. There are no other species around, no light for photosynthesis, and nothing that would normally serve as nutrients. So how do they survive? Amazingly, they make use of the energy from the radioactive decay of uranium in the surrounding rock, extract carbon from carbon dioxide, and pull nitrogen from rocks, also. These bacteria cannot handle the presence of oxygen.

So what’s the connection to “alien life”? Since other locales like Mars or the moons of Saturn or Jupiter have such hostile, unearthly environments, perhaps lifeforms like these bacteria could have evolved from the local goo. This is all the rankest of speculation, of course. As for the alleged naturalistic origin of life on the Earth, no one dares to attempt any quantitative scientific model for the production of nano-machines of any kind from the rocks of Mars, Titan, or Ganymede.

Let me offer a different perspective. Oddball bacteria represent another class of impossibilities for evolutionists. Since their metabolism is *entirely different* from “normal” bacteria, they can realistically be neither ancestors nor descendants, but must have arisen independently – and evolutionists agree on this. I’m just touching the surface here. There are quite a variety of cellular creatures in mines, under the Antarctic ice cap, and near deep sea vents that biologists have lumped into an entirely different animal domain, called *archaea*, as distinct from *bacteria* and *eukaryotes* (with nucleus). Note that every time that life must have arisen independently from the goo by random chemical processes, we have multiplied impossible by impossible.

Archaeobacteria have been found which metabolize (feed on) hydrogen and carbon dioxide to generate methane. Others thrive in salt and others live in acid and boiling hot temperatures (110 degrees C). Unique structures and specialized and robust biochemical processes are required to allow life in such extreme conditions. As we have discussed many times, all of these structures and processes must work first time / every time or the creature dies. It can’t hang around for another million mutations and generations to hope that just the right new nano-machines pop into existence.

Let's go back to what we can see in our own backyards: birds and their feathers. The supposed evolution of birds from reptiles is fraught with impossibilities. Let's consider some of the issues (see Denton), starting with the feather. A bird's feather is a wonderfully complex device, incorporating a million barbules of different kinds interconnected by a system of hooks to form an impervious vane. The structure is marvelously light and strong. When "ruffled" out of order, a quick "brush" produces realignment.

A feather exploits aerodynamic principles, employing a distribution of slots to smooth the air flow, thus minimizing turbulence. The feathered aerofoil allows variable geometry to enable all of the fascinating maneuvers we observe connected with powered flight, takeoff, gliding, soaring, turning, airbraking, etc. The feather allegedly evolved from reptiles' scales. Somehow, a transitional creature must have mutated a "frayed" scale which became more and more feather-like. But evolutionists' discussions on this subject have merely story-book quality. Scales and feathers are wildly different. A "fraying" scale would not provide the mutated reptile any advantage in any environment. To achieve the complexity of the feather, perhaps thousands of favorable mutations must have occurred, each with some population selecting advantage for environmental conditions that biologists have not even postulated . . . ie., no theory exists.

Worse than the problems with the feather are the incredibly unique lungs possessed by birds. In other vertebrates air goes in and out of the same passage. In birds, the microscopic and macroscopic structures are entirely different, producing unidirectional air flow. Additionally, the avian lung is fixed rigidly to the body wall, unlike other vertebrates. Also, the bird's lungs are so delicate that within the first few days before hatching, aeration must develop gradually to avoid collapse. A bird's lungs, once collapsed, cannot be re-inflated.

Since the respiratory system is vital to the moment-by-moment life of any creature, it is impossible to see how incremental changes could have produced such a revolutionary "new" system for birds. And no evolutionist has offered even a speculation . . . once again, no theory.

We have discussed animal life for the most part. There are equally amazing facts associated with plants. "Creation Moments" (2/4/11) reports on "The Fastest Flower in the Forest." The bunchberry dogwood flower is only one-tenth of an inch tall. These flowers open explosively to scatter their pollen. To measure the opening speed researchers needed a camera that recorded 10,000 frames per second. The petals open and the stamens unfold so fast that pollen is catapulted into the air in four tenths of a thousandth of a second. That's about 100 times faster than a chameleon launches his tongue to catch an insect. (We could spend pages on that, too!) The pollen are subjected to a force of 2,400 times the strength of gravity. What genius in design!

From plants to pollinators . . . University of London researchers have noted that bees are experts at solving the "traveling salesman problem." Given a list of locations (whether cities or plants) and the distances between them, finding the shortest route to cover all stops once is a fiendishly difficult computational problem when the number of stops is large. The scientists note that such problems "keep supercomputers busy for days." Bees solve this problem regularly, and are the first creatures known to do this, even when the number of pollinating stops is several hundred. They are able to minimize route distances and return home safely and efficiently. Furthermore, they do so even if they had discovered the flowers in a *different order* before embarking on their trip! Yet the bee brain is very tiny compared to that of a supercomputer. However, neuron / synapse / molecular switch numbers and

densities, plus some obviously brilliant pre-programmed software, enables a real-time performance far above what man can do, even with his best technology.

In this section we've listed just a handful of such cases. But, of course, there are thousands to be found just by looking around. Where is the scientific paper that does a serious analysis of ANY case?

Darwin was more honest than his modern compatriots when he wrote:

"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."

Perhaps if Darwin had available to him the knowledge of present-day biological science, he would not have dared to offer such foolishness as evolution. But evolution got "locked in" before the discoveries of modern science, and especially before the discoveries of molecular biology. It is clear that modern atheistic scientists commit to their faith early in life, and then try to cope with the hopeless impossibilities that refute their faith every day. If anyone would start from scratch and defer commitment to either the creationist or evolutionary worldview until after examining the evidence, the path of sanity would be easy to find.

The famous evolutionist Theodosius Dobzhansky once opined, "Nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of evolution." Rather, it is evident that "Nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of God's design."

References:

R. L. Wysong, *The Creation-Evolution Controversy*, Inquiry Press, 1976.

Michael J. Behe, *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*, Simon & Schuster, 1996.

Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution: Science or Myth? Why much of what we teach about evolution is wrong*, Regnery Publishing, 2000.

Jonathan Sarfati, *Refuting Evolution*, Master Books, 1999.

Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, Adler & Adler, 1985.

Chapter 8

It's not science if it's not falsifiable.

Advocates of evolution support a “theory” that refuses the criterion of falsifiability. On occasion, some of the “faithful” have proposed a “test.” When such tests have produced failure, the evidence is ignored or the “theory” leaps happily to an opposite point of view.

One of the foremost advocates and workers in human evolution is Richard Leakey. In an interview, he once said, “I think the study of early man (physical anthropology in a paleoanthropological sense) is a science that is just reaching its adolescence. I do not think the science has matured. I think we are still doing a great deal of guessing.”

This is a remarkable admission, quite different from the typical evolutionist’s assertion that evolution is both science and fact. Another ardent evolutionist, Carl Sagan, said this about how science is supposed to work: “The most fundamental axioms and conclusions may be challenged . . . (and the prevailing hypothesis) . . . must survive confrontation with observation . . . Appeals to authority are impermissible . . . (and) experiments must be reproducible.” Unfortunately, evolution gets a pass on all these principles.

Evolution does not act much like a science at all. Donald Johanson, the discoverer of “Lucy,” once commented that “. . . only those in the inner circle get to see the fossils; only those who agree with the particular interpretation of a particular investigator are allowed to see the fossils.” This is evident from the way that human fossils are kept in vaults and restricted from viewing. “Researchers” typically have to work with plaster sculptures, drawings, and photographs. Is there any other “science” that is so protective of its evidence?

A scientific theory must be consistent with observational evidence. The only physical evidence available for speculations on human origins must be in the fossil record. There are thousands of ancient human fossils. So there are, in fact, data to be observed. What might contradict evolutionary theory? If two different types of fossil humans are found at the same place and at the same stratigraphic level, it falsifies human evolution. There are a number of examples of this. Do the textbooks get rewritten? Do human evolutionists go find an honest job? Of course not. Evolution is a philosophy that supersedes any evidence.

Consider the quote from Mark Ridley, an evolutionist at Oxford University: “. . . no real evolutionist, whether gradualist or punctuationist, uses the fossil record as evidence in favor of the theory of evolution as opposed to creation. This does not mean that the theory of evolution is unproven.” The heading of Ridley’s article reads: “The evidence for evolution simply does not depend upon the fossil record.”

Wow! Then what does it depend on? I guarantee that the public perception of the “fact” of evolution has missed the point that you don’t have to depend on the fossil record.

But Darwin, himself, was aghast at the gaps in the fossil record. He wrote that “the number of intermediate varieties, which have formerly existed, is truly enormous. Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links?” He was aware that the gaps are “the most obvious and serious objections which can be urged against the theory.”

But evolutionists have been preaching for a hundred years that fossils are the basis of evolutionary evidence. In the decades following Darwin, true believers hoped that additional fossil finds would fill in the gaps. But presently, it is clear that fossils are in abundance on this planet. There are plenty of fossils. They just don't support evolution.

In Chapter 5 we discussed "living fossils" and cited Carl Werner's work. In Batten's interview, Werner was asked how evolutionists deal with findings that contradict their faith. Werner spoke of the evolutionist's willingness to invoke a "rescue hypothesis" whenever needed:

"For example, if a scientist believes in evolution and sees fossils that look like modern organisms at the dinosaur digs, he / she might invent a hypothesis to 'explain' living fossils this way: 'Yes I believe that animals have changed greatly over time, but some animals and plants were so well adapted to the environment that they did not need to change. So I am not bothered at all by living fossils.' This added hypothesis says that some animals did not evolve. But if a theory can be so flexible, adding hypotheses that predict the opposite of your main theory, one could never disprove the theory. The theory then becomes unsinkable, and an unsinkable theory is not science."

Why isn't an unsinkable theory a good thing? Unfalsifiability amounts to this (my own synopsis):

We will believe that evolution is the cause and explanation for everything in biology, no matter what evidence is discovered, no matter how many good alternatives there are, and no matter how many mysteries remain. If evidence seems to contradict some tenet of our theory, we will change the explanation, but will still be committed to a naturalistic model for origins. No matter how compelling an alternative explanation is, like creation or intelligent design, we will remain committed to evolution, even if we are stuck with mystery after mystery. Furthermore, we reserve the right to spin word stories about how creatures evolved and refuse any demands to provide details regarding changes in DNA or cellular structures, mutational probabilities, specific environmental pressures, or how populations must wax and wane millions of times in order to establish long chains of mutations.

That's the problem with unsinkability. Such a philosophy is devoid of logic, immune to evidence, and determinedly attacks all opponents, making use of ridicule and censorship as needed.

The July 2011 issue of *Scientific American* reports the discovery of a fossil of a large web-weaving spider, which apparently had a one-inch body and five-inch leg span. They are shocked to reveal that this fossil pushes back the supposed origin of web-weaving spiders by 130 million years. This type of "this changes everything" discovery is commonplace. In other areas of science, honest researchers are willing to question whether *their theory is wrong*. But not in this religion.

Shaun Doyle (see references) reported on researchers who happened upon the "oldest known fossil shrimp." The discoverers claimed, "The fossil is a very important step in unraveling the evolution of decapods." Really? No justification is offered about how / what is actually being unraveled. Such finds actually generate more mysteries. To start with, now you have a fully formed shrimp that looks like modern shrimp even further back in geologic history with no clues as to ancestry. The discovery allegedly extended the existence of the first shrimps from 245 million years ago all the way back to 360 million years ago. One fossil changes everything – suddenly evolutionists discover, based on one fossil, that shrimp have been around for 115 million years longer than previously thought! Since evolutionists allegedly depend on the ages of fossils derived from the so-called "geologic column" – a textbook

construct that doesn't exist anywhere physically on the Earth – discoveries like this should provoke them to trash their model entirely. As Doyle comments:

“However, if fossils as a rule continually have their stratigraphic ranges extended, how reliable can the geologic column concept be since it relies on index fossils?”

Evolutionary literature is so squishy, so speculative, and so flexible that it resists attack due to its sheer incompetence. In a featured article on evolution in the January 2011 issue of *Scientific American*, “Dawn of the Dead,” researcher John Long claims that sexual reproduction among vertebrates debuted 375 million years ago with the placoderms, now extinct. I will quote his closing paragraphs below in italics, underlining the squishy words, and interleaving my own comments in parentheses. I recommend that you read through the material below the first time, just reading the italicized parts. Then go back to pick up my comments.

“Many questions (always questions, never answers based on data or a quantitative genetic theory) about the origin and evolution of internal fertilization in vertebrates remain (We are still clueless.). For instance, scientists still do not know (At least they admit it in this sub-specialty . . . why not admit it across the entire field of evolution, since every sub-specialty has exactly the same cluelessness?) exactly (Use of the words “not . . . exactly” falsely implies that they actually know a good bit, just not everything. But it's clear they don't know anything.) how placoderms made the transition (no transitional fossils, no transitional genetic theory) from spawning to internal fertilization (That's a huge gap – millions of brilliantly coordinated changes in the DNA code!). Lacking the ability to observe (real science is about observation) them in action, I can only speculate (No theory!) about the nature of this sea change (admits the gap is huge). From a mechanical standpoint, it may have started (gross speculation – not even trying to develop a genetic fantasy; no evidence) with males and females spawning closer to each other to achieve (implies strategic intent on the fish's part) a higher success rate for fertilization or to better protect the fertilized eggs. There might also (so many possibilities, so squishy) have been an intermediate stage (Just one? How about hundreds? Where are the fossils and how do the genetics and the population shifts work?) whereby rather than depositing the eggs in water, the female or male carried the egg mass, as do some fishes, such as seahorses, which brood their eggs in pouches. Perhaps (not science) the use of well-developed pelvic fins to transfer sperm more accurately to the egg mass then brought (passive voice used to avoid the obvious question, Who brought? Where is the intent in a fish?) the male closer to the female, and this arrangement created natural selection pressure (Created pressure? Please use explicit scientific language. Arrangements don't create.) for larger, more elongated pelvic-fin lobes, which eventually became (Passive voice again, glossing over the millions of details.) claspers.

As for the neurological factors (more millions of genetic changes) that made males want to insert parts of their pelvic fins inside females for mating, perhaps (not science) this desire evolved as a by-product of natural selection acting to encourage (Acting? Encourage? Are the gods involved in evolution?) fertilization of the eggs before the female laid them, thus boosting the chances of beating other males to the punch. Further study of the chemical signals and neural triggers that govern mating behavior in sharks and other fishes may provide additional clues (sorry, we're clueless now) to how the first step toward the hookup evolved.”

David Catchpoole (see references) describes the colugo, a Southeast Asian rainforest animal which has been described as a “flying lemur,” although it neither flies nor is a lemur. It is a gliding mammal, but uniquely features a gliding membrane that covers almost the entire body perimeter, extending to the

tail, limbs, and finger / toe tips. The problem for evolutionists is that this unique creature simply doesn't fit into any known family tree. Richard Dawkins generalized from his consideration of the colugo's mysterious ancestry, by writing, "There is a correct tree of life, but we don't yet know what it is." So why all the arrogance about evolution being "established science"?

Colugo fossils supposedly have been dated at 34 million years, but look just like the modern creature. No surprise – yet another living fossil. Most interesting are the mental gymnastics exhibited by evolutionists when pondering such mysteries. On the one hand they call the colugo "primitive," hoping that its type might be ancestral to other mammals, but on the other hand they will admit that it is "the champion of all gliding mammals." Indeed. The colugo can glide more than 100 yards, turn sharply, and land gently on a tree. During a single night, it can travel up to two miles to find its favorite leaves. The structure and mechanics of their gliding system (membrane, musculature, neural control, claws for landing, etc.) are optimally designed. They have to work first time, every time. Where are the fossils of hundreds of different, gradually evolving ancestral types?

Regarding "first time, every time," the famous evolutionist J.B.S. Haldane noted in 1949 that "various mechanisms, such as the wheel and magnet, which would be useless till fairly perfect," could never arise through evolutionary mutation and natural selection. He was taking a rare gamble by actually identifying the type of evidence that would falsify evolution. This isn't done much in the field because of the obvious dangers.

Haldane would have been crushed at more recent discoveries of both wheels and magnets. We have previously discussed loggerhead turtles in this context. But there are many more examples. A perfect rotary motor drives the flagellum of a bacterium. A wheel is found in the vital enzyme responsible for manufacturing ATP, the energy-carrying molecule used by all living creatures. Regarding magnets – turtles, monarch butterflies, and bacteria use magnetic sensors for navigation. These involve more than "simple magnets," but rather complex systems in which magnets are integral components.

The evolutionary literature abounds with admissions of mysteries and impossibilities, yet the high priests in academia determinedly cling to their faith. For example, from Morris:

"But if it is true that through the genetic code, genes code for enzymes that synthesize proteins which are responsible (in a manner still unknown in embryology) for the differentiation of the various parts in their normal manner, what mechanism can it be that results in the production of homologous organs, the same 'patterns,' in spite of their not being controlled by the same genes? I asked that question in 1938, and it has not been answered." Gavin R. de Beer, *Homology: An Unsolved Problem*.

What is he admitting? The alleged evolutionary tree of life depends on similarities among different kinds of creatures. If two different kinds share some of the same basic organs, then evolutionists conclude that they have a common ancestor. De Beer admits that genetic studies have shown many cases where entirely different genes are responsible for the embryological development of a given organ in different species. Therefore, there could be no possible evolutionary incremental path which could be shared by the different species. The genetic data make it appear as if they are entirely separate created kinds.

Evolutionists Paul Ehrlich and Richard Holm admit (*Science*, 8/31/62):

*“It has become fashionable to regard modern evolutionary theory as the **only** possible explanation of these patterns rather than just the best explanation that has been developed so far. It is conceivable, even likely, that what one might facetiously call a non-Euclidean theory of evolution lies over the horizon. Perpetuation of today’s theory as dogma will not encourage progress toward more satisfactory explanations of observed phenomena.”*

Isn’t *dogma* supposed to be the problem associated with Biblical creationists? Experience shows that evolutionists are far more dogmatic. I wrote earlier that in the 1970s and 1980s there were hundreds of public debates between creationists and evolutionists. They stopped debating when they found out they couldn’t win on the merits of their arguments. The atheist is not looking for a fair fight. He wants to dominate the discussion by excluding alternative explanations for origins from the classroom. Ben Stein’s documentary *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed* does a good job reporting how academics who are even sympathetic to intelligent design have lost their jobs in research and academia. (You can watch it for free online.)

I have experienced the hatred of evolutionists personally when I was an associate professor of electrical engineering at Michigan Tech University. One of the university staff members conducted a seminar for faculty to discuss how professors should deal with students who come to the university with religious beliefs that oppose the positions that faculty preach in the classroom. Of course, the biggest specific issue concerned Christian students who rejected evolution, when confronted by professors in biology or chemistry or social science.

The discussion revealed the animosity that certain faculty had for such students. I recall that two of them proclaimed that they had a responsibility to destroy such beliefs, even if it required humiliation of the students. A couple of the faculty who professed to be Christians spoke of the need for disagreements between faculty and students to be treated gently and respectfully. But they were careful to wimp out and avoid criticizing the faculty who saw no reason to be gentle with ignorant students.

At the time I believe I was the only faculty member at the university who not only professed to be a Bible-believing Christian, but also took Genesis literally: namely, creation of the universe about 6,000 years ago in six literal days and creation of separate kinds of life forms during creation week. I spoke up quite emphatically, affirming my position and willingness to engage in debate to show that evolution wasn’t established science at all, and that the classroom should not be about intimidation, but about reasoned discourse and the promotion of critical thinking. In those years I also published several letters to the editor of the local newspaper supporting Biblical creation and contending against published items promoting evolution. Opposing letters arose from faculty who made it clear they were embarrassed that a creationist was even allowed to teach at their university. Consistently, letters written against my own submissions neglected to respond to my arguments, but rather resorted to name-calling, assertions, and appeal to the authority of the established high priests of evolution.

Even before my personal views were known in the local community, I experienced a singular example of censorship. Faculty across the campus were encouraged to generate courses for incoming freshmen that would enlarge their experience and, especially, foster critical thinking skills. I submitted a course description on the subject of the creation / evolution controversy in American society, promising (sincerely) to offer readings from both sides of the subject and allowing the students to analyze views and even hold debates during the term. My plan was to avoid making my own views known, because I genuinely wanted the students to explore the issues themselves. Uniquely, I believe, out of hundreds of

such course offerings, mine was refused. I was called into a meeting with the course coordinator and the university's academic Dean, who pointed out that such a course would only be allowed if it focused on evolution and criticized creation or design alternatives. They insisted that there was no controversy, because as far as academia was concerned, evolution was established fact and creation was simply mythology.

One of evolution's leading lights of the 20th century, Stephen Jay Gould, once wrote (*Natural History*, September, 1989):

"Evolution is strongly constrained by the conservative nature of embryological programs. Nothing in biology is more complex than the production of an adult vertebrate from a single fertilized ovum. Nothing much can be changed very radically without discombobulating the embryo. The order of life, and the persistence of nearly all basic anatomical designs throughout the entire geological history of multicellular animals, record the intricacy and resistance to change of complex development programs, not the perfection of adaptive design in local environments."

Tiny mutations can produce deformation, disease, and even the death of offspring. Gould admits the incredibly intricate system nature of embryological development. For millions of mutations to ultimately produce new organs and new biochemical processes, changes in the DNA and the 3-D structures associated with it must perfectly code for both the operation of the new organs, and also for the wildly different embryological processes that produce those organs from fertilized eggs. *There is no theory in the literature to account for these simultaneous and integrated constraints.*

On the fundamental subject of whether mutations can produce new biological wonders, as opposed to simply degrading and destroying subsequent generations, evolutionist Heribert Nillson admits in a 1953 publication (from Morris' book below; nothing has changed since):

"The proof of the occurrence of mutations is by no means a proof of a current evolution. The most important inescapable question, is whether the mutations are fully vital, so that they are able to survive in natural stands . . . A review of known facts about their ability to survive has led to no other conclusion than that they are always constitutionally weaker than their parent form or species, and in a population with free competition they are eliminated . . . It is therefore absolutely impossible to build a current evolution on mutations or on recombinations."

Nillson also puts the mysteries – mysteries from an evolutionist's point of view – of the fossil record on the table . . . note that these issues were surfaced within the community decades ago:

"And it is quite impossible to comprehend how the fossils have been deposited and preserved. The only certain thing is that these latter processes must have occurred during an epoch of revolution. We see every day that during a calm, alluvial epoch no fossils are formed. The length of such a period, thousands or millions of years, cannot change an iota in this respect. The incrustation of the fossils must, therefore, have happened during a revolutionary epoch . . . A perusal of past floras and faunas shows that they are far from forming continuous series, which gradually differentiate during the geological epochs. Instead they consist in each period of well distinguished groups of biota suddenly appearing at a given time, always including higher and lower forms, always with a complete variability. At a certain time the whole of such a group of biota is destroyed. There are no bridges between these groups of biota following one upon the other."

Nillson admits that fossils are formed very rarely under day-to-day conditions. Even more incredible are the fossil beds covering hundreds of square miles, and sedimentary (flood deposited) rock layers one to two miles thick in many locations on the Earth. Only a worldwide flood could possibly serve as an explanation, but that would falsify evolution so it must be rejected. Furthermore, Nillson admits that the fossil record shows no gradual development, but “well distinguished groups” of plants and animals. In more recent years, evolutionists have been more careful to avoid saying such things because creationists usually notice!

On the evolution of sex, evolutionist Julie Schechter marvels at the mystery (*Bioscience*, December, 1984):

“Sex is ubiquitous . . . Yet sex remains a mystery to researchers, to say nothing of the rest of the population . . . Why sex? At first blush, its disadvantages seem to outweigh its benefits. After all, a parent that reproduces asexually gives only one-half its genes to its offspring, whereas an organism that reproduces by dividing passes on all its genes. Sex also takes much longer and requires more energy than simple division. Why did a process so blatantly unprofitable to its earliest practitioners become so widespread?”

An unsolved and unsolvable mystery, once you’re committed to evolution. But the “theory / fact / science” marches on!

One of the most fascinating debates in recent years among evolutionists is whether birds evolved from dinosaurs or not. (See Oard for a comprehensive discussion.) One advocate goes so far as to claim that birds are modern dinosaurs, and anyone who disagrees with him is a non-scientist. Others are adamant that birds came from an earlier branch of reptiles. Each side offers compelling arguments against the other. The objections of both camps are certainly right! Birds didn’t evolve from any kind of reptiles. Of course, neither camp will even consider the possibility that evolution is wrong and that’s why they suffer such mysteries. They will not risk falsifying their religion! Here are some quotes in recent years from one of the leading evolutionary paleontologists in this field:

“However, answers to the question of the immediate ancestor of birds remain elusive, as does the overall early radiation from the Dinosauromorpha.”

“The major problems related to the origin of birds are still unresolved.”

“What’s the problem? We have some of the best-preserved fossils in the entire vertebrate series in the seven skeletons of Archaeopteryx, we have a wonderfully preserved array of fossil reptiles from the Triassic, Jurassic, and Cretaceous periods, and we have scores of well-educated scientists working on the problems of avian relations. So why isn’t the problem resolved after much more than a century?”

The answer is so simple: BIRDS DIDN’T EVOLVE. THEY WERE CREATED!

I could go on for an entire book on this particular subject, how commitment to evolution generates nothing but mysteries, ignores evidence, and suppresses dissent – therefore disqualifies itself on the basis of unfalsifiability. My intent has been to introduce you to the subject. If you’re energized by the examples above, do look into the subject. The bottom line – evolution is not honest enough to qualify as a “science,” not to mention “fact” or “truth.”

References:

Marvin L. Lubenow, *Bones of Contention – A Creationist Assessment of Human Fossils*, Baker Books, 1992.

Jonathan Sarfati, *Refuting Evolution*, Master Books, 1999.

Shaun Doyle, "Oldest Shrimp Fossil," *Journal of Creation* 25(1), 2011.

David Catchpoole, "The Colugo Challenge," *Creation*, April – June, 2011.

Henry M. Morris, *That Their Words May Be Used Against Them: Quotes from Evolutionists Useful for Creationists*, Institute for Creation Research, 1997.

Ben Stein, *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed*, 2008 documentary.

Michael Oard, "Did birds evolve from dinosaurs?", *Journal of Creation* 25(2), 2011.

Chapter 9

Come on, give me your best shot!

The “best” evidence cited for evolution is pitifully weak. Additionally, when evolutionists condescend to respond to a creationist argument, it is remarkable that they don’t realize how pitiful their counterargument is. I recently received from a friend in Michigan a series of letters to the editor of a local paper on the subject of evolution. A creationist letter appropriately cited the complexity of the eye, along with other biological structures, as examples of design for which evolutionists have no scientific explanations. A Ph.D. geologist responded (*Daily Mining Gazette*, 7/27/11) with tactics that are common to their evolutionary faith. For example:

“ . . . don’t pretend to care about scientific arguments if you won’t listen to what the majority of scientists with expertise in the field have to say.” Ah, I see. It isn’t actually the arguments that are important, but what the majority of the officially ordained high priests have to say.

Here’s another excerpt from this Ph.D. scientist:

“The same factors that cause ‘micro-evolution’ lead to ‘macro-evolution.’ Given millions of years, tiny changes that can be measured within a human lifetime add up to large changes in an organism’s lineage . . . An ancient Earth allows evolution to make sense.”

She asserts not just that it is reasonable, but that it is a fact that a mutation here and there can be extrapolated into major biological system reconfiguration. Now, since she says millions of years are enough, that would imply that she is aware of calculations that show that it is millions, and not thousands or billions or trillions that are required. After all, if you’re a Ph.D. scientist, you should be doing calculations with real numbers, shouldn’t you? But in fact, the “millions of years” assertion is religiously used without any calculational or evidential foundation. Recall our simple calculations early in this book that show that even trillions of years don’t get you to the first functional protein by naturalistic processes.

Now here’s her humdinger of an argument to respond to the problem of complexity:

“ . . . it is a false premise to start with an eye, take bits away and claim that it is the same as evolution in reverse. Earlier stages were fully functioning, but perhaps had different functions and capabilities than the ‘end’ results. Life co-opts existing structures for new purposes routinely. If you are in a boat without a paddle, you use whatever you’ve got, even if it wasn’t meant to be a paddle. The folded nylon webbing and metal supports of what is being used to move the boat is nigh impossible to explain, until you realize it used to be an umbrella.”

Let’s camp here a bit. Evolutionists believe that the wonderfully designed, perfectly integrated nano-machines of life – like your eyeballs or the bat’s sonar system or the bombardier beetle’s amazing defense system – started as crude organs serving entirely different functions. That’s why this Ph.D. evolutionist suggests the analogy of a boater using anything available for a paddle until a paddle shows up. Let’s make her example even simpler. Assume that the boater has only an old rolled up newspaper, which he uses as best as he can to propel the boat. As he uses and abuses this old newspaper, it SOMEHOW transforms itself into a large, multi-grained, laminated, hardwood paddle, contoured for perfect hydrodynamic efficiency. Or in her example, we start with an umbrella (Where did that come

from? Maybe it used to be a tennis racquet?) that becomes a lightweight, optimally designed metal and nylon paddle with contoured grips, etc. This must occur, in the evolutionist's view, because the "environmental pressure" of the swift current would, by "natural selection," send boaters with crude paddles over the falls to their death. So, of course, random destructive changes -- "mutations" -- must do the job of transformation. Otherwise, how could paddles exist!!

Do I really need to explain how ridiculous her position is? If you believe stories like this, you're not operating in the realm of science or even of faith, but rather in desperation to avoid the simple reality that you are a created being accountable for your sins to God. Life is short. You had better figure it out.

The most vivid memory I have from my youth in the public education system regarding the "evidence" for evolution is the story of the peppered moths in England at the beginning of the industrial age. The moths' light color camouflaged them from birds against light vegetative backgrounds.

Soot from industrial pollution darkened many of the urban surfaces where sat the moths, however. Within a hundred years the moths apparently "evolved" to a dark color to protect themselves. But the dark-colored variant was already in the population at the beginning of this adventure. Dark moths simply survived as the light moths were depleted over the years. When air pollution got cleaned up in the 1960s, the light-colored moth population recovered.

So where was the evolution? Did moths evolve into something more complex? Perhaps this is a nice little example of natural selection, but it has nothing to do with amoeba-to-man evolution. But even as the "poster-boy" example of natural selection, the moth story has had holes chewed into it. The photos we all saw in the textbooks turned out to be staged. Dark and light moths were *pinned* to tree trunks to show the relative contrast. It turns out that these moths don't sit on tree trunks, but hide on or under the leaves of the trees. Furthermore, the data show that the relative populations showed relative abundances that weren't very well correlated with pollution-tainted trees, after all. But even if you buy into the original *story* entirely, what do you have? You start with two varieties of moths and you end with two varieties of moths. Where is the *evolution*? Where did the moths come from in the first place and are they evolving into something else, like jet-propelled butterflies or miniature birds?

Another evolutionary foundation stone in the high school literature involves the synthesis of amino acids, the molecular building blocks of proteins. We have discussed some of these issues previously, but point them out here to indicate that the "natural" occurrence of amino acids is a really big deal to the atheistic faithful. Chemists in the 1950s, notably Stanley Miller and Nobel laureate Harold Urey, discovered that amino acids could be synthesized using conditions that they claimed could have been found on the ancient Earth. A number of experiments showed that with the right mix of chemicals at the right temperatures and with the right spark of energy (reminiscent of lightning!), amino acids could form.

Evolutionists were ecstatic. Over the years enough experiments were done to show that all 20 of life's amino acids could form under the "right" conditions, if you had professional chemists isolating the "right" chemicals and trapping out the "right" products before everything turns to sludge. But . . . *so what!* The real problem is the synthesis of a precisely sequenced and useful protein chain hundreds of amino acids long, folded (somehow without the aid of the cell's machinery) into a precise 3-dimensional geometry. No quantitative scientific explanation has been offered for this impossibility. Also, proteins in life only do their day-to-day enzymatic and structural jobs in the presence of DNA, RNA, and all the machinery of the cell. Evolutionists have suggested that the building blocks of genes — the nucleotides

— could form naturally. Unfortunately for them, the “natural” conditions that would allow formation of amino acids are incompatible with the conditions that would allow for “spontaneous generation” of nucleotides.

Quick aside: There are also *lots* of problems regarding Miller & Urey’s argument that they demonstrated that amino acids could form “naturally.” For example: the initial chemicals were all wrong, having nothing to do with Earth’s natural atmosphere. The spark discharge that initiated the chemistry would also destroy the product molecules if not trapped right away. Not just L-type amino acids were formed, but D-type also, preventing even the possibility of “life-like” chains. Additionally, toxic sludge was the normal result of the experiments. Also, the concentrations were woefully weak for any hope to get the building blocks together.

Interestingly, the cell’s machinery for protein synthesis is not simple at all. It involves wondrous complexity with a multitude of intermediate steps and molecules. Protein synthesis in cells defies the imagination of anyone who would suggest an origin based on incremental mutation / natural selection. George Wald, a Nobel laureate, once observed that a change in any one amino acid almost always markedly changes the properties of a protein. Proteins are intricate and optimally designed machines!

In addition to a couple of the examples in Chapter 3, here are some more that fall into the realm of de-olution, not evolution.

Perhaps the most dramatic observable “evidence” preached to support evolution is in the area of mutations that make insects resistant to insecticides and bacteria resistant to drugs. DDT works through a molecule that binds itself to the nervous system of an insect, interfering with the operation of nerves until the bug’s system just shuts down. There is apparently a mutation that can arise in an insect population that changes the shape of a molecule on the nerve site, spoiling the match with the DDT molecule. The insect loses its sensitivity to the DDT.

A mutation in bacteria can make it resistant to streptomycin. The drug has a molecule that locks onto the ribosome, interfering with protein synthesis. The bacteria can’t make the right proteins and dies. A mutation in bacteria can make the ribosome less “specific” so that the drug can’t bind to the ribosome.

In both cases, insects and bacteria, the resistivity comes at a price. The organisms do not function as well as before because these mutations degrade their day-to-day biochemical processes, with the *exception* of their survivability in the presence of the attacking drugs. The mutated bacteria do not produce proteins as effectively. The insect’s nervous system is more sluggish than his non-mutated forbear.

The mutations have actually made these creatures LESS COMPLEX, fortuitously allowing them to survive under a particular mode of attack. But where is the evolution? Where is the march toward higher complexity? The genetic codes have actually been reduced in complexity and in performance.

Behe’s second book listed below does a wonderful job detailing such cases, especially in his treatment of the age-old warfare between malaria and human beings and the attempts to find just the right chemical dagger to end this parasitic threat that still kills over a million people every year. Some people are more resistant to malaria (and other parasites, viruses, bacteria, etc.) than others. Behe’s analogy to describe genetic resistance in every day terms is instructive:

“Whenever two separate, automated mechanisms must interact, there are many opportunities for things to go wrong. Infection of a person by malaria can be pictured as the invasion of an automated city by a robot army. Although conscious humans can improvise, machines can’t. If the robot army is programmed to, say, cross just one particular bridge, the invasion route can be blocked by burning that bridge. If a robot invader has a key to a certain building in the city, it can be stopped by deforming that building’s lock, so the key no longer fits. On the molecular level, human resistance to malaria is much like these destructive examples.”

This analogy works for bacteria and insects and their resistance to antibiotics and poisons. In Behe’s analogy it is obvious that the desperation tactics of the defenders, burning bridges and wrecking locks, for example, is a wholly different matter from the skills and processes used in building that city in the first place. Evolution must explain how the “city” gets built in the first place. It is simply *lying* to equate antibiotic resistance to goo-to-you evolution.

In *Acts to Facts*, 6/30/11, Brian Thomas points out that biochemists suspect that some bacteria are able to adjust the shapes of some of their own nano-machines in order to defend against antibiotics. This could represent an additional mechanism for defense, beyond the normally reported case in which some fraction of a bacterial population has a deleterious mutation that improves survivability against drugs. Neither scenario has anything to do with evolution. If some bacteria have systems pre-programmed by their DNA to adapt their defenses, then evolution must explain the origin of such a brilliantly adaptive shield.

In a recent study, investigators worked to determine the mechanisms behind methicillin resistance in a strain of common skin bacteria. The antibiotic methicillin kills by attaching to a particular site on bacterial ribosomes, disrupting their function. Ribosomes are molecular machines that construct proteins in a cell. They consist of a large variety of proteins plus nucleic acids. The nucleic acids are specially configured to work properly, by joining certain molecules to the surface.

The methicillin attaches to a key “construction” site, clogging the surface and preventing critical proteins from forming. The resistant strain, however, has a mutation that modifies different nucleic acids, where the attached methicillin doesn’t happen to reach. This new location is not very efficient at manufacturing the critical proteins, but it does get by. Thus the mutant strain survives, but is less robust than the original, “wild” strain. At any rate, the questions are . . . where did the bacterium come from in the first place, including its DNA, proteins, ribosomes, etc., and why haven’t bacteria ever evolved into multicellular creatures?

One of the foundational elements of the whole construct of evolution is the variation exhibited by species, such as the finches Darwin so carefully observed in the Galapagos islands. Even creationists allow that some simple variations may arise through mutations and natural selection. But recent evidence disputes this particular example.

In 1967 about a hundred finches (all alike!) were relocated from one island group to another (hundreds of miles away) in the North Pacific. With some human help the birds dispersed among the 4 islands in the group. When checked again in 1984, the birds numbered about 800 and had changed from their ancestors in some noticeable ways, particularly in bill shape!

Evolutionary biologists admit that it is unreasonable to presume that mutation and natural selection could have operated so fast — over just a few generations. A more reasonable explanation would be

that the genetic variation was already in the genome and was triggered by chemical, dietary, or other influences in the environment. A separate study of finches in Africa indicates that 3 different species of finches can produce 2 different bill sizes and that the choice is adaptive to the particular feeding environment the birds find themselves in. The ability to adapt is already hardwired into the genome.

Much has been made since Darwin's time about the 13 different varieties of finches on the Galapagos, especially about how bill sizes vary with the environmental conditions. Depending on weather, birds may have an abundance of small seeds or big seeds to eat, and bill sizes affect prosperity. Any creationist chimes in with a hearty "Amen!" to such elementary considerations. The issue is the origin of the finches in the first place, including bills, feathers, eyes, high metabolism, flow-through lungs, etc. - not the simple variety in beak sizes.

Work in the area of quick, adaptive changes points more and more to inherently designed flexibility in a given creature's genome. It is interesting that even the simplest variations — as far from evolution as the variations among dogs or cats — may be explained entirely from pre-existing genetic information, designed so cleverly that environmental triggers can bring it out in one or a few generations. Whereas population models that assume random mutation and natural selection require enormous time to allow even the alleged possibility of such changes.

What about the evolution of horses? Evolutionary textbooks for school children typically show a chart that shows a series of horse-like creatures, from a 4-toed fox-sized creature to a 3-toed eohippus to a 2-toed merychippus to the present 1-toed equus. (From 4 to 1? Sounds like de-volution.) But even evolutionists have admitted publicly for the last several decades that this is a deceptive story, even though the museums and children's textbooks continue the lies. For one thing, there are just a handful of these so-called transitional forms and these creatures are quite distinct (different kinds), appearing in the fossil record abruptly with no hint of a series of intermediates between them. More importantly, some of these 3-toed and 1-toed horses show up in the same fossil bed, indicating that they lived together. Clearly we can't have evolutionary ancestors living together with their "improved" descendants — natural selection is supposed to weed out the older versions.

If you discuss these issues with an evolutionist, simply ask what his best evidence is. If evolution is such an overwhelming "fact," on a par with gravitational science or atomic theory, surely there must be some evidence supporting it!

Yo — you evolutionists out there — Come on! Give us your best stuff. Why in the world do you bet your scientific integrity (if you're a scientist), your worldview, and your very soul on this fantasy? You must have some reason. What is it? Is it just that so many scientists "believe" in it? But that just makes it a blind-faith-based religion.

The 2012 edition (although apparently printed in 2011) of the textbook *Human Biology: Concepts and Current Issues*, by Michael Johnson, continues the long tradition of repeating the lies of Ernst Haeckel, by showing crude line drawings of the embryos of an amphibian, a bird, and a human. Here is an example of what Johnson foists on unsuspecting college students:

"The embryos of all vertebrates tend to share certain developmental features, suggesting a common ancestry. In particular, all vertebrate embryos have either gill or pharyngeal arches. These arches ultimately have very different functions . . . all vertebrate embryos develop a series of arches just below the head. In fishes and amphibians these are called gill arches because they develop into gills. In humans

the homologous pharyngeal arches become parts of the face, middle ear, and mouth. The most likely explanation for these common embryonic structures with completely different functions is common ancestry. Later in embryonic and fetal development the paths of morphogenesis and differentiation diverge, giving us the variety of vertebrates we know today. It is almost as if embryonic and fetal development represent an acceleration of the entire evolutionary history of the vertebrates."

So you start with a crude black and white sketch of a couple of embryos and identify some folds that look similar when constrained to just a few pixels. Even though these folds produce entirely different structures and are generated by DNA sequences *entirely different*, let's just claim that humans represent just a little more embryological development than fish and amphibians. Haeckel didn't even get away with this stuff in the 1870s, but modern textbooks still trot out the story. We have discussed Haeckel before, but I wanted to emphasize in this chapter that the old game is still afoot.

Johnson also sketches the *homologous structures* of the forelimbs of humans, dogs, whales, and birds. The argument is that the similarities show that all these creatures must share a common ancestor. Of course, the possibility that they all share a common designer is banned from the discussion. We have also discussed this before, and here simply remind the reader that research has indicated that many such homologous structures are generated from entirely different sets of genes in the different creatures, thereby *proving* that they could not have arisen from a common ancestor.

In *Creation* magazine, July 2011, Don Batten points out that evolutionists love to portray whales as a prime example of the culmination of a series of transitional forms. One key element in the alleged series is a fossil called *Rodhocetus*, which is drawn as the first animal with legs changing into flippers, and the tail in transition to a whale's unique tail. Without this key element of the story it all falls apart.

Carl Werner asked the discoverer of the fossil, Dr. Philip Gingerich, how he knew that *Rodhocetus* had tail flukes, since the fossil bones were missing at that end. Gingerich replied, "I speculated that it might have had a fluke . . . I now doubt that *Rodhocetus* would have had a fluked tail." Werner also noticed that the fossil displayed no foot / flipper bones. He asked Gingerich how he knew the animal had flippers, who said, "Since then we have found the forelimbs, the hands, and the front arms of *Rodhocetus*, and we understand that it doesn't have the kind of arms that can spread out like flippers on a whale."

Nevertheless, museum displays and textbooks currently do and will certainly continue to display drawings and models of *Rodhocetus* as an established transitional form. Personally, as a scientist who conducted research in laser physics, I marvel at the persistence of such lies. Real scientists are embarrassed to be caught professing a model that has been debunked. For example, Einstein's theory of special relativity, along with the Michelson / Morley experiments, effectively clobbered the previously held idea of a medium called the *ether* that supposedly suffused space and allowed the propagation of electromagnetic waves. No physicist after those discoveries would be so foolish as to write a textbook that included the ether concept.

In recent years a fossil fish called *Tiktaalik* has been trumpeted as a link between fish and amphibians. As more details have been revealed it is clear that the differences between *Tiktaalik* and tetrapods (4-footed land dwelling creatures) are substantial. Nevertheless evolutionists insist they have found a transitional form. As an aside I note that the mere fact that there is a great promotional effort to try to establish *one* transitional form when there should be hundreds indicates how void of evidence the evolutionary story is. Recently, evolutionary biologists Neil Shubin and Igor Schneider have swapped

genes between living fish and mice. These particular genes serve to regulate fin and limb development in the respective animals. Because the gene swap worked, they conclude that Tiktaalik must have evolved genes for legs 400 million years ago, since fins are believed to be ancestral to limbs.

Interestingly, however, the fleshy fins of Tiktaalik do not attach to the bones of its pelvis and so could not possibly support weight on land for walking. The fin bones also do not resemble digits. Other evolutionist fish experts admit that the Tiktaalik fin bones have all the characteristics of modern fish's fin bones, writing in the journal *Nature*, "There remains a large morphological gap between them and digits . . . If the digits evolved from these distal bones, the process must have involved considerable developmental rearranging." So there is still a big gap in the fossil record . . . or, there never were any transitional forms.

In additional experiments regulatory genes controlling limb and fin development have been swapped among chickens, mice, frogs, zebrafish, and skate. Results indicated that the swapped genes were able to turn on the appropriate development of either limb or fin in the appropriate creature. These genes, sometimes called *Hox* genes, serve as master switches controlling development in the growing embryo. The creationist sees these common switches as common design features. The evolutionist sees similarity and insists on common ancestry.

Let me illustrate how evolutionists have missed the big point here. In the electronic world, it is possible to interchange "turn-on" switches for a large variety of systems such as personal computers, lamps, automobile headlights, a conveyor belt in a manufacturing plant, and the weapons of a fighter jet. Switches tend to be simple on / off systems. (Sometimes they are a little more complicated, but you get the idea.) The use of common switch designs in many different industries and applications does not suggest that fighter jets evolved from automobiles which evolved from computers.

Switching genes serve in embryological development to control when a limb (or any other structure) begins to grow in the unborn or unhatched organism. Too soon or too late and it's big trouble. Bio-switch genes are intrinsically much simpler than the genes that dictate the detailed tissue structures and processes that make all the difference between fins and limbs. The evolutionary issue is to find physical evidence and genetic modifications for the millions of new instructions required to turn a . . . fully functioning fin plus nervous system plus circulatory system plus neural system for operational control . . . into a fully functioning limb plus new nervous system plus new circulatory system plus new neural system for operational control. *It's not just about the switch that turns on the embryological development.* The land dwelling locomotion system is enormously different from the sea creature's swimming system.

Evolutionists still work to fool kids by claiming that *vestigial organs* are evidences of evolution. For example, the human tailbone (coccyx) is thought to be the vestigial (left-over) remnant of the tails of our apelike ancestors. Johnson's very recent textbook mentions this! Of course, the only "evidence" for this is the assumption that humans actually did evolve from apes! The coccyx is actually a wonderfully, optimally designed structure with a huge impact on our everyday life. As Wikipedia states:

"It is an important attachment for various muscles, tendons and ligaments – which makes it necessary for physicians and patients to pay special attention to these attachments when considering surgical removal of the coccyx. Additionally, it is also part of the weight-bearing tripod structure which acts as a support for a sitting person. When a person sits leaning forward, the ischial tuberosities and inferior

rami of the ischium take most of the weight, but as the sitting person leans backward, more weight is transferred to the coccyx.

The anterior side of the coccyx serves for the attachment of a group of muscles important for many functions of the pelvic floor (i.e. defecation, continence, etc.) . . . the coccyx supports the position of the anus. Attached to the posterior side is gluteus maximus which extends the thigh during ambulation.”

The article goes on to describe additional necessities. I don't think I need to elaborate how much difficulty you would be in without a well-designed and fully operational coccyx. I recall that David Menton, a creationist and a medical researcher, volunteered to remove the coccyx of any evolutionist who was convinced that it is a truly leftover and useless remnant from evolution.

As the 19th century closed, medical science identified over 100 such structures in the human body, such as the appendix and the tonsils. As the 20th century closed, this list had disappeared as research uncovered the designed functions of everything on the list. Wikipedia summarizes the case for tonsil functionality:

“These immunocompetent tissues represent the defense mechanism of first line against ingested or inhaled foreign pathogens. However, the fundamental immunological roles of tonsils have yet to be understood. Like other organs of the lymphatic system, some believe them to be involved in helping fight off pharyngeal and upper respiratory tract infections, but there is no conclusive evidence to that effect.”

Medical research continues, but at least tonsils have left the vestigial organ list! But the principle of assigning unknown organ functions – which simply reflects ignorance – to our supposed evolutionary lineage continues.

Evolutionists have believed the “adipose fin” on the back of some fish was vestigial. Hatcheries often clip this fin to assist in tracking the salmon they spawn. A University of Victoria evolutionary biologist, Tom Reimchen, reasoned that the fin would not persist “for 60 million years unless it had some use.” Now that's actually more like creationist thinking! Since God designed biostructures, it is evident that they are functional and it is up to us to figure it out. Reimchen discovered that removing the fin forced fish to expend more energy when swimming. The fin is also fully integrated with the fish's blood and nervous systems. “This strongly suggests that the fin acts as a mechano-sensory organ that relays positional information to the fish,” Reimchen said. The common practice of clipping the fin may thus be depriving hatchery fish of “a vital sensory device” and potentially endangering their very survival.

Thus we see that commitment to evolution can easily endanger wildlife and hold back the progress of science. For many decades physicians have lightly removed the human appendix, tonsils, and thymus gland based on such evolutionary thinking.

Regarding the origin of life by chemical processes, you will find matter-of-fact statements from evolutionary authors that suggest that the “RNA world” is a well-established explanation. A *Physical Review Letters* article (6/27/11) reports that Benedikt Obermayer's team in Munich has created a computer simulation of “prebiotic RNA.” Also, Christopher Deck's team in Stuttgart reports (*Nature Chemistry*, 7/10/11) on experiments to show how RNA can replicate itself.

Since scientists in this field are aware of the hopelessness of going directly from goo to DNA and proteins (not to mention a fully operational cell), they are hopeful (desperately so) that RNA, which serves in living cells as a go-between from DNA to proteins, may have been the starting point and *somehow* DNA and proteins followed.

For many years, efforts to synthesize self-replicating RNA molecules long enough to actually encode a useful biochemical molecule have failed. The Stuttgart group was able to get some RNA strands *8 bases long* to add another 4 bases – by isolating the strands in just the right laboratory environment with just the right *chemically activated* (by design!) nucleotides surrounding them. It didn't always work and, besides, 12 bases is a long way (don't you think) from the thousands required for the level of information associated with a functional protein. Yet the researchers have declared success, suggesting that early life forms may have gotten by with simpler molecules than we observe today. So . . . are you evolutionists getting excited out there?

The Munich group's computer simulation invoked the idea of a "natural" hydrothermal "RNA reactor," consisting of sea floor rocks where nucleotides can accumulate in the presence of strong temperature gradients. The conditions they modeled suggested that if everything is just right, then bits of RNA might pair up more efficiently and hang around for a while. Here is the conclusion they leap to:

"Hybridization simultaneously protects a sequence motif and its complement from degradation. Thereby, it extends not only the lifetime of the sequence motif, but also the lifetime of its complement, which in turn can protect other copies of the sequence motif after dissociation. This constitutes a form of information transmission between molecules, since it can conserve the information in the sequence motif beyond the lifetime of a single molecule. We show that a combination of simple physico-chemical mechanisms can greatly facilitate the spontaneous emergence of a prebiotic evolutionary system, such as envisaged by the RNA world."

Allow me to translate. They modeled non-real world conditions (what about the presence of nasty interfering chemicals, for example) to show *theoretically* that bits of RNA can extend into short strands. Hopefully, the model indicates that they won't fold up or dissociate too soon before generating a copy. Furthermore, the mere presence of a *randomly sequenced* string of nucleotides is hereby declared to contain information! And now that we have a string of information bearing molecules, we are close to the spontaneous appearing of pre-life life, that will evolve even though it isn't alive yet!

But of course there is no information at all in a random string of nucleotides. And non-living chemicals cannot *evolve* by mutations and natural selection. Regarding just how distant they are from an explanation of the origin of life, I'll ask you to go back and review chapters 1 and 2.

I'll conclude this chapter by using a specific example to illustrate just how ridiculous it is to believe that mutations serve as the creative engine for new biochemical processes, new nano-machines, new tissues, new organs, and amazingly new creatures. The August 2011 *Scientific American* discusses the causes of cystic fibrosis at the nano-machine level. Cystic fibrosis often causes death sometime in the patient's twenties or thirties, despite the best efforts of medical science. Thick mucus builds up in the lungs so that breathing is more and more difficult. The mucus also tends to harbor harmful bacteria and can lead to problems affecting the digestive system. Life is miserable and short.

The cause of the disease is a mutation in the CFTR gene, which codes for a protein which transports chloride and other ions out through the cell membrane. When working, this ion channel attracts water out of the cell to hydrate the outside, keeping the mucus under control. The CFTR protein consists of 1500 amino acids. There are at least 1600 different mutations that have been discovered so far that can degrade or disrupt the channel. One common mutation is the deletion of the 508th amino acid in the sequence. This deletion causes the protein to fold just ever so slightly differently. The protein would still work as a channel, except that there are hundreds of helper proteins in the cell that work to transport the channel protein to the membrane and insert it correctly. This system detects the slight folding flaw and rejects the protein, setting in motion a cellular system to destroy the flawed machine.

Another mutation occurs at amino acid position 1282 which results in the protein being truncated and useless. The point to take away is the critically optimized design of our life's nano-systems. The slightest defects – mutations – can be debilitating or lethal. Yet evolutionists must *believe* that the thousands, millions, or tens of millions of mutations required for significant biological change must occur in such clever ways that at every step a new, more robust, improved population survives and out-thrives the previous non-mutants, on the way to an entirely different organism . . . whether fish to amphibians, reptiles to birds, or apes to men. They must *believe* all this in the total absence of evidence.

References:

R. L. Wysong, *The Creation-Evolution Controversy*, Inquiry Press, 1976.

Michael J. Behe, *Darwin's Black Box*, Simon & Schuster, 1996.

Michael J. Behe, *The Edge of Evolution — The Search for the Limits of Darwinism*, Simon & Schuster, 2007.

Lee Spetner, *Not By Chance*, Judaica Press, 1998.

Duane T. Gish, *Evolution: The Fossils Still Say No!*, Institute for Creation Research, 1995.

"News to Note," *Answers in Genesis* email newsletter, July 16, 2011 for items on vestigial fins, Tiktaalik, and RNA.

Chapter 10

The universe is younger than you think.

There is considerable evidence that the universe and the Earth are far younger than the billions of years absolutely required by evolutionary fantasy – although “billions of years” isn’t enough to make it work!

Evolutionists rely on the magic of infinite time to overcome their probabilistic impossibilities. They are sure that a few billion years is sufficiently close to infinity to allow for chance chemical processes and the guidance of natural selection to account for all the pageantry of God’s living creation. But as we have seen, even a few billion years isn’t enough. Don’t be impressed by the size of “billions.” If in the room you are sitting right now there were only a few billion molecules of oxygen, you would be in deep trouble. Sometimes a billion is a big number and sometimes it isn’t. Compared to infinity, it is nothing at all. But “millions” and “billions” are thrown into the game by evolutionists to dupe the unwary into thinking that the impossible becomes possible if you just wait around long enough.

But there is much evidence to indicate that the Earth, in particular cannot be billions of years old. Let’s look at just a very few items. (Sarfati’s book, below, and many other authors have good summaries of many of these issues, and creationist web sites such as answersingenesis.org, creation.com, and icr.org have many archived articles to expand on these arguments.)

i. Carbon 14 dating has been ‘born again.’ (See De Young.) The half-life of ^{14}C is 5730 years. Dead organic matter contains trace elements of ^{14}C , which the organism ingested from the biosphere while alive. Once dead and buried, however, the ^{14}C content drops by 50% every half-life. (That’s what “half-life” means.) An evolutionist would expect that coal samples, allegedly hundreds of millions of years old, would have absolutely zero atoms of ^{14}C remaining after all this time. In fact, coal shows readily measurable ^{14}C . Samples from coal beds across North America should date anywhere from 40 to 320 million years old, but consistently date at about 50,000 years. But isn’t that *too old* for flood deposits that were laid down about 4400 years ago in Noah’s day? Creationist models point out that the early created Earth’s biosphere contained much more animal and plant life, as has been demonstrated in the fossil record. Thus the ^{14}C would have been diluted a good bit. Furthermore, the atmosphere only gradually increases in ^{14}C concentration as centuries go by, and the initial starting condition would have been effectively zero. So there wasn’t as much ^{14}C in the air in Noah’s day as there is today. The bottom line is that from a creationist point of view, the coal dates are just about right. Diamonds, allegedly a billion years old, also contain ^{14}C . That is IMPOSSIBLE from an evolutionary point of view. If the entire Earth were made of solid ^{14}C , in a ‘mere’ one million years (174 half-lives), not one atom would remain. Ergo, the Earth is young.

ii. Zircons are tiny crystals which are often found in granite. A given zircon serves as a cage for helium atoms which derive from uranium decay. Careful experiments have measured the rate at which helium diffuses out of zircons. Considering the amount of uranium decay, which is interpreted to be equivalent to that of billions of years under uniformitarian assumptions, essentially all of the helium should have escaped. But helium is abundant inside zircons. The measured abundance indicates that the crystals and the granite are about 6,000 years old.

iii. Spiral galaxies present a real mystery to evolutionary cosmologists. Stars closer to the center of a galaxy orbit around the center faster than those at the extremities, just as low Earth orbit satellites move faster than those in geosynchronous orbits. The same gravitational dynamics govern satellites in

orbit around the Earth and planets around the sun. For spiral galaxies, this leads to the “winding-up dilemma.” If any spiral were more than a few hundred million years old, it would “wind up” and look like a uniform disk. For example: A typical period of galactic rotation is 100 million years. In a lifetime of 10 billion years, 100 rotations would occur. No spiral structure could survive that! Lots of hypotheses have been built and discarded over the last 50 years, but none have survived careful examination. An additional problem is that the orbital velocities don’t fit the right profile anyway, given reasonable assumptions for the mass of a given galaxy, based on the number of observed stars. This problem increases the stability issue for an age of billions of years. Assuming that undetectable and unimaginable “dark matter” suffuses galaxies at just the right concentrations to solve this problem shows the level of desperation in cosmologists’ hearts. But even dark matter doesn’t solve the wind up problem.

iv. Globular clusters found near our galaxy contain hundreds of thousands of stars. Some are moving rapidly away from our galaxy, and definitely not in orbit around it. They will depart the vicinity in just a few million years. But then how could they have existed in proximity to the Milky Way for the last 10 billion years? And how can it be that their spherical symmetry hasn’t been distorted by the galaxy’s gravitational field in all that time? It has also been noted that there isn’t much gas within a large number of clusters – but the “solar wind” from each star in a cluster should have been spewing gas into its vicinity for billions of years!

v. Groups of galaxies produce the same dilemma. Individual galaxies move too fast to be contained within their group for long. Backtracking the trajectories implies that they were “together” not so long ago.

vi. Speaking of spewing gas, note how a comet evaporates as it approaches the sun. Calculations indicate that so much material is lost that they couldn’t possibly be more than 10,000 to 100,000 years old.

vii. A supernova is a violently exploding star, a spectacular example of decay in a fallen universe. Based on astronomical observations, a galaxy like ours, the Milky Way, should see about one supernova every 25 years. The gas cloud that results will expand and glow for hundreds of thousands of years. Analysis indicates that we should be able to see quite a number of such “old” expanding gas clouds. But all of the approximately 200 remnants observed indicate an age of just a few thousand years at most. There are zero “old” remnants.

viii. There isn’t enough mud on the sea floor. About 25 billion tons of dirt and rock erode from the continents annually. The average depth of ocean mud is less than 400 meters. At current rates, this limits the age of the oceans to about 12 million years. That’s not long enough for the evolutionary time scale, which requires the oceans to be at least 3 billion years old. (We know from Biblical history that most of that mud is runoff from the Genesis flood – that’s why there is as much as there is, but not nearly enough for the evolutionist.)

ix. Similarly, there is not enough sodium in the sea. Annual deposits amount to about 450 million tons. The numbers work out to a limit of about 62 million years. Measurements of other sea water elements pose even younger ages for the ocean.

x. The Earth's magnetic field is decaying too rapidly. A backward extrapolation over even millions of years would require a virtually infinite amount of energy in the early Earth's field – enough to melt the Earth and vaporize it!

xi. Geologic strata are tightly bent, with many folded into hairpin shapes. Conventional wisdom says that these formations were bent by crustal movements hundreds of millions of years after they were formed and solidified. Yet the folding occurs without severe cracking, and with radii so small that entire formations had to be wet at the time. Thus the folding must have occurred within months to years at most after formation. We know Biblically that the layers were laid down rapidly during the Genesis flood and would have been folded during the geologic upheavals of that period.

xii. Evolutionists claim that men and women, including Neandertals, populated the “stone age” for at least 100,000 years. The world population was allegedly a few million during this period. These people buried their dead, which would demand a total of billions of skeletons. But only a few thousand have been found. Perhaps the stone age was only a few hundred years – after Noah's flood.

xiii. Similarly, archeological evidence indicates that agriculture is only about 10,000 years old. But other evidence indicates that stone age people were certainly as creative and intelligent as modern man. Is it reasonable that intelligent people would not have discovered for 100,000 years that seeds grow into food?

xiv. Furthermore, written records only go back about 4,000 – 5,000 years. But, allegedly, prehistoric man built monuments, painted beautifully, and recorded the lunar phases. Did he really live for 100,000 years before figuring out how to write? By the way, the Great Pyramid in Egypt is the oldest one on the plain of Giza. The other pyramids are more recent in construction and less well made. It sounds like people were smarter at the beginning and civilization declined from there . . . cultural de-volution.

xv. In addition to the famous discovery a few years ago of T. rex bones with unfossilized blood vessels and cells, many more fossils of “ancient” extinct creatures have been discovered with soft tissues. For example, a team in Sweden showed that collagen (a protein) has survived in the fossilized bones of a dinosaur-era large ocean reptile called a *mosasaur*. Since these creatures allegedly went extinct 50 million years ago, all such biological molecules should long since have broken down due to elementary considerations of thermal chemistry.

For each of the items above (and there are hundreds more that are discussed in the literature), there are a variety of speculations to *explain away* the dilemmas. But speculation is not evidence. The evidence – looked at honestly – would lead one to believe that the universe has been here just a short time. If you are confident that the time scales are huge, then your confidence derives from a deep faith in evolution, which is based on the weakest of speculations, which in turn are unsupported by both reason and mathematics.

What about the “speed of light – time of flight – horizon” problem? One of the biggest issues in cosmology for the creationist is how can the Earth / universe be 6000 years old while we can see galaxies millions to billions of light years away? If the light has been traveling for billions of years, then surely the universe has been around that long, hasn't it? Interestingly, the evolutionary cosmologists have a related problem called the “horizon problem.” One of the most famous evidences for a Big Bang cosmology is the presence of the cosmic microwave background radiation, which comes from all parts of the sky with incredible uniformity (1 part in 100,000). This radiation is supposedly the leftover “heat”

from the early stages of the big bang. As the universe expanded over billions of years, everything cooled down (except for stars and galaxies!), leaving the universe in radiative thermal equilibrium.

But there's a problem. The universe is now at least 80 billion light years across (estimates vary), yet is allegedly "only" 14 billion years old. For equilibrium to occur there must be continual interchange of energy among all regions enjoying that equilibrium. Yet the speed of light is nowhere fast enough to produce that equilibrium for such a huge universe. Furthermore, the uniformity was a shock to cosmologists because of the serious "lumpiness" of the universe. Galaxies are "lumps" and are themselves "lumped" into clusters of galaxies which are distributed (lumped) in nonuniform ways throughout the universe. The microwave background was supposed to have been lumpy!

The evolutionists' ad hoc way around this problem is termed "inflation." When the universe was VERY young and VERY small, it may have lingered long enough in this state (10^{-35} seconds) to achieve thermal equilibrium, and then the universe expanded (inflated) much faster than the speed of light for a time ("FTL" on a universal scale!), then dropped out of FTL and resumed the current normal expansion. The speculative details keep changing, but anyone with any scientific training should appreciate the imaginative ad hoc inventions used to avoid the bigger problem – Big Bang cosmology is a bad model.

Just consider a short list of the unexplainables:

1. Out of *nothingness* (get your head around that!) popped the entire universe with space, time, and all of its carefully balanced physical laws and varieties of interacting particles. How? Why? There is no science supporting this point. Physicists speak glibly of a "quantum fluctuation" as the cause. Now, quantum fluctuations of matter and energy have been discovered at the *subatomic* level in laboratory experiments, which take place in an already existing universe with already existing matter, energy, and physical laws. The supposed quantum fluctuation that started the universe had no space, no matter, no energy, and no physical laws. And it supposedly didn't create a mere subatomic disturbance, but rather "fluctuated" into our entire universe. This story sets a world record for use of the word *extrapolation*. I would suggest that *lying* is a better term.
2. This universe-crammed-into-a-point decided to expand. How? Why? There is no science supporting this point.
3. Once the right mix of particles and radiation achieved thermal equilibrium, the universe decided to accelerate its expansion far beyond the speed of light. How? Why? There is no science supporting this point. Note that within this universe it has been well established that the speed of light is an absolute maximum speed limit. Yet for necessity's sake, cosmologists presume that the entire universe moved matter and space at much greater speeds.
4. When the universe got to a size so that it could exhibit radiative equilibrium and we could eventually enjoy it, it dropped out of hyper-speed. How? Why? There is no science supporting this point.
5. Matter coalesced into nice tidy stars arranged into picturesque, orderly galaxies. How? Why? There is no science supporting this point.
6. Some of the matter coalesced into nice tidy planets arranged into picturesque, orderly solar systems. How? Why? There is no science supporting this point.

7. The universe continues to expand at a still accelerating rate. How and Why is it still accelerating?
There is no science supporting this point.

8. If the Big Bang occurred, known physics predicts that the hot temperatures at the beginning of the process should have produced many magnetic monopoles. (All magnets normally have both a north and a south pole, so monopoles would be unusual under normal circumstances.) But the monopoles are missing.

9. For every particle of “matter” there corresponds a particle of “antimatter.” For the electron there is a positron, for the proton an antiproton, etc. Whenever matter is created from energy, as demonstrated in high energy physics laboratories, equal amounts of matter and antimatter are produced. Antimatter doesn’t hang around long because when it interacts with matter, it flashes back into energy, particularly high energy photons. The Big Bang should have produced equal amounts of matter and antimatter. What we see in our universe is nothing but matter. Oops. Bad model.

10. The original stars formed after the Big Bang would have contained hydrogen, helium, and just a tiny bit of lithium. Stars we observe now, like our sun, contain much of the entire periodic table. These new elements were supposedly produced in the intense conditions generated by supernova explosions of previous generations of stars. Known physics indicates that many of the original generation of hydrogen / helium / lithium stars should still be around. *None are.* Even the most distant galaxies, which should contain *new* stars formed in the early stages of the Big Bang universe, contain stars much like those around us.

What types of games are played to explain away difficulties? The continued accelerating expansion is “explained” by the presence of “dark energy” in the universe. What is dark energy? It must be a “negative” energy, because the gravitational acceleration from all the matter of all the galaxies would produce de-celeration, not acceleration. How can energy be negative? Nobody knows. Just what / why / where is dark energy? There is no science.

Furthermore, galaxies exhibit rotational structure (orbits of stars) that just can’t exist for a universe billions of years old. And galactic clusters have similar problems. Thus “dark matter” is invoked to explain observables that just can’t be in an evolutionary universe.

It’s fascinating. Cosmologists estimate (in order to make their models believable) that dark energy accounts for 73% of all the stuff / energy in the universe, that dark matter must account for 23%, and the stars / galaxies make up the other 4%. Evolutionists proclaim that their cosmology / philosophy is FACT, and yet they have not observed the first two (96% of everything!) and still have no credible science supporting the formation of the remaining 4%. One of the world’s foremost physicists / cosmologists, Stephen Hawking, in his book *A Brief History of Time*, writes, “This (Big Bang) picture of the universe . . . is in agreement with all the observational evidence that we have today . . . Nevertheless, it leaves a number of important questions unanswered . . . (the origin of the stars and galaxies).” Indeed. Evolutionary cosmologists cannot explain the stars and the galaxies, which constitute essentially *everything* that can be seen. They postulate dark matter and dark energy which cannot be detected and do not fit any known laws of physics. So just what is it that they actually know about origins?!? One of Hawking’s collaborators, George Ellis, has admitted, “What I want to bring into the open is the fact that we are using philosophical criteria in choosing our models. A lot of cosmology tries to hide that.” Including from the kids in school.

Now that's a long discussion to make the point that although creationists have a real challenge – worthy of continued research – to lock down the speed of light problem, the “other side” is sunk without a trace. There is much current speculation about a so-called *multiverse* which allegedly spawned off our particular universe. There is much I could say about this, but will simply suggest that the philosophical invention of an undetectable multiverse in order to explain evolutionary impossibilities may be the ultimate act of desperation for atheists. But back to the speed of light – how are creationists doing on their problem?

Russell Humphreys (see references below) has developed a “white hole” cosmology, using the theory of general relativity. This cosmology assumes a center of expansion and a bounded, finite universe. (Big bangers assume no center and no edge – get your head around that!) With the Biblical book of Genesis in mind, Humphreys postulates an originally created universe that is localized to within a few light years of Earth, which then expands continuously until the present day. At the center of this gravitational well, clocks run slower, while in the expanding universe they run faster at the edges. Expansion produces the red shifts that we presently observe in astronomy. The results from general relativity allow the entire process to take place in days for clocks on the Earth (under a guided hand – God's), while up to several hundred million years (NOT many billions!) of time tick by in faraway galaxies. This allows for some galactic rotation and distant events such as supernovas without the destruction of spiral structures that would occur in a billions-of-years-old universe.

There is much more to this, of course, and many issues to investigate both mathematically and observationally, and that's why Humphreys has written a book on the subject. Please check it out.

Another book-length creationist treatment by John Hartnett is available. Hartnett employs Einstein's general relativity, plus modifications of the theory generated by Moshe Carmeli in the 1990s, and constrains it to a Biblical time frame. His theory also involves accelerated clocks in the distant universe, and is able to explain much of what astronomers observe in galactic / universal structure while avoiding ideas like dark matter and dark energy.

In both of the models of Humphreys and Hartnett are found solutions to the speed of light problem – namely, that within the bounds of known physics (general relativity), the Earth and the universe are young (by Earth clocks) and yet we enjoy distant starlight.

CAUTIONARY NOTE: Getting your heads around these theories will require some real work on your part. You'll probably want to have taken at least graduate work in physics if you really want to check these guys out. The main point is that there are dueling cosmologies out there. As a PhD physicist myself and, more importantly, as someone simply trained in the scientific method, it's easy for me to see who has to be more inventive and arbitrary in constructing models. I also recommend the last two books in the reference list for analysis of this subject at the popular level.

A recent issue of *Astronomy* magazine (June 2011) includes a number of startling admissions from normally cocksure evolutionists. Columnist Bob Berman writes:

“Astronomy is a fascinating mixture of stuff we're learning, processes we're merely guessing about, and information we've nailed down cold. But most articles and news stories omit such nuances. Instead, they present everything in the same high-confidence tone as the salesman who convinced me to buy the most expensive vacuum cleaner in the solar system.”

I love those rare occurrences when the other team admits just a shard of humility and honesty. Here are some other notes from Berman about what is not known, implying that scientists should be more humble about what they claim to know:

“ . . . most of the universe is invisible. All evidence suggests that light from at least 98.4 percent of galaxies will never reach us because the stretching of space effectively makes them recede faster than light . . . their light . . . will never meet our eyes.”

“Our theories tell us it’s all homogeneous, but if the cosmos is infinite, as many theorists believe, then our data sample is close to worthless.”

“The bottom line is that our current ‘take’ on such basics as the universe’s age, size, content, and likely future is extremely low confidence. Despite this, scientists routinely speak as if our present cosmological picture is true. Or at least probable.”

“When a student asks a truly simple, totally reasonable question – like why do barred galaxies have bars, or what makes Jupiter’s Red Spot red – I’m sometimes intimidated at having no answer . . . It’s not always easy to fess up and utter those dreaded words, ‘Nobody knows.’”

“So let’s create an English / Cosmology dictionary. Then we can translate what they tell us on those TV science shows. When they weaselly say, ‘It’s not clear,’ it really means, ‘We don’t know diddly.’ The phrase ‘We’re not yet sure’ means ‘We haven’t a clue.’”

Berman cites an interview with an astronomer who was asked about a novel swirling, scintillating jet of light from the center of a distant galaxy. What causes this jet and why does its brightness vary so unpredictably? The answer: “We’re not yet sure.”

Thus we see that evolutionary dogma and its dogmatists can be antagonistic to critical thinking and actually hinder the advancement of science.

In the same issue of *Astronomy*, I picked up the following factoids:

- a. Regarding the origin of the planets in our solar system, researchers admit that “scientists still don’t really understand the first stage – when millimeter-sized grains floating in the nebula accreted into comets and asteroids.” The problem is that gas in free space does not tend to accrete into grains and, even if it did, fast moving grains of dust tend to pulverize each other and not glue themselves together.
- b. “Scientists have revised their ideas about the birth of galaxies.” For years they had thought that “mysterious” dark matter plus the mass of a gas cloud must equal about 5 trillion solar masses. The model has been changed to about 300 billion solar masses. But not too much more and not too much less. “If you have just the right amount of dark matter, then a galaxy bursting with stars will pop out.” I don’t object to their modeling, mind you. I do object to their airs of certainty all the while they know better.
- c. Regarding whether the universe’s first stars formed in groups or by themselves, new modeling produces computer results provoking this comment: “Just how to square previous theories with this revelation, and finding experimental evidence to support it, remains a challenge for the future.”

d. On the Big Bang, “It’s not clear how the universe assembled structure out of a cooling fireball. The puzzle pieces don’t fit together as well as we’d like.” This is a hint about the fundamental lack of an evolutionary model on the origin of stars and galaxies.

And these admissions, plus the Berman article, are from just one issue of a magazine that promotes evolutionary cosmology to the general public. Namely, these are not quotes from creationists, but admissions from hostile witnesses. Are there counterpoints to points I have made? Sure. And counter-counterpoints, etc. It is impossible to be exhaustive on any particular subject, including the vast realms of astronomy and cosmology, but it is feasible for you, O reader, to open a more critical eye the next time you flip on a TV documentary or read about the latest hyped discovery in the newspaper.

References:

Paul M. Steidl, *The Earth, the Stars, and the Bible*, Baker Book House, 1979.

D. Russell Humphreys, “Evidence for a Young World,” *Creation Matters*, a publication of the Creation Research Society, July/August 1999.

D. Russell Humphreys, *Starlight and Time – Solving the Puzzle of Distant Starlight in a Young Universe*, Master Books, 1998.

Jean-Marc Perelmuter, “Chiaroscuro in Space: The Suggestion of Matter Bears Much Meaning for the Universe,” Fox News on the web, 8.00 a.m. ET (1200 GMT) July 14, 1999.

John Hartnett, *Starlight, Time and the New Physics*, Creation Ministries International, 2007.

Alex Williams and John Hartnett, *Dismantling the Big Bang – God’s Universe Rediscovered*, Master Books, 2005.

Jonathan Sarfati, *Refuting Compromise – A Biblical and Scientific Refutation of Progressive Creationism (Billions of Years) As Popularized by Astronomer Hugh Ross*, Master Books, 2004.

Chapter 11

How does all this fit into your life?

I know that you recognize that I haven't been exhaustive. What about the next newspaper article or TV documentary that claims that a new missing link has been discovered or that scientists have almost figured out how life originated? Hopefully, I have suggested ways for you to analyze such claims. Experience shows that such headlines are often exaggerated or perhaps outright deception. Researchers are tempted to hype their work, just like anyone else.

In this final chapter I want to address you more personally. First, I would like to be an encouragement to the atheist who is reading this book. If you have read thoughtfully up to this point, I am confident that I have at least dented the foundation of your worldview. Hey, you're not alone. I've been there, done that. I am also sure that you would agree that truth is of the utmost importance in your evaluation of who you are, what life is about, where you came from, and where you are going. Life is indeed short and fragile and the prospect of eternity future – especially if you get it wrong – should motivate you to find the truth.

As an atheist, you have a big problem. You're out of touch with reality. Your real problem is whether YOU exist, not whether God exists. If there is no God, then everything is just physics and matter, molecules and forces. Your brain is essentially no different from a rock on the ground, except for the particular arrangement of atoms. And the next thing that you say is just brain chemistry. There is no YOU that speaks, just brain chemistry producing sound out of your mouth. Is that right or not?

So what do you say to that? . . . Now, was that YOU that chose to say that or just brain chemistry? Molecules can't decide between good ideas and bad ideas, between logic and illogic, between right and wrong. Everything about YOU tells YOU that YOU exist! There is more to YOU than molecules. And once YOU admit that YOU exist, it's easy to figure out that God exists.

Look at a nearby building. Do you know who the architect was that designed and built it? . . . Neither do I, but there is NO doubt in your mind or mine that someone with intelligence and skill built that building. Time, physics, and chance don't put structures like that together. Time, physics, and chance tear down structures – a consequence of the 2nd law of thermodynamics. And that building is really fairly simple. Look – mostly rectangles, perhaps some triangles, bricks, stone, glass – if an architect wants to win an award he may throw in a curve or two. YOU, on the other hand, are walking nano-technology. Every cell in your body is far more complex than a supercomputer. And time, physics, and chance don't make supercomputers. Nor the nanotechnology of life, which is way beyond man's capabilities.

The designer of life is almighty God – the Lord Jesus Christ – who walked among us 2000 years ago. When an engineer builds something he doesn't throw it away. He has a purpose for it. And God has a purpose for you – first that you find Him.

That mind of yours – your soul – is going to live forever somewhere. You have a God-given conscience – you know the difference between right and wrong. Is murder wrong? . . . Is rape wrong? . . . Is molesting

children wrong? When terrorists behead a captive, your heart cries out for justice. But are YOU ready for justice?

Life is full of problems, but none compare with death. Whatever you accomplish in life, death takes it away. Then you face God and will be judged for everything you have done, for every word you have said, and for every thought. Imagine a microchip attached to your brain that records EVERYTHING! Scary, isn't it? Especially because God is holy, just, and righteous . . . He will not let sin dwell in His presence. You and I have sinned against God thousands of times. Ever lied? Liars will be cast into Hell. Ever committed adultery or even thought about it? Pornography counts, too. Adulterers will be judged. Have you insulted someone or gotten angry without just cause? God judges you guilty of murder in your heart and unworthy of Heaven or the resurrection that could allow you to live on a New Earth when the Lord Jesus Christ returns.

Is there a way out? Your greatest need is forgiveness from God. Here is some good news. God so loved the world that He was made flesh in the person of Jesus Christ 2000 years ago. Jesus lived 33 years and never sinned. He made people angry by preaching repentance ("Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish!") and angrier yet by proclaiming that He is the only way to find God. Jesus was crucified on a cruel cross to pay the punishment for your sins. He was innocent, but loves you that much! Three days later He rose from the dead. Nobody else ever did that! He is the exclusive license holder for the technology to overcome death. Don't you want to live again? Jesus, God Himself, the Author of life, can give you everlasting life. Please, I beg you, confess your sins to God and forsake them. Repent: Change your mind about *everything*, and turn from the sins you are addicted to. Then trust in Jesus as your Lord and Savior. You will be born again, a new creation, with a home in Heaven. God will give you the strength to live right, follow Him, and get rid of the sins that only hurt you and others. Please contact me to start a dialogue and I can explain more. You can contact me through truthreallymatters.com. Life is too short to neglect your very soul!

The alternative is called Hell (temporarily), but for eternity is a place called "the Lake of Fire." If you don't seek and find God's forgiveness, you will be cast into it so you won't cause any more trouble. Haven't you noticed that this world is messed up? Whose fault do you think that is? You, me, and 7 billion others on this planet have rebelled against God. We don't want God telling us what to do and we don't care about others nearly as much as we love ourselves. God is not going to mess up Heaven with our garbage and when the Lord returns to rule this Earth, He won't tolerate rebels and lawbreakers like you to continue to foul it up.

Perhaps you object that God may indeed exist, but why must He be the God of the Bible? I have included Appendix 1 to address this subject briefly. Face it. You already know plenty of truth at this point. God has designed you to recognize truth when it smacks you in the face. You have no excuse. Rather, you have the freedom – temporarily, while your heart is beating yet today – to choose righteousness and life over disgusting self-absorption, rebellion, and eternity in an inescapable dark prison. You will be resurrected in the final judgment in a body that can feel *everything* and yet can never be obliterated. You were made in the image of God. You don't have the choice to go out of existence. You don't make the rules. One writer speculates that "the Lake of Fire" just might be a dark star in a far corner of the universe. Such a star would serve well for an inescapable prison, with nothing to build with, nothing for distraction, and with no need for guards or wardens, far from a life of learning, exploration, fellowship, and joy that the family of God will enjoy throughout God's universe for the rest of eternity . . . So just what is it that's holding you back? Are you crazy?

Now let me address the believer, the Christian. With this book's introduction to the subject of Biblical creation and the ridiculous fallacy of evolution, you should walk with confidence, knowing that God's infallible word is clear and all the facts of observational science are in perfect sync. Truth is recognizable. Preach it. Scripture is repeatedly clear that . . .

The Heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handywork. Psalm 19:1

Therefore, our responsibility as followers is to . . .

Sing unto the LORD, all the Earth; show forth from day to day his salvation. Declare his glory among the heathen; his marvellous works among all nations. For great is the LORD, and greatly to be praised: he also is to be feared above all gods. For all the gods of the people are idols: but the LORD made the Heavens. Glory and honour are in his presence; strength and gladness are in his place. Give unto the LORD, ye kindreds of the people, give unto the LORD glory and strength. 1 Chronicles 16:23-28

Don't hesitate to proclaim the truth. Our God and His word are rocks / foundations on which to stand and reach out to others. As God instructed His prophet Isaiah:

Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins. Isaiah 58:1

Do you claim to be a Christian, but still believe in evolution? You stand against God's word, against rationality, and against all scientific evidence and reasoning. If you insist on standing there, I declare with all certainty that you are not a Christian, no Christ believer and no follower, at all! You cannot claim to believe in Jesus and call Him a liar, as He said:

He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God. John 8:47

For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words? John 5:46-47

The Lord Jesus Christ repeatedly affirmed the historical record of Genesis. He had plenty of opportunities to set the record straight and explain that God actually used disease, destruction, and death to fashion life over a billion years, if that were the case. Consider the apostle John's warning:

He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. 1 John 5:10

If you are a Christian, believing God's word from Genesis to Revelation, then I hope that I have provided some useful ammunition for the spiritual war you are engaged in. I also hope that this book has served to stiffen your backbone a bit. This is no time for compromise. Preach the truth. Train your children, not just for them to know the truth, but for them to contend for the faith also. I encourage you to consider reading the three other books I have written before this one, as posted in the free e-book store on truthreallymatters.com. And I trust that together, in the New Heaven and the New Earth, we will have stories to swap as we meet to thank God and praise Him for His wonderful truth and the life He has given us to share with Him.

Appendix 1

How I know with certainty that the Bible is true.

The stakes are infinite, aren't they? Life is short and fragile – it's guaranteed that you don't get off this planet alive (unless you qualify for the rapture and live long enough). If there is any possibility that there is life after death, and furthermore, that such life involves only two destinies – Heaven or Hell – isn't it worth doing some research??!!?

In this short treatment of the subject, I'll make a case that *THE TRUTH* is found in the Bible based on four lines of reasoning:

1. Logic
2. History
3. Science
4. Experience

I encourage you to examine these areas yourself. If you are a true Christian, you should know why and be ready to explain it. If you are not a Christian, I assure you that you are basing your life and eternal destiny on a worldview void of evidence.

1. The Bible is true because logic demands it.

(In this section, I'll presume upon you that there is a Creator God. If this is a problem for you, see section 3 of this appendix and chapters 1-10 above.)

Everything about your life screams, "Purpose!" The very design of the Earth and its relation to a stable sun, the ocean / land / weather systems, seasons for agriculture, the beauty of a sunset, the warmth of a kitten, an eagle in flight, the activity of an ant colony, the taste of strawberries, the handy design of a banana . . . you shouldn't take such things for granted. Did you ever think about the abundance of trees providing wood for construction, without which civilization couldn't exist?

We see startling differences in the lives of plants and animals on the one hand, and humans on the other. For human beings, life is far more than food acquisition and reproduction. You strive to fit in with your family and community. You spend many years of your life in school to learn / learn / learn – much of which has nothing to do with earning a living. You spend enormous effort to find love and fulfillment, not just a mate. You want a career, not just a job. You want to lavish love on your children and grandchildren. You want respect and even admiration. You have a strong moral compass. Some things are *right*. Some things are *wrong*. You see evil in the world and your heart cries out for justice. You feel guilt when you do things that violate your own conscience. You take pleasure when good deeds are rewarded. You lament that evil deeds often go unpunished. You love and spend money on things of beauty. You despise and discard ugly or broken objects.

Above all, you can *think* – construct reasonable, logical arguments. You live as if you are more than a collection of molecules in motion. You can discern between sensible and stupid ideas. There is a *you* that is more than just brain chemistry.

The Bible claims that we are made in the image of God. Qualities of our own lives that are characteristic of God include love, justice, logic, beauty, morality (righteousness), pleasure, sadness, determination, thoughtfulness, and purpose. These qualities are not properties of matter; yet they are real to us. Would a creative God care about His creation and His thinking creatures? Do we not care about our children, our houses, our furniture, our poetry, our paintings, and everything that we put our energy, time, and creativity into?

God, as revealed in the Bible, is just and holy. Do we not respect most greatly those among us that have the highest integrity and spend their lives on good and constructive activities? What man respects most and to what he most aspires, are characteristics found perfectly only in the Biblical God. The gods of the Muslims or the Hindus or the Calvinists or the Roman Catholics are often capricious and arbitrary. Such false gods choose who will be saved based on unknowable criteria. Assurance is impossible.

The Bible lays out repetitively and in detail what is required to please God and how to attain eternal life. Would not God do just that? Even human parents make clear to their children what is expected of them. The Biblical God makes clear what you must do to be adopted into His family – no mystery, no excuses, all perfectly reasonable.

All of the false religions of the world – namely, anything outside of Biblical Christianity – offer some hope for salvation based on some types of good works. Logically, what ratio of good to evil deeds would earn life forever in the presence of a perfect, holy God for eternity? Biblically, one sin is enough to merit separation from God. When I ask non-Christians how many sins it takes to deserve Hell, most get it right the first time – just one. We all have a God-given sense of justice, whereby we know that murderers should be punished, along with rapists, child-molesters, and violent thieves. But how about your sins? Consider the teachings of Jesus Christ. Anger is judged as murder in the heart. Lust is judged as adultery. What you think is what you are. Liars will be cast into Hell along with Satan and the angels (now demons) who rebelled against God. Did you ever tell one lie? Ten lies? Thousands?

Is not every one of your sins an act of rebellion against God? Can you even remember a fraction of the tens of thousands of willful sins in your life? Do you have any possible escape from judgment?

Logically, only the Bible offers you rescue. God is perfectly just and so must find you guilty and punish your sins. Yet God is love and so offers you a way out. Justice and love met at the cross.

The perfect Son of God (God incarnate in the flesh) offered Himself as the unblemished sacrificial lamb (foreshadowed throughout the Old Testament) to satisfy justice in your place. Three days later He rose from the dead – the most historically verified event in ancient history. (See my article, “Honest Skeptic or Stubborn Scoffer? — Analysis of the Resurrection,” on truthreallymatters.com.)

Do you want the technology to live forever? Only Jesus Christ has the license for that technology.

God offers you salvation, eternal life, as a gift. Don't you have a strong will to live? Like everyone else, you abhor the thought of dying, yet such thoughts come often. God gave you a will to live – forever. Living forever in God's presence – on a reborn Earth (2 Peter 3, Revelation 21, 22) – is only possible if you have been forgiven. Don't you want forgiveness? If you don't, you must be crazy – illogical. Repent from your sins and trust the Savior. You can have eternal life right now, as a present possession, and spend the rest of your life in logical, constructive, joyful activities in obedience to the word of God – the Bible.

Then your desire for a loving family will be multiplied and fulfilled – many times in this life because you become brother or sister to many other believers, and for eternity in the ages to come, when you become joint-heir with Christ of everything that God owns. Logically, that’s a good deal!

Your desire to love and be loved is multiplied in this life and in the ages to come in fellowship with the saints of God – all those who have repented from their stupid sins and trusted in Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior.

Your desire to spend time with wife / husband / children / grandchildren will be fulfilled in the ages to come when there will be no more sorrow, sickness, or death.

Your desire to acquire knowledge, appreciate beauty, and learn amazing things will be fulfilled for eternity. This universe is big and God is infinitely brilliant and creative. God has made a lot of “stuff.” If you like stuff, there will be a lot of it to work with, if you repent now from making stuff your god and seek the true God, who owns all the stuff.

Your desire to have a clean conscience and avoid the morally ugly, the vicious, the cruel, the selfish, the wasteful, will be fulfilled because God will clean up your mind perfectly when He gives you a new body, along with everyone else who is part of the family. You won’t have to associate with the determinedly wicked and ungodly. They will be cast into a prison called the “Lake of Fire,” off in some corner of the universe, never to bother anyone again.

Logically, do you really have any reason to hesitate? Repentance is changing your mind from insanity and stupidity to that which is right, sensible, and beautiful. You can repent now, even before reading the rest of this article.

2. I know the Bible is true because of overwhelming historical evidence.

I write this section with great trepidation because of the injustice I do to libraries worth of information on the subject. My hope is to whet your appetite a bit. If you’re a Christian already, you have an obligation to grow in the knowledge of history and prophecy so that you can be a more useful servant. If you’re not a Christian, then you are missing out on the keys to understanding human history – past, present, and future – and your place in it.

The Bible is a collection of 66 books inspired by God, written down over a period of about 4,000 years by about 50 different human authors. Its perfect consistency on such subjects as the nature and character of God and man, God’s laws for human behavior, requirements for salvation, and the fate of the nations is miraculous. There is nothing comparable among human “religious” writings. The Koran, for example, both plagiarizes and distorts portions of the Bible, was written down by one man, has numerous internal inconsistencies, and clearly demonstrates its non-divine origin by the actions of its sword-wielding followers over the last 14 centuries.

The book of Genesis contains the eye-witness account of creation. We see the creation of separate kinds of creatures. According to the Bible, the following are entirely unrelated to each other: man, chimps, bananas, petunias, lizards, turtles, and dust mites. According to evolutionary fantasies, we all share a common grandpa. The flood of Noah’s time produced such destruction that you would expect to find billions of dead things (fossils), buried in rock layers, laid down by water, all over the Earth. What

you find is exactly that – fossils representing the extinction of separate kinds of creatures buried in sedimentary layers up to miles thick. The extinct creatures clearly group into separate kinds, quite opposed to a Darwinian fantasy in which creatures morph gradually into other types over time. Thus Biblical Earth history is validated. (But more on this in the next section.)

Bill Cooper’s book “After the Flood” compiles genealogical records of nations all over the world. Kings took much care in preserving genealogies, in order to establish their right to rule. Cooper shows that nations and kings from Britain, Ireland, Scandinavia, Africa, China, and the Middle East trace their lineage back to the 3 sons of Noah. Cooper (and many others) also describe historical accounts of man living with and battling with dinosaurs, namely the descendants of creatures that survived the flood on the ark. Consider ancient Chinese drawings and “legends” of dragons, ancient European and Native American (both North and South American) drawings of dinosaurs, Native North American accounts of flying reptiles (pteranodons), and the accounts of heroes battling dragons.

The Bible is unique among the writings of man in its detailed and fulfilled prophecies. Over 300 specific OT prophecies relate to the first coming of Jesus Christ including the place of His birth (Bethlehem), the miraculous nature of His birth (of a virgin), his manner of death (crucifixion prophesied before its invention), his lineage (from Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, on down through the descendants of David), that He would have the legal right to rule, and that He would have the very nature, power, and character of God in the flesh. Also, the prophet Daniel was given the insight precisely when, to the day, that the Messiah would present Himself to His people. (See Linton below for details.) The prophecy specified that 69 weeks (literally, “sevens”) of prophetic years (360 days each) would pass between a Persian king’s decree to rebuild the Jewish temple and the presentation of the Messiah. The decree was proclaimed by Artaxerxes in 445 B.C., long after Daniel’s death. Counting the prescribed 173,880 days leads us to the day in history that Jesus Christ entered the gates of Jerusalem, loudly cheered by the Jews from all over the world (in town for the annual high feast of the Passover). Several days later, He was rejected and crucified, as detailed by King David as Psalmist 1000 years before, and by another prophet, Isaiah, 700 years before.

The perfection of Christ, and His death as a perfect sacrificial lamb, was typified by the original Passover in Exodus Chapter 12, as the Jews prepared to leave Egypt. The annual date for each Passover was established by God. Jesus’ death occurred on just the right day in history. The location of Jesus’ crucifixion on Mount Moriah was shown prophetically in the offering of Isaac by Abraham in Genesis 22 – also on Mount Moriah. The giving of God’s laws to Moses on Mount Sinai was celebrated in the feast of Pentecost for 1500 years. On the day of Pentecost after Jesus’ resurrection (Acts 2), the Holy Spirit visited the disciples in an awesome display of power, proclaiming the transition from the Old Covenant to the New Covenant. Study up — the parallels are incredible, yet not editorialized by the Biblical writers – it’s up to you to see the supernatural character of these historical records.

Other amazing prophecies include Ezekiel’s prediction (Ch. 26) of the destruction of the fortress city of Tyre, fulfilled over the next 250 years in painstaking detail by Nebuchadnezzar and Alexander the Great. Other prophecies fulfilled in ancient history include the destruction of the cities of Samaria, Gaza, Ashkelon, and Jericho. Perhaps the most dramatic “political” prophecies are associated with the Jewish people, nation, and the “city of God” – Jerusalem. Over 2500 years ago, the prophet Zechariah foretold that in the last days Jerusalem would become a “cup of trembling” and a “burdensome stone” for the world and that all the nations would come against it.

Several prophets foretold that the Jews would be scattered around the world for their rejection of God's laws and His Messiah, but that they would be regathered to their land in the last days. What tribal people in history has suffered such consistent dispersion and persecution and has yet remained intact – and reacquired their nation's land? Furthermore, the prophecy was clear that their return would be in unbelief before their eventual repentance and faith in Christ. (Don't wait for the Jews to turn to Christ as a nation. That will be late in the tribulation. You will likely be dead by then.) Consider the events of the last 100 years in this context, especially since 1948. We're getting close to the Lord's return. You don't want to be on the "other team" when He comes back to clean up this mess and take charge.

The prophets, apostles, and the Lord Himself predicted that the followers of Christ would suffer persecution in every age. This continues today all over the world. Many Biblical writers foretold a false version of Christianity that would fool multitudes. Roman Catholicism and many pseudo-Christian cults fulfill this. Hebrews Chapter 11 describes some heroes of the faith, and their determined and devoted behavior in the face of persecution. What we see in that chapter of the Bible is typical of the millions of martyrs over the last 2,000 years. I recommend Cloud's book below for a synopsis of Christian history and the development of Roman Catholic apostasy, the centuries-long inquisitions, the events of the so-called Reformation, the propagation of true and independent Bible-believing churches, and the birth of modern foreign missions. I also heartily recommend some missionary biographies so you can thrill in more recent demonstrations of the ancient truths and heroes of the Christian faith.

The imminence of the return of Jesus Christ is shown by Biblical prophecies such as: Arab nations plus Russia collaborating to attack Israel, an increasing rate of natural disasters and wars, the onset of global government, worldwide communications and the explosion of knowledge, religions coming together in an ecumenical movement, the rise of evolutionary philosophies, hatred for the Jewish people . . . there are many others.

History only makes sense in light of the historical record that God has provided in the Bible.

3. The Bible is true scientifically.

Only the Biblical account of creation explains what we observe – from subatomic particles to planets to life to the distribution of stars and galaxies. Evolutionary ideas about star formation are refuted from basic physics. The collapse of a large gas cloud of hydrogen and helium requires very stringent conditions on the temperature of the gas (low) and its density (high). Simple physics demonstrates that gas clouds expand in vacuum – they don't collapse into stars and rocky planets. The postulated conditions associated with a "Big Bang" don't connect. The formation of individual stars would be extremely rare under any naturalistic view of the origin of the universe. Yet we see up to hundreds of billions of stars in each of trillions of galaxies.

The existence of elements in the periodic table above helium is alleged to be the result of sequential generations of supernovas and new star formation. There should be evidence of many large clouds from such supernovas within the Milky Way, considering the evolutionary age of this galaxy – oops, the numbers are consistent with an age of only thousands of years. The Hubble telescope was deployed in part to find the "oldest stars" – containing just hydrogen and helium – in the "oldest galaxies" billions of light years away. But spectroscopic data indicate that the most distant galaxies have the same types of "young stars" that we see nearby.

The orbits of stars around galactic centers of mass are wonderfully ordered. But a barred-spiral galaxy could not possibly be stable in shape over billions of years. Yet they abound. Stars in many star clusters and galaxies in certain galactic clusters don't show the velocities required to hang together over the alleged age of the universe. Yet they are there. The universe is expanding at an accelerating rate, consistent with the seventeen proclamations by God in the Old Testament that He is stretching out the Heavens. This mystery has a name, "dark energy," that shows the utter cluelessness of Big Bang cosmologists.

If you insist on a naturalistic view, consider this: The very existence of all the matter and energy in the universe violates the most powerful law of science – the first law of thermodynamics: conservation of matter / energy. The incredibly ordered structures of galaxies, solar systems, planets, ecologies, living creatures, and the human brain violate the next most powerful law of science – the second law of thermodynamics: entropy (disorder) continually increases in either closed systems or open systems that don't have well-designed machines to convert energy and materials into functional systems.

The location of our solar system within our galaxy is wonderfully special. Much closer to the center and harmful radiation would threaten us. Also, too close to the center or too close to the galactic plane and we would be surrounded by obscuring interstellar gases. This would destroy much of the science of astronomy. Too far out and the sky would be depressingly dark, and it would be much harder to understand the dynamics of our own galaxy or the created wonders of the universe.

Within our own solar system, the Earth is in a nicely circular orbit comfortably within a narrow "habitable zone." Note how much we depend on liquid water and our thin, but "just right" atmosphere. The Earthly climate is simply not possible much closer to or much farther from the sun. The Earth's magnetic field protects us from harmful radiation, our moon produces rich ecological tidal zones, and the moon's size produces perfect solar eclipses – which has provoked a multitude of scientific discoveries and validations; for example, in the fields of atomic spectroscopy and general relativity.

Life is only possible because of the design of carbon atoms, which depend on the perfect design of protons, neutrons, and electrons – and whatever may comprise them. (Quarks are still model constructs – they haven't been "seen" yet.) The atmospheric ratio of oxygen to nitrogen is well-designed. Too low and respiration is limited, thus limiting the types of life forms possible on the Earth. Too high and spontaneous fires break out and destroy everything. It's fascinating that all of modern civilization depends on our ability to control fire. The relevant gases, the chemistry of combustion, the existence of wood, and the physical size of humans are all designed to make fire a tool, and not just a threat. Note that intelligent ants would be too small to control fire. But fires have to be big enough to generate heat on scales appropriate for comfort and industry. People are just the right size.

If you want to increase your awe at the brilliance of our Creator God, just read a book on cell biology, ignoring whatever silly panderings to evolution may crop up in the preface. The nano-technology of the cell goes far beyond human technology.

Regarding life's "Biblical kinds": The advent of molecular biology with the technology to sequence DNA gave evolutionists hope that the Darwinian tree of life could be derived from similarities. Denton, in the second book of his cited below, does a wonderful job showing the impossibility of constructing an evolutionary tree at the molecular level. Note: to have a "scientific theory of evolution" it must be constructed and proven at the molecular level – life is intrinsically a system of nano-machines. (It's simply not good enough to compare bone shapes – even though the fossil record provides no joy for

evolutionists either!) For example, from an evolutionary point of view, you would expect to trace gradual DNA changes from fish to amphibians to reptiles to mammals. What invariably occurs, however, is that such creatures are equally well-separated in their DNA sequences, with no hint of evolutionary descent. One example Denton cites is the percent differences in the protein cyclostome C between carp (fish) and the following animals: bullfrog, turtle, chicken, rabbit, and horse. The percent differences all turn out to be about the same. Clearly, this was a shock to those who thought that the amphibian frog is a much closer relative to fish than a rabbit would be.

The Biblical account of the flood of Noah's time has generated creationist scientific models that consistently explain the observable data. Uniformitarian geology is left with a multitude of mysteries. The nature of fossilization makes it clear that under normal conditions it rarely happens. But there are enormous fossil graveyards, with billions of specimens, covering hundreds of square miles. Some of the sedimentary layers that contain similar fossils can be traced across and even between continents. These observables are consistent only with a worldwide flood catastrophe. Snelling (below) details the observable facts of geology and does comparisons of creationist and evolutionary models.

Deposition layers that were supposed to have been laid down over millions of years have been found with tree trunks standing vertically within them. Clearly, such "polystrate trees" were buried suddenly. Worldwide, there are many examples of "unconformities," where one sedimentary layer is topped by another very smoothly, but with allegedly millions of years separating the times of deposition. In real life, a smooth, broad plain will suffer much erosion over the course of even a few decades, not to mention millions of years. Clearly, many such unconformities can be explained only if very little time elapsed between deposition of the layers. Even the existence of such smooth boundaries covering tens of thousands of square miles can be explained only by sheet flow of global proportions.

I know that I can only touch the surface in this appendix to proclaim that all of creation cries out that God must get the glory for what we see. People spend lifetimes in the study of particular sub-branches of astronomy, physics, chemistry, biology, and geology. Wherever you look in the study of science you will see purpose and design. Where we see disease and death we also find the only rational explanation in the Bible. When man chose rebellion, man chose to separate himself from God. God cursed this world, allowing decay and death, but promises ultimate restoration and resurrection for His creation and those of us who repent and believe. If you insist that all of creation arose from some unexplainable Big Bang, and all of the design since is simply the result of random physical processes, then you truly have a blind faith – in opposition to rational science – with no purpose and no hope. Worse, you will be proven wrong and admit it when you kneel before your Lord, but it will be too late. Wake up! Think! If you have some intellectual stumbling blocks, investigate! Contact me and we'll correspond.

4. The Bible is true because I know it experientially.

Becoming a Christian, according to the Bible, is as straightforward as drinking water (John chapters 4 & 7), eating bread (John 6), or walking through a door (John 10). The transformation that takes place is like being born again (John 3), passing from death to life (John 5), acquiring life everlasting in this present world (John 3 & 10), becoming an entirely new creature (2 Corinthians 5), being cured from blindness unto perfect sight (John 9), and experiencing a peace that passes human understanding (Philippians 4). I could go on for quite a while, because the Bible is quite clear that there are only two types of people: saved and lost. The lost are wrapped up in this world and its trivial concerns, whereas the saved have an inheritance that is assured, and live in gratitude to the Savior who purchased it for them.

I was raised to be “religious” — which typically means some system of manmade beliefs and ritual behaviors with the purpose of earning salvation. My Roman Catholicism had quite a list of do’s and don’ts, just like all other human religions, including Islam, Hinduism, the JW Kingdom Hall, Mormonism, Christian Science, Bahaism, and Buddhism.

Ironically, the pseudo-intellectual scam of false science – evolution – coupled with a weak understanding of history foisted on me by the RC Church (see my article on “The 10 Most Deadly Heresies . . .,” section #10, on truthreallymatters.com) led me to a life of atheistic beliefs and behavior as a young man. I recall that as an atheist, I told a religious classmate that I considered it impossible that anyone could ever convince me that God existed. I was right, of course, because my heart was hard. I was determined to live life by my own rules, making myself god.

Patient Christians befriended me and gave me much to think about in discussion and reading materials. I wised up enough about pseudo-science and revisionist history to open myself up to TRUTH. I highly recommend the Gospel of John, which was written specifically to reveal the truth of the Gospel: that Jesus Christ, God incarnate, suffered the wrath of God on the cross in payment for my specific wicked and vile sins, that He rose from the dead offering me eternal life, and that my part is to humble myself, repent, and follow Him for the rest of this life and for eternity. The words of Jesus Christ are designed to connect with the God-fashioned spirit of man so that we can recognize truth when it hits us in the ears. You’ll see that principle again and again in the book of John, if you read it with an open heart.

When I realized that the Bible is true, I knew that I would be insane to continue on my own self-destructive path. How about you? Sane or willfully insane?

What I discovered experientially is that God is real and that Jesus Christ is my Savior. From the time of my conversion, the Lord began a wonderfully patient work on me, transforming my attitudes, my speech, my purposes in life, my music, my care for others with less for myself, and an ever increasing desire to know God and to please Him. I wouldn’t go back to my self-absorbed life if I could. Furthermore, it’s impossible to go back. Once you’re in God’s family, born again with an everlasting life that starts right now, you can’t get kicked out of the family. And God won’t let you go. Scripture teaches that when a child of God starts to rebel, God will convict his conscience and even bring chastisement as necessary. But you can’t escape the family. That’s good. If you could sin your way out of salvation, then none of us would last through a fraction of a day. Yet the true Christian shows a transformed life, because he has changed roads and directions completely.

That’s the trouble with most of American Christendom. There is much profession and little action. Namely, there are many false converts who will wake up in Hell. Salvation brings a change of worldview. Everything that’s important in this world makes sense under a Biblical worldview. In any other system, whether atheistic or pantheistic evolution, Marxism, false religions, or secular humanism, mysteries abound and inconsistencies reign.

For example, the following areas often evoke a sense of confusion or mystery in the non-Christian, but make perfect sense to the Bible believer:

- a. The origin, purpose, and destiny of human life – for all of humanity and for each one of us.
- b. Why mathematics and science even work, in all ages and in all times.

c. Conscience and morality – where do they come from? Why are there so many universal constants of right and wrong? Why such a distinction between right and wrong in the human heart?

d. The existence of consciousness – if it's just brain chemistry, then why should anyone listen to anyone else? I may as well listen to a rock as to someone who admits that the next argument he makes is just the result of chemical reactions in his brain.

e. Pervasive occult and psychic phenomena throughout human history, and with common elements in thousands of well-separated human cultures – physics and secular history cannot explain it, but rather the existence of demonic spirits.

f. UFOs – see part “e” above.

g. Why “liberals” are more interested in saving whales or seals or “mother Earth” than unborn babies.

h. Why feminists despise the Christian model for the family, but don't lift a finger to relieve the slavery of the half-billion women in Muslim countries.

i. Why the Biblical instruction on marriage and child-raising works, producing stable societies with minimal crime.

j. Why individual liberty brings prosperity and why “liberal” / socialist / Marxist / Keynesian schemes bring poverty. Note that most non-Christian worldviews are complicit with despotism and true Christians despise despotic government practices.

k. Why true Christians are so consistently persecuted, even though they insist on religious liberty for everyone else. (Recall that Roman Catholicism's inquisitions are perfectly consistent with its extremely anti-Biblical worldview. If that is a new thought to you, see “The 10 Most Deadly Heresies . . .” article.)

l. Why there are so many anti-Christian religions and why they are all so similar philosophically – namely, they are works-based and driven by self-righteousness.

m. Why the Arab-Israeli conflict is so persistent.

n. Why there are such powerful and universal human aspirations in concepts such as justice, selflessness, beauty, and love.

o. Why the world is so messed up and irrationality, corruption, and evil are so widespread, especially among the most “educated” of the human race.

p. Why death is so feared and man has such a strong desire to live – forever.

I could go on for a long time, but you should get the idea that whatever worldview is TRUE should explain everything that's important under the sun. What do you believe? Does it really make sense? Does it satisfy your longings for purpose and give you peace from day to day? Will you be content to die with your beliefs intact? Where will you be the moment after you die?

Do something about it!

Tiny Bibliography:

Jason Lisle, *The Ultimate Proof of Creation*, Master Books, 2009.

Bill Cooper, *After the Flood – The early post-flood history of Europe traced back to Noah*, New Wine Press, 1995.

Irwin H. Linton, *A Lawyer Examines the Bible – a defense of the Christian faith*, Appendix A, Baker Book House, 1977.

David Cloud, *History of the Churches*, Way of Life Literature, 2005.

Dr. & Mrs. Howard Taylor, *Hudson Taylor's Spiritual Secret*, The Moody Bible Institute, 1989.

Courtney Anderson, *To the Golden Shore – the life of Adoniram Judson*, Judson Press, 1987.

Don DeYoung, *Thousands . . . Not Billions*, Master Books, 2005.

Ken Ham, ed., *The New Answers Book – Over 25 questions on creation/evolution and the Bible*, Master Books, 2006.

Ken Ham, ed., *The New Answers Book 2 – Over 30 questions on creation/evolution and the Bible*, Master Books, 2008.

Ken Ham, ed., *The New Answers Book 3 – Over 35 questions on creation/evolution and the Bible*, Master Books, 2010.

Bruce Malone, *Censored Science – the suppressed evidence*, Search for the Truth Publications, 2009.

Guillermo Gonzalez and Jay W. Richards, *The Privileged Planet – How our place in the cosmos is designed for discovery*, Regnery Publishing, 2004.

Michael J. Denton, *Nature's Destiny – How the laws of biology reveal purpose in the universe*, Simon & Schuster, 1998.

Michael J. Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis – How developments in science are challenging orthodox Darwinism*, Adler & Adler, 1986.

Andrew A. Snelling, *Earth's Catastrophic Past – Geology, creation, & the flood*, Volumes 1 & 2, Institute for Creation Research, 2009.

Appendix 2

A short biographical sketch of the author

Dr. Dave is a former atheist / evolutionist who became a Christian as a teenager, and has been involved in many levels of ministry throughout his Christian life. Presently, he is active in full-time street evangelism. He holds five academic degrees, including a Ph.D. in laser physics and an MBA. He enjoyed a 20-year Air Force career in research and development, and has won the Air Force R&D Award for Advanced Technology. After retiring from the Air Force he enjoyed a second career as an R&D manager at a large defense contractor and then as a professor at a major state university.

In ministry, by the grace of God, he has served as a Sunday school teacher, a junior church director, a bus captain and bus ministry director, taught evening classes at a rescue mission, created a training program for street evangelism . . . and should have done far more and wasted far less of his discretionary time through the years. Presently, he is blessed to be leading a small house church and doing street evangelism in Rockford, Chicago, and other northern Illinois locations.