

# *God, or No God?*

## *Some Clues From Science*

### *Christian Biblical Church of God Offices:*

#### *United States*

Post Office Box 1442  
Hollister, California 95024-1442

#### *Canada*

Post Office Box 125  
Brockville, Ontario  
K6V 5V2 Canada

#### *Australia*

GPO 1574  
Sydney 2001  
Australia

#### *United Kingdom*

Post Office Box 6144  
Kings Langley WD4 4DY  
United Kingdom

#### *New Zealand*

Post Office Box 8217  
Cherrywood  
Tauranga 3145  
New Zealand


#### *Republic of South Africa*

Post Office Box 494  
Frankfort 9830  
Rep. of South Africa

#### *La Verdad de Dios*

[www.laverdaddedios.org](http://www.laverdaddedios.org)  
Post Office Box 831241  
San Antonio, Texas 78283

[www.truthofgod.org](http://www.truthofgod.org)  
[www.churchathome.org](http://www.churchathome.org)  
[www.afaithfulverston.org](http://www.afaithfulverston.org)



*by*  
***Duncan MacLeod***

© 2012, 2014, 2016  
*Christian Biblical Church of God*  
*P.O. Box 1442*  
*Hollister, CA 95024-1442*

[www.truthofgod.org](http://www.truthofgod.org)  
[www.churchathome.org](http://www.churchathome.org)  
[www.afaithfulversion.org](http://www.afaithfulversion.org)

*May be freely copied with full acknowledgment of copyright holder.*

## ***Suggested Further Reading***

- Behe, Michael, *Darwin's Black Box*, New York, Touchstone by Simon & Schuster, 1996
- Flew, Antony, *There Is No A God: How The World's Most Notorious Atheist Changed His Mind*, New York, Harper One, 2007
- Hunter, Cornelius, *Science's Blind Spot*, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Brazos Press, 2007
- Johnson, Philip, *Darwin On Trial*, Downers Grove, Illinois, InterVarsity Press, Second Edition, 1993
- Sarfati, Jonathan, *The Greatest Hoax On Earth? Refuting Dawkins On Evolution*, Atlanta, Georgia, Creation Book Publishers, 2010
- Stove, David, *Darwinian Fairy Tales*, New York, Encounter Books, 1995
- Suggested Viewing***
- Stein, Ben, *Expelled, No Intelligence Allowed*, (as DVD documentary), Vivendi Entertainment, 2008
- Strobel, Lee, *The Case For A Creator*, (as DVD documentary), Illustra Media, 2006

## **Table of Contents**

Introduction .....	1
<i>Chapter One</i> Origins .....	4
<i>Chapter Two</i> Elements Form .....	8
<i>Chapter Three</i> Earth: The Favored Planet .....	10
<i>Chapter Four</i> And There Was Life .....	13
<i>Chapter Five</i> From There to Here .....	18
<i>Chapter Six</i> Not A Leg to Stand On .....	20
<i>Chapter Seven</i> Do Organization, Coordination and Control "Just Happen"? .....	24
<i>Chapter Eight</i> The Conundrum of Sex and Reproduction .....	27
<i>Chapter Nine</i> Are We all Just "Mutant Protozoa"? .....	30
<i>Chapter Ten</i> The No-God Delusion .....	34
<i>Chapter Eleven</i> A Logical Next Step .....	37
End Notes .....	39
Bibliography .....	40

## *Bibliography*

- Davies, Paul, *God and the New Physics*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 1983
- Dawkins, Richard, *The God Delusion*, New York, Houghton Mifflin, 2008
- Dembski, William, *Uncommon Dissent, Intellectuals Who Find Darwinism Unsatisfying*, Wilmington, Delaware, ISI Books, 2004
- Gonzales, Guillermo, Richards, Jay Wesley, *The Privileged Planet*, Washington, DC, Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2004
- Hawking, Stephen, *A Brief History of Time—From The Big Bang to Black Holes*, New York, Bantam Books, 1988
- Heeren, Fred, *Show Me God*, Wheeling, Ill., Searchlight Publications, First Edition, 1995
- Kirshner, Robert, “The Earth’s Elements,” *Scientific American*, October 1994
- Morris, Richard, *The Fate of the Universe*, New York, Playboy Press, 1982
- Sanford, J.C., *Genetic Entropy & The Mystery of the Genome*, Lima, NY, Elim Publishing, Second Edition, 2005
- Simmons, Geoffrey, *What Darwin Didn’t Know*, Eugene, Oregon, Harvest House Publishers, 2004
- Strobel, Lee, *The Case For a Creator*, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan, 2004
- Wells, Jonathan, *Icons of Evolution*, Washington, DC, Regnery Publishing, 2000

<sup>31</sup> Brad Harrub and Bert Thompson, “Evolutionary Theories On Gender And Sexual Reproduction,” pp. 1, 2 (from the Web site, *The True Origin Archive*)

<sup>32</sup> Harrub & Thompson, p. 11

<sup>33</sup> Sanford, p. 15

<sup>34</sup> Sanford, p. 16

<sup>35</sup> Sanford, p. 17, emphasis added

<sup>36</sup> Sanford, p. 25

<sup>37</sup> Sanford, p. 25

<sup>38</sup> Sanford, p. 27

<sup>39</sup> Sanford, p. 46, first emphasis added, the rest, author’s

<sup>40</sup> Simmons, pp. 43, 44

<sup>41</sup> Richard Dawkins, *The God Delusion*, p. 138

## Introduction

Is there a God, or isn’t there?

Atheists may ridicule you and try to make you feel foolish, ignorant and gullible for even considering the existence of God a possibility. On the other hand, people who believe there is a God may say you have to “take it on faith,” and might judge you for being skeptical or in doubt.

Your uncertainty about whether there really is a God is no reason to feel ashamed. Don’t let anyone lay a guilt trip on you for a “lack of faith.” While some may pass their entire lives never questioning the existence of God, many of us at some time have felt good reason to doubt it.

How could we not? **Nearly every subject we learn in school and college is taught from a materialistic, anti-supernatural, evolutionary point of view**—as if there were no God. Many with advanced academic degrees, who consider themselves “educated and enlightened,” are sure there is no God. Businesses we deal with each day operate primarily for their own benefit—as if there were no God. And a lot of people we know live their personal lives as if there were no God to whom they will someday have to answer.

Many God-doubters doubt for the rest of their lives. Some, after a period of uncertainty, make up their mind one way or the other: Either they conclude there is no God and become confirmed atheists, or they decide there is a God. Of the latter group, some—but not all—adopt a formal religion.

The fact is, however, that few people in any of these groups have continued a relentless, unflagging quest through research and experience to determine the *truth* of the matter. Some, who repeatedly hear the mantra “We can’t know for sure,” eventually buy into it. They give up the quest and resign themselves to never knowing for certain if there is or isn’t a God. These people will no doubt remain lifetime agnostics.

Many others attempt to *profess* a “faith,” while underneath they’re still uncertain of God’s existence. They aren’t exactly hypocrites—they mean well. They’re *trying* to believe; they *want* to believe. Consciously they’re striving to convince themselves of some *rational* basis for a very weak faith; but this kind of uncertain faith may not stand the test of adversity. Intelligent, rational people

realize that any faith in a God to whom they're going to commit their life needs to be based on a much more firm footing than mere self-persuasion.

If you're reading this book, you're probably still uncertain. But chances are you haven't given up your search for the truth. You may be skeptical about the idea of a God; that's perfectly reasonable, given how little you know. But at least you haven't made up your mind, as have confirmed atheists like Richard Dawkins, that any belief in God is some kind of "delusion."

All that being a skeptic should mean is that, before you decide to believe anything, **you want proof**—or at least substantial credible evidence. You don't want to be part of the easily led mass who buy into beliefs which later turn out to be fables.

The reality is, not many people have arrived at their points of view—whether the issue is spiritual or material—only after diligently researching the facts and carefully sorting truth from error. More typically, we tend to adopt a package of beliefs handed to us by someone else. It might be parents, peers, professors, authors of books we've read—whoever is most persuasive, whoever offers the view that's most appealing, whomever we most respect, or whom-ever we most fear to displease.

The idea of **independently searching out the truth of a matter is so foreign to most people that—even if they wanted to—they wouldn't know the first step to take.** Nor, at the end of the process, would they necessarily trust their own findings. Nearly all of us have looked at times to *someone else* to lead us to "the truth."

**Yet in this "information age," your enquiring mind can find the facts about most any issue. You don't need to take anyone else's word for it, when you can verify or debunk almost any statement you hear or read.** It can be a lot of work—brain strain—but what is it worth to you to get the *true answer* to such a fundamental question as "Is there *really* a God?" The answer you find may determine how you direct the rest of your life.

In this volume, you and I will examine a small sampling of **the evidence for the existence of God** and give your *open* mind enough facts discovered by scientists to let you decide whether or not there is such a being. We won't waste time with unconvincing philosophical arguments or theological apologetics. We'll confine ourselves mostly to careful observations and calculations by people whose day-to-day occupation is with observable, measurable

## End Notes

- <sup>1</sup> Paul Davies, *God and The New Physics*, pp. 10, 11
- <sup>2</sup> Davies, p. 12
- <sup>3</sup> Fred Heeren, *Show Me God*, first edition, p. 149, emphasis added
- <sup>4</sup> Richard Morris, *The Fate of the Universe*, p. 153 (as quoted in Heeren, p. 182)
- <sup>5</sup> Morris, p. 152, (as quoted in Heeren, p. 185)
- <sup>6</sup> Davies, p. 21
- <sup>7</sup> Stephen Hawking, *A Brief History of Time—From The Big Band To Black Holes*, p. 125, emphasis added
- <sup>8</sup> Robert Kirshner, "The Earth's Elements," *Scientific American*, October 1994
- <sup>9</sup> Heeren, p. 179, emphasis added
- <sup>10</sup> Lee Strobel, *The Case For A Creator*, p. 167
- <sup>11</sup> Strobel, p. 171
- <sup>12</sup> Strobel, p. 170
- <sup>13</sup> Strobel, pp. 169-170
- <sup>14</sup> Strobel, p. 171
- <sup>15</sup> Strobel, p. 174
- <sup>16</sup> J.C. Sanford, *Genetic Entropy & The Mystery of the Genome*, p. v
- <sup>17</sup> William Dembski, *Uncommon Dissent, Intellectuals Who Find Darwinism Unconvincing*, p. xvii
- <sup>18</sup> Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution, Science Or Myth?* pp. 235-6
- <sup>19</sup> Heeren, p. 183
- <sup>20</sup> J.C. Sanford, *Genetic Entropy & The Mystery of The Genome*, Chapter 2
- <sup>21</sup> Geoffrey Simmons, *What Darwin Didn't Know*, p. 306 (emphasis added)
- <sup>22</sup> Cornelius Hunter, "Why Evolution Fails The Test of Science," in William Dembski, Ed., *Uncommon Dissent*, p. 200
- <sup>23</sup> Dembski, p.201
- <sup>24</sup> Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 172
- <sup>25</sup> Wells, p. 173
- <sup>26</sup> Wells, pp. 174, 175
- <sup>27</sup> Wells, pp. 29-31
- <sup>28</sup> Wells, pp. 41, 42
- <sup>29</sup> J.C. Sanford, *Genetic Entropy & The Mystery of the Genome*, pp. 1-3
- <sup>30</sup> Sanford, p. 3

**the things that are made—both His eternal power and Godhead—so that they are without excuse;** because when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but they became vain in their own reasonings, and their foolish hearts were darkened. While professing themselves to be wise ones, they became fools.”

It is almost fashionable today among highly educated academic types to disdainfully dismiss the idea of a creator God. They not only embrace materialistic paradigms like Darwinian evolution, they put pressure on their peers to do the same. Any dissenters are likely to lose their teaching positions; and getting their findings published becomes almost out of the question. Today in academic circles, as previously pointed out in Chapter Four, the truth most certainly does too often get “suppressed.” An excellent documentary by Ben Stein, entitled *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed*, also points out how the supposedly “open-minded” academic community shows its *intolerance* of any dissent from the Darwinian evolutionary paradigm. We might have expected to see that in the Communist Soviet Union in the Cold War days—but here in the United States, today? So much for “**academic freedom**.”

The people God through Paul is mainly addressing in Romans chapter one probably are the self-styled “intelligentsia,” the highly educated, who have enough knowledge of the reality of the physical creation and its intricacies that they should be able to see God’s hand in His creation. But for whatever reason, they reject Him. Ordinary lay people like you and me, with our limited knowledge, are not necessarily condemned—IF we’re willing to *open our minds* to what the scientific evidence is telling us as we learn more about the real world.

This volume has presented but a small sampling of recent *real world* discoveries that point to the existence of God. If this overwhelming evidence has convinced you there is indeed a Creator God, will you now take the next step? Will you examine the evidence that the Holy Bible is the inspired Word of the God you now *know* exists? May He inspire and guide you to do so!

*physical reality* and its implications. We’ll document the sources of that information, so you can verify it for yourself—**which you should do.**

## Origins

**How did the universe—including the earth and all life on it—get here?** Did the unfathomably vast universe—with all the heavenly bodies, the earth and the marvelously intricate fabric of interdependent life on it—all just fall together by accident, all by itself, out of nothing? There are those who would have us believe just that. Others would have us believe the cosmos has always been here.

Let's just deal with physical matter: Do the basic facts of science confirm the idea of matter having always existed, or did it have a beginning? Is material existence moving toward greater organization and "higher forms," or is it essentially breaking down? One of the best-known and most fundamental laws of nature discovered by scientists is the **Second Law of Thermodynamics**—also called the **"Entropy Law."** Physicist Paul Davies explains what this law means: "In its widest sense this law states that **every day the universe becomes more and more disordered**. There is a sort of gradual but inexorable descent into chaos. Examples of the second law are found everywhere: **buildings fall down, people grow old, mountains and shorelines are eroded, natural resources are depleted.**"

After postulating that eventually the universe will wind down and die, "wallowing, as it were, in its own entropy," Davies concludes that "the universe cannot have existed for ever, otherwise it would have reached its equilibrium end state an infinite time ago. **Conclusion: the universe did not always exist.**"<sup>1</sup> (*Bold emphasis added.*)

### Starting Off With a Bang

Most scientists today agree that the universe had a *beginning*. Among cosmologists currently, the most popular theory of how that beginning occurred is the "Big Bang" in its various versions. Since astronomer Edwin Hubble's discovery in 1927 that "the galaxies are not falling together because they are rushing apart instead,"<sup>2</sup> scientists have extrapolated backward in time to conclude that there must have been a time when the heavenly bodies were all together in one primal mass. This mass was supposedly very tiny

## A Logical Next Step

Many of us who were once skeptical of God's existence but now are convinced of it—**persuaded by the evidence**—have gone on to search for His communication, if any, to mankind. That communication, we feel, is found in the Holy Bible.

After carefully examining historical and archaeological confirmation of the Bible's accounts, analyzing its prophetic predictions, and their subsequent fulfillment over centuries, we've become convinced the Bible is the inspired Word of God. When the Bible quotes God, we are sure it is accurately communicating God's point of view. In a future volume entitled *The Bible: Myths and Fables or the Inspired Word of God?*, we carefully examine in detail the evidence for the veracity and divine inspiration of the Bible.

We are told that God created the universe, including the earth and all life on it. We are not told when this creation took place, how long ago, or how long it took God to complete everything. What we are told in no uncertain terms is *Who* did the creating, and that the entire physical realm—including all life—was indeed **created. It did not all fall together by accident all by itself out of nothing, with no one supervising.**

The Scriptures include dozens of psalms (songs) by King David of ancient Israel, who wrote lyrics in poetic verse under divine inspiration, then turned them over to the chief musician to put them to music. Two of David's psalms start off with this pronouncement: "**The fool has said in his heart 'there is no God'**" (Psalm 14:1; 53:1). Here is God's opinion of anyone who will *not even entertain the possibility* of God's existence. Most people at least acknowledge that there "might" be a God, though they may be uncertain. Many others are sure there is one, though they may not have proved it.

Among the erudite and supposedly "enlightened" is where we see a disproportionate ratio of atheists. Note what the apostle Paul says of this in Romans 1:18-22: "Indeed, the wrath of God is revealed from heaven upon all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who *suppress the truth* in unrighteousness; because that which may be known of God is manifest among them, for God has manifested it to them; **for the invisible things of Him are perceived from the creation of the world, being understood by**



to be false, does that prove any and *all* belief in God is false, “delusional,” and leads only to evil?

Not remotely. On the contrary, in the face of all that science has uncovered about the realities of the material universe, **to refuse even to acknowledge the possibility of the existence of God is the REAL DELUSION.**

Jonathan Sarfati does a commendable job of answering Dawkins’s latest attempt to dupe the gullible. Dawkins titles his volume appropriately, *The Greatest Show On Earth*. Sarfati answers with *The Greatest Hoax On Earth? Refuting Dawkins On Evolution*.

Countering all the false reasoning and misrepresentations in Dawkins’s writings would require this booklet to become excessively long. Hopefully we’ve included enough here to help you realize that the real delusion is the belief in no God, and that Darwinian macroevolution is the real “failed hypothesis.”

and tightly compacted, consisting mostly of matter, anti-matter and energy. The “big bang” occurred, the theory goes, when this mass exploded into hot gasses, which eventually condensed into nebulae, which in turn coalesced into galaxies, which divided into stars, planets and the other stuff comprising the universe. The galaxies continue to this day to move away from one another, as Hubble’s photographs show.

No matter which version of the “big bang” (if any) you accept, they **all start with something, however infinitesimal, that had to be there to “go bang.”** Is it possible for nothing to “go bang?” Is it illogical to acknowledge that nothing IS nothing and DOES nothing? Those who studiously avoid considering any possibility of supernatural creation here refuse to ask, **“How does NOTHING go bang?”** If they acknowledge that *something* had to be there to go bang, they refuse to ask, “Where did that ‘something’ come from that went bang?”

Other questions someone should ask include, **“What was the detonator that triggered the bang?”** If the bang itself happened according to some established laws of physics, where did those physical laws come from? Does a physical law—and the regulated power by which it consistently and reliably operates—come into effect all by itself?

**If indeed the evidence does turn out to prove that some sort of “big bang” really occurred, does that by itself disprove the existence of God?** To many, the concept has reinforced their belief in God. At least it shows the material universe had a beginning. Further investigations into the universe’s origin, and observations and calculations by astrophysicists, have yielded an impression that it was “not a random explosion, which could never have produced the galaxies we observe, but a *precisely controlled beginning* for the universe.”<sup>3</sup>

If the universe truly did start with a “big bang,” what happened after that? Is all the rest of astronomic history merely one chance, random happening after another, “supervised by no one,” as some would have us believe? Not according to many astronomic observers.

### Laws and Forces

**From the beginning, multiple laws and forces have governed the material universe.** Four of the most fundamental of them are gravity, electromagnetism, strong nuclear force and weak

nuclear force. **There is a balance between these forces, without which physical life would be impossible.** According to physicist Richard Morris, “Every one of these forces must have just the right strength if there is to be any possibility of life. For example, if electrical forces were much stronger than they are, then no element heavier than hydrogen could form... But electrical repulsion cannot be too weak. If it were, protons would combine too easily, and the sun [and presumably all other stars] ... would explode like a thermonuclear bomb.”<sup>4</sup>

In an expanding universe, the force causing the expansion needs to be precisely balanced with gravitational force. Morris adds, “If our universe had been expanding at a rate that was slower by a factor of one part in a million, then the expansion would have stopped when it was only 30,000 years old, when the temperature was still 10,000 degrees.”<sup>5</sup> Too-rapid expansion on the other hand would keep matter from gravitating together to form bodies on which any life could develop.

In addition to the **law of gravity**, Isaac Newton discovered several other important laws of physics, one of which is called “**centrifugal force.**” This force causes a circling body to be pulled outward, away from the center of the circle. **It is a balance between centrifugal force and gravity that keeps satellite bodies in orbit around their mother bodies**—e.g., planets around stars. If gravity were much stronger than centrifugal force, the planets would be drawn into the stars and consumed. If centrifugal force were much stronger, they would fly out into space and eventually reach nearly absolute zero temperature, making any life on them impossible.

Another force, the “cosmological constant” (the energy density of empty space), is according to physicist Stephen Weinberg “remarkably well adjusted in our favor.” If it were greater and electrically positive, it would keep matter from coalescing into heavenly bodies; if it were greater but negative, it would keep the universe from continuing to expand and would force it ultimately to collapse back onto itself. In either case, life would be impossible. Though relatively small, this force is discernable.

**More than thirty distinct physical forces regulate all that goes on in the universe**, each with a range of differing possible magnitudes. Those mentioned above are just a few examples. Not only do all require *precise settings* across their respective possible ranges, but they all must be in balance with one another for life to be possible anywhere in the universe—and they ARE, in fact, *in that*

selection, which supposedly account for all macroevolutionary development from the imagined primal single-celled creature to humanity. But **he either ignores or is ignorant of the fact that almost no mutations actually improve a species**, much less send it in an upward evolutionary direction. His “Mount Improbable,” where we see a steep cliff in front, but where in back small steps ascend a mild gradient, could not possibly have enough steps to get us even to the first multi-celled creature.

To get to the higher forms—if such a thing were possible at all—would require the climbing of **WHOLE RANGES** of Mount Improbables on multiple planets! Instead of a few billions of years, we’d be talking quadrillions or quintillions of years. “Natural selection” has almost no opportunity to work when almost no positive mutations *ever* occur. As pointed out in Chapter Nine, **mutations do not add information to the genome, but either lose or distort it.**

Dawkins repeatedly refers to what he has not yet proved as if he had. He admits the occurrence of DNA is a “staggeringly improbable event,” but he reasons, “It must have happened, because here we are”! Now there’s real convincing proof.

Applying supposed “probability” to the possibility of life having spontaneously generated, Dawkins reasons thus: “Suppose it was so improbable as to occur on only one in a billion planets ... even with such absurdly long odds, life will still have arisen on a billion planets—of which Earth, of course, is one.”<sup>41</sup> Where is the problem with this reasoning?

Dawkins is either dishonest or conveniently ignorant of Wickramasinghe and Hoyle’s mathematical calculation of the REAL odds against *even a protein* spontaneously generating as being higher than—not the supposed number of *planets* in the universe—but the number of *atoms*! They have shown that **spontaneous generation is not ‘improbable’—it is IMPOSSIBLE!**

To be fair, in other chapters of *The God Delusion* Dawkins makes many valid points regarding the evils perpetrated in the name of religion. No thinking person even superficially acquainted with either history or current events could argue the contrary. However, **he pretends no good ever came from people acting on their religious beliefs.** Nothing could be further from the truth, as any honest survey would quickly show.

In pointing out all the “evil” of religion, he is *begging the question*: Given the fact that most belief in a God or gods turns out

## Chapter Ten

## The No-God Delusion

Atheist author and biologist/philosopher Richard Dawkins was recently famous for his bestsellers *The God Delusion* and *The Greatest Show On Earth: The Evidence for Evolution*. In his introduction to *The God Delusion*, he expresses the hope that the reader, upon finishing his book, will have become an atheist like himself.

Dawkins seems to love the “straw man” tactic of either misrepresenting the other side’s arguments in such a way as to make them easy to refute, or selecting an authentic but weak argument—again one he can easily knock down. An example of the latter is his use of Fred Hoyle’s supposed argument that the chances of life originating spontaneously on earth are no greater than that of a hurricane blowing through a scrap heap and accidentally assembling a fully functional Boeing 747 jet plane. (Dawkins noticeably **fails to disprove** Hoyle’s assertion, by the way.)

Hoyle’s *real* contribution to the issue of spontaneous generation of life on earth is his calculation of the odds against such a thing: one in  $10^{40,000}$  power, or **500 times the number of atoms in the known universe** (see Chapter Four)! **We’re not talking “improbable” here. We’re talking IMPOSSIBLE! Dawkins has conveniently ignored this quotation from Fred Hoyle.**

In Chapter Four of *The God Delusion*, entitled “Why There Almost Certainly Is No God,” Dawkins cites mostly weak arguments for God’s existence, such as Hoyle’s “747 argument” (**which he refers to later as if he had disproved it, when in fact he had not**). He devotes considerable space to arguments in *The Watchtower* for design of one species after another. He surely knows that arguments from religious tracts are not the most convincing ones for a God, by any means.

What Dawkins seems to studiously avoid dealing with (except to ridicule or dismiss them as “religiously motivated”) are the discoveries of *scientists* such as those we’ve cited in previous chapters, which leave little room—to a truly open mind—for rejection of a higher creative power.

Dawkins cites another of his books, entitled *Climbing Mount Improbable*, to explain how evolution supposedly occurred “step by step” through a series of small changes (mutations) and natural

*exact balance!* Did it “just happen” that way?

**Without these and many other physical laws—all operating in balance—there would not have been the formation of elements and compounds, much less galaxies, stars and planets on which life could develop. Did the laws and forces of nature all just happen by accident?**

## Chapter Two

### Elements Form

The most basic, primal element in the universe is *hydrogen*. According to the big-bang theory, during the initial explosion of matter, there was only hydrogen at first, with its one proton, one neutron and one electron. At somewhere “between one second and five minutes [after the presumed initial explosion], conditions would have been suitable for nuclear reactions to have occurred. The major process would have been the fusion of hydrogen nuclei to form helium....”<sup>6</sup> These two elements together even now still form most of the matter of the entire universe.

Cosmologists postulate that later, as outer temperatures of stars cooled, trace amounts of the other elements, formed by the fusing together of smaller nuclei into larger ones, massed together and spun off from stars into orbit around them. These still-molten specs (by comparison in size to their mother star) coalesced to form molten planets, on some of which the outsidies cooled into the solid crusts we associate with planets like Earth.

As various elements were formed by nuclei of simple atoms merging to form more complex ones, **conditions developed by which those elements necessary for life could form in just the right configurations and proportions.**

One of these essential conditions is the ratio of the size of the proton (one of three main components of all atoms) to the electron. The proton is 1,836 times the weight of the electron. If the ratio of the two were much different, the required molecules could not develop into the compounds necessary for life. According to cosmologist (and atheist) Stephen Hawking, “The remarkable fact is that the values of these numbers seem to have been very much *finely adjusted* to make possible the development of life.”<sup>7</sup> We might ask Mr. Hawking, “**Who did the adjusting? Do fine adjustments just happen?**”

As various elements formed, a phenomenon called “resonance” existed in the nucleus of each atom. Stable nuclei are normally in a state of “ground energy,” with the positive protons and negative electrons in balance. Collisions of nuclei produce “excitement” and lead to formation of other elements and compounds. The potential for this kind of excitement varies from one element to another.

It was easy to imagine an original single-celled organism that was so simple it could have spontaneously come to life sometime in the murky past. Today, to any honest, knowledgeable biochemist, such a notion must seem **naively childish**. We cited earlier the calculated odds against even the necessary proteins having come together by chance, in the right order, as requiring multiple times *all the atoms in the known universe*—and that still doesn’t give us everything else needed to make the cell function, or the needed DNA so it could reproduce!

sampling of some of these realities.

**“Every cell contains an estimated one billion compounds. That’s as many as 75,000,000,000,000,000,000 (75 sextillion) compounds per person—give or take a billion—and among these compounds are approximately five million different kinds of proteins.... [These proteins] can have more than one function or electrical charge, they all know where to go and how to get there, when to act, how fast to react, and when to stop. Nearly every chemical reaction is helped along by one or more of the 3000-plus different enzymes. Some of these chemical reactions take only a millionth of a second.**

**“The nucleus of each cell contains 23 pairs of very complex chromosomes (DNA), with 100,000 genes that can be further broken down into six billion chemical bases. There are only four kinds of these bases, abbreviated A, G, C, and T; yet these four bases, which are relatively simple compounds, appear in such varying combinations that they tell the cell, and ultimately the body, everything that it needs to know about growing up, surviving, fighting, fleeing, digesting food, breathing, thinking, pumping blood, eliminating wastes, and perpetuating the species. The first few cells in an embryo already know what a person’s height will be, his or her propensity to be obese, the color of his or her eyes, the number of curls in his or her hair, whether he or she will have musical skills, if his or her teeth will grow in crooked, and whether he or she is vulnerable to certain diseases such as breast cancer or Huntington’s chorea. Some scientists call the DNA-coded instructions the Book of Life; it’s a book like no other.**

**“Each cell has an assigned location, a seemingly lifetime role, hundreds to thousands of tasks to accomplish, and a distinct longevity. Each cell is also programmed to take care of its own needs—as well as the entire being. Proof of this became evident with cloning. If the nucleus from a skin cell is placed inside a female egg after its nucleus has been removed the skin’s (hidden) DNA Book of Knowledge can duplicate an entire individual.”<sup>40</sup> (Bold emphasis added.)**

**In the mid-Nineteenth Century, when Charles Darwin was doing his research and writing, cells of the body were not known to be much more than tissue building blocks or conduits for body fluids. No one had yet seen the myriad chemical processes that take place inside each cell of all living organisms. It was all too easy to oversimplify how bodily metabolic functions worked. No scientist at that time could have conceived how unfathomably complex the functioning of a single cell is.**

As one helium nucleus collides with another in a star, it produces an unstable element called beryllium. Then, as Harvard astronomy department chairman Robert Kirshner describes it, “another helium nucleus collides with this short-lived target, leading to the formation of carbon....A delicate match between the energies of helium, the unstable beryllium and the resulting carbon allows the last to be created. **Without this process, we would not be here.**”<sup>8</sup> (Bold emphasis added.)

**“Astrophysicist Sir Fred Hoyle is credited with the discovery of the resonances of carbon and oxygen atoms. Working with William Fowler, Hoyle discovered that, by all rights, the carbon atom, which seems to have been uniquely designed to make life possible, should either not exist or be exceedingly rare.”** For a carbon atom to form, there needed to be just the right resonance. Hoyle predicted what that resonance would be before physicists corroborated it. They found it to be almost exactly what Hoyle had thought it would be. **“When Hoyle then calculated the chances that such resonances should exist by chance in these elements, he said that his atheism was greatly shaken.”<sup>9</sup> (Bold emphasis added.)**

How many cases of forces being in precise “balance,” proportions being “finely adjusted,” elements in a “delicate match,” and atoms being “uniquely designed” for life must we encounter before we question whether it all could have happened by accident, all by itself? If you haven’t seen enough yet, read on.

## Chapter Three

### Earth: The Favored Planet

Could a life-supporting planet have formed just *anywhere* in the universe?

According to astronomer Guillermo Gonzalez, “**You just can’t form a habitable planet anywhere**; there’s a large number of threats to life as you go from place to place.”<sup>10</sup> (*Bold emphasis added.*)

#### The Sun’s Safe Location

There are three basic kinds of galaxy in the universe: There are irregular ones with no discernible shape or pattern of movement; there are elliptical galaxies, shaped somewhat like an egg in space; and there are spiral galaxies, shaped rather like a pinwheel, with arms extending out into space away from their center.

Irregular galaxies are the worst possible supporters of life-harboring planets. According to Gonzalez, irregular galaxies are “distorted and ripped apart, with supernovae going off throughout their volume. There are no safe places where there are fewer supernovae exploding, like we have between our spiral arms.”<sup>11</sup> In the estimation of many astronomers, irregular galaxies would be unlikely to have any stars with life-harboring planets.

In elliptical galaxies, the stars have “very random orbits, like bees swarming in a beehive. The problem for life in these galaxies is that the stars visit every region, which means they’ll occasionally visit the dangerous, dense inner regions, where a black hole may be active. In any event, you’re less likely to find Earth-like planets in elliptical galaxies because most of them lack the heavy elements needed to form them.

“Most elliptical galaxies are less massive and luminous than our galaxy,” which is “on the top one or two percent of the most massive and luminous. The bigger the galaxy, the more heavy elements it can have, because its stronger gravity can attract more hydrogen and helium and cycle them to build heavy elements. In the low-mass galaxies, which make up the vast majority, you can have whole galaxies without a single Earth-like planet. They just don’t have enough of the heavy elements to construct Earths.”<sup>12</sup>

Sanford then relates nearly a century of attempts at plant improvement by geneticists inducing mutations, from which “almost no meaningful crop improvement resulted. The effort was for the most part an enormous failure, and was almost entirely abandoned.”<sup>37</sup>

“In conclusion, mutations appear to be overwhelmingly deleterious, and even when one may be classified as beneficial in some specific sense it is still usually part of an overall breakdown and erosion of information.”<sup>38</sup>

“For many people, including many biologists, natural selection is something like a magic wand. Simply by invoking the words ‘natural selection’—there is no limit what one can *imagine* accomplishing.... The entire field of population genetics was developed by a small, tightly knit group of people who were utterly and radically committed to the Primary Axiom.... For the most part, other biologists do not even understand their work—but accept their conclusions ‘by faith.’ Yet it is these same population geneticists themselves who have exposed some of the most profound limitations of natural selection. Because natural selection is *not* a magic wand but is a very real phenomenon, it has very real capabilities and very real *limitations*. It is not ‘all-powerful.’<sup>39</sup>

The idea that the human species is the result of billions of beneficial mutations to what started out as a single-celled protozoan **is totally debunked!** Mutations almost never add information the way they would be required to if Darwin’s theory of macroevolution were true. The few that have ever been even thought to be “beneficial” to the organism still constituted a loss or an altering of information, but not an adding of it. We are NOT the result of billions of mutations to any original one-celled life form. Billions of mutations would have resulted in an overall *loss* of information, not the addition of information that would have been necessary for an upward evolutionary development into thousands of species from one single-celled proto-life form.

Genetics has proven such a thing to be utterly *impossible*. It NEVER HAPPENED!

#### Realities Darwinism Can’t Explain

There are whole volumes written by scientists whose own empirical findings are in conflict with the idea of evolution—at least the Darwinian version of it. Most of these researchers do believe in some form of evolution, but their observations simply can’t be explained by the Darwinian paradigm. Let us examine a brief

## Chapter Nine

### Are We All Just “Mutant Protozoa”?

We’ve briefly answered Tenet 2, subdivision c, of Darwin’s theory of macroevolution—that the main agents of evolutionary change in organisms, and from one kind of organism into another, were mutation and natural selection. The *assumption* that mutations are usually beneficial is inherent in this belief. This assumption is part of what J. C. Sanford calls the “Primary Axiom.”

He emphatically asserts that “people are hurt by mutation.... If we include all genetic predispositions to all pathologies, we must conclude that we are *all* highly ‘mutant’.... Mutations are the source of immeasurable heartache—in fact, they are inexorably killing each of us....

“Can we say mutations are good? Nearly all health policies are aimed at reducing or minimizing mutation.... **How can anyone see mutations as good?** Yet according to the Primary Axiom, mutations are good because they create the variation and diversity which allows selection and evolution to occur, creating the information needed for life.”<sup>33</sup>

After explaining the important difference between *random* variation and *designed* variation, Sanford reminds us that, since in Darwinian evolutionary theory “no genetic variation by design is allowed,” it can thus “very reasonably be argued that random variations are never good.”<sup>34</sup>

The higher one goes in classification of organisms, the *more* genetic information is contained in DNA and genetic material. Yet Sanford tells us, “The overwhelmingly deleterious nature of mutations can be seen by the incredible *scarcity* of clear cases of information-creating mutations.”<sup>35</sup> After citing graphs by researchers that indicate how “**bad**” mutations outnumber “**good**” ones by as much as 100 to one, Sanford assures us, “Everything about the true distribution of mutations argues against their possible role in forward evolution.”<sup>36</sup>

Yet, if macroevolution were true, millions or billions of such beneficial, information-*adding* mutations would have been required for life to have gone from “simple” one-celled organisms to the incredibly complex human body and brain, regulated and controlled by the DNA of humans (with *thousands of times the information* than that of a one-celled organism)!

The spiral galaxy (such as our Milky Way) “**optimizes habitability, because it provides safe zones ... and Earth happens to be located in a safe area**, which is why life has been able to flourish here.... Places with active star formation are very dangerous, because that’s where you have supernovae exploding at a fairly high rate. In our galaxy, these places are primarily in the spiral arms, where there are also hazardous giant molecular clouds. Fortunately, though, we happen to be situated safely between the Sagittarius and Perseus spiral arms.

“Also, we’re very far from the nucleus of the galaxy, which is also a dangerous place. We now know that there’s a massive black hole at the center of our galaxy. In fact, the Hubble telescope has found that nearly every large nearby galaxy has a giant black hole at its nucleus. And believe me—these are dangerous things!

“Now, put all this together—the inner region of the galaxy is much more dangerous from radiation and other threats; the outer part of the galaxy isn’t going to be able to form Earth-like planets because the heavy elements are not abundant enough; and I haven’t even mentioned how the thin disk of our galaxy helps our sun stay in its desirable circular orbit. A very eccentric orbit could cause it to cross spiral arms and visit the dangerous inner regions of the galaxy, but being circular it remains in the safe zone.”<sup>13</sup> (*Bold emphasis added.*)

### Location, Location, Location

Gonzalez concludes, “In terms of habitability, I think we are in the best possible place. That’s because our location provides enough building blocks to yield an Earth, while providing a low level of threats to life. I really **can’t come up with another place in the galaxy that is as friendly to life as our location.**”<sup>14</sup> (*Bold emphasis added.*)

Not only is the sun located in the most optimal part of the universe for a life-supporting planet, but of all the planets in the solar system, only on Earth do we find the exact combination of conditions necessary for carbon-based life as we know it. Mercury is too hot. Venus has a toxic atmosphere. Mars is too cold and dry.

Gonzalez explains it this way: “There’s a concept invented by astrobiologists called the Circumstellar Habitable Zone. That’s the region around a star where you can have liquid water on the surface of a terrestrial planet. This is determined by the amount of light you get from the host star. You can’t be too close, otherwise

too much water evaporates into the atmosphere and it causes a runaway greenhouse effect, and you boil off the oceans. We think that might be what happened to Venus. But if you get too far out it gets too cold. Water and carbon dioxide freeze and you eventually develop runaway glaciation.... It's only in the very inner edge of the Circumstellar Habitable Zone where you can have low enough carbon dioxide and high enough oxygen to sustain complex animal life. And that's where we are."<sup>15</sup>

**Is this all mere “coincidence”?**

formulate any sort of purpose, and blind, inanimate forces are supposedly all evolutionists think drove the whole process of evolution. So why are they even speculating (and these theories are pure speculation) on what the “purpose” of sex might be? **If macroevolution is scientifically proven to have occurred, then the questions of how sex originated and how it has been passed down from one generation to another should at least be asked** and some substantial theory be available to answer those questions.

Once we understand the difference between how *body cells* divide and reproduce on the one hand and how *reproductive cells* (gametes) divide and reproduce, we will have a clue as to the *magnitude* of the problem of the origin of sex and its perpetuation down through untold generations. The nucleus of every cell contains two strings of genes known as “chromosomes.” (The “higher” organisms have more sets of chromosomes, the “lower” species fewer.)

Each body cell divides so that everything is completely replicated in both daughter cells—a process called “mitosis.” Reproductive cells, on the other hand, split each pair of chromosomes so that only one chromosome of each pair (per parent) becomes either a sperm cell (in the male) or an egg cell (in the female). This process is called “meiosis.” Meiosis takes place in preparation for the combination of sperm and egg in the sexual reproduction process itself.

As Harrub and Thomson point out, “With all due respect, **there is not an evolutionist on the planet who has been able to come up with an adequate (much less believable) explanation** as to how somatic [body] cells reproduce by mitosis (thereby maintaining the species’ standard chromosome number in each cell), while gametes are produced by meiosis—wherein that chromosome number is halved so that, at the union of male and female gametes during reproduction, the standard number is reinstated.”<sup>32</sup> (*Bold emphasis added.*)

If the impossibility of evolution accounting for sexual reproduction—not so much the “why,” but the “how”—isn’t enough to make you doubt the whole theory, please read on. In the next chapter, we examine the phenomenon of the *genome* in more detail.



In real life, the theory has lost many adherents, because recent research has revealed sexually reproduced organisms doing better in stable environments and asexually reproduced organisms doing better in unstable ones—the opposite of what the theory would predict.

The “tangled bank hypothesis” is named for a depiction in Darwin’s *Origin of Species* of a diverse group of creatures all competing for life’s necessities on a “tangled bank,” as he put it. In such conditions, the organisms that are most diversified in their range of characteristics would have the advantage for survival.

Based on this paradigm, one would expect sex to occur most predominantly in small organisms that produce prolifically and compete most heavily with each other. Yet in real life, the smaller organisms are the ones in which we still find asexual reproduction, while sex is found invariably in larger ones that produce comparatively few offspring. Thus, this theory, which was once popular, now has few adherents.

The next idea as to why sex exists is named for a character out of *Alice In Wonderland*—the Red Queen, who told Alice how it takes all the running one can do just to stay in the same place. Called the “Red Queen hypothesis,” the concept is that in the competitive world of nature, organisms have to constantly move and change just to maintain existence. Since they must constantly be trying to improve, sex is thought to have come about as one of those improvements many species had to make. Yet with all its “inefficiencies,” is sexual reproduction really an improvement (if you believe in evolution) at all? Many evolutionists doubt that.

One more supposed explanation of sex is the “DNA repair hypothesis.” The basic idea seems to be that deleterious changes can be essentially eliminated by the sexual reproduction process, because to show up in the offspring, they would have to have been in both parents. If such a change was in only one, it can be overcome by the good gene in the other parent.

The fact that bad genes *are* often passed on to offspring would seem to call this idea into question. Certainly if the purpose of sex is to prevent such a thing, it has not been totally effective.

One thing we should note about all the theories described above: They deal only with the “why” of sexual reproduction, **when supposedly in evolution there is no “why,”** there is no *purpose* involved. **For there to be any purpose, there must be a “being” of some kind to have that purpose.** Blind, inanimate forces do not

## Chapter Four

### And There Was Life

The Law of Biogenesis establishes that **life can come only from other life.** The Second Law of Thermodynamics shows **all matter is becoming increasingly random and chaotic—not better organized,** as the theory of evolution demands. Yet despite these proven realities, many with educated, supposedly rational minds still believe in the Darwinian theory of evolution—that life on earth somehow came into existence spontaneously, all by itself. Then, starting with the simple lower forms, life evolved into better-organized and more-complex “higher” forms (by a process of “mutations followed by natural selection,” “supervised by no one”)—and culminated in the human species.

Geneticist J.C. Sanford has his own expression for this idea: “Modern Darwinism is built, most fundamentally, upon what I will be calling ‘The Primary Axiom.’ The Primary Axiom is that man is merely the product of *random mutations plus natural selection.*”<sup>16</sup>

Does Charles Darwin’s theory of macroevolution, as outlined in his oft-quoted but little-read *The Origin of Species*, really disprove the existence of God, or has the “disproof” itself actually been disproved?

Belief in macroevolution has attained such a state of entrenched fundamentalist orthodoxy—the **blind faith of evolutionists** (in spite of all the evidence to the contrary)—that **disagreement is no longer permitted in most academic circles.** “The proponents of ‘Darwinian liberalism’ tolerate no dissent and regard all criticism of Darwin’s fundamental tenets as false and reprehensible.”<sup>17</sup>

“Critics [of Darwinian evolution] are then labeled unscientific; their articles are rejected by mainstream journals, whose editorial boards are dominated by the dogmatists; the critics are denied funding by government agencies, who send grant proposals to the dogmatists for ‘peer’ review; and eventually the **critics are hounded out of the scientific community altogether.**”

“In the process, evidence against the Darwinian view simply disappears, like witnesses against the Mob. Or the evidence is buried in specialized publications, where only a dedicated researcher can find it. Once the critics have been silenced and counter-evidence has been buried, the dogmatists announce that

there is no scientific debate about their theory, and no evidence against it. Using such tactics, defenders of Darwinian orthodoxy have managed to establish a near-monopoly over research grants, faculty appointments, and peer-reviewed journals in the United States.”<sup>18</sup>

Who says politics has nothing to do with science and education? It has EVERYTHING to do with both!

Despite the enforced orthodoxy of Darwinism in academic circles, there are a growing number of honest scientists often *risking their careers* by voicing their misgivings—based on their own empirical findings—about one aspect or another of the theory of evolution. And despite the attempts of Darwinian fundamentalists to paint them as “religious fanatics,” most of them have no religious agenda. Many in fact are still evolutionists. These scientists simply are pointing out the discrepancies between the Darwinist paradigm and *their own scientific findings*.

Since evolution as a dogmatic belief is considered a “disproof of God” (though some God-believers also embrace macro-evolution), we need to ask some questions. First, what are the fundamental tenets of the Darwinian theory of biological evolution? Second, which of those tenets (if any) are scientifically established, and which are not? Third, do any of the provable tenets of Darwin’s theory by themselves prove the over-all theory of macroevolution?

### Basics of Darwinian Evolution

The fundamental tenets of Darwinian evolution are essentially two:

1. All life traces its descent to a common ancestor—probably a “simple” single-celled organism of some kind that was *spontaneously generated* by random natural processes acting upon whatever elements and compounds existed on the primordial earth.
2. The simple forms of life evolved into more and more complex higher forms—by a combination of inheritable chance variations (mutations) and “natural selection”—until ultimately the **human species came into being, evolving out of primate ancestors**. The entire process occurred over millions of years, but with no external causal or guiding factor; and at no time was the process in any way

## Chapter Eight

# The Conundrum of Sex And Reproduction

The vast majority of both plant and animal species procreate by a phenomenon known as “sexual reproduction.” If **Darwinian evolution is true, sex must have evolved as well**. Yet if it developed by a series of random steps supervised by no one—if sex evolved by an almost endless series of mutations followed by natural selection—it boggles the mind to try to contemplate the nearly infinite number of “**miraculous coincidences**” that would have been required to occur on countless fronts *within every last species* that reproduces sexually.

“The evolution of sex (and its accompanying reproductive capability) is not a favorite topic of discussion in most evolutionary circles, because no matter how many theories evolutionists conjure up (and there are several), they still must surmount the **enormous hurdle of explaining** the origin of the first fully functional female and the first fully functional male necessary to begin the process.... Sexual reproduction requires organisms first to produce, and then [to] maintain, gametes (reproductive cells—i.e., sperm and eggs).”<sup>31</sup> (*Bold emphasis added.*)

There are four popular theories attempting to explain why there is such a thing as sexual reproduction: the “lottery principle,” the “tangled bank hypothesis,” the “red queen hypothesis,” and the “DNA repair hypothesis.”

The “lottery principle” recognizes that asexually reproduced organisms merely perpetuate the same limited set of characteristics from one generation to the next. This is seen as akin to someone buying multiple lottery tickets, but all the same number. Presenting a limited array of characteristics, they would be less adaptable to changing environments. If they could not alter their characteristics when their environment went from a forest to a prairie, for example, they might die off.

Sexually reproduced organisms keep varying their combinations of characteristics due to each parent contributing different combinations of them. As an environment changes, at least some of their descendants have a chance to survive. This is like buying lottery tickets with all different numbers.

### Did Someone Make It?

A paleontologist walking along a dry riverbed in the Rift of East Africa can spot a crude triangle-shaped stone with chip marks along the edges and be certain he has found something designed, fashioned, worked and *made*. It's probably a spearhead or an axe of some kind made by a "primitive" tribesman centuries ago.

Some of the same people who will admit that something that crude was *made* will look at the multiple libraries of instruction manuals in the human genome, the convoluted loops of feedback and control mechanisms that determine not only how the organism develops but how its thousands of vital functions are controlled and regulated—a complete multiple-facility plant more extensive *by far* than that which built and launched our expeditions into space—and say **it all just fell together by accident, all by itself, out of nothing!** It developed by a series of trillions of favorable mutations, followed by **"natural selection," "supervised by no one."**

**And they call God-believers "delusional"?**

supervised or directed. None of the organisms, or any parts of them or their functioning metabolic systems was in any manner, shape, or form "designed," despite how much it may appear so.

Tenet number two above actually consists of several sub-tenets: **(a)** Initial changes in an organism usually occurred by mutation. **(b)** The mutations must have been inherited by subsequent generations. **(c)** Those mutations which made the species "more fit" prevailed, over those which did not, by "natural selection." **(d)** After multiple such changes and selections, one species gave rise to a new species—a process repeated thousands of times over millions of years, in the direction of more-complex "higher" life forms, culminating in the development of the "human species."

It should be noted that what is being questioned in this chapter is the concept of *macroevolution*, not that of *microevolution*. Microevolution is basically adaptation *within a species or genus*. Microevolution—*adaptation*—has been repeatedly demonstrated, and is not here in question.

Because adaptation *within* a species or genus (kind) *has* taken place, Darwin and all believers in evolution since have *begged the question* of whether that means one species eventually *gave rise* to another species or genus—macroevolution. But **NO SUCH CHANGE has ever been proven to take place!**

### Tenet #1: Spontaneously Generated?

How likely is it that the first life formed all by itself without any outside causal agency? How likely is it that even the *necessary proteins*—basic building blocks of life, but *FAR FROM* being life itself—could come into existence all at once in the same place, with all component amino acids forming almost simultaneously and in the *correct necessary order*, by random events?

One of the most loudly heralded supposedly "scientific" experiments ever conducted occurred in 1953. A graduate student at the University of Chicago named Stanley Miller, working in the laboratory of Harold Urey, reproduced what was *assumed* to be the atmosphere of the primordial earth. By sending electrical sparks through it to simulate lightning, he managed to produce some residues containing **a few amino acids**. News media jumped on the report of this experiment with screaming headlines such as **"Scientists Almost Create Life!"**

What few have heard since (and no evolution-teaching

textbook has admitted) is that the experiment ultimately was *discredited* for several reasons. Miller’s presumption of what elements comprised the primordial atmosphere has since been so altered as to make the findings of his experiment *irrelevant*. To repeat the experiment using what is now believed to have been the makeup of the early atmosphere would not yield even amino acids; but indeed if it could, the *gap* between that and actual life would still be incalculable. **To say that by the creation of a few amino acids “scientists ‘almost’ create life” is about as believable as saying that an astronaut who hasn’t yet even boarded his spaceship has ‘almost’ crossed the universe.”**

Another and oft-overlooked reason the Miller experiment constituted no “proof” of Darwinian evolution is that, while Darwin’s theory requires *no outside agency* to have been involved in the evolutionary process, the Miller experiment, in order to produce any amino acids, *required* an outside agency—Miller himself and the apparatus with which he created the artificial “lightning.”

Astrophysicists Chandra Wickramasinghe and Fred Hoyle calculated the odds against all of the necessary proteins for life, with their component amino acids forming in *one place at the same time and in the right order by chance*. Their finding was that the odds against such a random occurrence would be  $10^{407000}$  power to one. The number of atoms in the *entire known universe* is only about  $10^{80}$  power. **It is clear that such a thing is IMPOSSIBLE,** “even if the whole universe consisted of organic soup.”<sup>19</sup> Not only that, but all the matter of the universe would have to be in *one contiguous mass*, not divided into billions of separate bodies, and it still would be impossible! **Mind you—we’re not even talking about a complete “simple” organism coming to life, but only about one of the proteins needed for that life!**

The difference between having the necessary proteins for life and having an actual organism might be illustrated by contrasting a small pile of building materials dumped from a single truck, versus a carefully designed and fully constructed high-rise building.

For the sake of argument, however, let us suppose that a few “primitive,” “simple” one-celled life forms managed to come into being all by themselves. In the absence of other life, what would nourish them? What would they eat—each other? If natural selection eliminated all but the biggest, strongest, or “fittest,” then what would that one organism eat? If the single cells divided and thereby multiplied, then the competition for nonexistent food would be even

(the **entire library**). [*Bold emphasis added.*]

“A complete human genome consists of two sets of 3 billion individual ‘letters’ each. Only a very small fraction of this genetic library is required to directly encode the roughly 100,000 different human proteins, and the uncounted number of functional human RNA molecules which are found within our cells. Each of these protein and RNA molecules are essentially miniature *machines*, each with hundreds of component parts, each with its own exquisite complexity, design, and function. But the genome’s *linear* information, equivalent to many complete sets of a large encyclopedia, is not enough to explain the complexity of life.”<sup>29</sup>

Sanford goes on to show that the linear codes are only the beginning; they only designate how cells are to be built and maintained. Then multiple overlapping codes also control the thousands of functions going on in a typical cell. “In addition to multiple overlapping, linear, language-like forms of genetic information, the genome is full of countless loops and branches—like a computer program. It has genes that regulate genes that regulate genes. It has genes that sense changes in the environment, and then instruct other genes to react by setting in motion complex cascades of events that can then modify the environment. Some genes actively rearrange themselves, or modify and methylate other gene sequences—basically *changing* portions of the instruction manual!”

“Lastly, there is good evidence that linear DNA can fold into two- and three-dimensional structures (as do proteins and RNAs) and that such folding probably encodes still higher levels of information. With the typical non-dividing nucleus, there is reason to believe there may be fabulously complex three-dimensional arrays of DNA, whose 3-D architecture controls higher biological functions.”<sup>30</sup>

All this incredibly miniaturized organization, coordination and control “**just happens**,” according to the faithful apologists for the religion of Darwinian evolution. Sanford’s “Primary Axiom” (which his book quoted here totally disproves) is that a long series of mutations and “natural selection”—“**supervised by no one**”—made all this happen.

Right!

Can we agree that organization, coordination and control DO NOT “just happen”?

**What is an accident? It is a result of a LACK of control!**

## Chapter Seven

### Do Organization, Coordination and Control “Just Happen”?

Biological life is, if nothing else, *organized*. Organization is observable at every level, starting at the single cell. In higher forms, cells in turn are grouped into tissues; tissues into organs, glands, bones, muscles, vessels; all those into systems, each of which performs specific functions—all of which are *coordinated* in such a way as to sustain the organism and enable it to perform the necessary tasks for survival.

**At the cellular level, there is not only supreme organization but regulation—control, if you will.** The substance known as DNA (deoxyribose nucleic acid) is the component substance of genes and chromosomes (strings of genes) that are in the nucleus of every living cell. Together, along with molecules called nucleotides, they form the “genome,” which in turn controls all metabolic functions performed in each cell.

According to genetics expert John C. Sanford, “**The complex nature of the genome can only be appreciated when we begin to grasp how much information it contains....** If you compiled all the instruction manuals associated with creating a modern automobile, it would comprise a substantial library.... There is simply no human technology that can even begin to serve as an adequate analogy for the complexity of a human life. Yet the genome is the instruction manual encoding all that information—as needed for life!”

Sanford goes on: “**We have thus far only discovered the first dimension of this ‘book of life’**—which is a linear sequence of 4 types of extremely small molecules called nucleotides. These small molecules make up the individual ‘steps’ of the spiral-staircase structure of DNA. These molecules are the *letters* of the genetic code, and are shown symbolically as A, T, C, and G. These letters are strung together like a linear text. They are not just symbolically shown as letters, they *are* very literally the *letters* of our instruction manual. **Small clusters** or motifs of these molecular letters make up the **words of our manual**, which combine to form genes (the **chapters of our manual**), which combine to form chromosomes (the **volumes of our manual**), which combine to form the whole genome

more fierce. Surely, if the theory of “survival of the fittest” were at work here, there would soon be *fewer* of these organisms, not more. The last few would most likely starve to death before they could reproduce, and certainly in any case before they had chance to take the very *first step* in any upward evolutionary process.

## Chapter Five

### From There To Here

In the last chapter, we found that Tenet #1 of Darwinian evolution—that life originated spontaneously in some primordial soup—is utterly *unsupported*, disproved by countless known scientific facts and by mathematics.

Does Tenet #2 of Darwinian evolution stand up any better to scientific scrutiny? Let's see. There were four sub-tenets to Tenet #2 of the theory of biological macroevolution. Let us examine each, one at a time.

- a) "Changes in a species of organism occur by mutation." Do mutations occur in nature? They most certainly do.
- b) "Mutations must be inherited by subsequent generations." Can some mutations be genetically inherited? Some mutations are in fact passed on to the next generation.
- c) "Through 'natural selection,' those mutations that made the species 'more fit' prevailed over those which did not improve the species." Are most mutations of a nature that "improves" an organism or makes it more fit?

**Far from it!** (We will examine this issue in more detail in a later chapter.)

Here is where we begin to have a problem. **Almost no mutations are to the benefit or improvement of an organism. Most have little or no effect on it at all, and are labeled as genetically "neutral." Of those few that have any significant effect, however, nearly all are of a *degenerative* nature.** In fact, in the opinion of many geneticists, any mutations that would contribute to an upward evolutionary spiral are virtually *non-existent*.<sup>20</sup>

- d) "After multiple such changes and selections, one species eventually gave rise to another species—a process repeated thousands of times over millions of years, in the direction of better-organized, more-complex 'higher' life forms, culminating in the development of the 'human species.' " While adaptations *within* species and genera over time have been repeatedly demonstrated, evolutionists have

was found there *conflicted* with his theory, because such divergence of forms should appear only after millions of years of evolution. He reasoned that the record was incomplete and that more primitive forms would someday be found in lower strata.

A lower stratum than the Cambrian has in fact been found. But the fossil life forms found in it have not been shown to have given rise to the Cambrian forms for the most part.

"Darwin's theory claims that phylum- and class-level differences emerge only after a long history of divergence from lower categories such as species, genera, families and orders. Yet the Cambrian explosion is inconsistent with this picture.... Darwinian evolution is 'bottom-up,' referring to its prediction that lower levels in the biological hierarchy should emerge before higher ones. But the Cambrian explosion shows the opposite.... [T]he Cambrian pattern 'creates the impression that [animal] evolution has proceeded from the top down....' Nevertheless, evolutionary biologists have been reluctant to abandon Darwin's theory. Many of them discount the Cambrian fossil evidence instead."<sup>28</sup>

**Surprise, surprise!**

A National Academy of Sciences booklet on Darwin's finches pretty much does the same thing. "Rather than confuse the reader by mentioning that selection was reversed after the drought, producing no long-term evolutionary change, the booklet simply omits this awkward fact.... [T]he booklet misleads the public by concealing a crucial part of the evidence. This is not truth-seeking. It makes one wonder how much evidence there really is for Darwin's theory."<sup>26</sup>

Suppose all the changes in the beaks of Galapagos finches had been proven to go in one consistent direction—which they most emphatically *have not*. Would that prove *macroevolution* (which remember requires one species giving rise to *another* species)? Would it at any point demonstrate one species "evolving" into another? Not remotely. After all the extensive observation of these birds and all the changes, guess what? They're STILL FINCHES! There is even good reason to question whether the multiple varieties of Galapagos finches represent *any* distinct (from one another) "species" at all!

#### Darwin's Tree of Life vs. the Fossil Record

**Darwin thought that all life forms might be descended from "one primordial form....** *The Origin of Species* included only one illustration, showing the branching pattern that would result from this process of descent with modification. Darwin thus pictured life as a tree, with the universal common ancestor at its root, and modern species as its 'green and budding twigs.' He called this the 'great Tree of Life.'

"Of all the icons of evolution, the tree of life is the most persuasive, because descent from a common ancestor is the foundation of Darwin's theory. Neo-Darwinist Ernst Mayr boldly proclaimed in 1991 that 'there is probably no biologist left today who would question that all organisms now found on the earth have descended from a single origin of life.' Yet Darwin knew—and scientists have recently confirmed—that the **early fossil record turns the evolutionary tree of life upside down**. Ten years ago it was hoped that molecular evidence might save the tree, but recent discoveries have dashed that hope. Although you would not learn it from reading biology textbooks, **Darwin's tree of life had been uprooted.**"<sup>27</sup>

In Darwin's day, the lowest known strata level in which fossils had been found was the Cambrian. Darwin knew that what

*begged the question* of whether one type of organism can, by this means, ever give rise to another kind of organism.

**Such a transformation has NEVER been demonstrated,** either in the fossil record or by observation! There is evidence some genera may have diversified into several species (such as *canidae* giving rise to wolf, fox, jackal, dingo, etc). Essentially, this "genus" (using the terminology of Mendel, who based his classifications on Bible terms) corresponds to the biblical term "kind." If some genera have diversified into species, that does not by itself prove macroevolution.

The notion that "beneficial" mutations passed on by heredity (followed by natural selection) comprise the entire explanation for how a one-celled proto-life "evolved" into the diversity of living organisms we have today—including humanity—is utterly disproved. Those who insist on believing it are simply believing in fairy tales!

Geoffrey Simmons, M.D., points out, "Some scientists think that one beneficial mutation happens per 20,000 mutations. Or reverse this: **19,999 out of 20,000 mutations are useless, dangerous or quickly diluted out. To calculate the mathematical likelihood of man's DNA having so come correctly—by mere chance—multiply 6,000,000,000 by a number just short of infinity.**"

"Nesse and Williams estimate the likelihood of any gene being altered as one in a million per generation—and most often these changes are either lethal or lead to freaks. How could so many efficient and effective changes have taken place so quickly?"<sup>21</sup> (*Bold emphasis added*). Assuming the imagined succession of one species by another could have *ever* occurred—much less in the order generally pictured—**the time required for the process to happen purely by chance would be multiple quadrillions of years, not just a few billion.**

## Chapter Six

### Not A Leg To Stand On

In this chapter, we'll examine three of the main pillars of supposed proof of the Darwinian theory of evolution: comparative anatomy, small-scale change within species (called microevolution), and fossil evidence for Darwin's supposed "tree of life." We will quote scientists whose findings *debunk* the idea that any of these phenomena constitute "proof" of Darwinian macroevolution.

#### Comparative Anatomy

Evolutionists argue that similarities in anatomical structure between one organism and another prove common ancestry. But in reality, there are similarities in certain features between two organisms on diverse sides of the "tree of life;" while kindred species exhibit noticeable differences in those same anatomical features—such as, for example, eye structure.

**"Even the similarities claimed by evolutionists are ambiguous, for they do not share the same developmental pattern. For example, two closely related species of frog, *Rana fusca* and *Rana esculenta*, have eye lenses that are similar but they form very differently in embryological development. Did these two species evolve their eye lenses independently? There are many such similarities that develop differently or arise from different genes, and they seriously challenge the claim that they could have arisen through common descent."** *(Bold emphasis added.)*

"Evolutionists claim that the Linnaean hierarchy [of plant/animal classification] is a crucial test that their theory has passed. But from the placental and marsupials to molecular comparisons, nature is full of *deviations* from that pattern. If the theory predicts the Linnaean hierarchy, then do the many deviations disprove the theory? Not according to evolutionists. Instead, they employ a number of ad hoc explanatory devices, from convergent evolution and non-gradualistic evolutionary change to massive horizontal gene transfer and computational adjustments. But if evolution can explain the many deviations from the Linnaean hierarchy so well, it can hardly claim the general hierarchical pattern of the species as a crucial test."<sup>23</sup>

Let's look at a favorite example cited by evolutionists of changes within a species—Darwin's **Galapagos finches**—and ask whether these changes prove that any net long-term evolutionary development is going on at all among the Galapagos finches.

Though Darwin spent considerable time on the Galapagos Islands, he makes little mention of the finches in his writings. It seems that others have extrapolated conclusions many years later that the variations in beak sizes of the 14 supposed "species" on the archipelago somehow demonstrate evolutionary change governed by "natural selection."

In the 1970s, Peter and Rosemary Grant spent extensive time and detailed research on the Galapagos over a number of years. They noted that **during times of normal rainfall, the average beak size of the more abundant finches was smaller, while during periods of drought the fewer birds had larger beaks.** They concluded that natural selection favored those with larger beaks, because these were needed to crack the harder, less abundant seeds during the drought period. But rather than a continuous trend in the same direction (toward ever-larger beak size), **the average size of the finch beaks returned to where it had been before, once normal rainfall resumed.**

Another surprising find that the Grants made was that on some islands, there were numerous cases of interbreeding between some of the "species." Some of the hybrids produced actually seemed to do better than their predecessors. "So Darwin's finches may not be merging or diverging, but merely oscillating back and forth. Their success in hybridizing, however, raises a question about whether they are separate species at all."<sup>24</sup>

"Thanks to years of careful research by the Grants and their colleagues, we know quite a lot about natural selection and breeding patterns in Darwin's finches. First, selection oscillates with climatic fluctuations and does not exhibit long-term evolutionary change. Second, the superior fitness of hybrids means that several species of Galapagos finches might be in the process of merging rather than diverging."<sup>25</sup>

A television documentary of the Grants' research on the Galapagos details the early findings—which seem to support the evolutionary notion—but **conveniently omits the later conflicting findings** in which the earlier supposed "evolution" was reversed.