

6

EVOLUTION, PART ONE

The ten lines of evidence presented in chapters three and four are easily sufficient to prove, even apart from the Bible, that God exists, and that the spirit world is real, and that supernatural events do occur – unless evidence can be produced by the other side to undermine or disprove the affirmative evidence. In chapter five, we considered five lines of evidence that have been used by the other side, and demonstrated that none of them disproves the existence of God, or spiritual things, or supernatural events. None of the evidence in chapter five in any way undermines the evidence in chapters three and four.

In chapters six and seven, we continue with the

examination of the evidence for the other side. These two chapters deal with the most important doctrine of humanism – the theory of evolution. There are just two ways to explain the existence of the universe – creation or evolution. If the universe were created, then a supernatural Creator is necessary, and thus, there can be no doubt that God does exist, that He dwells in the spirit world, and that He can do supernatural things.

Furthermore, if God is the Creator, then He owns everything in the universe, including human beings; He has the right to demand our obedience; and He can punish us for our disobedience. Thus the whole secular humanistic faith depends upon evolution. It is the only way to escape from God. This explains why unbelieving scientists cling so desperately to evolution, despite the growing mountain of evidence against it, and it explains why secular humanists fight so vigorously to suppress any mention of creation science in our public schools, or in any of our public discourse.

*BOTH CREATION AND EVOLUTION
ARE MATTERS OF FAITH*

The claim is often made that evolution is a proven scientific fact. That claim is not true. Scientific fact or law is established by observation or by re-enactment and by repeated testing. No human was present to observe either creation or evolution, and no human can re-enact either creation or evolution. Thus, neither creation nor evolution can ever be established as a scientific law. Both must remain matters of faith.

Reference is made in Chapter 2 to a recent book entitled *Darwin on Trial* by Phillip Johnson. Professor Johnson is a graduate of Harvard and the University of Chicago and served as a law clerk for Chief Justice Earl Warren of the United States Supreme Court. He has taught law for over 20 years at the University of California at Berkeley. His excellent book testifies to his expertness in matters of logic and evidence. His educational and professional background makes any bias in favor of conservatism very unlikely. In fact, he describes himself as a philosophical theist and a Christian who believes that God could have created out of nothing or could have used some evolutionary process.

He took up the study of Darwinism because he saw that the books defending the theory were dogmatic and unconvincing. His carefully reasoned conclusion is that Darwinism has become a stubbornly uncompromising and emotionally defended religious faith. The following quotation is from page 9:

Another factor that makes evolutionary science seem a lot like religion is the evident zeal of Darwinists to evangelize the world, by insisting that even non-scientists accept the truth of their theory as a matter of moral obligation. Richard Dawkins, an Oxford zoologist who is one of the most influential figures in evolutionary science, is unabashedly explicit about the religious side of Darwinism. His 1986 book *The Blind Watchmaker* is at one level about biology, but at a more fundamental level it is a sustained argument for atheism. According to Dawkins, "Darwin made it possible to be an intellectually fulfilled atheist."

When he contemplates the perfidy of those who refuse to believe, Dawkins can scarcely restrain his fury. "It is absolutely safe to say that, if you meet somebody who claims not to believe in evolution, that

person is ignorant, stupid or insane (or wicked, but I'd rather not consider that)." Dawkins went on to explain, by the way, that what he dislikes particularly about creationists is that they are intolerant.

The fact that creation and evolution are both matters of faith rather than scientific law, does not mean they are not subject to scientific investigation or that we are unable to arrive at any sound conclusions concerning them. We can still look at the evidence to see which is a reasonable faith, and which is unreasonable. We can look at the results, at what we can see and learn about the universe today, and determine which theory most reasonably and accurately explains those results. Chapters six and seven are a study of the results — the evidence that has been found and the scientific facts that have been proven — to see which way the evidence points — toward evolution or toward creation.

The trial of a case in a court of law sometimes involves evidence of a scientific or technical nature. In such cases, expert witnesses are called to assist the jury in understanding the evidence. In evaluating the testimony of an expert witness it is very important to know his qualifications and to know if he is subject to any bias or prejudice. Following is a list of the experts who will be quoted in chapters six and seven, along with their qualifications and grounds for possible bias.

SIR ALISTER HARDY was born in England, graduated from Oxford University, and after teaching at the University of Hull and the University of Aberdeen, he became head of the Department of Zoology at Oxford University. He was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1940 and was knighted in 1957. His book quoted here is *The Living Stream*, Harper and Row,

1965. He was an evolutionist but was troubled by problems which he felt evolution could not explain by natural laws alone. He remained an evolutionist but concluded that evolution must be guided by some unknown spiritual force.

SIR FRED HOYLE is also an Englishman, a professor at Cambridge University. He founded the Cambridge Institute of Theoretical Astronomy in 1967. He was made a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1957 and was elected as associate member of the American National Academy of Sciences in 1969 – the highest U. S. honor for non-American scientists. He was knighted in 1972, and in 1974 was awarded a Royal Medal by the Queen in recognition of his contribution to theoretical physics and cosmology. His book quoted here is *The Intelligent Universe*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1983. He is an evolutionist but believes that Darwinism and its modern modifications are plainly wrong. He argues that life is far too complex to have risen by random processes, but that evolution was directed by some intelligence in outer space that sent the components of life to earth on cosmic particles.

MICHAEL DENTON is an Australian medical doctor and molecular biologist. He is currently doing biological research in Sidney. His book quoted here is *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, Adler & Adler, 1986. He is an evolutionist but believes that Darwinism and its modern modifications are on extremely shaky ground. He points out many serious problems with evolution including the fact that modern molecular biology has cast serious doubt on the theory. He is unwilling to accept creation, and instead, seems to be waiting for some other explanation of origins.

HENRY M. MORRIS received his B.S. from Rice Uni-

versity and his M.S. and Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota with a major in hydraulics and hydrology and minors in geology and mathematics. He spent 28 years on the faculties of 5 universities, 18 of those years as chairman of academic departments. He was formerly an evolutionist but switched to creationism and is presently President of the Institute for Creation Research. His book quoted here is *What Is Creation Science?* Master Books, 1987, which he wrote together with Dr. Gary E. Parker.

GARY E. PARKER earned his doctorate in biology, with a cognate in geology (paleontology). He is the author of four programmed textbooks in biology and was elected to the American Society of Zoologists. He taught biology at the college level for 10 years, first as an evolutionist. After switching to creationism, he became Chairman of the Biology Department at Christian Heritage College.

From the foregoing, it should be clear that the experts to be quoted are extremely well qualified and are more likely to be biased in favor of evolution than creation. The books described above may be referred to merely by the author's last name and the page numbers.

THE FIRST LAW OF THERMODYNAMICS

Morris and Parker at page 201:

The First Law of Thermodynamics (also known as the Law of Conservation of Energy – which in our nuclear age, is known also to include Mass or Matter) states that there can be no creation or annihilation of Mass/Energy. One form of Energy can be converted

into another, one state of Matter can be converted into another, and there can even be Matter/Energy inter-conversions, but the totality of Mass/Energy in the universe remains constant. The Two Laws of Thermodynamics are the most universal and best-proved laws which science has . . .

Evolution requires a natural process for bringing matter into existence. This implies a natural process for taking matter out of existence. Yet by every observation that scientists have ever made and by every experiment that scientists have ever conducted, it has been proven that no such natural process exists. Never, in all the history of science, has even one tiny atom been created nor has even one tiny atom been annihilated.

Creation requires a supernatural process for bringing matter into existence. This implies that only a supernatural process can take matter out of existence. In the meantime, until the Creator is ready to take matter out of existence, it will all stay here. And that is precisely what the First Law of Thermodynamics, one of the two best proved laws of science, tells us. Men can change matter/energy around; we can turn coal into heat energy, and heat energy into electric energy, and electric energy into light energy, but we cannot create or destroy any of it.

Surely this is a humbling thought even to evolutionists. With all our modern technology, we still can't even destroy one tiny particle of matter, let alone create one. The barrier between existence and non-existence remains impenetrable. In fact we can't even imagine what is on the other side of that barrier. What is non-existence? Where is matter when it doesn't exist? Obviously, we are not dealing with natural

processes, but with the supernatural.

Thus, while we cannot observe or re-enact either creation or evolution, and thus cannot establish either as a proven law of science, we can compare them to the First Law of Thermodynamics, which is a proven law. It is clear that creation is in perfect harmony with the First Law, and that evolution is in direct conflict with it. Since the First Law of Thermodynamics is one of the two best proved laws of science, this is powerful evidence in favor of creation.

THE SECOND LAW OF THERMODYNAMICS

Morris and Parker at page 201:

Eddington also originated the term "Time's Arrow" to describe the Second Law, noting that the arrow points downward. If present processes continue to function into the indefinite future, eventually all energy will become useless, uniform, heat energy; all structures will have disintegrated into maximum disorder, their state of maximum probability; and all information will have become meaningless noise. The sun and stars will burn out, all processes will stop, and the universe will die an ultimate "heat death." It will still exist (by the First Law), but will be dead (by the Second Law).

Evolution claims to be a universal process of improvement, a universal organizing process, a natural process that has taken the universe from cosmic dust, or hydrogen gas, to its present complexity. Yet by every observation that scientists have ever made and by every experiment scientists have ever conducted, it has been proven that the universe is going in the opposite direction.

Creation claims that the supernatural Creator brought the universe into existence and organized it according to His own design. Energy was put where it would be used for accomplishing the Creator's purpose. And by every observation that scientists have ever made and by every experiment scientists have ever conducted, it has been proven that this is happening. Energy is being used and is becoming unavailable. The universe is not winding itself up, it is running down. Time's arrow points downward.

Again, we can compare the two faiths, creation and evolution, to a proven law of science to see which is a reasonable faith and which is unreasonable. Creation tells us that the universe moves from a highly organized state toward a state of disorganization. This agrees with the Second Law. Evolution claims the universe moves from a state of disorganization toward a highly organized state. This disagrees with the Second Law. The Second Law of Thermodynamics is more powerful evidence in favor of creation.

THE LAW OF BIOGENESIS

Louis Pasteur conducted experiments that proved that living organisms come only from other living organisms, and not from non-living matter. Countless observations and experiments have proven this to be true. Yet evolution requires spontaneous generation of life from non-living matter, that is, some natural process that can produce life from chemicals. If there is no spontaneous generation, then in order to get the first life into existence, supernatural creation is required. Again, evolution is in direct conflict with an

established law of science.

But evolutionists claim that billions of years ago, under different conditions, spontaneous generation of life did occur. They claim that over millions of years by chemical processes, there was a build-up of the basic organic compounds necessary for life; that these were gathered in ancient seas, forming a "pre-biotic soup"; and after more millions of years combinations were formed that were able to reproduce themselves, thus becoming the first living organisms. There is no evidence that this actually happened. It is simply something that evolutionists like to think might have happened. There are, however, three good lines of evidence that show it did not happen.

1. There is no trace of "prebiotic soup" in the sedimentary rocks. Quoting from Denton, pages 260-261:

The existence of a prebiotic soup is crucial to the whole scheme. Without an abiotic accumulation of the building blocks of the cell no life could ever evolve. If the traditional story is true, therefore, there must have existed for many millions of years a rich mixture of organic compounds in the ancient oceans and some of this material would very likely have been trapped in the sedimentary rocks lain down in the seas of those remote times.

Yet rocks of great antiquity have been examined over the past two decades and in none of them has any trace of abiotically produced organic compounds been found. . . . As on so many occasions, paleontology has again failed to substantiate evolutionary presumptions. Considering the way the prebiotic soup is referred to in so many discussions of the origin of life as an already established reality, it comes as something of a shock to realize that there is absolutely no positive evidence for its existence.

2. The "prebiotic soup" could not have formed if

there were oxygen in the atmosphere, nor could it have formed if there were no oxygen in the atmosphere. Denton, pages 261-262:

In the presence of oxygen any organic compounds formed on the early earth would be rapidly oxidized and degraded. For this reason many authorities have advocated an oxygen-free atmosphere for hundred of millions of years following the formation of the Earth's crust. Only such an atmosphere would protect the vital but delicate organic compounds and allow them to accumulate to form the prebiotic soup. . . . But even if there was no oxygen, there are further difficulties. Without oxygen there would be no ozone layer in the upper atmosphere which today protects the Earth's surface from a lethal dose of ultraviolet radiation. . . . What we have then is a sort of "Catch 22" situation. If we have oxygen we have no organic compounds, but if we don't have oxygen we have none either.

3. The amazing complexity of life precludes spontaneous generation. Denton, pages 328-329:

To grasp the reality of life as it has been revealed by molecular biology, we must magnify a cell a thousand million times until it is twenty kilometres in diameter and resembles a giant airship large enough to cover a great city like London or New York. What we would see would be an object of unparalleled complexity and adaptive design. On the surface of the cell we would see millions of openings, like port holes of a vast space ship, opening and closing to allow a continual stream of materials to flow in and out. If we were to enter one of these openings we would find ourselves in a world of supreme technology and bewildering complexity. We would see endless highly organized corridors and conduits branching in every direction away from the perimeter of the cell, some leading to the central memory bank in the nucleus and others to

assembly plants and processing units. The nucleus itself would be a vast spherical chamber more than a kilometre in diameter, resembling a geodesic dome inside of which we would see, all neatly stacked together in ordered arrays, the miles of coiled chains of the DNA molecules. A huge range of products and raw materials would shuttle along all the manifold conduits in a highly ordered fashion to and from all the various assembly plants in the outer regions of the cell.

We would wonder at the level of control implicit in the movement of so many objects down so many seemingly endless conduits, all in perfect unison. . . . What we would be witnessing would be an object resembling an immense automated factory, a factory larger than a city and carrying out almost as many unique functions as all the manufacturing activities of man on earth. However, it would be a factory which would have one capacity not equalled in any of our own most advanced machines, for it would be capable of replicating its entire structure within a matter of a few hours. To witness such an act at a magnification of one thousand million times would be an awe-inspiring spectacle.

Viewed through the microscopes available in Darwin's time, the cell appeared to be a rather disordered blob. But, as can be seen from Dr. Denton's description, we now know that the single cell is an object of incredible complexity. What is equally incredible is that modern scientists can still insist that life was accidentally produced by spontaneous generation.

Dr. Robert Gange, whose expertness is in physics and mathematics, in *Origins and Destiny*, Word Publishing, 1986, after describing the incredible complexity of a living cell and showing the mathematical

impossibility of its formation by accidental means, stated the following at page 77:

The groundless belief that life spontaneously arose from nonliving physical matter was rationally defended for centuries because no one had any information to the contrary. Now that is over, and we know better. Today, we can see inside living cells and study the resplendent majesty of a structure so awesome that it reeks of divine fingerprints. It's one thing to defend wrong beliefs out of ignorance, but it's quite another to perpetuate the folly when the light of day shows a more truthful way.

Sir Fred Hoyle's comment on this is worth repeating. Hoyle, page 23:

In short there is not a shred of objective evidence to support the hypothesis that life began in an organic soup here on the Earth. Indeed, Francis Crick, who shared a Nobel prize for the discovery of the structure of DNA, is one biophysicist who finds this theory unconvincing. So why do biologists indulge in unsubstantiated fantasies in order to deny what is so patently obvious, that the 200,000 amino acid chains, and hence life, did not appear by chance?

The Law of Biogenesis tells us that life comes only from prior life. Creation agrees. The first life on Earth was created by a living God who enabled it to be fruitful and multiply and fill the Earth. Evolution, in direct conflict with the Law of Biogenesis, claims that life was formed accidentally. As Sir Fred Hoyle says, it is obvious that life did not appear by chance, and to think otherwise is to "indulge in unsubstantiated fantasies." Clearly the Law of Biogenesis is strong evidence in favor of creation.

Study Questions

1. Why is evolution important to the faith of secular humanism?
2. Explain why neither evolution nor creation can be established as a scientific law.
3. What should we know about experts upon whom we rely for scientific information?
4. Explain the First Law of Thermodynamics.
5. How does the First Law relate to evolution and to creation?
6. Explain the Second Law of Thermodynamics.
7. How does the Second Law relate to evolution and to creation?
8. What is the “prebiotic soup” theory and why have evolutionists developed this theory?
9. Why is the presence or absence of oxygen in the atmosphere a problem for the prebiotic soup theory?
10. Describe the complexity of a single cell and explain why this precludes spontaneous generation of life.