

Introduction

Evidence Against Evolution

A. No Naturalistic Processes To Account For The Origin Of Life (i.e. Chemical Evolution)

Stanley Miller's 1953 experiment combining methane, ammonia, hydrogen produced some basic amino acids needed for life.

What problems are there with Stanley Miller's experiment?

1. **There is no proof that earth ever had an atmosphere composed of methane, ammonia and hydrogen.**
2. **Miller made sure there was no oxygen present.**
3. **Miller's experiment produced a mixture of right-handed and left-handed amino acids.**

What other problems is there with chemical evolution?

1. **There is also a major problem with life starting in the ocean.**
2. **We have never observed life coming from non-life.**
3. **How can incredibly complex and compact information code found in DNA come from non-intelligence?**

ILL: Compare DNA to the complex software code that runs Microsoft Windows, etc. It is obvious that there was some intelligence behind it, though Mac users might disagree. ☺ No one would say that computer programs developed by random chance processes.

ILL: No one believes that the presidents' heads on Mt. Rushmore were the products of millions of years of erosion. We can recognize design and the outworking of intelligence.

What is the probability of life evolving from non-life?

The probability of getting one small protein of 100 left-handed amino acids is that of getting 100 heads in a row when flipping a coin. The probability of amino acids forming into an average-size protein (300 left handed amino acids) is $4.9/10^{191}$. The astronomers Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe placed the probability that life would originate from non-life as $1/10^{40,000}$. This number is unimaginably larger than the number of atoms in the known universe (10^{80}). According to the laws of probability if the chance of an event occurring is smaller than $1/10^{50}$, then the event will never occur! ILL: The evolutionist is asking us to believe that a tornado can pass through a junk yard and assemble a jumbo jet.

Questions To Ask Regarding The Origin Of Life

1. How can life come from non-life?
2. How can incredibly complex and compact information like that found in DNA come from non-intelligence?

B. No Evidence For Darwin's Tree of Life (i.e. Biological Evolution)

What are the major problems with Darwin's "tree of life"?

1. **There are no transitional forms in the fossil record.**

Stephen Jay Gould, professor of geology and paleontology at Harvard University, says, "*All paleontologists know that the fossil record contains precious little in the way of intermediate forms; transitions between major groups are characteristically abrupt.*" He goes on to assert, "*The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology.*" Stephen J. Gould, "Evolution's Erratic Pace," *Natural History* 86, no. 5 (May 1977): 14-15.

David Raup of the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago asserts, "*We now have a quarter of a million fossil species but the situation hasn't changed much. The record of evolution is still surprisingly jerky and, ironically, we have fewer examples of evolutionary transition than we had in Darwin's time.*"

2. **We don't see a "tree of life." All we see is something like an orchard with some variation within each kind.**
3. **We don't see any new species being formed.**
4. **Beneficial mutations are not observed.**
5. **Darwin's "tree of life" would require a tendency for things to improve in function and become more orderly without intelligent intervention.**

What would we expect to see in the world if evolution is true?

1. Transitional forms (not observed!)
2. New species (not observed!)
3. Beneficial mutations (not observed!)
4. Tendency for things to improve in condition and become more orderly without intervention (not observed!)

What would you expect to see in the world if Genesis 1 and 6 – 9 is true?

1. Evidence of intelligent design in nature
2. The 2nd Law of Thermodynamics - *tendency for decay and for things to go from order to disorder*
3. Plants and animals reproducing after their kind - *separate and distinct kinds*
4. Extinction of species
5. Ken Ham: "**Billions of dead things buried in rock layers laid down by water all over the earth**" (i.e. evidence of a world-wide flood)
6. Much larger plants and animals (such as dinosaurs) in the fossil record

What is the difference between microevolution and macroevolution?

Microevolution	Macroevolution
Change <i>in</i> kinds	Change <i>of</i> kinds
Change <i>within</i> one kind of bird	Change <i>from</i> reptile to bird
Possible to occur	Impossible to occur (requires major systemic changes)
Many fossils to support	No fossil support
Does occur today	Does not occur today
Can be observed	Cannot be observed
Scientific	Unscientific

ILL: A person can make minor changes in a car gradually without altering its basic type (fenders, color, trim). But, if changes are made in the size of the pistons there has to be simultaneous changes in the cam shaft, block, cooling system, engine compartment and other systems.

Is evolution a proven fact based on good science?

Good science involves that which is observable, measurable and reproducible. Evolution cannot be observed, reproduced or measured. The truth is that theory of evolution is simply just that . . . ***a theory.***

Charles Darwin, in *Origin of Species*, wrote, “If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive slight modifications ***my theory*** would absolutely break down.”

Michael Behe, professor of biochemistry at Lehigh University, writes in his book Darwin’s Black Box, “No one at Harvard University, no one at the National Institutes of Health, no member of the National Academy of Sciences, no Nobel prize winner – no one at all can give a detailed account of how the cilium, or vision, or blood clotting, or any complex biochemical process might have developed in a Darwinian fashion. But we are here. All these things got here somehow: if not in a Darwinian fashion, then how?” Michael J. Behe, “Darwin’s Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge To Evolution (New York; The Free Press, 1996), 187.

What about cavemen?

What about ape-men discoveries?

What happened to the dinosaurs and how do they fit into the Bible?

What about Archaeopteryx? Isn’t this fossil an example of a transitional form?

Evidence Against Evolution From Animals

The Giraffe -

The Bombardier Beetle -

The Gecko -

Birds -

Woodpeckers -

The Hummingbird -

The Chinook Salmon -

The Sea Slug -

Charles Darwin, in *Origin of Species*, wrote, “If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive slight modifications my theory would absolutely break down.”

Job 12:7-10

Psalm 104:24-26

Evidence Against Evolution From The Human Body

Darwin himself wrote, “To suppose the eye with all its inimitable contrivances for adjusting the focus to different distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree.” Charles Darwin, *On the Origin of Species* (New York: Random House, Inc., 1993), 227.

Psalm 139:14

Evidence Against Evolution From Plant Life

Genesis 1:11-12

Why do so many people, including scientists, accept evolution as fact?

1. Many people, including scientists, overestimate the evidence for evolution. They have never really investigated the facts.
2. Some teachers present evolution as fact and the students blindly accept it. Many scientists have been taught to accept and believe the theory of evolution as fact, so they pass it on to their students.
3. Many professors would lose their jobs if they stopped teaching evolution and began teaching intelligent design. Ben Stein’s movie, *Intelligence Expelled*, reveals what is going on in the world of academia and the media.
4. Some people believe evolution is fact because they have absorbed it by “osmosis” (i.e. it is everywhere, in books, magazines, movies, TV programs, museums, etc.)

Actually, many scientists today are rejecting evolution. Over 600 scientists with PhDs from around the world have signed a document entitled “*A Scientific Dissent From Darwinism.*”

CONCLUSION

It takes more faith to believe in evolution than in a supremely powerful and intelligent designer.

Romans 1:20-23

ADDENDUM

Bob South's Comments On Life From Accidental Chemical Reactions

(Bob South has a PhD in chemistry and is a member of HCCC)

It is so improbable that it is mind boggling! Consider for a moment amino acids. There are a total of 20 common amino acids and all of them are L (*for levorotatory*). Only one of them does not occur in two possibilities D and L. That is Glycine. Two Chiral amino acids, like Alanine and Tryptophan, if produced by accident would occur as 50/50 mixtures of D and L amino acids. If there are two amino acids, both D and L, there are 4 possible combinations. If they were to combine (*not a spontaneous reaction*), all four possible combinations would be formed. If you get 100% yield on your reactions (*never happens, but can get close*) you would only have a 25% of the one desired combination. The number of combinations, assuming all the amino acids are present in equal amounts and have equivalent reactivity, would be 20 (*the number of available amino acids*) raised to the power of the number of amino acids in the protein chain. So, the number of available combinations for proteins of length 4 would be 20 to the 4th power, or 16,000 different possible proteins with only 4 amino acids in the chain. All possible combinations can form and that is only considering L amino acids. If you consider there would be equal amounts of D and L amino acids it would be 39 to the 4th power or 2,313,000 possible combinations. Only 1 of those 2 million length 4 proteins would be the one that you wanted or needed. Now consider a protein may have hundreds of amino acids and they are all L. Most calculators cannot even calculate numbers that big. In reality you would have a total of 39 amino acids, including all the D and L amino acids, so the true calculation would be 39 raised to the power of the protein length.

The cell is incredibly complex. Enzymes and enzyme complexes create all the chemicals within the cell. Some times we get them from what we eat (*i.e. another organism's enzymes had to make it*) or we make it ourselves. Enzymes are very complex proteins and they are made out of amino acids. There may be hundreds of them in a single enzyme (*imagine the number of combinations*). It is difficult to make complex proteins even when we try. DNA and RNA are made with enzymes. DNA codes proteins through transfer and messenger RNA. You can have both materials and mix them with amino acids, but nothing will happen (*i.e. no protein will be made*). It requires enzymes. The synthesis occurs in the cell ribosome, which is a complex organelle within the cell. These reactions just don't occur by mixing them in water. You need amino proteins, enzymes, DNA, and RNA and other things all working in combination to form a simple protein. None of them works by themselves to produce proteins. You must have a cell or at least a ribosome to manufacture cell materials, yet the cell is made of these materials. Thus, the chemicals would have to already be available and magically self assemble to form a perfect cell in order for cell processes to commence, but you must have a cell in the first place to make the chemicals. It is a circle that does not join to itself.

It is like having all the pieces of a car: a transmission, wheels, axles, engines, fuel, ignition system and so on. Remove any one of these systems and the car does not move. It is not a chicken and an egg scenario. You must have a chicken, a rooster and resulting egg to get more chickens. It doesn't matter which comes first because they must all be present to function.

You have the same combination issues with regard to nucleic acids and sugars as well.

I don't care what time scale you set, billions of years, trillions of years or trillions of trillions of years. There is not enough time for this to happen by accident. It is the biggest needle in a haystack ever.

Time is not the miracle as evolutionist say. Time is limited and finite in this universe and it is too little and too short for this to happen on its own. 16 billion years is not a second in the time it would take for this to happen. No matter how long the time frame it would never happen.

God is good and too amazing to comprehend. Eternity will not be long enough to understand the mind of God. I glory in the fact that the love and mercy of God is enough. If we had to understand Him it would be impossible to us.