

Lesson 4: God Is—Evidence against Darwin

I. What is the Theory of Evolution?

- A) It says that all life has a common origin and that enough time has passed for natural evolutionary change (that is, innumerable small changes over a large period of time) to explain the staggering array of different life forms on the earth. This is, by definition, macroevolution because we're considering changes that lead to separate species, not just variation within a species.
1. "According to neo-Darwinian theory, the process that accounts for the evolution of all life is that of random mutations shaped by natural selection. The theory says that evolution is built up by a long series of many steps. In each step many random changes occur in the hereditary storage of organisms. If one of these random changes should by chance happen to make the organism better adapted to its environment, then natural selection will spread that change through the population. Each of these changes is said to be small, but the accumulation of a long series of them is said to account for large changes in populations adapting them to their environment. This process is assumed to work, and on the basis of that assumption evolution is said to account for the development of all life. Experiments have also been performed to show that the process of selection does indeed work under the right conditions. Moreover, random mutations have been observed that do improve the adaptiveness of the organism under certain conditions. From these observations, evolutionists have extrapolated to say that random mutations and natural selection can account for the development of life."
- B) The theory maintains two tenets as its foundation. First, there must have been just exactly the right conditions for the spontaneous generation of life from ordinary, nonliving matter. Evolutionary biologists will try to impress us by using the term abiogenesis, but we call it spontaneous generation. The second tenet is that there had to be a transition from simple organisms to complex organisms. Again, they'll expert you to death and call it transmutation, but what it really means is that two things occur to every living organism. First, natural selection essentially makes the creme rise to the top. Cavemen and cavewomen with lots and lots of body hair were better equipped to survive harsh winters, thus they remained around long enough to reproduce. Evolutionary biologists would say, then, that those cave children would likely exhibit similar characteristics as the parents, thus the cycle would continue. Second, random changes to the DNA in life forms occasionally occur. In other words, you might wind up with a yellow rose on a red rose bush because that flower's DNA underwent a random mutation that altered what color it exhibited.
- C) Of course, we've already let other scientists show what spontaneous generation is—it's a fanatsy that goes against ALL natural law. But, there are some theories that attempt to explain it. Most of them either involve alien life forms or they involve a "primordial soup" a very, very long time ago that contained all the right conditions for that to occur. In other words, both time and chance appear to favor Darwinism. But, do they? Let's let two committed Darwinists, and who are world-renowned experts in the field, speak for themselves:
1. Harold Klein, once the chairman of the National Academy of Sciences, said this after reviewing origin of life research: "The simplest bacterium is so complicated from the point of view of the chemist that it is almost impossible to imagine how it happened."
 2. Francis Crick, the scientist who discovered the double-helix form of DNA said "The origin of life appears to be almost a miracle, so many are the conditions which would have had to be satisfied to get it going."

3. Now, let's examine some of the chemistry experiments that, on the surface, appear to make the primordial soup theory at least plausible.
- a) Stanley Miller, after giving some thought to the fact that hydrogen is the most abundant element in the universe, and also considering that oxygen, nitrogen and carbon are relatively abundant on earth now, tried to come up with chemicals that were likely abundant on the ancient, lifeless earth. When hydrogen reacts with those other three elements, it forms methane, ammonia, and water. So, Miller then decided to see what chemicals—specifically, what precursor materials for lifeforms—could be produced in a simulated atmosphere using methane, ammonia, water vapor and hydrogen. This simulated atmosphere would be unreactive, so he knew that, in order to start pumping out interesting chemicals, he would have to supply some energy into the system. So, what energy source would have been available on an ancient earth? How about lightning? That's what Miller thought, too, so he put together a lightning simulation apparatus and began pumping energy into the gaseous mix. After a week of doing this, the pool of water had become reddish brown and, after a chemical analysis, Miller announced that the mixture contained several types of amino acids, which are proteins used by nearly every lifeform. It appeared as though electricity passing through inanimate matter could perhaps produce life.
 - b) Other experimenters rushed to build on Miller's work, where they altered the makeup of the simulated atmosphere, used UV radiation or strong pressure pulses instead of electricity, and more sophisticated chemical analyses were developed that could detect other proteins in the soup that were previously undetectable. This sustained effort by a number of researchers eventually paid off—almost all of the twenty naturally occurring amino acids were produced in such a manner.
 - c) Other successes occurred, too, in generating substances like adenine, which is a component of one of the building blocks of nucleic acid and the sugar ribose, which forms part of RNA.
 - d) So, why would a researcher, Klaus Does, conclude the following, in light of this research? “More than 30 years of experimentation on the origin of life in the fields of chemical and molecular evolution have led to a better perception of the immensity of the problem of the origin of life on Earth, rather than to its solution. At present, all discussions on principal theories and experiments in the field either end in stalemate or in a confession of ignorance.”
 - e) It's primarily because these chemical experiments gloss over a plethora of problems that can only be appreciated when you consider how these building blocks that are admittedly benign generated in a lab really form a life.
 - f) Making the molecules of life is rather easy—any competent chemist can buy some chemicals, weigh them in the right proportion, dissolve them in a solvent, heat them in a flask and purify the desired chemical away from unwanted chemicals generated from side reactions. Not only can amino acids and nucleotides—the building blocks—be made, but so can the buildings themselves: proteins and nucleic acids. This process has been automated and machines that mix and react chemicals to produce them can be had commercially. A careful undergraduate can produce a long piece of DNA in a day or two.
 - g) But, there were no chemists four billion years ago. No chemical supply houses, distillation flasks, nor any of the other modern devices chemists must use to produce adequate results. A convincing origin of life scenario requires that no intelligent direction be used in the construction of those buildings. Thus far, no such scenario

has been put forth.

- D) In other words, time and chance do not, in reality, solve the dilemma posed by trying to get around natural law. A simple thought experiment can help us get our minds around this. Suppose you have ten poker chips, on which the numbers 1 through 10 are written. Put those chips in a bag and draw them out one at a time. The probability of drawing those ten chips out in the correct numerical sequence 1-2-3, etc., is about 1 in 10 billion. The probability that just the right conditions to occur for abiogenesis is hundreds of orders of magnitude smaller than that. That is, for all practical purposes, it is impossible for it to occur. Atheists will argue that the probability is yes, very small, but not zero. Given enough time, almost anything can happen. How I counter this is to assert that, if it is reasonable to believe the Darwinist view of the origin of life with a mathematical probability that is infinitesimal, then it must also be reasonable that all three of the largest pyramids in Egypt were constructed, one sand particle at a time, by nothing but the wind and the rain (in a desert!).
- E) Transmutation is the other keystone to this puzzle—that is, there is a transition in life from the simple to the complex. This transition is most easily recognized by the words “survival of the fittest.” The fittest members of a species survive and have offspring (natural selection) and some member of species are often much better adapted through a chance happening in their DNA. Some portion of this fittest member's genes have mutated.
- F) Natural selection has been shown time and again that it does work, at least within a species. The Finches that bear Darwin's name and that acted as triggers to spark the thought of evolution in his mind are but one example. These finches live all over the Galapagos Islands, living off the food that is available to them. Some live in trees, some live on the ground, others in and around cactii—and they all vary in size to some extent. The interesting thing is that the beaks of these finches change drastically, depending upon where they primarily live and what their diet consists of. The some 13 different species are difficult to tell apart, as cross breeding does occur and the fact that size and coloration of birds that are this closely related is not very granular. A large-sized medium ground finch will be hard to distinguish from a small-sized large ground finch, for example. The assertion is that all 13 species have a common ancestor and that natural selection has caused the differentiation. This is, by definition, microevolution, and it is something we can witness today. I don't have a problem with natural selection within a species.
- G) The kink in the microevolution chain—at least with how it relates to macroevolution—is that I do not believe that all variations within a species (finches, for example) are a result of mutations—that is, random alterations of genetic material. To say that ignores the biological realities of chromosomal dominance and recession. You may recall from your biology class when you studied genetic reproduction and inheritance that, because each parent of an offspring donates some genetic material to the offspring, combinations of both parents' traits often show up. For example, people have remarked that Jason looks a lot like me, but Ryan looks a lot like Deborah. That is a result of genetic dominance—in Jason's case, the genes that control how he looks are dominated by my genes, and Ryan's genes are dominated by Deborah's genes.
- H) So, then let's examine mutation itself—what is mutation:
1. “In the process of [copying] DNA...the two halves of DNA separate and new halves are made. Because [the two halves must match in specific ways] the...information [from the offspring's parents] is copied exactly. Despite this, *rarely*, a mistake occurs...This changes the sequence of amino acids in a protein. This is mutation, the raw material of evolution.”
- I) What happens when a mutation occurs?

1. “The consequences of mutation are varied. Due to the redundancy built into genetic code many mutations have no effect upon DNA functions. Genes describe how to make proteins. As a result of mutation a protein may not be produced, may be produced but act abnormally, or remain fully functional. Only a few mutations improve the organism's performance and are therefore favored by natural selection.”
 2. “It is nature's intention that the exact genetic information from both parents will be seen in the offspring's DNA in the critical stages of fertilisation. However, it is possible for this genetic information to mutate, which in most cases, can result in fatal or negative consequences in the outcome of the new organism.”
 3. Tay-Sachs disease, a fatal genetic disorder usually in infants that is a progressive destruction of the central nervous system, is an example of an offspring inheriting two mutated genes—one from each parent. There are literally hundreds of genetic diseases, many of which preclude, one way or the other, reproduction. How could mutation, in general, be beneficial for microevolution, much less macroevolution?
- J) These facts highlight the subtlety that is absolutely crucial for Darwin's theory to hold true. Namely, for macroevolution to work, the random mutations must not only make the lifeform better adapted to its environment—that is, some trait of that lifeform must both function and function better than other examples in the population. This is a primary key to understanding the Intelligent Design theory.