

# How True Science Slaughters Darwin's Sacred Cow—*Evolution*



*by*  
*Duncan MacLeod*

1 Tim 6:20 "... guard the doctrine which has been entrusted to you, avoiding profane, empty babblings, and contradictions of false knowledge that is called science."

All Scriptures quoted are from *The Holy Bible In Its Original Order—A Faithful Version* unless otherwise noted.

© 2019, 2024  
York Publishing Company  
Post Office Box 1038  
Hollister, CA 95024-1038

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

*All rights reserved. Except for brief excerpts for review purposes, no part of this publication may be reproduced or used in any form or by any means without the written permission of the copyright owner. This includes electronic and mechanical photocopying or recording, as well as the use of information storage and retrieval systems.*

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<i>i</i>
<b>Chapter 1</b> The Nature of Darwin’s “Sacred Cow”: Evolution Summarized .....	1
<b>Chapter 2</b> Academic Freedom—or Sacred Dogma? .....	4
<b>Chapter 3</b> Did Life Spontaneously Arise From Inanimate Matter? .....	7
<b>Chapter 4</b> Does Subtraction Yield a Larger, or a Smaller, Number? .....	11
<b>Chapter 5</b> Has Any Species Ever “Evolved Into” Another Species? .....	17
<b>Chapter 6</b> Did Matter Organize <i>Itself</i> Into Biological Information Without Any Origin? .....	21
<b>Chapter 7</b> Is Man Merely a Hairless Ape? .....	28
<b>Chapter 8</b> Providing The Needed Excuse for Athiesm .....	32
<b>Conclusion</b> Where To From Here? .....	35



# Introduction

For centuries in the Western culture of “Christendom,” most of the population—educated or uneducated—took for granted the truth of the biblical teaching that God had created the earth and all life on it. No doubt there were skeptical individuals; but on the whole, most people at least professed a belief in creation by God. However, in 1859, a new book appeared on bookstore and library shelves that began a “sea of change” in the worldview of Western civilization. That book, authored by a British naturalist named Charles Darwin, was entitled *On the Origin of Species*. Published originally in English, it was soon translated into nearly every European language and was read by thousands of college and high school students across Europe and America—or at least taught to them.

It is impossible to overstate the deep and transforming impact of both Darwin’s book itself and of the popularization of his “theory of evolution” by science writers in magazine articles and books of their own. Indeed, whole volumes have been written on the impact of Darwinism alone. Darwin’s theory has affected countless other fields of inquiry besides biology and cosmology. “Darwin’s idea has been used to explain finch beaks and horse hoofs, moth coloration and insect slaves, and the distribution of life around the globe and through the ages. The theory has even been stretched by some scientists to interpret human behavior: why desperate people commit suicide, why teenagers have babies out of wedlock, why some groups do better on intelligence tests than other groups, and why religious missionaries forgo marriage and children. There is nothing—no organ or idea, no sense or thought—that has not been the subject of evolutionary rumination.”<sup>1</sup>

In academic circles, it is now decidedly unfashionable (if not downright dangerous) to attempt to dispute even a portion of Darwin’s theory of evolution—much less to question the entire theory. The result is that most colleges and schools teach evolution as if it were “scientifically proven fact.” But in reality, it is *nothing of the sort!*

---

<sup>1</sup>Michael Behe, *Darwin’s Black Box*, p. 4

## Introduction

In academia, the world of the supposedly educated and enlightened, Darwin's theory of evolution has become like the sacred cow in India—not to be disturbed or molested in any way. Woe be unto any university professor who dares question evolution—however solidly based *in objective science* his reasons may be for such questioning.

At the same time, some religious organizations and professing Christians oppose evolution—but only because it disagrees with their established *religious dogma*. Still other church organizations actually *accept* evolution as if it were fact. Some even try to reconcile the idea of evolution with divine creation, believing that perhaps God “used evolution” as His vehicle for developing the diverse array of life forms on earth.

But is Darwin's theory of evolution actually the “proven scientific fact” we're pressured to believe it is? Are you sure? There are a growing number of *scientifically trained* scholars who, in the course of their own empirical research, have found good reasons to question whether Darwin's theory of evolution is actually “proven scientific fact”—or only mistakenly accepted dogma.

“Over the past 130 years, Darwinism, although securely entrenched, has met a steady stream of dissent both from within the scientific community and from without it.”<sup>2</sup>

According to Dr. Geoffrey Simmons, “Evolution, much like a religion, requires a lot of faith. There are no conclusive facts that reliably support Darwin's theories—yet there are millions of facts that challenge them. Maybe billions.”<sup>3</sup>

“*Modern scientific studies have not made evolution more believable; they have made it less believable.* There are exponentially more questions nowadays than answers. Scientific inroads into biochemistry, microbiology, immunology, ecology, parasitology, genetics, microscopy, and quantum mechanics (to name a few) have left the path of evolution littered with mud puddles, potholes, loose gravel, quicksand, dangerous critters, and dead ends.”<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Behe, p. 26

<sup>3</sup> Geoffrey Simmons, *What Darwin Didn't Know*, p. 309

<sup>4</sup> Geoffrey Simmons, *Billions of Missing Links*, p. 24; emphasis by author

## Introduction

Tom Bethel asserts, “It’s also time to point out that Darwinian evolution never did have much in the way of evidence to support it. Today, following Julian Huxley’s lead, it is often embraced more for the support it gives to atheistic philosophy than for its science. The scientific evidence for evolution is not only weaker than is generally supposed, but as new discoveries have been made since 1959, the reasons for accepting the theory have diminished rather than increased.”<sup>5</sup>

Dr. Carl Wieland adds, “Those who have been used to seeing the commonly repeated criticisms of creation may be surprised to see just how seriously deficient the case for evolution is overall. In fact, many of the assumptions underlying evolutionism within the various subject areas fly in the face of known scientific laws and principles in physics, chemistry, and probability.”<sup>6</sup>

“In any case, modern scientists, despite public statements supporting newer Darwinian theories, are steadily disproving the theory of evolution. As they delve deeper into the chemical and biological sciences, the more complex and perplexing it is becoming. Ask any medical researcher how DNA, or more specifically our genes, came about, and you will more than likely get a shrug.”<sup>7</sup>

“The scientific arguments against the theory of evolution are steadily mounting and, contrary to common perception, they do not conflict with survival of the fittest or natural selection among or within species. There are too many missing links, discovery disconnects, anatomical and functional complexities, unexplained genetic changes, and too overwhelming a number of inexplicable and improbable coincidences for evolution to be placed among proven scientific theories.”<sup>8</sup>

As educator Randall Hedtke points out, “Darwin lacked the one attribute required of great scientists—total objectivity. In his autobiography, Darwin described the *Origin* as one long argument from the beginning to the end; consequently, it was a foregone conclusion that he would not be objective. The game was to

---

<sup>5</sup> Tom Bethel, *Darwin’s House of Cards*, p. 43

<sup>6</sup> Carl Wieland, “Foreword” to Robert Carter, ed., *Evolution’s Achilles Heels*, p. 13

<sup>7</sup> Simmons, *Billions of Missing Links*, p. 20

<sup>8</sup> Simmons, pp. 272, 273

## *Introduction*

disguise his lack of objectivity in what was really a persuasive argument. He succeeded in persuading large numbers of people who were perhaps already predisposed to accept evolution.”<sup>9</sup>

“It is often claimed that people in the nineteenth century were converted to Darwin’s theory because he provided so much evidence for it, but this is not true.... And despite the title of his most famous book, he failed to explain the origin of species. People were converted to Darwin’s theory mainly because it fit the increasingly materialistic tenor of the times.”<sup>10</sup>

Adolf Hitler, the infamous dictator of Nazi Germany, is noted for having said, “If you tell the public a lie often enough, eventually they will believe it.” Probably no lie has been repeated more often than Darwinian evolution; consequently, millions of “enlightened” people believe it. Are you one of them?

In this volume, we will quote from multiple scientists whose work in such fields as astronomy, physics, chemistry, and of course biology, brings the theory of evolution into serious question. Taken together, this body of material actually *slaughters* Darwin’s sacred cow—the theory of evolution.

---

<sup>9</sup> Randall Hedtke, *Secrets of the Sixth Edition*, pp. 47, 48

<sup>10</sup> Jonathan Wells, *Zombie Science*, pp. 19, 20



## CHAPTER ONE

---

### **The Nature of Darwin’s “Sacred Cow”: Evolution Summarized**

Darwin’s hypothesis of biological evolution can be thus summarized: In the deep, dark reaches of the earth’s past, in a “chemical soup” under the primordial atmosphere, conditions existed in which inanimate elements and chemical compounds fortuitously combined to form a simple, single-celled primitive life form. Then, over a period of millions of years, that simple life form gave rise to ever more complex forms by a process consisting of mutations followed by natural selection—all, according to Richard Dawkins, “supervised by no one.”

“In 1859, Charles Darwin proposed that minor variations within existing species are either preserved or eliminated by natural selection (survival of the fittest), and that given enough time this process generates new species, organs, and body plans. Darwin argued that variations and selection are unguided, so the results of evolution are left to the working out of what he called chance. ‘There seems to be no more design in the variability of organic beings, and in the action of natural selection,’ he once wrote, ‘than in the course which the wind blows.’”<sup>11</sup>

So says Charles Darwin. However, as geneticist Michael Behe points out, “Evolution is a flexible word. It can be used by one person to mean something as simple as change over time, or by another person to mean the descent of all life forms from a common ancestor, leaving the mechanism of change unspecified. In its full-throated, biological sense, however, evolution means a process whereby life arose from non-living matter and subsequently developed entirely by natural means. That is the sense that Darwin gave to the word, and the meaning that it holds in the scientific community.”<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Jonathan Wells, *Zombie Science*, p. 19

<sup>12</sup> Michael Behe, *Darwin’s Black Box*, pp. x, xi

## Chapter One

“[T]he essential claim of evolutionary biology is that an unguided physical process can account for the emergence of all biological complexity and diversity.... Think of it this way: we start with some organism. It incurs some change. The change is incidental in the sense that it doesn’t anticipate future changes that subsequent generations of organisms may experience.... What’s more, incidental change is heritable and therefore can be transmitted to the next generation. Whether it actually is transmitted to the next generation and then preferentially preserved in subsequent generations, however, depends on whether the change is in some sense beneficial to the organism. If so, then natural selection will be likely to preserve organisms exhibiting that change.”<sup>13</sup>

The noted geneticist John C. Sanford explains the evolutionary hypothesis thus: “The standard [evolutionary] answer to the origin of biological information is that *mutation* combined with *selection* have created all biological information. All genomes (manuals) must have derived from some simple ‘first’ genome—via a long series of mutations (typographical errors) and lots of natural selection (differential copying). In fact, this is the *Primary Axiom* [Sanford’s expression] of biological evolution. **Life is life because random mutations at the molecular level are filtered through a reproductive sieve on the level of the whole organism.**”<sup>14</sup>

It’s one thing to find facts about natural phenomena and the development of life forms, but researchers almost always *interpret* the facts they discover according to a paradigm or outlook to which they already subscribe. As physicist Jonathan Sarfati points out, “It is a fallacy to believe that facts [always] speak for themselves—they are always *interpreted* according to a framework. The framework behind evolutionists’ interpretation is *naturalism*—it is assumed that things made themselves; that no divine intervention has happened, and that God has not revealed to us knowledge about the past. Evolution is a deduction from this assumption, and it is essentially the idea that things made themselves. It includes these unproven ideas: nothing gave rise to

---

<sup>13</sup> William A. Dembski, “The Myths of Darwinism,” in *Uncommon Dissent*, pp. xx, xxi

<sup>14</sup> J. C. Sanford, *Genetic Entropy & The Mystery of the Genome*, pp. 4-5; emphasis by author

## *The Nature of Darwin's "Sacred Cow": Evolution Summarized*

something [by which the universe originated] at an alleged “big bang”; non-living matter gave rise to life; single-celled organisms gave rise to many-celled organisms; invertebrates gave rise to vertebrates; apelike creatures gave rise to man; non-intelligent and amoral matter gave rise to intelligence and morality; man’s yearnings gave rise to religion; etc.”<sup>15</sup>

Among highly influential books, Darwin’s *Origin of Species* is one of the *least thoroughly read*. Though its main argument is accepted as supposedly true and proven, few people have taken the trouble to read the book all the way through. Educator Randall Hedtke explains why: “The psychology involved in Darwin’s method of persuasion is the highlight of the *Origin*. It is the writing style and his unique presentation of evidence, not the ‘scientific-ness’ of the hypothesis, that is the persuasive factor. The skeptical reader is generally mentally unprepared to untangle arguments as intricately woven as those in the *Origin*. One is also confronted with imagination extensively applied, and the critic, thinking in terms of reality, is left with the only recourse, silence, if not acceptance. Even the mechanics of sentence structure, such as the frequent use of semicolons, seem to conspire against the reader. Quite often the essence of a sentence or sentences is difficult or impossible to discover.... Darwin **confuses the reader** by making an assertion and then obscuring it by qualifying it or appearing to renege. Generally, Darwin followed the rule of using a maximum number of words to establish a minimum number of concepts or ideas, rather than the other way around. Consequently, not everyone has the patience or the mental stamina to read the *Origin* cover to cover.”<sup>16</sup>

Even those readers who consider themselves intellectually up to the task of addressing Darwin’s argument are generally unwilling to undergo the time-consuming brain strain necessary to read the book all the way through. Since they assume others (at least their teachers) have already read and evaluated the book, they take for granted that the hypothesis is scientifically proved—when in fact it has *not* been proved at all. The fact is, as pointed out earlier, those few who have read the entirety of *Origin of Species*, and have accepted it, did so mainly because they were “already predisposed” to do so.

---

<sup>15</sup> Jonathan Sarfati, *Refuting Evolution*, pp. 15, 16; emphasis by author

<sup>16</sup> Randall Hedtke, *Secrets of the Sixth Edition*, p. 24

## CHAPTER TWO

---

### Academic Freedom—or Sacred Dogma?

A typical university today will claim to have an atmosphere of “academic freedom.” Yet if a research scientist in that institution encounters information causing him to question some aspect of Darwinian evolution—and shares his findings with colleagues—he may be risking loss of any tenure he may have, or even outright *dismissal* from the faculty. Then, lacking academic affiliation, his work will be unlikely to get published in any “peer-reviewed” journal; and his work, like witnesses against the mob, may eventually just disappear. Darwinian evolution has become very much like India’s “sacred cow.”

William Dembski asks, “Do we live in a society where controversial ideas like Darwinism can be reasonably disputed without fear of reprisal, or is this one of those topics for which uniformity of opinion has to be enforced?”

“We now face a Darwinian **thought police** that, save for employing physical violence, is as insidious as any secret police [in a dictatorship] at ensuring conformity and rooting out dissent. To question Darwinism is dangerous for all professional scholars, but especially biologists. As Michael Behe pointed out in an interview with the *Harvard Political Review*, ‘There’s good reason to be afraid. Even if you’re not fired from your job, you will easily be passed over for promotions. I would strongly advise graduate students who are skeptical of Darwinian theory not to make their views known.’”<sup>17</sup>

“Within the academic world, dissenters from Darwinism could be ‘expelled.’ As for biology departments, no dissent is permitted for untenured faculty. *Creationist* has come to be the accusation of choice against dissenters, while authoritarianism or ‘scientism’ is frequently substituted for [true] science.”<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> William A. Dembski, “The Myths of Darwinism,” in *Uncommon Dissent*, p. xxxiv; bold emphasis added

<sup>18</sup> Tom Bethel, *House of Cards*, pp. 18, 19

## *Academic Freedom—or Sacred Dogma?*

“Indeed, the whole psychology of the unbeliever [including those in the academic world] is built on fear.... [Thus,] atheists are afraid of real arguments, and instead prefer to do battle with phony straw men of their own invention. They’re afraid of history and instead prefer to remain in a state of profound ignorance. They’re afraid of honesty. And instead [they] resort to big lies to defame their opposition. They’re afraid of democracy, and instead use ruthless suppression and intimidation as a means of silencing viewpoints that are contrary to their own.”<sup>19</sup>

“In order to qualify evolution as a scientific theory, one would have to include alternative points of view for each item of evolution evidence, something evolution proponents, beginning with Darwin himself, have studiously avoided. Then and only then can evolution be labeled a [scientific] theory. The truth is, students believe they are being taught a theory, when in reality the prevailing dogma that constitutes evolution research and the evolution curriculum has all the earmarks of an unquestionable religious doctrine. Being a student advocate, I regard the deception a violation of their academic freedom and an abuse of authority by those responsible for the evolution curriculum format. Students are blissfully unaware and youthfully ignorant that evolution dogmatists are taking advantage of their trust. In any other kind of investigation the deliberate withholding of information results in censure. But evolution proponents, concealed behind a [veneer] of scientific objectivity, subject students to a blatant indoctrinating belief in evolution and do it with impunity. The harsh reality is that theories are explanations for phenomena and exist to be overthrown if possible. That explains why evolution is labeled a theory, which allows [it] access into science classrooms, but the evidence is presented as unquestionable dogma in the typical curriculum.... Evolution, as the textbooks present it, is **not true science** at all.”<sup>20</sup>

“Put another way, there may be many debates and controversies within secular scientific circles over the *how* of evolution ... but never over the *whether*. Such foundational **presuppositions** are **sacrosanct** to establishment thinkers, even if they are

---

<sup>19</sup> Anthony DeStefano, *Inside the Atheist Mind*, p. 86

<sup>20</sup> Randall Hedtke, *Secrets of the Sixth Edition*, p. 51; bold emphasis added

## *Chapter Two*

rarely stated outright. It is precisely one's presuppositions (a.k.a. axioms—starting beliefs or assumptions taken for granted without proof) about reality that largely determine one's interpretation of it.”<sup>21</sup>

In academic circles, Darwinian evolution has truly become a “sacred cow.” But if you're not afraid to see the cow's demise, read on—because don't look now, but Darwin's “sacred cow” may be teetering on weak, spindly legs.

---

<sup>21</sup> Carl Wieland, “Foreword” to Robert Carter, ed., *Evolution's Achilles Heels*, p. 10; emphasis by author

## CHAPTER THREE

---

### **Did Life Spontaneously Arise From Inanimate Matter?**

According to Darwin, all life on earth began with a single cell that came into existence all by itself in some organic soup. From there, the single cell developed additional cells, and those cells developed into primitive organs. Those organs then developed into systems, all leading to more and more complex organisms—and finally to higher animals and humans. The one and only illustration in Darwin’s original edition of *Origin of Species* was a portrayal of the supposed “tree of life,” with the simplest of organisms at the bottom gradually transitioning upward into complex “higher” organisms.

But several questions need to be asked: Can inanimate chemicals come together *by chance* and form even the simplest primitive organism? “Darwin himself seems to have struggled with the origin of life and how to fit it into his theory.... He knew that the old ideas of spontaneous generation (of things like mice and flies) had been disproved by Francesco Redi in 1668, but he then had to come to grips with the powerful arguments of his contemporary, the creationist scientist Louis Pasteur, who had utterly debunked spontaneous generation—even of microbes—by 1861, just two years after the *Origin of Species* was published.”<sup>22</sup>

Biochemist John Ashton asks, “So how can we know that it is impossible for a living cell to arise by chance? The answer lies in understanding that a single cell is vastly more complicated than anything human minds have ever engineered.”<sup>23</sup>

“For the first life to start from non-living matter, thousands of specialized large, complex molecules must somehow be synthesized in very large numbers from simple small inorganic

---

<sup>22</sup> Jonathan Sarfati, “The Origin of Life” in Robert Carter, ed., *Evolution’s Achilles Heels*, pp. 80, 81

<sup>23</sup> John Ashton, *Evolution Impossible*, p. 40

### Chapter Three

molecules. These molecules then have to come together randomly over and over again until somehow the structure of the cell is formed. This remarkable and complex structure would still, however, not be alive. To become alive, hundreds of metabolic reactions would have to be initiated, with metabolic intermediates already in place at just the right concentrations so that the reactions went the right way.”<sup>24</sup>

“In some ways, grown-up scientists are just as prone to wishful thinking as little boys.... For example, centuries ago it was thought that insects and other small animals arose directly from spoiled food. This was easy to believe, because small animals were thought to be very simple (before the invention of the microscope, naturalists thought that insects had no internal organs). But as biology progressed and careful experiments showed that protected food did not breed life, the theory of spontaneous generation retreated to the limits beyond which science could not detect what was really happening. In the nineteenth century that means the cell. When beer, milk, or urine were allowed to sit for several days in containers, even closed ones, they always became cloudy from something growing in them. The microscopes of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries showed that the growth was very small, apparently living cells. So it seemed reasonable that simple living organisms could arise spontaneously from liquids.

“In Darwin’s day, many people swallowed the theory of spontaneous generation—that life arose from non-living matter. It was somewhat easier to believe then because the cell’s structure was almost unknown. Ernst Haeckel, Darwin’s German ‘bulldog on the continent,’ claimed that a cell was a ‘simple lump of albuminous combination of carbon.’ There was no excuse for this, though, because light microscopy had advanced enormously, even before Haeckel’s day, to a level that could resolve many subcellular components.

“However, the molecular biological revolution of the last half century has shown how the cell requires both *information content* [about which we’ll have more to say in a later chapter] and a means to pass this information on to the next generation (reproduction).”<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Ashton, p. 43

<sup>25</sup> Sarfati, p. 84



## *Did Life Spontaneously Arise From Inanimate Matter?*

On the issue of whether life could have originated by itself from non-living chemicals, two of the world's leading scientists, Sir Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe, together calculated the odds against such processes forming *even a protein*, with all of its amino acids coming into being *at once* and in the *correct order*, by chance—much less a fully developed single living cell. (Proteins are essential building blocks of life; but a single protein “falling together” by accident and being called “life” is like calling one or two bricks a “building.”) These two scientists found the odds against such a phenomenon to be one in  $10^{40,000}$  power. The total estimated number of atoms in the entire universe is only  $10^{80}$  power! Because it's important to understand how they came to the conclusion that “abiogenesis” is impossible and never happened, they explain in detail the steps they went through for this calculation in their joint work *Evolution From Space*.

“There are some ten to twenty distinct amino acids which determine the basic backbone of the enzyme and these simply must be in the correct position in the polypeptide structure. The rest of the amino acids, usually numbering a hundred or more, then control the details of the inner surface shape. There are also the active sites that eventually promote the biochemical reactions in question, and these too must be correct in their atomic forms and locations.

“Consider now the chance that in a random ordering of the twenty different amino acids which make up the polypeptides, it just happens that the different kinds fall into the order appropriate to a particular enzyme. The chance of obtaining a suitable backbone can hardly be greater than one part in  $10^{15}$ . Because the fine details of the surface shape can be varied, we shall take the conservative line of not ‘piling on the agony’ by including any further small probability for the rest of the enzyme. The two small probabilities we are including are quite enough. They have to be multiplied when they yield a chance of one part in  $10^{20}$  of obtaining the required enzyme in a functioning form.”

Here the authors are explaining the pathway they followed in calculating the odds against inanimate molecules coming together by chance to form *even one component* of a single-celled living organism—much less an entire “simple” one-celled organism! They continue:

### Chapter Three

“By itself, this small probability could be faced, because one must contemplate not just a single shot at obtaining the enzyme, but a very large number of trials such as are supposed to have occurred in an organic soup early in the history of the Earth. The trouble is that there are about two thousand enzymes, and the chance of obtaining them all in a random trial is only one part in  $(10^{20})^{2000} = 10^{40,000}$ , an outrageously small probability that could not be faced even if the whole universe consisted of organic soup”<sup>26</sup>

What Hoyle and Wickramasinghe are telling us is that the spontaneous generation (or as some call it, “abiogenesis”) of even the simplest single-celled organism is not merely unlikely, such an imagined phenomenon is *impossible*.

Some may dismiss this questioning of Darwin as “religion masquerading as science.” These people should note, however, that Sir Fred Hoyle remained an *atheist* to his dying day in 2001. Yet he was at least honest enough about the issue of possible “abiogenesis” to publish his anti-Darwinian findings. Others have since corroborated these findings. Is it not reasonable to conclude that if the odds against a chance formation of even a protein or enzyme (much less an entire single-celled organism) are *500 times* the total number of atoms in the entire known universe, that such a thing is not merely “improbable”—it’s IMPOSSIBLE! No such chance occurrence ever happened, or ever could happen. The first and foundational tenet of Darwin’s evolutionary hypothesis stands scientifically and *mathematically disproved*.

But be careful: Don’t try to confuse any dedicated evolutionist with this fact, or you could stir up a hornet’s nest!

---

<sup>26</sup> Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe, *Evolution From Space*, p. 24

## CHAPTER FOUR

---

### Does Subtraction Yield a Larger, or a Smaller, Number?

Darwin's theory of evolution depends heavily on *mutation*. Evolution also depends on *new genetic information* being constantly added to an organism as it "evolves." So we must ask: Do mutations "add information" to the genome—or do they take away from it?

Remember, the human genome is astronomically massive and exceedingly complex. By way of analogy, the genome of a primitive single-celled life form (such as what Darwin thought was the ancestor of all present-day creatures, including man) has been likened to a single-paged set of instructions for assembling a child's play wagon. The human genome, on the other hand, is likened to the multiple warehouses full of the thousand-page instruction manuals needed for building and assembling all the parts and devices needed for the rocketry, the computerized controls, the training of the astronauts and technicians, calculating the spaceship's trajectory and routing, and all the other multiple operations involved in landing astronauts on the moon!

So, could *mutations* account for the size and complexity of the human genome? What do the experts say?

"[M]utations 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.... [M]utations, even when coupled with [natural] selection, cannot generally create new information."<sup>27</sup>

"If essentially no beneficial mutations (i.e., resulting in more net information) could be recovered from this vast science-guided process, why do we think the identical process, in the absence of any guiding intelligence, would be more fruitful in nature?"<sup>28</sup> "Bergman (2004) has studied the topic of beneficial

---

<sup>27</sup> J. C. Sanford, *Genetic Entropy & The Mystery of the Genome*, p. 27

<sup>28</sup> Sanford, p. 26

## Chapter Four

mutations.... He was unable to find a single example of a mutation which unambiguously created new information. While it is almost universally accepted that beneficial (information-creating) mutations do occur, this belief seems to be based primarily upon uncritical acceptance of the Primary Axiom [see Chapter 1], rather than upon actual evidence.”<sup>29</sup>

**“So what we actually observe in organisms are mechanisms to minimize mutations. These are mechanisms that minimize diversity outside of that which has been already coded for in the DNA. When mutations do occur, they often lead to disease or death of the organism. So where Darwin assumed that mutations would be nature’s way to maximize diversity for survival, which would in turn constitute the platform for evolution, we observe that in fact the very opposite is true.”**<sup>30</sup>

“There is a great principle here, similar to the principle that the number of useless polypeptides crushes the number of useful ones. The Georgia Tech geneticist John F. McDonald calls this one a ‘great Darwinian paradox.’ Meter explains: ‘Genes that are obviously variable within natural populations seem to affect only minor aspects of form and function—while those genes that govern major changes, the very stuff of macroevolution, do not vary or vary only to the detriment of the organism.’ The philosopher of biology Paul Nelson summarizes the body-plan problem: ‘Research on animal development and macroevolution over the last thirty years—research done from within the neo-Darwinian framework—has shown that the neo-Darwinian explanation for the origin of new body plans is overwhelmingly likely to be false—and for reasons that Darwin himself would have understood.’ Darwin would easily have understood that minor variations are common, but can’t create significant evolutionary change; major mutations are rare and fatal. It can hardly be surprising that the revolution in biological knowledge over the last half century should call for a new understanding of the origin of species.”<sup>31</sup>

Most genetic authorities agree that few if any mutations add information to the genome; rather, they delete or distort it—much as a typographical error does to a sentence or paragraph. According to Sanford: “Newsflash—random mutations consistently

---

<sup>29</sup> Sanford, pp. 26, 27

<sup>30</sup> John Ashton, *Evolution Impossible*, p. 61; bold emphasis added

<sup>31</sup> David Gelernter, *Giving Up Darwin*, pp. 8, 9

## *Does Subtraction Yield a Larger, or a Smaller, Number?*

destroy information.”<sup>32</sup> They *subtract or distort* information. If this is true, how would the genome of the assumed first simple organism (which, as we have shown, never came into being by itself) have developed via mutations from a relative *few* bits of information to the *multiple billions* of bits in the human genome? Mutation leads to *subtraction*—and didn’t we learn in second-grade arithmetic that subtraction *always* yields a smaller number, *never* a larger one?

Yet there are multiple authors who would have us believe there are such things as “beneficial mutations” that make the organism more fit to survive. Bill Nye, often called on TV “the science guy,” has written a book called *Undeniable: Evolution and the Science of Creation*. While the book offers a number of interesting facts about nature, it also proffers, in an attempt to prove Darwinian evolution, a fair number of questionable if not actually *disproven* assertions.

For example, on page 23 Nye claims: “Evolution is not random; it’s the opposite of random. One of Darwin’s most important insights is that natural selection is a means by which small changes can add complexity to an organism. With each generation of offspring, the beneficial modifications can be retained. Each mutation that doesn’t work as well in nature either dies off with the organism directly, or gets outcompeted by others of its kind in succeeding generations of offspring. It’s by the process of evolution that beneficial changes are added up and up and up.”<sup>33</sup>

Nye says the “beneficial modifications can be retained.” Question: *What* beneficial modifications? If there ever were any, they certainly were not numerous enough to develop an organism into one that moved higher “up and up” the evolutionary ladder, as Nye asserts.

Nye’s whole book is intended to convince the reader of how “undeniable” the theory of evolution supposedly is. In the process, he makes multiple assertions that do not hold up to scrutiny. An example of disproven assertions: On page 283, Nye speaks excitedly of friends at Cornell who were attempting to replicate the Miller-Urey experiment of 1953 in which Stanley Miller

---

<sup>32</sup> Sanford, p. 15

<sup>33</sup> Bill Nye, *Undeniable: Evolution and the Science of Creation*, p. 23

## Chapter Four

remixed the supposed components of the earth's primordial atmosphere. By subsequently introducing an electrical spark, Miller generated a few amino acids in a test tube. What Nye and his friends seem unaware of (or hope the reader is unaware of) is that the Miller-Urey experiment was later *discredited*, because it was shown that Miller's assumptions about the components of the primordial atmosphere was *incorrect*. "The Miller-Urey experiment of 1953 produced mainly a simple amino acid (along with traces of some others) under conditions that **did not match the early earth environment** it intended to replicate."<sup>34</sup>

Attempts to replicate the experiment with a more accurately blended atmosphere produced no amino acids at all. Another reason the experiment was dismissed (as supposedly proving that abiogenesis is possible) was that for anything to happen an *outside factor* was necessary—Miller himself. But of course Darwin's theory of evolution permits *no outside factor* to have caused inanimate chemicals to come together all by themselves to form the first life.

Nye asks, "What would the deniers [of evolutionary theory] have us do? Ignore all the scientific discoveries that make our technologically driven world possible; things like the ability to rotate crops, pump water, generate electricity, and broadcast baseball?"<sup>35</sup> Question: What on earth does any of that have to do with evolution? Absolutely nothing! Crop rotation, water pumping, and electricity were already well along in development before Darwin's 1859 theory. Granted, radio broadcasting came later—but *in no way* because of evolutionary theory. Talk about introducing red herrings, begging the question, and false either/or choices!

Then Nye complains, "As an engineer trained in the U.S., I look at the assault on evolution—which is actually an assault on science overall—as much more than an intellectual issue; for me

---

<sup>34</sup> Tom Bethel, *House of Cards*, pp. 21, 22; bold emphasis added. Regarding that experiment, Geoffrey Simmons comments wryly, "The scientific method requires vigorous testing of any hypothesis. Since time machines have yet to be invented, scientists are left to their own imaginations and false realities. The infamous Miller-Urey experiment was one of these. A mixture of organic chemicals, presumably mimicking a primordial sea no one has ever seen, was subjected to electrical shocks. These 'lightning strikes' produced a reddish, gooey tar that could not feed itself, defend itself, belch, hide, perspire—or mate with any other heretofore-known gooey tar of the opposite sex. I should guess it was also hard to clean up" (Simmons, *Billions of Missing Links*, p. 19).

<sup>35</sup> Nye, p. 4

## *Does Subtraction Yield a Larger, or a Smaller, Number?*

it's personal.”<sup>36</sup> But *is* the “assault on evolution” actually an assault on science? Here, Nye begs the question of whether evolution *is* in fact true science. As we are in the process of showing, true, *honest* science *disproves* evolution!

Another evolution apologist is Jerry Coyne, author of *Why Evolution is True*. Coyne also begs the question of whether questioning evolution is an “assault on science.” He also would have us believe that many mutations are “beneficial” in the sense of helping an organism become more fit to survive and reproduce. He asserts, “If individuals within a species differ genetically from one another [because of mutations], and some of these differences affect an individual’s ability to survive and reproduce in its environment, then in the next generation the ‘good’ genes that lead to higher survival and reproduction will have relatively more copies than the ‘not so good’ genes. Over time, the population will gradually become more and more suited to its environment as helpful mutations arise and spread through the population, while deleterious ones are weeded out. Ultimately, this process produces organisms that are well adapted to their habitats and way of life.”<sup>37</sup> But since it has been demonstrated above that almost *no* mutations ever are actually “helpful,” nearly all *do* get “weeded out.” How then is there ever any “up and up” movement as postulated by Nye, Coyne, and their fellow evolutionists?

Again, we see “helpful mutations” glibly referred to in a matter-of-fact manner, as if their existence had been thoroughly established—when in fact the *opposite* is the case. According to Geoffrey Simmons, “Some scientists think that one beneficial mutation happens per 20,000 mutations. Or reverse this: 19,999 out of 20,000 are useless, dangerous, or quickly diluted out. To calculate the statistical chance of man’s DNA codes having so come about—correctly and 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.”<sup>38</sup>

Ultimately, the idea of mutations leading to higher-level organisms is a myth. Like typographical errors in an instruction

---

<sup>36</sup> Nye, p. 5

<sup>37</sup> Jerry Coyne, *Why Evolution is True*, p. 11

<sup>38</sup> Geoffrey Simmons, *What Darwin Didn't Know*, p. 306

## *Chapter Four*

manual, either they do not affect how the organism develops and functions, or they foul it up. The result either way is a net *loss* of information, not a net gain. Did the simple genomes of “primitive” organisms become the complex ones of higher animals and humans by *subtraction*? Is that what we learned in second-grade arithmetic?



## CHAPTER FIVE

---

### Has Any Species Ever “Evolved Into” Another Species?

One of the major tenets of Darwin’s theory of evolution is that over a period of time, through gradual and incremental changes that accumulated, different species evolved into other species. This was the basic assumption behind the supposed “family tree” of all living things [the only illustration in the first edition of Darwin’s *Origin of Species*], leading to the idea that horses are distantly related to alligators and bears to spiders. According to Darwin, every organism of any kind we find on earth today supposedly descended from the first proto-life form that fell together by accident in that imagined organic soup millions of years ago.

While adaptations within a species certainly have been noted, those who point out this fact too often *beg the question* of whether such adaptations prove that one species ever “evolved into” another distinct species.

According to biologist David Gelernter, “There’s no reason to doubt that Darwin successfully explained the small adjustments by which an organism adapts to its circumstances: changes to fur density or wing style or beak shape. Yet there are many reasons to doubt whether he can answer the hard questions and explain the big picture—not the fine-tuning of existing species but the emergence of new ones. The origin of species is exactly what Darwin *cannot* explain.”<sup>39</sup>

Tom Bethel acknowledges, “We all know that small differences are observed between the generations.... [But] Darwin’s mistake was to assume that these differences somehow accumulate over millennia, so that one species eventually transforms itself into another. Without evidence, Darwin’s supporters today

---

<sup>39</sup> David Gelernter, *Giving Up Darwin* p. 2; emphasis by author

## Chapter Five

still accept that intergenerational differences accumulate, eventually transforming their phenotype, or bodily form. But such a transformation **has never been observed**. No species has ever been seen to evolve into another. What scientists do observe is something quite different: reversion to a mean. Such reversion can be analogized to commuting, or going back and forth. But Darwin's theory perceives intergenerational changes as something more resembling an incessant journey. In short, Darwin's mistake was one of extrapolation. Although extrapolation can be a legitimate procedure in scientific analysis, it is always a risky one, and if done without due care can lead to erroneous conclusions."<sup>40</sup>

Many scientists who were contemporary with Darwin contested all or at least part of his theory of evolution. Among them was Harvard biologist Asa Gray. "According to Asa Gray, 'Admitting, therefore, that natural selection may improve organs already useful to great numbers of species, does not imply an admission that it can create or develop new organs, and originate species.' Asa Gray was a Harvard professor of botany and a contemporary of Darwin, which indicates to me that the incipency problem has always been common knowledge throughout the science establishment, but has been deliberately withheld from the public."<sup>41</sup>

John Ashton, in his current work entitled *Evolution Impossible*, tells us: "Type 3 evolution [the author's term for one species evolving into another] would involve the generation of totally new useful genetic information within the DNA code of an organism by some supposed process in nature, which results in a completely new function that has never occurred before. An example would be a worm evolving jointed legs so it could walk or developing eyes so it could see. These new features, when they first form, would require massive amounts of new genetic information to encode for all the parts of the legs, their control mechanisms, and programming of the brain to use them. Similarly, with the first eye, all the components, the lens, focusing mechanisms, the optic nerve, the blood supply, and so on would have to be encoded for in the DNA of the organism. Biophysicist Dr. Lee Spetner, who taught at both Harvard and Johns Hopkins Universities,

---

<sup>40</sup> Tom Bethel, *House of Cards*, p. 25; bold emphasis added

<sup>41</sup> Randall Hedtke, *Secrets of the Sixth Edition*, p. 49

## *Has Any Species Ever “Evolved Into” Another Species?*

points out that this type of evolution—that is, type 3 evolution—has never been observed. In fact, there is no proven mechanism that can explain the formation of the large quantities of new genetic information required to produce major phenotype changes such as the appearance of jointed limbs during the proposed evolution of, for example, arthropods—that is crustaceans, insects, and spiders. These significant challenges in explaining how this type of evolution could have taken place are now a major and fundamental area of study in biology.”<sup>42</sup>

While most researchers accept Darwinian macroevolution as accounting for the diversity of living organisms we find on earth today, they are at a loss to explain how any species could have “evolved into” another one. Could it be because no such thing has ever happened?

All too often, those who classify organisms tend to use the word “species” for what in fact are only *varieties* of a species. Darwin himself often did this. “When it came to classification, Darwin was a ‘lumper,’ not a ‘splitter.’ He concluded that there is ‘no fundamental distinction between species and varieties.’ This worked greatly to his advantage because mutation and natural selection can be shown to increase the number of **varieties** but not to generate new species. To this day, such species-transformations **have not been demonstrated**. They would be headline news if they had.”<sup>43</sup>

As biologist Robert Carter points out, “Darwinism needs life to be simple. Natural selection needs the ability to take the little tweaks caused by mutation and select the best from a herd or group of animals. Once a species is in existence, perhaps natural selection could work in limited ways.... [B]ut can this process explain how the species came into existence in the first place? Hardly, for a simple process of error accumulation and selection could not create a complex, interleaved four-dimensional system with an amazing amount of data compression and flexibility. And, once that system is in place, it will be seriously threatened by future random changes through mutation. This is the situation we are in today. It is fine to imagine changes to an already-existing, complex system. To use small changes as an explanation for the origin of that system itself, however, is tantamount to

---

<sup>42</sup> John F. Ashton, *Evolution Impossible*, p. 56

<sup>43</sup> Bethel, p. 33; bold emphasis added

## *Chapter Five*

saying there was no intelligence involved in the production of the latest computer operating systems. Yet the [human] genome far surpasses in complexity and efficiency any operating system in the world today.”<sup>44</sup>

No example has ever been observed of one species being transformed into another; nor has any biological means been demonstrated by which such a thing ever conceivably could have happened. Evolution’s second major tenet, like the first one, stands disproved by both logic and honest science.

---

<sup>44</sup> Robert Carter, ed., *Evolution’s Achilles Heels*, p. 63

## CHAPTER SIX

---

### **Did Matter Organize *Itself* Into Biological Information Without Any Origin?**

One of the chief notable characteristics of all life is functional *organization*. The very word by which biologists designate a living entity is “organism”—which implies that it *is* in fact *organized*. If biological science has revealed anything, it is how highly organized the components of life are—from atoms and molecules to cells made from them, from cells to tissues, from tissues to organs, from organs to functioning systems, all connected and nourished by blood vessels and controlled through nerves carrying electrical impulses all controlled by a brain. Indeed, a living organism is nothing if not organized.

But does organization along logical, functional lines “just happen”?

Some theorists have tried to show how matter could have organized itself into a living, functioning cell. They usually base their proposals on the idea that laws of chemistry and physics somehow work together to make life “inevitable” (such as laws dealing with the natural affinities of certain elements or compounds for other elements or compounds).

Michael Polanyi was a Hungarian-born physician and scientist who taught at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute in Berlin until 1933, when he relocated to England as a chemistry professor at the University of Manchester. Polanyi’s most notable observation was that the information contained in the DNA molecule is *not* reducible to the laws of physics and chemistry. Although a DNA molecule cannot exist without physical properties, those properties are constrained by *higher-level ordering principles*. He emphatically questions the prevailing mechanistic world view of most modern scientists.

Science writer Stephen Meyer tells us that Polanyi took issue with the whole notion that the component elements of a system determined how it would work. “Polanyi argued that, in the

## Chapter Six

case of communications systems, the laws of physics and chemistry do not determine the arrangements of the characters that convey information. The laws of acoustics and the properties of air do not determine which sounds are conveyed by speakers of natural languages. Neither do the chemical properties of ink determine the arrangements of letters on a printed page. Instead, the laws of physics and chemistry allow a vast array of possible sequences of sounds, characters, or symbols in any code or language. Which sequence of characters is used to convey a message is not determined by physical law but by the choice of the users of the communications system in accord with the established conventions of vocabulary and grammar—just as engineers determine the arrangement of the parts of machines in accord with the principles of engineering.”<sup>45</sup>

Meyer also points out, “The properties of the building blocks of DNA simply do not make a particular gene, let alone life as we know it, inevitable. Yet the opposite claim is often made by self-organizational theorists, albeit without much specificity. De Duve states, for example, that ‘the processes that generated life’ were ‘highly deterministic,’ making life as we know it ‘inevitable,’ given ‘the conditions that existed on the prebiotic earth.’ Yet imagine the most favorable prebiotic conditions. Imagine a pool of all four DNA bases and all necessary sugars and phosphates. Would any particular genetic sequence inevitably arise? Given all necessary monomers, would any particular functional protein or gene, let alone a specific genetic code, replication system, or signal transduction circuitry, inevitably arise? Clearly not.”<sup>46</sup>

It seems that the assertions of the proponents of “self-organization of matter into life” are based more on *wishful thinking* than on any evidence—much less proof. These theorists would have us believe that life’s origin is explained by what would have to be essentially an “uncaused phenomenon.” But there is skepticism among many scientific thinkers about such an idea.

As David Gelernter points out, “The obvious fact is that genes, in storing blueprints for the proteins that form the basis of cellular life, encode an awe-inspiring amount of **information**.

---

<sup>45</sup> Stephen Meyer, *Signature In The Cell*, p. 239

<sup>46</sup> Meyer, p. 245

## *Did Matter Organize Itself Into Biological Information Without Any Origin?*

You don't turn up a useful protein merely by doodling on the back of an envelope, any more than you write a Mozart aria by assembling three sheets of staff paper and scattering notes around. Profound biochemical knowledge is somehow, in some sense, captured in every description of a working protein. Where on earth did it all come from? Neo-Darwinianism says that nature simply rolls the dice, and if something useful emerges, great. Otherwise, try again. But useful sequences are so gigantically rare that this answer simply won't work. Studies of the sort [Stephen] Meyer discusses show that neo-Darwinism is the quintessence of a bad bet."<sup>47</sup>

Most of us have wondered what controls the processes by which living things reproduce, develop, and function? What makes an acorn grow into an oak tree instead of a pine tree? How is it that a chicken egg does not produce a duck? Why, when two golden retrievers mate, do their puppies not come out as collies or German shepherds—or kittens? It all has to do with highly *organized* genetic information.

Dr. Lee Spetner explains, “The science of biology took a pivotal turn ... when biologists began to learn how [organizational] information plays its role in living organisms. We have discovered the location of the information in the organism that tells it how to function and how to grow, how to live and how to reproduce. The information is in the seed as well as in the plant; it's in the egg as well as in the chicken. The egg passes the information to the chicken it becomes, the chicken passes it to the egg it lays, and so on.

“Evolutionists claim to know how it all began and how chickens and eggs became what they are today.... But it turns out that the theory cannot account for the way information [would have had to] build up to make evolution work.... Scientists have discovered where life's information is stored; they have learned a great deal about the message it contains and how that message is used.”<sup>48</sup>

Note that the author uses the words “information” and “message” several times. Has there ever been *information* without any meaning or origin? Has there ever been an intelligible, controlling *message* that was not *originated* by someone?

---

<sup>47</sup> David Gelernter, *Giving Up Darwin*, p. 8; bold emphasis added

<sup>48</sup> Lee Spetner, *Not By Chance*, p. 23

## Chapter Six

Just asking.

Dr. Spetner goes on to explain what scientists have discovered about how heredity and bodily functions operate: “When an animal reproduces sexually, the two parents make a child. Each parent contributes one cell, known as a sex cell, or *gamete*, and these two cells fuse into one. The mother contributes a female gamete (an egg), the father a male gamete (a sperm). The process through which an organism builds itself from a single cell is called *development*. Development starts when the two gametes unite and fuse into a single cell, called the *zygote*.... This fusion marks the beginning of a new organism. From that stage until birth the organism is an *embryo*.

“The cells of the embryo divide, and their number doubles at each division. At an early stage the cells begin to become different from each other; we say they *differentiate*. In the frog this happens after the cells number a few thousand. Some animals start to differentiate after just a few divisions.... As the embryo grows, the cells differentiate into all the tissues and organs of the body.

“The cells change and **develop according to a program that’s part of the information built into each of them**. The program also accepts inputs from outside the cell. We can compare the development program to one that runs a computer. All the various kinds of cells, such as skin cells, muscle cells, nerve cells, and blood cells form by differentiation. We see that, according to evolutionary theory, if a fish has evolved into a salamander, then the program that builds a fish must have evolved into one that builds a salamander.

“The development program doesn’t stop at birth but continues to control the animal’s growth and maintenance even after birth. The program continues to operate as long as the animal is alive. It leads not only to birth but beyond. It brings a young mammal to maturity, and maintains its body. The program dictates the building of new tissues as old ones are damaged or wear out. Some animals can even regenerate destroyed limbs. Many biologists consider this maintenance process as an extension of the development program....

“Most of the information in the cell is found on small bodies called chromosomes. When the cell is ready to divide, the chromosomes are visible through a microscope, and they look like thin threads. In cells that have nuclei ... the chromosomes are



## ***Did Matter Organize Itself Into Biological Information Without Any Origin?***

in the cell nucleus. The part of the chromosome that carries the information is a molecule known as *deoxyribonucleic acid*, or DNA for short. All the DNA in all the chromosomes of a cell is called the *genome*, and the information in it is called *genetic information*....”<sup>49</sup>

“The information in the genome tells the cell what kind of proteins to make. Because proteins play a dominant role in cell function, they play a dominant role in the whole organism. The information in the genome, by controlling the making of protein, fixes the form and function of the entire organism.”<sup>50</sup>

“If the organism is to function properly, the right proteins must be made at the right time and in the right place. Each cell therefore has a control system that tells each of its genes when to turn ON and when to turn OFF. A gene is said to be on when it’s active, directing the synthesis of its protein; it is said to be off when it’s not active.”<sup>51</sup>

For the sake of brevity and simplicity, we have only excerpted Dr. Spetner’s thorough description of how the organization, development, and function of living organisms are *controlled by information* contained in the nucleus of every cell of the organism’s body. Spetner repeatedly uses words like “message” and “reading,” and even compares the information to a computer program. Isn’t it fair to ask this question: How did matter “organize itself” based on controlling *information* that came into being in the nucleus of living cells without any external *mind* having originated that information? And how did the physical, chemical, and biological *laws* by which these incredibly complex processes are controlled “just happen” to be in force?

Early in the 20th century, scientists began to see from their examination of living cells that the controlling mechanism determining both the development and the functioning of any living organism had to reside in the cell nucleus. Some thought it had to do with energy; some thought protein structure was the key. By the late 1940s, most were convinced that a molecule in the chromosomes called deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) was the key. A race then ensued to model the *structure* of DNA.

---

<sup>49</sup> Spetner, pp. 26, 27; bold emphasis added

<sup>50</sup> Spetner, p. 34

<sup>51</sup> Spetner, p. 36

## Chapter Six

In the Cavendish Laboratory at Cambridge University, England, a pair of unknown researchers—James Watson and Francis Crick—finally worked out the structure by February of 1953. After unsuccessfully trying other shapes, they settled on the now-famous “double helix,” with its four bases on the inside, like the rungs of a flexible ladder.

After describing in detail the painstaking multi-step process by which the two researchers arrived at their important conclusion, Meyer tells us, “The Watson-Crick model made it clear that DNA had an impressive chemical and structural complexity. It was a very long molecule composed on the outside of a regular arrangement of sugar and phosphate groups. But on the inside it could contain many potentially different arrangements of the four bases. Thus, it had an impressive potential for variability and complexity of sequence as required by any potential carrier of hereditary information. As Watson and Crick later explained: ‘The phosphate-sugar backbone of our model is completely regular, but any sequence of the pairs of bases can fit into the structure. It follows that in a long molecule, many different permutations are possible, and it therefore seems likely that the precise sequence of the bases is the **code** which carries the genetic **information**.’ Thus their paper not only described the structure of DNA, it also anticipated what later discoveries would confirm: **DNA was a repository of information.**

“Watson and Crick’s discovery would forever change our understanding of the nature of life. At the close of the nineteenth century, most biologists thought life consisted solely of matter and energy. But after Watson and Crick, **biologists came to recognize the importance of a third fundamental entity in living things: information.** And this discovery would redefine, from that point forward, what theories about the origin of life would need to explain.”<sup>52</sup>

Any theory of the origin of life would need to explain *how* information could come into being without any intelligent *source* of that information.

Robert Carter, while explaining in detail the working of the genome, says, “Multiple overlapping DNA and RNA codes defy naturalistic explanation and make it impossible for natural selection to operate as an agent of long-term evolutionary change.

---

<sup>52</sup> Meyer, pp. 93, 84; bold emphasis added

## *Did Matter Organize Itself Into Biological Information Without Any Origin?*

Selection runs into a ‘wall of insurmountable difficulty’ when faced with mutations that affect more than one trait simultaneously.... How could a simple process of trial and error, always seeking the simplest answer to an environmental problem, create an interleaved and multilayered system of regulation? In fact, this system is one of the wonders of the universe. Without this level of multitasking, the genome would have to be much larger, and it might not be possible for DNA-based, multicellular organisms to exist at all without it.”<sup>53</sup>

Another scientist, Jonathan Sarfati, affirms the importance of *information* to biological life: “Information, not chance, is the key to life. Information is not random (goo), neither is it regularly predictable like crystals, which contain little information.... Rather, information is a non-repeating, non-predictable *arrangement of signals that can be read by some pre-engineered system* with a predetermined set of rules for storing, retrieving, and interpreting instructions. *In all modern forms, information is created by an intelligent agent in order to convey a message. And life is based on information.*

“As physicist and evolutionist Paul Davies (1946-) says: ‘We now know that the secret of life lies not in the chemical ingredients as such, but with *the logical structure and organisational arrangement of the molecules....* Like a supercomputer, life is an information processing system.... It is the software of the living cell, not the hardware.... How did stupid atoms write their own software?... There is no known law of physics able to create information from nothing.’”<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Robert Carter, ed., *Evolution's Achilles Heels*, pp. 64, 65

<sup>54</sup> Jonathan Sarfati, “The Origin of Life” in Robert Carter, ed., *Evolution's Achilles Heels*, p. 85; bold emphasis added

## CHAPTER SEVEN

---

### Is Man Merely a “Hairless Ape”?

Darwin and evolutionists after him have tried to establish the descent of the human race from a common ancestor—supposedly of the great apes. Paleontology textbooks will typically feature a depiction that starts with a knuckle-dragging ape walking nearly on all fours, followed by a less apelike creature walking more nearly upright, followed by one with a bit more human-looking face walking almost upright, then finally a naked human being—perhaps with a beard and wearing a fur loincloth. This picture, in various art styles, is probably the best known of the *icons of evolution*.

The evolutionary paradigm calls for man to have descended from an apelike ancestor that “came down from the trees of Africa” thousands of years ago. Yet there are many knowledgeable dissenters from this view; we’ll sample the writings of just a few.

In *Icons of Evolution*, Jonathan Wells tells us: “In the **absence of fossil evidence**, similarities between humans and living apes served as a proxy. In an 1863 book entitled *Evidence as to Man’s Place in Nature*, Thomas Henry Huxley compared skeletons of apes to that of a human to show gradations between them.... ‘But if man be separated by no greater structural barrier from the brutes than they are from one another,’ wrote Huxley, ‘then there would be no rational ground for doubting that man might have originated ... by the gradual modification of a man-like ape [or] as a ramification of the same primitive stock as those apes.’ Huxley concluded, ‘Man is, in substance and in structure, one with the brutes.’

“The striking similarity between Huxley’s illustration and the ultimate icon is unmistakable. Yet neither Huxley nor Darwin believed that living apes were our ancestors. What Huxley’s illustration shows is that, from the very beginning, the ape-to-human icon was simply a restatement of materialistic philosophy. Its

## *Is Man Merely a “Hairless Ape”?*

form **preceded any fossil evidence** of ancestor-to-descendant relationships, and it made do with whatever evidence happened to be at hand—in this case, similarities to living apes. Fossils discovered later were just plugged into this **preexisting framework.**”<sup>55</sup>

Can we conclude reasonably that before any “scientific evidence” was discovered, the theorists already had their minds made up as to *how that evidence would be interpreted*? They *assumed* that man came from ape-like ancestors, then they searched for “proof” of their idea!

Wells references Henry Gee, chief science writer for *Nature* magazine, who “points out, for example, that all the evidence for human evolution ‘between about 10 and 5 million years ago—several thousand generations of living creatures—can be fitted into a small box.’ Thus the conventional picture of human evolution as lines of ancestry and descent is ‘a completely human invention created after the fact, shaped to accord with human prejudices.’ Putting it even more bluntly, Gee concludes, ‘To take a line of fossils and claim that they represent a lineage is not a scientific hypothesis that can be tested, but an assertion that carries the same validity as a bedtime story—amusing, perhaps even instructive, but not scientific.’”<sup>56</sup>

Unquestionably, individual fossils and other evidence are subject to a variety of possible interpretations. Which interpretation gets applied to a given discovery depends upon the *preconceived view* of the interpreter!

“Out of all the major sequences of Darwinian evolution, the evolution of man is the nearest to us in time and should, therefore, be backed by an abundance of fossils. It isn’t. In fact, we have many more dinosaur fossils to study than we have putative human ancestors. Even worse, most of the fossil evidence is in the form of teeth, not [entire] skeletons or even individual bones.

“Over the last 50 years, the story of the evolution of *Homo sapiens* has changed drastically, from the classical tree diagram, to a tangled bush, then to an orchard. None of these visual representations offers a clear, even if fragmentary, descent (or, more appropriate to the evolutionist, ‘ascent’) of man. Every such representation abounds with uncertainties and many possible alternative

---

<sup>55</sup> Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, pp. 215, 216; bold emphasis added

<sup>56</sup> Wells, pp. 220, 221

## Chapter Seven

evolutionary paths, and representations have shifted radically over the decades. We are left with the impression that any path from multiple candidates can be chosen, according to preference, since they all ‘prove’ that man evolved from ‘ape-like progenitors.’ As Darwin put it, various fossils related to the alleged evolution of man have been going up and down the ladder to make room for new discoveries. And most new discoveries are, in fact, old samples kept in drawers for decades, only to be rediscovered by new researchers at a later date. Anthropology, more than most other areas of science, craves the limelight, which facilitates funding.

“*Zinjanthropus boisei*, aka Nutcracker Man, was once a very popular ‘proof’ that humans evolved from apes. Discovered in 1959 by the famous paleoanthropologist Mary Leakey, it was heavily promoted by the evolutionary establishment for well over a decade before being pushed off to the side. Renamed *Paranthropus*, it is now seen as a more distant relative and part of the australopithecine apes, that group of extinct, robust apes that includes the famous Lucy.”<sup>57</sup>

“The influence of Darwinian evolution on the public understanding of the origin of humanity cannot be understated, especially since it has fuelled various justifications for colonialism and racism of all sorts.... Perhaps this is why hoaxes have stained the face of anthropology from its inception—the ape-men that never were. The first major hoax was Piltdown Man, presented with pomp at the Geological Society of London in 1912 as pieces of a recent human skull.... In 1923, the German anatomist Franz Weidenreich pointed out that the skull fragments were human, but the jaw was of an orangutan with filed teeth! It took the scientific community 30 years after that to admit he was right. That was the science of the day, later proved wrong.”<sup>58</sup>

“These are just a few of the many cases [of bias in academia toward belief in ape-to-man descent] that could be cited. It makes us wonder why the need for so much fraud if the evolution of humans is certain. The answer is obvious: fossils do not support the evolution of humans and apes from a common ancestor. It is this absence of evidence that forces frustrated anthropologists

---

<sup>57</sup> Emil Silvestru, “The Fossil Record” in Robert Carter, ed., *Evolution’s Achilles Heels*, p. 144

<sup>58</sup> Silvestru, pp. 146, 147

## *Providing The Needed Excuse For Atheism*

to explore every possible way to compensate for the lack of fossils.”<sup>59</sup>

Despite the fact that most of the overhyped “evidence” of man being related to apes has been either reinterpreted or shown to be downright fraudulent, the believers in Darwinian evolution still cling to the discredited ape-to-man paradigm in much the same way that believers in a “flat earth” cling to that discredited idea—except that the disciples of Darwin far outstrip the Flat-earth Society in both numbers and influence.

Indeed, the detrimental effects of Darwinism—especially on the younger generation—cannot be overstated. If evolution is accepted as true, then there is no accountability to a Creator or a divine moral code that defines what is normal. The inevitable result is exactly what we now have: aberrant sexual behaviors, including same-sex “marriage,” and unrestrained abortion. But what do you expect from mere “hairless apes”?

---

<sup>59</sup> Silvestru, p. 148

## CHAPTER EIGHT

---

### Providing The Needed Excuse For Atheism

Why do so many of those who consider themselves “enlightened” insist on buying into the scientifically *disproved* Darwinian idea of evolution? Could it be that some evolutionists have actually *sought* to dismiss the idea of creation? Indeed, some adherents of Darwinism have openly admitted their motives. For example, at a gathering of evolutionists at Chicago in 1959 to celebrate the 100th anniversary since the publication of Darwin’s *Origin of Species*, Sir Julian Huxley (grandson of “Darwin’s bulldog,” Thomas Huxley) declared, “Darwinism **removed the whole idea of God as the creator** of organisms from the sphere of rational discussion.”<sup>60</sup> Most of those gathered there agreed with Huxley.

Another Huxley, philosopher and novelist Aldous Huxley, has been even more candid in admitting his motives: “I had motives for not wanting the world to have meaning; consequently I assumed that it had none, and was able without any difficulty to find satisfying reasons for this assumption.... For myself, as no doubt for most of my contemporaries, **the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation**. The liberation we desired was simultaneous liberation from a certain political and economic system, and **liberation from a certain system of morality. We objected to the morality because it interfered with our sexual freedom.**”<sup>61</sup> Now there’s “rational thinking” for you. He didn’t want something to be true, so he simply *assumed* that it was, in fact, *not* true! (Sort of like the Flat Earth Society expecting the earth to become flat just because they choose to believe it is.)

Thus, the Darwinian theory of evolution, as promoted by the Huxley family, has seemingly freed its adherents from any

---

<sup>60</sup> Tom Bethel, *House of Cards*, p. 39; bold emphasis added

<sup>61</sup> Aldous Huxley, Robert S. Baker, James Sexton, “Complete Essays”: 1956-1963, and supplement, 1920-1948; bold emphasis added



## *Providing The Needed Excuse For Atheism*

concern that they might ultimately have to answer to anyone for their behavior in this life.

Jonathan Sarfati shares with us a revealing quote from evolutionist Richard Lewontin: “We take the side of science *in spite* of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, *in spite* of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, *in spite* of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because **we have a prior commitment, a commitment to materialism**. It is not that the methods or institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, we are forced by **our *a priori* adherence to material causes** to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counterintuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. **Moreover, that materialism is an absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door.**”<sup>62</sup>

We get additional insight into the thinking of many atheists from Anthony DeStefano: “This whole [atheistic] way of thinking is best summed up by Larry Flynt, publisher of *Hustler* magazine (and clearly a paragon of virtue), who said: ‘Religion has caused more harm than any idea since the beginning of time. There’s nothing good I can say about it. Religion is the worst enemy of mankind. It should be banned.’... Most of them [celebrities expressing attitudes like Flynt’s] simply parrot ideas they’ve heard or read, which happen to agree with their own feelings or their, shall we say, ‘lax’ brands of morality.”<sup>63</sup>

Answering the accusations of people like Flynt and Richard Dawkins, DeStefano goes on to say, “As we’ve discussed, they’ve had to place huge blinders over their eyes in order to avoid seeing all the good that religion has done throughout history. They’ve essentially had to force themselves not to recognize the extraordinary contributions to civilization religion has made to culture, politics, education, and the arts.... The bottom line is that cataloging the bad behavior of believers doesn’t prove anything—except perhaps the bad behavior of humanity. It certainly doesn’t prove that religion itself is bad; and it doesn’t go anywhere near proving that believing in God is bad.”<sup>64</sup> Nor does

---

<sup>62</sup> Jonathan Sarfati, *Refuting Evolution*, pp. 17, 18; italics by the author Sarfati quotes; bold emphasis added

<sup>63</sup> Anthony DeStefano, *Inside the Atheist Mind*, p. 18

<sup>64</sup> DeStefano, p. 71

## Chapter Eight

it prove that God does not exist.

Addressing the atheist claim that the rejection of God doesn't preclude the existence of decent and moral people, DeStefano points out a candid admission by the nineteenth-century atheist philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche. "In his famous treatise *Beyond Good and Evil*, Nietzsche wrote: 'Severity, violence, slavery, danger in the street and in the heart, secrecy, stoicism, tempter's art, and devilry of every kind,... everything wicked, terrible, tyrannical, predatory, and serpentine in man serves as well for the elevation of the human species as its opposite.... Such kind of men are we, we free spirits!... The noble type of man regards himself as a determiner of values ... he is a *creator of values*.'... That's what Nietzsche believed atheists should be—free spirits. Spirits who were really free to do whatever they wished, once they had thrown off the shackles of religious 'oppression.' In Nietzsche's philosophy, it is permissible to go 'beyond good and evil,' because without God, there really is no such thing as good and evil. These concepts are merely human inventions. What makes something good or evil is determined solely by whether it serves our own personal, practical purposes. That's why Nietzsche urged his followers to become *Übermensch*—or supermen—individuals who could understand that good and evil are simply artificial restrictions imposed by religion in order to prevent the strong from dominating the weak. He embraced a philosophy of social Darwinism that advocated not only survival of the fittest but also the survival of the most powerful.

"And why not? If God doesn't exist, how can there be any kind of objective moral law to protect the weak? How can any objective moral law exist at all?"<sup>65</sup>

We should note that the atheistic philosophy of Nietzsche's social Darwinism provided much of the justification for the atrocities of the Nazi Third Reich in Germany from 1933 to 1945 and the mass murders of Stalin and Soviet communist dictators from 1917 to 1989. Typically, atheists hate religion; but they love materialistic theories like Darwinian evolution because such theories support their *rejection* of religion or any idea of God as Creator. Such rejection leaves them free to live as they please, without any concern about the effect of their behavior on others or that they may some day have to answer for it.

---

<sup>65</sup> DeStefano, pp. 87, 88

## Conclusion

### Where To From Here?

So ... having seen that Darwin's "sacred cow" of evolution has been *slaughtered* by true science and *done in* by the work of honest scientists (and yet it has been used by too many to justify all sorts of evil) will you be like the many who continue to cling to a patently false belief, letting it underpin your rejection of God as Creator so you can justify ungodly behavior? Or will you be among the few who accept the reality of His existence, seek His favor and ask forgiveness for that ungodly behavior?

God speaks to us through His Word, the Bible. The Apostle Paul, speaking to the Athenians after noting they had a shrine to the "Unknown God," said he was preaching that God to them. He said that God had created all mankind: "In order that they might seek the Lord, if perhaps they might feel after Him and might find Him; though truly, He is not far from each one of us, for in Him we live and move and have our being; as some of the poets among you also have said, 'For we are His offspring.' Therefore, since we are the offspring of God, we should not think that the Godhead is like that which is made of gold, or silver, or stone—a graven thing of art devised by the imagination of man; for although God has indeed overlooked the times of this ignorance, He now commands all men everywhere to repent, because He has set a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness by a Man Whom He has appointed, having given proof to all by raising Him from the dead." (Acts 17:27-31) If you've read this volume carefully, you now know that life did *not* evolve; it was created by the supreme God who also created the universe and all that exists.

He gives us free choice as to whether we'll seek Him and obey Him or not.

Which will you choose?

***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

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

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