***The Emperor Has No Clothes***

Genesis 1:1

**I. Introduction:**

1. 2 What does the phrase “the emperor has no clothes” mean? 3

A. It comes from a fairytale written by Hans Christian Andersen in 1837.

B. In the tale there was an emperor who only cared about dressing well and showing off his clothes.

(1) Two swindlers came to town and approached the emperor telling him they could make him the finest suit of clothes ever made.

(2) They told the emperor the clothes had a very special quality: they were invisible to anyone who was either stupid or not fit to be a citizen of his kingdom.

(3) However, in reality the “clothes” did not exist. Therefore, when the emperor put on his new “clothes” he was too proud to admit he was naked. After all, he did not want to be thought of as “stupid” or “unfit” to be a citizen of his own kingdom.

(4) So the emperor put on his new “clothes” and paraded around town. No one had the courage to tell the emperor he was marching around in his underwear. Instead they praised his magnificent clothes. You see, everyone realized it was a scam but they were too timid to say so!

C. So the expression “the emperor has no clothes” is often used in political and social situations where there is an *obvious truth* denied by the majority *despite* readily available evidence to the contrary. This is especially the case when the issue under consideration is proclaimed by those in positions of authority (e.g., scientists, media). People are afraid to challenge them!

2. 4 How did life begin? A vitally important question! Knowing the truth about our origins is essential because it affects:

A. Our attitudes toward ourselves and the way we treat other people (value of human life, morality, etc.). It is quite a different world if humankind is the end result of billions of years of chance biochemical reactions vs. the result of an intelligent Creator who designed us and created us in His image (think Hitler and the Holocaust).

B. Our concept of God: if human beings are the accidental by-product of a random genetic mutations occurring over billions of years then God is myth at best and a lie at worse.

C. Very importantly our views on “origins” has a dramatic impact upon how we view the Bible and Jesus Christ. There can be no middle ground (e.g., theistic evolution) mankind is either the result of evolution or creation (more scrips). Jesus was a “young earth creationist”; Mk. 10:6; Matt. 19:4; Jn. 5:45-47.

D. People’s attitude towards Christians, the Bible and science. Consider the attitude of evolutionists in some comments from the recent “Creation vs. Evolution” debate between Ken Ham and Bill Nye (“The Science Guy”):

5 ArtCarnage: Nye's only problem may be that he'll be running into a deeper level of stupid than he's unaccustomed to. After all, he's used to answering questions from children.

James M.: He is about to run into a Super Massive Black Hole of Stupid. From which no logic or reason can escape.

Benoit Brousseau: Nye shouldn't waste time giving Ham scientific facts, Ham (and the crowd we can expect) simply doesn't speak that language.

6 James M.: THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO and I mean NO evidence to support Creationism. Get this straight. THE Bible is not evidence. No more than the LoTR is evidence of dragons and elves and Hobbits. No more than War of the Worlds is proof of life on Mars. There is no scientific verifiable, evidence in the geological, fossil, or climatic, astronomical records to back up any claims made by Creationists. The Earth is old. Tremendously old.

Steve P.: Agree 100%, trying to debate these people is like trying to smell the color 9. They are willfully ignorant, at least kids may honestly not know better.

7 Ray J.: it is legitimizing stupidity.

Aaron Booth: I almost fell out if my chair at work laughing when I read "evidence for creation."

Ray J.: only in this country do we waste monumental amounts of time on stupidity like this.

Robert Guercio: Debating a creationist is just so demeaning!

Guy C.: The debate is pointless. People that believe in creationism think in twitter like sound bytes. Nye won't be able to hold their attention long enough to get things into their heads.

8 Andrew J.: I don't blame Nye in the least, putting a light on ignorance is the only way to combat it. It is true that the creationists get a platform to spout their dogma but on the other hand, they also have a very real chance to be shown as the charlatans they are to those who are in doubt.

HarryPotter: This will not be a debate. A debate is between two opposing opinions. This is between scientific fact and unscientific stupidity. \*\*

E. We need to be ready to give answers! 1 Pet. 3:15 Opponents of “creationism,” God, the Bible, etc. can be very condescending and intimidating. They will falsely accuse “creationists” as being “unscientific,” believing in “old wives tales,” on the same level as “flat earthers,” on par with those who persecuted Galileo and Copernicus. However, if we properly arm ourselves with the facts we can give a more than adequate answer! True science supports creationism much more than it does evolution.

3. 9 Darwinian evolution defined:

A. Darwin really didn’t invent evolution as the roots of evolutionary theory date back thousands of years to the ancient Greeks.

B. Darwin published his book *Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection* in 1859 several years after a 5-year voyage around the world as the naturalist on the sailing vessel *Beagle*.

C. Interestingly, Darwin was originally trained at Cambridge as a minister in the Church of England.

D. \*\* But, somewhere along the way he lost whatever faith he had and it is important to realize that this surely biased his thinking.

“The Old Testament, from its manifestly false history of the earth, was no more to be trusted than the sacred books of the Hindus, or the beliefs of any barbarian. The New Testament is a damnable doctrine. [I can] hardly see how anyone ought to wish Christianity to be true.” (Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species* (London: A.L. Burt, 1859)

E. The world rapidly accepted Darwin as an authority and adopted his theory as fact.

F. 10 Today Darwin’s TOE remains the most widely held explanation for the origin of life (statistics for the U.S.):

* General public: ~69%
* Scientists: ~87%

G. 11 The TOE states that:

(1) All life on earth arose randomly and spontaneously from non-living matter billions of years ago. TOE adherents believe the universe is 13.77 billion years old (NASA) and the Earth is 4.54 billion years (NASA).

(2) The process of evolution first produced common biological molecules (e.g., amino acids, proteins, sugars, DNA, RNA, etc.) from a “primordial soup” and then somehow through the random and spontaneous interaction of these biomolecules the first one-celled creatures were formed (spontaneous generation of life). Then over millions and millions of years these one-celled creatures eventually evolved into every form of life seen on the earth.

(3) It is truly the “molecules-to-man” theory. The most egregious error of TOE is what I call “extreme extrapolation.” In other words, TOE adherents see the biological change within “kind” (e.g., changes within species like cats [lions, tigers, panthers, housecats] or changes due to selective breeding [Holstein, Jersey, Angus, Hereford] and through “extreme extrapolation” *jump to the conclusion* that dead molecules eventually became man.

**II. Discussion:**

1. 12 ***Evolution’s Four Pillars***: The TOE is built upon four pillars:

A. **Spontaneous generation:** This means that at some point(s) in the far distant historical past, life randomly and spontaneously arose from dead, inanimate chemicals. Supporters of TOE are fond of theorizing that billions of years ago on the primitive earth there existed a “primordial soup” of such chemicals which presented the “conditions” for the production of carbon-based biomolecules of life. And then through some unknown processes these randomly produced biomolecules were able, *without intelligence*, to organize themselves into the first living one-celled creatures. Amazingly this must have happened many times over and these first cells were miraculously able to protect themselves, grow, prosper, reproduce, and evolve into every living plant and animal on the Earth.

B. **Random mutations:** To understand this pillar we must talk about the biomolecule DNA (\*\*show). DNA is the molecule common to all life and contains the “blueprint” for life. DNA contains the code absolutely required for cells to produce every biomolecule required for life (e.g., proteins, sugars, fats, etc.) and to reproduce themselves. Under various circumstances minor changes can take place in the DNA genetic code and these changes are called *mutations*. Most mutations occur when a creature’s genetic code is copied at the time of reproduction. Also, various environmental toxins (e.g., radiation, chemicals) can cause mutations in DNA (e.g., ultraviolet radiation from the sun causes skin cancer)(fruit flies from genetics course).

C. **Natural selection:**  This concept is often referred to as the *survival of the fittest*. According to TOE, stronger creatures survive and weaker creatures die off and become extinct. *Survival of the fittest* states that *harmful* random mutations result in a weaker creature, therefore, their ability to reproduce and survive is low. On the other hand, *helpful* random mutations make a creature stronger and enhance their ability to reproduce and survive (aka, *competitive advantage*).

D. **Time:**  If TOE is true an amazing multitude of *helpful* random mutations are necessary to change a creature into an entirely new specie. If random mutations are the key to TOE’s success then time (and lots of it!) are required. \*\* One could only imagine the millions, if not billions, of years it would take for enough helpful random mutations to accumulate to change a bacterium into an elephant.

2. 13 ***Evaluating the Evidence***: How does one go about deciding which better explains the origin of life, evolution or creation?

A. The best way to prove any theory is to observe the subjects of that theory in action. This is called *empirical science*. In *empirical science* a scientist formulates a hypothesis (i.e., what he thinks is true; e.g., diet A produces more milk in dairy cows than diet B). He then designs an experiment (e.g., two groups of cows, one is fed diet A and a second group is fed diet B). He then conducts the experiment (i.e., the two groups are fed diet A and diet B for a period of time) and collects data on the subjects (e.g., milk production on diets A and B). Then, by analyzing the data and using various statistical methods the scientist can use this directly observed data (*empirical data*) and the laws of probability to make conclusions (e.g., diet A produces 5 more pounds of milk per day than diet B at a 95% level of confidence or probability). Very importantly, *empirical science* requires the *direct observation and collection of data from the subjects under investigation*.

B. This introduces a very big problem: Evolution and creation can neither be directly observed. Creation happened at least 6,000 years ago and we don’t have a time machine to go back and directly observe it. Evolution is also outside the bounds of *empirical science* because, if it is true, it happened over millions and millions of years; therefore, we cannot set up an experiment to observe it directly.

C. So neither TOE or creation can be evaluated *directly* by *empirical science*. We have to evaluate both by looking at *indirect evidence*. This method is often called the *historical method* or *historical science*. We can certainly use many of the same scientific tools used by *empirical science*, but we cannot design an experiment and make *direct observations* on the overall process of either evolution or creation (e.g., detective doesn’t directly view the crime, but collects evidence from the crime scene in order to formulate a “theory of the crime” and hopefully find the person(s) responsible for the crime).

D. I just want to add a very important note here. Who’s being “unscientific”? Many people, especially those in the scientific community and the media, look down on people who believe in creation (i.e., creationists). Very often they falsely accuse creationists of not believing in science. They heap ridicule on creationists and place them in the same intellectual category as those believing in a flat earth, the tooth fairy, or Santa Claus. A major goal of this lesson is to show you that the exact opposite is true!

E. 14 Famous scientist who were creationists:

**Biology:**

* ***Louis Pasteur*** (1822-1895)***:*** developed the science of medical microbiology, developed the germ theory of disease, vaccinations (rabies, anthrax); also made many discoveries in chemistry (e.g., symmetry of crystals; also proved spontaneous generation does not occur).
* ***Gregor Mendel*** (1822-1884)***:*** father of the modern science of genetics.

**Physics:**

* ***Sir Isaac Newton*** (1642-1727)***:*** discovered the law of gravity, developed laws of motion, co-discover of calculus, invented the reflecting telescope, considered one of the most influential scientists of all time.
* ***Lord William Kelvin*** (1824-1907)***:*** energetics, thermodynamics.

**Astronomy:**

* ***Nicolaus Copernicus*** (1473-1543)***:*** developed heliocentric model of the solar system.
* ***Johann Kepler*** (1571-1630)***:*** celestial mechanics, physical astronomy.

**Electronics:**

* ***Samuel Morse*** (1791-1872)***:***  co-inventor of Morse code and helped develop the commercial use of telegraphy.
* ***James Clark Maxwell*** (1831-1879)***:*** electrodynamics, statistical thermodynamics.
* ***Michael Faraday*** (1791-1867)***:*** electromagnetism, field theory.

**Medicine:**

* ***Joseph Lister:*** developed the science of antiseptic surgery (contemporary of Louis Pasteur and applied Pasteur’s germ theory to surgery).
* ***Georges Cuvier*** (1769-1832)***:*** developed the sciences of comparative anatomy and vertebrate paleontology.

**Chemistry:**

* ***Robert Boyle*** (1627-1691)***:*** regarded by many as the first modern scientist and founder of modern chemistry, also developed science of gas dynamics.
* ***Humphrey Davy*** (1778-1829)***:*** Developed the science of thermokinetics (Michael Faraday was his lab assistant).

**Mathematics:**

* ***Blaise Pascal*** (1623-1662**)*:*** developed geometry and probability theory, invented the mechanical calculator, also developed basic concepts in fluid dynamics and concepts related to pressure and vacuum.

**Other:**

* ***Sir Francis Bacon*** (1561-1626)***:*** considered the father of the scientific method (empiricism).
* ***Charles Babbage*** 1791-1871 invented the first modern computer.

3. 15 ***Tools to Evaluate TOE and Creation***: The evidence we’ll examine comes from four main sources.

A. **Probability:** Spontaneous generation and random mutations are events for which probabilities can be estimated for likelihood of them happening. Natural selection can also be statistically analyzed. If TOE is true we should find that the mathematical probability favoring it should be very reasonable (95% confidence).

B. **Earth Age:** TOE demands millions, even billions, of years for it to take place. If TOE is true there should be abundant evidence that the Earth is at least 4.54 billion years old (*Wikipedia*). Analysis of the historical evidence for TOE demands a very ancient Earth, otherwise there simply has not been enough time for evolution to occur.

C. **Fossil Record:** The fossil record in the Earth’s outer crust serves as a natural museum of past life. If TOE is true the process of random mutation and natural selection would over millions of years have produced a vast array of fossils demonstrating the gradual change of one species into another (for example the change of one-celled creatures into elephant). We would also expect the oldest and deepest layers of fossils to contain the earliest and most primitive forms of life. Shallow layers should show a gradual transition from primitive to increasingly more complex forms of life. Very importantly, if TOE is true we would not expect new life forms to appear suddenly and fully developed, but rather appear slowly and with many transitional forms showing increasing levels of complexity (e.g., fish to amphibians, reptiles to birds, apes to men, etc.). If TOE is true these transitional fossils should be so abundant that museum collections should be overflowing with them. We would also expect for fossils to be relatively evenly distributed over the habitable regions of the Earth. \*\*

D. **Evidence of Design:** It is axiomatic that things showing evidence of design demand an intelligence that produced that design. For example, it would be ridiculous to look at a 747 airliner and theorize it was produced by series of random explosions in a junk yard. But even simple items show evidence of design. \*\*Consider the lowly mousetrap. It demonstrates the principle of *irreducible complexity*. This simply means that if you remove any one of its parts it is no longer able to function as a mousetrap. All creatures on the Earth have organs, tissues, cells, and biomolecules that demonstrate this principle (*Darwin’s Black Box*).

4. 16 ***Evaluating TOE and Creation***:

A. **Spontaneous generation:** remember the TOE is the “molecules to man” theory and absolutely requires spontaneous generation (i.e., nonlife🡪life) to have occurred in the far distant past. How reasonable is the probability that the random collision of dead, inanimate chemical molecules produced all living creatures?

(1) *Protein synthesis*: proteins are vital to life ; structural proteins (skin, hair, bones), physiologically active proteins (muscle, hormones (e.g., growth hormone, insulin), molecular transport (e.g., hemoglobin), metabolism (Kreb’s cycle), enzymes (e.g., digestion, cellular metabolism), DNA and RNA replication), etc.

a. 17 Proteins are made of smaller molecules called *amino acids*. There are 20 naturally occurring amino acids.

b. Amino acids are joined together like pearls on a necklace to form proteins; also several chains of amino acids can be joined to form one protein. For example, in humans the smallest protein contains 44 amino acids and the largest (titin) contains 34,350.

c. The sequence of amino acids for a specific protein is absolutely critical. 18 Even one mistake in the sequence damages or completely destroys the protein’s structure and function (e.g., sickle-cell anemia involves only one amino acid in the protein hemoglobin which consists of two alpha chains (141 amino acids each) and two beta chains (146 amino acids each; total of 574 amino acids).

d. 19 Now think about TOE and how could proteins ever form spontaneously and randomly? Let’s consider a hypothetical protein only 20 amino acids long. Each of the 20 spots can be filled by any one of the 20 amino acids. So the chance of getting the right sequence randomly would be: 2020 which equals: one chance in 104,858,000,000,000,000,000,000,000! Now think about a hemoglobin molecule with 574 amino acids or a molecule of titin with 34,350 amino acids!

e. But the odds are even worse when you consider that 19 of the 20 amino acids come in two forms, D (left handed) and L (right handed).

(i) Amino acids demonstrate a chemical property known as *chirality* (from Greek for “hand”).

(ii) *Chirality* means each amino acid comes in two isomers (same kinds and numbers of atoms in a different arrangement) called *stereo isomers* or *mirror-image isomers* (enantiomers, explain “handedness”).

(iii) Nature only uses left-handed (L) isomers of amino acids.

(iv) But in the random formation of proteins demanded by TOE the “primordial soup” would have contained equal amounts of right-handed (D) and left-handed (L) amino acids; therefore, the odds for the spontaneous and random formation of proteins is even more remote.

f. Proteins and protein synthesis are an important aspect of the biochemistry of all living things, but there is much, much more!

(i) DNA (already seen) is a very complex molecule necessary for life. The *reproduction* and *function* of every one of the 100 trillion cells in the human body is determined and controlled by the DNA in each cell’s nucleus (\*\*BTW: nucleotides a component of DNA must be D isomers! Who says God doesn’t have a sense of humor!)

(ii) How much information can DNA store? “One gram of DNA can store 700 terabytes of data. That’s 14,000 50-gigabyte Blu-ray discs… in a droplet of DNA that would fit on the tip of your pinky. To store the same kind of data on hard drives — the densest storage medium in use today — you’d need 233 3TB drives, weighing a total of 151 kilos.” (Harvard University)(~2,800 hard drives the size that’s on my laptop!) 20

“Not only is the amount of information in cellular DNA staggering, it’s also incredibly compact. We marvel at computer storage disks with ever greater capacity. Yet the quantity of information that could be stored in a pinhead’s volume of DNA is equivalent to the content of paperback books spanning the distance from the earth to the moon 500 times—each book being unique from the others.” (Werner Gitt, information scientist)

g. But we’ve only touched the hem of the garment. From proteins and DNA TOE requires blind chance to produce a multitude of other biomolecules and then assemble them all into a functioning cell!

(i) Single cells are deceptively complex structures (21 show diagram).

(ii) The average cell is about 10-6 meters thick, a human hair is 1,000 time wider!

(iii) The human body contains ~100 trillion cells (100,000,000,000,000; a 100 thousand billions!). There at least 210 different general cell types and many more thousands of sub-types within these 210 general types.

(iv) If lined up side-by-side these 100 trillion cells would encircle the earth 200 times!

(v) Every cell is a self-contained unit with a myriad of sub-cellular organs required for its function.

(vi) 22 Consider these words from Michael Denton, molecular biologist

“Perhaps no other area of modern biology is the challenge posed by the extreme complexity and ingenuity of biological adaptations more apparent than in the fascinating new molecular world of the cell…To grasp the reality of life as it has been revealed by molecular biology, we must magnify a cell a thousand million times until it is twenty kilometers (~12.5 miles) in diameter and resembles a giant airship large enough to cover a great city like London or New York. What we would then see would be an object of unparalleled complexity and adaptive design. On the surface of the cell we would see millions of openings, like the portholes of a vast space ship, opening and closing to allow a continual stream of materials to flow in and out. If we were to enter one of these openings we would find ourselves in a world of supreme technology and bewildering complexity.

23 Is it really credible that random processes could have constructed a reality, the smallest element of which—a functional protein or gene—is complex beyond our own creative capacities, a reality which is the very antithesis of chance, which excels in every sense anything produced by the intelligence of man? Alongside the level of ingenuity and complexity exhibited by the molecular machinery of life, even our most advanced artifacts appear clumsy…

It would be an illusion to think that what we are aware of at present is any more than a fraction of the full extent of biological design. In practically every field of fundamental biological research, ever-increasing levels of design and complexity are being revealed at an ever-increasing rate.” (Michael Denton, molecular biologist)

Now contrast that with these words: 24

“Whether the earth cooled from a molten mass or condensed out of cold dust, life could not have existed when the earth was formed some 5,000,000,000 years ago; it must have originated since…it is not unreasonable to suppose that life originated in a watery ‘soup’ of prebiological organic compounds and that living organisms arose later by surrounding quantities of these compounds by membranes that made them into ‘cells.’ This is usually considered the starting point of organic evolution.” (Encyclopedia Britannica)

(vii) Amazingly many famous evolutionists recognize the impossibility of life arising spontaneous and randomly from non-life and are in agreement that it is nearly impossible to believe in what TOE demands: 25

“The likelihood of the formation of life from inanimate matter is 1 to a number with 40,000 noughts after it (1040,000)…It is big enough to bury Darwin and the whole theory of evolution. There was no primeval soup, neither on this planet nor any other, and if the beginnings of life were not random, they must therefore have been the product of purposeful intelligence.” (Sir Fred Hoyle, English astronomer)

(viii) Sir Fred Hoyle compares the probability of the spontaneous generation of life to the probability of 1050 blind people each simultaneously solving a Rubik’s cube. Then he said, “The notion that not only biopolymers (i.e., biomolecules, cvt) but the operating program of a living cell (i.e., DNA/RNA, cvt) could be arrived at by chance in a primordial organic soup here on earth is evidently nonsense of a high order.”

(ix) Other famous evolutionists agree with Sir Fred Hoyle:

* Dr. Harold Morowitz (biophysicist at Yale and George Mason; testified at “McLean v. Arkansas” trial that creationism has no scientific basis and should not be taught in public schools) said:

“The probability for the chance of formation of the smallest, simplest form of living organisms known is 1 to 10340,000,000…the size of this figure is truly staggering, since there are only supposed to be approximately 1080 electrons in the whole universe!” (from *Energy Flow in Biology*)

* The late Dr. Carl Sagan (PBS television series “Cosmos”) put the odds even higher at 102,000,000,000.

(x) Dr. Emile Borel, the father of modern probability, stated that “the occurrence of any event where the chances are beyond” 1050 “is an event which we can state with certainty will *never happen*, no matter how much time is allotted and no matter how many conceivable opportunities could exist for the event to take place.” (*Probabilities and Life*)

(xi) Despite these insurmountable odds evolutionist desperately cling to TOE! Why? 26 Consider this quote from Dr. George Wald, Harvard professor and received the Nobel Prize in Physiology (1967) for his work in the biochemistry of human vision:

“There are only two possible explanations as to how life arose: Spontaneous generation arising to evolution or a supernatural creative act of God…There is no other possibility. Spontaneous generation was scientifically disproved 120 years ago by Louis Pasteur and others, but that just leaves us with only one other possibility…that life came as a supernatural act of creation by God, *but I can’t accept that philosophy because I do not want to believe in God.* Therefore, I choose to believe in that which I know is scientifically impossible, spontaneous generation leading to evolution.” (“Origin, Life and Evolution” in *Scientific American*, 1978)

(xii) There is only one thing I can say: 27

**Romans 1:18-20:** *For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who suppress the truth in unrighteousness,* ***19*** *because what may be known of God is manifest in them, for God has shown it to them.* ***20*** *For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse,*

***Spontaneous generation is a total “non-starter”; it’s an impossibility that even the most dyed in the wool evolutionists recognize; it’s impossibility is fatal to TOE! Indeed the emperor has no clothes.***

B. 28 **Random mutation/Natural selection:** remember, TOE is the “molecules to man” theory and absolutely requires spontaneous generation to have occurred in the far distant past.

(1) *Random mutations*: mutations are small changes made to a creature’s DNA; recall that DNA is the “blueprint” for life and determines everything that happens in a cell and hence in the animal/plant. According to TOE these beneficial DNA mutations are supposed to increase the organism’s ability to survive and reproduce.

a. *Numbers problem:* \*\*Can you imagine how many favorable/beneficial mutations would be required to turn a bacterium into an elephant?! It would take billions, if not trillions!! Each mutation would have necessarily increased the organism’s survival rate! Well, what about that? Can random mutations and natural selection possibly get the job done?

(i) Population geneticists tell us that animals with a 20 year generation interval (humans it is ~30 years) could pass along no more than 1,700 total mutations in 10 million years.

(ii) Paleontologists estimate that humans have only been on the Earth for 100,000 to 200,000 years, far too short of a time span.

(iii) Because, even if we assume the human generation interval is only 20 years; over the span of 200,000 years only 34 total mutations would have had time to take place!

b. 29 *Information problem: \*\**One can only imagine the tremendous increase in information coded for in DNA that would have to occur for a bacterium to turn into a man.

(i) However, research on genetic mutations overwhelmingly shows they result in *less* DNA information rather than more. 30

“The NDT (i.e., TOE) is supposed to explain how the information of life has built up by evolution. The essential biological difference between a human and a bacterium is in the information they contain. All other biological differences follow from that. The human genome (i.e., entire genetic code, cvt) has much more information than does the bacterial genome. *Information cannot be built up by mutations that lose it.* A business can’t make money by losing it a little at a time.” (Dr. Lee Spetner, biophysicist in *Not By Chance*)

(ii) Perhaps this is one reason Darwin himself abandoned his own theory in the 6th edition of *Origin of* Species.

“Natural selection is incompetent to account for the incipient stages of useful structures.” (Charles Darwin, *Origin of Species*, 6th ed.)

c. 31 *Survival problem:* Almost all mutations have been shown to be harmful to creatures rather than helpful.

(i) All known evidence shows that the result of a random mutation in a creature does not produce a new creature, but the same creature that is almost always less able to thrive, survive, and reproduce (e.g., Down’s syndrome, cystic fibrosis, Huntington’s disease in humans; according to John Hopkins University there are 21,565 known genetic disorders in humans and 3-4% of babies are born with a genetic disorders many of which are fatal.)

\*\*“The mass of evidence shows that all, or almost all, known mutations are unmistakably pathological and the few remaining ones are highly suspect.” (Dr. Pierre-Grasse, University of Paris, past-president of the French Academy of Science)

32 “No matter how numerous they may be, mutations do not produce any kind of evolution. The opportune appearance of mutations permitting animals and plants to meet their needs seems hard to believe. Yet Darwinian theory is even more demanding. A single plant or a single animal would require thousands and thousands of lucky, appropriate events. Thus, miracles would become the rule: events with infinitesimal probability could no longer fail to occur…There is no law against day dreaming, but science must not indulge in it.” (Dr. Pierre-Grasse, University of Paris, past-president of the French Academy of Science)

d. 33 *Irreducible complexity problem:* According to TOE random mutations working in tandem with natural selection makes gradual, almost imperceptible changes over millions of years as it turns simple life into complex life.

(i) Irreducible complexity:

“A single system which is composed of several interacting parts that contribute to the basic function, and where the removal of any one of the parts causes the system to effectively cease functioning.” (Michael Behe, *Darwin’s Black Box*)

Example—mousetrap (if any piece is missing it will not work!).

(ii) The point is simply this: what good is half a wing or half a leg?

(iii) But, actually it is much more complex than even half a wing or half an arm. TOE must explain changes down to the cellular, sub-cellular and molecular level.

e. 34 *Fossil record problem*: Since TOE says random mutations and natural selection produce very small changes over millions of years; there should be an abundance of evidence for this in the fossil record (explain transitional fossils; i.e., “the missing link”; e.g., reptiles🡪birds).

(i) \*\*Even Darwin recognized the importance of transitional fossils to TOE (both quotes from Charles Darwin in *The Origin of Species*).

“So that the number of intermediate and transitional links, between all living and extinct species, must have been inconceivably great. But assuredly, if this theory be true, such have lived upon the earth.”

35 “Why then is not every geological formation and every strata full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely-graduated organic chain; and this perhaps, is the most obvious and serious objection which can be urged against my theory.”

36 “The abrupt manner in which whole groups of species suddenly appear in certain formations has been urged by several paleontologists…as a fatal objection to the belief in the transmutation of species. If numerous species, belonging to the same genera of families, have really started life at once, the fact would be fatal to the theory of evolution through natural selection.”

(ii) A 155 year search of the fossil record has revealed it is devoid of so-called *transitional forms predicted* and *required* by the TOE!

“I fully agree with your comments on the lack of direct illustration of evolutionary transitions in my book. If I knew of any, fossil or living, I would certainly have included them. I will lay it on the line, there is not one such fossil for which one might make a watertight argument.” (Dr, Colin Patterson, served as senior paleontologist for the British Museum of Natural History)

(iii) Fossils appear abruptly in the geologic column (37); show complex life even in the “oldest” fossils (some species that are even alive today!); primitive fossils are not necessarily in the bottom layers of rock. More than 5,000 species are found in what is usually considered the lowest and most ancient layer (Cambrian layer) and demonstrates modern, fully-formed creatures.

38 “In a burst of creativity like nothing before or since, nature appears to have sketched out the blueprints for virtually the whole animal kingdom.” (“When Life Exploded,” *Time*, p. 68, December 1995)

39 “Since 1987, discoveries of major fossil beds in Greenland, in China, in Siberia, and now in Namibia have shown that the period of biological innovation occurred at virtually the same instant in geologic time all around the world. What could have possibly powered such an advance?” (“When Life Exploded,” *Time*, p. 68, December 1995)

40 “It remains true, as every paleontologist knows, that most new species, genera, and families…appear in the record suddenly and are not led up by known, gradual, completely continuous transitional sequences.” (Dr. G. G. Simpson, noted evolutionist)

(iv) Evolutionist’s response to problems presented by spontaneous generation and lack of transitional fossils:

***\*\*Panspermia*** (Stephen Hawking, famous theoretical physicist and cosmologist at Oxford University; Francis Crick, co-discover of the structure of DNA): basically states that life on earth came from outer space.

***\*\*Punctuated equilibrium*** (the late Dr. Stephen Gould, famous paleontologist, evolutionary biologist and historian of science at Harvard University): “Major structural transitions can occur rapidly without a smooth series of intermediate steps.”

f. *Summary*: Instead of supporting TOE, mutations and natural selection show TOE is a false theory!

41 “To propose and argue that mutations even tandem with ‘natural selection’ are the root cause of 6,000,000 viable, enormously complex species is to mock logic, deny the weight of evidence, and reject the fundamentals of mathematical probability.” (Dr. I. H. Cohen)

42 “I suppose that nobody will deny that it is a great misfortune if an entire branch of science becomes addicted to a false theory. But this is what happened in biology…I believe that one day the Darwinian myth will be ranked the greatest deceit in the history of science. When this happens, many people will pose the question: ‘How did this ever happen?’” (Dr. I. L. Cohen, *Darwinism: The Refutation of a Myth*)

***Random mutations/natural selection are total “non-starters”; they are mechanisms that even leading evolutionists recognize cannot legitimately make TOE true; again a fatal blow to TOE! Indeed the emperor has no clothes.***

C. 43 **Time:** recall that TOE requires a great deal of time; \*\*time for helpful mutations and natural selection to transform simpler creatures into more complex creatures (i.e., “molecules-to-man”). Does the scientific evidence support a 4.54 billion year old Earth?

(1) 44 *Fossil problem*: How are fossils formed? *Uniformitarianism* or *Catastrophism*? Explain differences…

a. 45-48 Mt. Saint Helens formed a mini-Grand Canyon in the space of a few hours!

b. Imagine the power of Noah’s flood! There is very good evidence that Noah’s flood probably carved out the Grand Canyon and raised and sculpted many of the Earth’s mountain ranges. Fossils are not found evenly distributed over the inhabitable parts of the Earth, but are found in vast fossil beds. Only a catastrophe on the scale of Noah’s flood can explain this phenomenon.

49 “Vast animal graveyards and fossiliferous rubble shifts have been found worldwide. Evidence of a great, sudden, and recent water cataclysm, followed by a deep freeze, across the entire great north, accompanied by titanic hydraulic forces and crustal upheavals, burying a host of mammoths, mastodons, elephants, and other great beasts in a region which is now almost totally devoid of vegetation has been documented.

50 Vast numbers of fossil trees and plants, standing erect, oblique, and even inverted while piercing through successive beds of water-laid stone have been discovered. There is abundant evidence of profuse vegetation and a temperate, even subtropical climate prevailing in Antarctica and the north polar regions at some time in the past.

51 Worldwide fossilization has occurred in vast quantities, including fossils in sedimentary strata, often at great depths and under great pressure. Vast and numerous rifts, fissures, and lava beds have been discovered, scarring the world ocean floor, all clearly recent and speak of some gigantic submarine upheaval of the earth’s crust (as in breaking up of the ‘fountains of the deep’). Marine fossils have been found buried and exposed at almost every altitude. And on and on such evidences could be listed.” (Dr. Bert Thompson, *The Global Flood of Noah*)

c. 52 Polystrate fossils: tree fossils that traverse several layers of sedimentary rock or coal (picture).

(2) 53 *Circular reasoning problem*: \*\*Geologists date rocks by the fossils they contain, while paleontologists date fossils by the rocks in which they are found.

(3) 54 *Radiometric dating problem*: Scientists use radiometric dating methods to date rocks, fossils, etc.

a. Radiometric dating is based on the radioactivity of certain elements.

b. Certain elements exist as isotopes. Isotopes are atoms of the same element which have the same number of electrons and protons, but differ as to the number of neutrons in their nucleus. Certain isotopes of some elements are radioactive. Over time they change from one isotope of the same element or even into other elements as they emit radioactivity.

c. 55 In radioactive dating there is always a *parent* element and a *daughter* element. Over time by emitting radiation the *parent element* turns into the *daughter element*.

d. 56 But every form of radioactive dating makes certain assumptions that cast great doubt on their accuracy (explain with hourglass example). Empirical data have consistently shown that all radioactive dating methods produce wildly and obviously conflicting results rendering them pretty much useless.

e. 57 Examples of conflicting dating:

(i) Wood sample from Australia: C-14 method, 45,000 years old; K-Ar method, 45 million years old.

(ii) Fossilized wood: C-14 method (found C-14); K-Ar method, 250 million years old (C-14 is undetectable in samples over ~75,000 years old).

(iii) Fresh rock from Mt. St. Helens volcano (1986) K-Ar method, 350,000 million years old.

(iv) Fresh (1949 & 1975 eruptions) rock from Mt. Ngauruhoe (New Zealand) radiometric dated between 270,000 and 3.5 million years old.

(v) Mummified seals from Antarctica (C-14 method), 615-4,600 years old; freshly killed seal, 1,300 years old.

(vi) Dr. Alan Riggs, USGS, University of Washington: “By radiocarbon dating, living snails ‘died’ 27,000 years ago!”

(vii) Experiments by the “RATE” team (*Radioisotopes and the Age of the Earth*) detected C-14 in coal (hundreds of millions years old), dinosaur fossils (~65 million years old) and diamonds (billions of years old) and found C-14 present. However, according to current scientific techniques items older than 75,000 years should be “C-14 dead.”

58 “It is obvious that radiometric techniques may not be the absolute dating methods that they are claimed to be. Age estimates on a given geological stratum by different radiometric methods are often quite different (sometimes by hundreds of millions of years). There is no absolutely reliable long-term radiological ‘clock.’ The uncertainties inherent in radiometric dating are disturbing to geologists and evolutionists.” (Dr. William D. Stansfield, biology professor California Polytechnic State University)

59 “The radiocarbon method is still not capable of yielding accurate and reliable results. There are gross discrepancies, the chronology is uneven and relative, and the accepted dates are actually selected dates. This whole blessed thing is nothing but 13th century alchemy, and it all depends upon which funny paper your read.” (R. E. Lee, “Radiocarbon: Ages in Error,” *Anthropological Journal of Canada*, p. 9-29, vol. 19(3), 1981)

(4) 60 *Other time problems*: Here is just a sample of literally dozens of phenomena supporting a young earth.

a. The earth’s magnetic field is continually diminishing in strength. Calculations reveal the earth’s magnetic field cannot be more than about 10,000 years old.

b. The salt concentration in the earth’s oceans increases each year. However, the oceans are not nearly as “salty” as they should be if the earth is really billions of years old (max of 62 million years).

c. The helium concentration in earth’s atmosphere is gradually increasing. Currently the concentration is only about 1/2000 of what would be expected if the earth were really 4.54 billion years old (max of 2.27 MY).

d. The earth’s human population grows at about 2% per year. If we conservatively drop that growth rate to ½% per year (i.e., to account for famines, wars, natural disasters, etc.) the earth’s population would be ~102100! At the ½% growth rate per year it would take about 4,000 years to produce today’s population (approximate time elapsed since Noah’s flood).

e. There are literally dozens of other examples we could cite to support a young earth.

“There are a number of indicators that seem to indicate an age of no more than 10,000 years, at the very most, for the solar system and earth.” (Dr. Harold Slusher, astrophysicist and geophysicist)

***Time, rather than a friend of TOE, is an enemy; there is plenty of solid scientific evidence that the earth is not billions of years old, but only thousands of years; again a fatal blow to TOE! Indeed the emperor has no clothes.***

D. 61 **Evidence of Design:**

(1) *Design demands a designer.*

a. The late Dr. Carl Sagan wrote the book *Contact* (movie starred Jodie Foster) in which SETI scientists, who scan the heavens for radio signals from outer space, \*\*received this radio signal over and over again:

2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23, 29, 31, 37, 41, 43, 47, 53, 59, 61, 67, …(up to a total of 261 of these numbers)(prime numbers are numbers divisible, without a remainder, by 1 and themselves).

b. Why did the SETI scientists get so excited when they heard this repeated message? It is a designed message that is evidence of intelligence. The notion that such an ordered list of numbers could be purely randomly generated is so unlikely as to be deemed impossible.

c. \*\*Human DNA codes the message needed for every of the ~100 trillion cells in the human body, every tissue, every organ, every organ system, absolutely everything needed for life. The same is true for every living organism. DNA is the most fantastic information storage system in the universe (elaborate). How could it have possibly resulted from random collision of molecules?

d. 62 **Vision**: Physiology of vision involves >40 complex biomolecules interacting in picoseconds (10-12; time it takes light to travel the width of a human hair!) biomolecules🡪electrical nerve impulses (137 million nerve endings)🡪brain🡪vision! Takes place millions of times per second, day-in and day-out! Not one of those 40 plus biomolecules can be missing for the system to work (*irreducibly complex*). Every one of them would have to have evolved at the very same instant or the eye would be useless. In reality it is even more complex than that; for all of the connections with the brain and the brain itself would have had to have evolved simultaneously for it to work!

e. Even Darwin recognized this as a major obstacle to TOE. 63

“To suppose that the eye with all its inimitable (cvt: incapable of imitation, matchless) contrivances for adjusting the focus to different distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest sense.” (Charles Darwin, *Origin of Species*)

f. **Blood clotting**: requires over 35 enzymes, co-factors and cells (e.g., platelets). If even one component is missing the system does not function properly and the animal is at great risk even potentially death (e.g., *hemophelia*). Over 25 genetic disorders due to mutations have been identified that *negatively* affect blood clotting.

***The evidence of design is a common feature of nature; from the solar system to the simplest of one-celled organisms. Throughout the animal and plant kingdoms evidence of design is stamped on everything we see. Furthermore, this evidence is not just at the level of gross morphology; it permeates even to the molecular level. In fact the deeper one penetrates the more evidence of design one finds! Again a fatal blow to TOE! Indeed the emperor has no clothes.***

(2) 64 Need more? Psa. 139:14; 65 19:1-3; 66 Rom. 1:18-20

**III. Conclusion:**

1. 67 TOE is a classic of example of “the emperor has no clothes.”

68 “Scientists at the forefront of inquiry have put the knife to classical Darwinism. They have not gone public with this news, but have kept it in their technical papers and inner counsels.” (William Fix, *The Bone Peddlers*)

69 “The explanation value of the evolutionary hypothesis of common origin is nil! Evolution not only conveys no knowledge, it seems to convey anti-knowledge. How could I work on evolution ten years and learn nothing from it? Most of you in this room will have to admit that in the last ten years we have seen the basis of evolution go from fact to faith! It does seem that the level of knowledge about evolution is remarkably shallow. We know it ought not be taught in high school, and that’s all we know about it.” (Dr. Colin Patterson, former senior paleontologist for the British Museum of Natural History)

70 “A growing number of respectable scientists are defecting from the evolution camp…moreover, for the most part these ‘experts’ have abandoned Darwinism, not on the basis of religious faith or biblical persuasions, but on strictly scientific grounds, and in some instances, regretfully.” (Dr. Colin Patterson, former senior paleontologist for the British Museum of Natural History)

2. So why do so many scientists cling to it?

71 “There are only two possible explanations as to how life arose: Spontaneous generation arising to evolution or a supernatural creative act of God…There is no other possibility. Spontaneous generation was scientifically disproved 120 years ago by Louis Pasteur and others, but that just leaves us with only one other possibility…that life came as a supernatural act of creation by God, but I can’t accept that philosophy because I do not want to believe in God. Therefore, I choose to believe in that which I know is scientifically impossible, spontaneous generation leading to evolution.” (Dr. George Wald, biology professor Harvard University, Nobel Prize in biology 1971; “Origin, Life and Evolution” in *Scientific American*, 1978)

3. 72 There is only one thing I can say:

Romans 1:18-20: *For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who suppress the truth in unrighteousness, 19 because what may be known of God is manifest in them, for God has shown it to them. 20 For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse,*