

"Milk & Meat" - Answering Questions on Christianity
Life Bible-Presbyterian Church Adult Sunday School

KNOWING GOD - part 5

27. What about Evolution? [*Creation, Evolution & Intelligent Design, Gonzalez & Richards*]

- a. "Evolution is a belief that all life developed from non-living and simpler forms to more complex on its own, without God." - James Beeke (p.166).
- b. Evolutionists believe that matter always existed, our solar system was formed through a great explosion (Big Bang) or some other process, and life on earth formed by chance from non-living substances and over billions of years. None of these beliefs can or have been proven scientifically.
- c. In fact, there are at least 10,000 practising scientists in the USA alone who reject the evolutionary story entirely and who accept the Bible's creation account. (*Answers to the 4 BIG Questions*, Carl Wieland etc, p.7).
- d. In 1859, Charles Darwin published "On the Origin of Species". He proposed that all species of life have descended over time from common ancestors. Together with Alfred Russel Wallace, Darwin posited that evolution resulted from natural selection, in which the struggle for existence led to the survival of the stronger. Not every member of the species is the same; some have traits that are more fit for survival. Given enough time, the fitter species will fill the population, resulting in slight changes in their body and giving rise to new species. Darwin thought that when extrapolated over time, natural selection working on random variations could explain the origin of birds from nonbird ancestors. In the 20th C, the origin of these random variations came to be identified in random mutations in DNA (information-bearing molecule inside cells). Mutations are accidents caused by radiation events or errors in chemistry that alter genes, some of which may give an organism a survival advantage over others. As a result, this organism will leave more offspring, and the trait will get passed on to later generations. Natural selection sifts among variations, excluding some, favouring others.

28. Theistic Evolution. (www.answersingenesis.org)

- a. This view claims that God used evolution as a means of bringing about His creation. Adam and Eve evolved from apelike creatures. Many liberal scholars accept this view and see no problem with incorporating evolutionary principles into the Bible.
- b. Conservative Christians typically reject this idea because it attacks the idea that Adam was made in the image of God and from the dust of the earth (Gen 1:27, 2:7). Theistic evolution says that for millions of years, there was death, bloodshed, disease, and suffering in the animal kingdom even before the first man (or the Fall of man). Could God have called a world with millions of dead animals as "very good"? As with day-age and gap theories, theistic evolution is not supported by Scripture.

29. What is Life Church Position on this?

- a. "We do believe that God created the universe out of nothing (cf. John 1:3, Col 1:16, Heb 11:3)." [*Life BPC website*] Thus we reject the theory of evolution, or the theistic evolution, which teaches that God created all things, but used the process of evolution to do it. We reject the view that Adam and Eve were apes that God "transformed" into humans. Evolution is an unproven hypothesis developed by 19th-century men, Lamark, Darwin and Wallace, who were influenced by humanist philosophy.
- b. Because we are created and not creatures that evolved out of pre-existing material, our existence is planned and purposeful; we are responsible to our Creator. Human life is precious. Many scientists are now convinced that the facts of science and biblical truths combine to declare that creation took place.
- c. The evolutionist view was also rejected by the PCA (Presbyterian Church of America) in its declaration "That God made Adam immediately from the dust of the ground and

not from a lower animal form and that God's in-breathing constituted man a living soul" (see the minutes of the PCA General Assembly, June 1999).

30. What is the scientific evidence against the molecules-to-man evolution theory?

- a. Even the Simplest Bacteria is Complex. Even 'simple' bacteria are phenomenally complex creatures - far more complex than the most sophisticated machine any man has ever made. And they can reproduce themselves in less than 20 minutes! Such 'bacterial machines' contain the equivalent of a large book of coded information on their DNA. Books don't write themselves and neither could bacteria make themselves. If a book needs an intelligent creator, the bacteria need a creator even more so. The source of this information is an insurmountable problem for the evolutionary belief that life originates without a creator. Michael Behe, a microbiologist, who wrote a book entitled *Darwin's Black Box*, points out that certain systems in the cell, like the blood clotting mechanism or the hair like structures called 'cilia' are like incredibly complicated microscopic machines that cannot function at all unless all the parts are present and functioning. Thus they cannot evolve part by part. In their book, Barrow and Tipler (*The Anthropic Cosmological Principle*) listed 10 steps in the course of human evolution, for example, the development of aerobic respiration, the development of an inner skeleton, the development of the eye - each of which is so improbable that before it would occur." It is estimated that one human eye contains approximately 130 million rods and 7 million cones located in its retina. When light, which travels at 300 km per second, strikes at these cones or rods, chemical changes are produced which cause each cone or rod to transmit an electrical impulse through the nerve connected to it. These impulses pass into the optic nerve, which transmits them to the visual cortex of the brain. The brain continually and instantly reads the complex image of millions of electronic impulses with such precision that colour, even shades of colour - from red to violet - can be clearly distinguished. Could you imagine such an intricate system could have occurred by chance?
- b. Limits to Variation. The breeding of plants and animals shows there are limits to how far natural selection can go. Breeding of dogs will never make them fly! Nor can natural selection grow feathers on a reptile! Things were created to reproduce according to their kind or species (Gen 1:11, 12, 21, 24-25).
- c. Mutations Do Not Generate New Information for Creation of Complex Forms.
 - i) According to evolution, random mutations produce new features in living things, such as legs, feathers, brains, eyes, could evolve, and those that are advantageous for survival are preserved and get reproduced. The truth is that mutations are random changes in the genes. Mutations destroy; they do not create. Eg. mutations cause cancer and other diseases (Sanford, J, 2005, *Genetic Entropy and the Mystery of the Genome*: FMS Publications).
 - ii) In all mutations studied, there has been a loss of function. Mutations will never produce the new complex information needed for evolution to proceed (Spetner, L, 1998. *Not by Chance*.). Evolutionists' supposed evidence of selection and mutation explains only tiny changes within species.
 - iii) Those few changes almost always involve some loss of function. For example, there are animals living in dark caves that are blind and lack skin coloration. It's reasonable to infer that these animals have lost their eyes and pigment as the result of mutations, which were preserved because it is advantageous not to have eyes or skin pigment in dark caves. But evidence of how eyes can be lost in dark caves does not tell us where eyes came from in the first place.
 - iv) In the longest-running laboratory experiment on bacterial evolution, Richard Lenski and his research teams at Michigan State University have monitored over fifty thousand generations of bacteria. Every mutation they have observed has produced either a slight modification of existing function or loss of function in the bacteria. There has never been a true gain in function, let alone a new system. Despite plenty

of laboratory prodding, the bacteria refuse to become anything but the same species of bacteria that was present at the start of the experiment.

- d. No Transitional Forms Have Been Found in Fossils.
- i) One of the major weaknesses of evolution was that no transitional forms have been found to exist between species. Darwin was confident that these transitional animals existed in the past and would eventually be discovered. But as paleontologists have unearthed fossil remains, they have not found these transitional forms; they have just found more distinct animals and plants that have died off. Sure, there are a few suspected transitional forms, like the Archaeopteryx, a bird with some reptilian features. Claimed evidence of fossils linking different kinds of organisms does not stand scrutiny (Gish, D.T. 1995. *Evolution: The Fossils Still Say No!* Institute for Creation Research). But if evolution were true, there would be millions of transitional forms in the fossil record. How many intermediate forms would have existed for a bat and a whale to have evolved from a common ancestor!
 - ii) The fossil evidence goes against the Darwinian theory of common ancestry (Ravi Zacharias, p.69). Furthermore, there are many hundreds of types of creatures in the fossil record, which are still present today. Jellyfish, starfish and snails are present in rocks supposedly hundreds of millions of years old and yet they are like the ones we have in the oceans today. Things breed according to their kind, just as the Bible says.
 - iii) If the evolution process can't produce new functions in an organism with such an enormous population size, then why think that it can make birds, mammals and fish from simpler creatures?
 - iv) Even if natural selection acting on random genetic mutations could create new proteins, organs and animals, it cannot account for the origin of life itself. They assume that the biological world bubbled up somehow from nonliving chemicals. Many speculative scenarios sprung up that explain only a few of the required many steps to get from nonlife to life, as Meyer states, "life is an information-rich reality that transcends chemistry." [*Signature in the Cell: DNA and the Evidence for Intelligent Design* by Stephen Meyer]
- e. The Second Law of Thermodynamics. This law teaches us that all ordered systems left to themselves tend to become more disordered, and tends to break down from its complex forms to simpler forms. What happens to a running car engine when its power source is cut off, and is left alone for ten, fifty or 1,000 years? Would it become a more complex Boeing 777 engine or break down and rust? Evolution says that matter and energy left to themselves developed from simpler to more complex forms without rusting or breaking down. Is that logical?
- f. Evolution from One Species to Another Is Not Observable Today. Adaptations of animals within their own species are observable. Eg. insects will develop stronger resistance to chemical poisons requiring the development of new insecticide sprays. Moths will become lighter coloured in drier and lighter climates and dark coloured in wetter darker climates. This type of adaptation is called "microevolution." However, "macroevolution" - the development of insects into amphibians, or of moths into other species of animals - has never been witnessed.

31. Do Humans Really Share 99% Common DNA with Chimpanzees?

- a. In 2005 the Cornell University News Service reported "Chimpanzees and humans share a common ancestor, and even today **99 percent** of the two species' DNA is identical." In 2010 the University of California at San Francisco New Center concurred: "The genetic codes of chimps and humans are **99 percent identical**." However, in 2005, the National Institute of Health News (NIH) reported that "our closest relatives shares perfect identity with **96 percent** of our DNA sequence."
- b. So is it 96% or 99%? It's interesting to note that the same NIH report also contains a 99% figure. Both are 'correct' but needs to be qualified as they: (1) ignore repetitive

sequences; (2) compare only sequences that can be aligned naturally with one another; (3) consider only base-pair substitutions, not "indels" (i.e. insertion/ deletion is a variation when one of sequences has extra letters). Indels account for 3% of the differences. Even the 96% deal with only DNA regions for which alignment or partially matching sequence can be found. Actually, an article in 2002 reported that **28%** of the total DNA had to be excluded because of differences in alignment, and that "**for 7%** of the chimpanzee sequences, no region with similarity could be detected in the human genome." "For **about 23%** of our (human) genome, we share no immediate genetic ancestry with our closest living relative, the chimpanzee."

c. Does Similarity Mean Two DNA Sequences Have the Same Meaning or Function? Not necessarily. For example, compare the following sentences:

- There are many scientists today who question the evolutionary paradigm and its atheistic philosophical implications.
- There are **not** many scientists today who question the evolutionary paradigm and its atheistic philosophical implications.

There is 97% similarity between these two sentences, and yet their meanings are the opposite. The difference may be only 3%. This is similar to the way DNA sequences can be turned off or on by relatively small control gene pairs.

- d. Even if we accept the DNA difference is very small, there is no way the mutations could bridge even the gap between chimps and humans. Chimps are animals. Man is made in the image of God, and there is no way the chimps will be able to read this or be discussing with one another!
- e. Do DNA Similarities Prove that Human Beings Have Ape Ancestry? No, but the similarities may actually be part of God's intelligent design. For example, the greatest genetic similarities between humans and chimps lie in many of the protein-coding regions within the DNA because proteins are the backbone of chemical machinery inside a cell. Cells need machinery for metabolism, cell division, translating DNA into proteins, dealing with toxins, and responding to the environment. The machinery has to accomplish many similar things in cells of many kinds, so it should not be surprising that there are similarities among proteins not only between man and chimpanzees but throughout the world of living things.
- f. When God made man, he became a living creature - the same expression used to describe animals (Gen 1:20, 21 & 24). Man is created from the dust of the ground (Gen 2:7), which hints at the common material making up his body. Man in the image of God is supreme over the animals (1:28) but also shares solidarity with them.

32. Are the Human Appendix and Emus' Wings Vestigial Organs?

- a. Evolutionists claim that the flightless bird Emus' small wings and human appendix are leftovers of evolution, and so evidence for evolution. The appendix contains lymphatic tissue that polices bacteria entering the intestines. It functions in a similar way to the tonsils at the other end of the alimentary canal, which increases resistance to throat infection. (Wieland & Doyle, 2008, *creation.com/appendix 4*; Glover, 1988, *J. Creation* 3:31-31-38)
- b. Loss of genetic information is possible as Emus and Ostriches could have been derived from smaller birds that once could fly. But loss of genetic information is not evidence for evolution, which requires masses of new genetic information. Besides, Emus' wings are not useless, but provide balance while running, cooling in hot weather, warmth in cold, protection of the rib cage in falls, mating rituals, sheltering of chicks, etc. (Wieland, etc, 2011. *Answers to the 4 Big Questions*, creation ministries, 18-19)