

## Chapter 19—How Did We Get Here? The Question of Origins

Copyright Russ Breault 2018

**Background:** The following is a chapter from a yet to be published book. The characters are fictional. To help you make sense of the dialogue, here is the back story. The professor is a retired dean of religion from a local college. Brett is his eager protégé while Terry is Brett's boss and a skeptical agnostic. Sarah is Brett's wife and a strong believer. Brett has been meeting with the professor to discuss another topic, the Shroud of Turin. Terry learns of his interest and becomes concerned his new hobby will impact his job performance. A series of circumstances allow for the professor to address Terry's major objection to the Christian faith---evolution. Are we here due to unguided random chance or are we created in the image and likeness of God? They both can't be true. We will pick up the story from here.

\*\*\*\*\*

Brett saw Terry in the hallway. "Are you still planning to meet with the professor tomorrow?" asked Brett.

"I'm going to try. I made a commitment and even confirmed it on Saturday before we left the meeting. Look, I know you are completely on board the faith train but I still have questions," answered Terry.

"I understand. Mind if I tag again?"

"I kind of expected you to be there."

"Ok then, it's a date," said Brett as he started towards his office.

-----  
Brett got home from work and was eager to see Sarah and the kids. "Hi honey. You'll be happy-closed another deal today."

"That's great. I hope Terry is pleased." Sarah said as she hugged her husband in the kitchen. Brian and Brittany ran in to see dad and joined the hug.

"You kids go wash your hands for dinner," said Sarah.

They had a few minutes alone. "How was Terry today?"

"He is not convinced yet but still wants to meet with the professor tomorrow. No issues with work. He knows how Gerard feels. I would really have to mess up for him to get on my case again."

"I forgot about the meeting tomorrow," Sarah said. "Are you going too?"

"I'm planning on it. Terry expects me there. You know, with the kids in school, maybe you should come too."

"Why do you think that?"

"The professor is going to explain his view of the whole creation evolution debate. This is a real sticking point for Terry and to his credit, he wants to hear another side of the story. I think you would enjoy the conversation," said Brett.

“Hmmm...tempting. I would love to hear his take on it” It didn’t take much convincing. “Ok, I’ll go. I hope Terry will be cool with it.”

“Don’t worry, I’ll just tell him you’re coming.”

It was time for dinner.

---

Back at Ted’s Montana Grill, Brett was able to secure the same booth they had last week. A good omen he hoped!

The others arrived with greetings all around. The professor scooted to the back of the booth and put his laptop against the wall as before.

“Our group is growing,” said the professor. “It’s great to see you again Sarah.”

“Once I heard the topic, I couldn’t stay away.”

Terry felt a little intimidated--seemed like it was three against one. “You guys aren’t going to gang up on me are you?”

“Not at all,” said the professor. “Like you said, they both can’t be true, at least not from the standpoint of the grand plan. This is called the *Law of Non-Contradiction*. As I said last week, I am confident evolution occurs. The question is how much? It’s kind of like the global warming debate. Everyone knows the climate is changing...it is always changing. The question is how much does man contribute to it? And how much may be due to predictable cycles or even solar flare activity? Seems like everyone has a different opinion. The creation-evolution debate is much the same.”

Emily was their waitress again. She was a beautiful young college student with a smile that could melt ice. Wavy brown hair that framed her face and enhanced her sparkling eyes that shined even brighter when she smiled.

“Well I don’t always remember our patrons but I remember you guys. You’ve added someone,” she said acknowledging Sarah. “Welcome to Ted’s, I look forward to eavesdropping on you again!” She said smiling while taking drink orders and dropping off menus.

“Let’s take a minute and figure out what we want to order and then we can keep talking,” suggested Terry.

When Emily came back for the order...it was bison burgers all around...again.

“My cardiologist would not approve of this meal. I am supposed to limit my intake of red meat. But I refuse to live in fear of a burger!”

That got the table group laughing.

The professor retrieved his laptop and opened the same files as last time. “Let’s get started. Brett, perhaps you can bring Sarah up to speed on what we discussed last week.”

“He already filled me in the NDE discussion you had. I read a few accounts in the past so I think we’re ok to move on,” said Sarah.

“Great! As I said last week, there are really only three religious questions.

- How did we get here? (Origins)

- Why are we here (Purpose)
- Where are we going? (Destiny)

“You saw last week how the science related to Near Death Experiences, with documented accounts numbering in the thousands, directly challenges the materialist view. Perhaps not all is as it seems. It is clear that consciousness, cognition and even sensory input are NOT limited to the brain. In fact it may be more accurate to say the body places limits on what the spirit can perceive. This poses a huge problem for naturalism which essentially rejects any consideration of the supernatural. The Bible has something to say about this. Hebrews 11:3 states that *what we see did not come from what is seen*. In view of the evidence from NDE’s perhaps it’s time to consider a different approach to the question of origins.

“People of faith often think we are physical beings having a spiritual experience. Yet it is the exact opposite, we are spiritual beings having a physical experience.”

Sarah jumped in. “I like that idea! Our physical bodies are not going to live forever yet we know our spirit lives on after this life.”

“A true statement! In fact Paul writes in second Corinthians, *So we fix our eyes not on what is seen but what is unseen, since what is seen is temporary, but what is unseen is eternal (permanent)*. 2 Cor 4:18

“I have to admit, Near Death Experiences was something I had never considered. It makes you think there might be more around us than what meets the eye,” said Terry.

“Yes, and it is a direct challenge to the materialist view which is the belief that matter is the fundamental substance in nature. They believe everything is simply the result of material or chemical interactions. There is no spiritual realm that has any relevance to the material. Not according to Scripture and well supported by NDE’s. So just like the creation-evolution debate, they both can’t be true,” added the professor.

“We know that even among evolutionists there are many different views. There is pure Darwinism which is also called gradualism. Most subscribe to Neo-Darwinism which includes modern genetics and then there are those who follow Stephen J Gould who came up with “punctuated equilibrium”. There are several views among creationists too--young earth, old earth, gap theorists and theistic evolution.”

“Over the centuries, the question of origins has mostly been answered by religion. It can be found in the first statement of the Nicene Creed crafted by theologians in 325 AD.

*We believe in one God, the Father, the Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all that is, seen and unseen.*

Darwin tried to answer the question from science and ever since there has been a great chasm between the two. The issue really becomes:

What questions can science truly answer? And what questions remain a matter of faith?”

*What questions can science truly answer? And what questions remain a matter of faith?"*

“For Christians, creation is a big deal. From Genesis to Revelation, God is honored as the Creator. Here is a verse from Revelation: *You are worthy, our Lord and God, to receive glory and honor and power, for you created all things, and by your will they were created*

*and have their being.* Rev 4:10-11

“In contrast, we have already discussed the materialist view, that everything must be explained only by natural processes. So ingrained is this view that, according to Gallup, 93% of scientists associated with the American National Academy of Sciences claim to be atheist or agnostic at best. These are the scholars that determine the approach your high school or college text book will take on this subject. In fact, so slanted is their approach, they rarely even allow discussion of controversies among evolutionists for fear a student might get a clue they don’t have all the answers. (Larson, E. J and Witham, L. “Leading scientists still reject God”. Nature **394** (6691) :313, 23 July 1998.)

About this time, Emily returned with their orders while everyone made room for the incoming burgers. “A different topic this time I see,” Emily injected. “I am a pre-med student at Georgia State and am familiar with this debate.” Her voice dropped to a whisper. “When it comes to this issue—I don’t believe half of what they tell me. Anatomy class was enough to convince me most of it is wishful thinking. Sorry to interrupt. Enjoy your meals!” Her smile lit up the table.

“Thank you Emily. Good luck with your studies!” said Brett.

“Well that was interesting!” said the professor looking straight at Terry who rolled his eyes and shrugged. Then everyone laughed.

The professor continued. “When we look at the grand plan of evolution, from bacteria to man, it is a creation story that leaves God out of the equation. Every religion must answer the question of origins. Evolution is the creation story of atheism.”

Terry objected. “Are you saying evolution is a religion?”

“Yes, but don’t take my word for it. Here is a quote from Dr. Michael Ruse, he teaches philosophy of science at Florida State University. Here is what he said, “*Evolution is promoted by its practitioners as more than mere science. Evolution is promulgated as an ideology, a secular religion—a full-fledged alternative to Christianity....Evolution is a religion.*” Ruse, Michael. “Saving Darwinism from the Darwinians.” National Post, May 13, 2000, B-3.

“I never heard that in college,” said Terry somewhat shocked.

### **Random Chance and Natural Selection**

“Let’s look at the primary driver--the organizing principle of evolution. Random chance and natural selection: Mutations occur in the genetic code that create gradual changes in the organism

leading to entirely new species. This process is repeated billions of times leading ultimately to you and me.”

“The process of Random Chance and Natural Selection is by definition:

- Unguided
- Undirected
- With no plan
- And no purpose

“This is essential to understand. For just as soon as you invoke a plan or a purpose you invoke intelligence—and when it involves intelligence, it is no longer random. When you assume a guiding or directing force--you are inevitably pointing to a Creator. Darwinists would assume that natural selection itself becomes a guiding force, that somehow it gives it direction. They assume that increasing complexity is self-selective through the process of survival. Don’t get me wrong, natural selection is real but also limited. It is designed to be a filter—a biological process that eliminates harmful mutations for the protection of the species. It is NOT a creative force. A creative force by definition would have to involve intelligence. ”

Sarah chimed in again. “I never really thought how ludicrous this notion really is. How can complex organisms come about with no inherent plan or purpose? It is contrary to logic.”

“Exactly!” replied the professor.

“All living organisms are characterized by three key attributes:

- Complexity
- Order
- Design

“Take microbiology for instance. Advanced technology, has revealed the astonishing complexity of just a single cell.”

The professor pulled up a slide that displayed a diagram of a cell with all the unique and specific functions showing a bustle of activity rivalling that of a city. “Life, even in its simplest form is exceedingly complex. In fact, all parts of the cell have to be in place simultaneously or it will not function at all! We will talk more about this later.

“Then there is order. Natural physical laws—show that everything operates within a prescribed order. Natural laws include:

- Laws of motion and momentum
- Laws of energy and mass
- Laws of thermodynamics and many more.

“There is a law evolutionists don’t like to talk about, the *law of biogenesis*. Living things come only from other living things, by reproduction. Life does not arise from non-living material. Spontaneous generation does not happen. Life does not arise from non-living matter. We have never observed it in any laboratory setting.”

“So I guess we have to presume this law was suspended while the first cell was evolving from the inorganic primordial soup?” the professor said in a questioning tone.

“The last one is design. From the simple to the complex—from a pencil or a chair—to the iPad, we intuitively know they were: *designed, engineered and manufactured* to be exactly what they are. Design is the clear evidence of intelligence. There is a branch within the creation movement called Intelligent Design with many capable PHD’s at the Discovery Institute in Seattle. They propose the radical notion that behind the design is a designer. <https://www.discovery.org/id/>

“Paul weighs in on this matter in his letter to the Romans. He expresses the insight that design is evidence for God’s involvement in creation. *For since the creation of the world God’s invisible qualities—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen, **being understood from what has been made**, so that people are without excuse.* Rom 1:20

“Paul is telling us clearly that creation itself is all the evidence we need to believe in God. It is intuitive within the heart of man. It is why we cry out to a higher power in times of need. The subtle tragedy of evolution is that through education and indoctrination, modern man has been systematically stripped of the natural belief in a creator.

“Here is another example of why belief in a Creator-God should be intuitive. I can be sitting in my living room and see the trees move back and forth. I don’t need to go outside to know that it is windy. I can’t see the wind, but I can see the effect of the wind. Creation is the effect of God and perfectly correlates with Newton’s law of cause and effect.

“I love the wind analogy. It makes perfect sense,” said Sarah.

The professor nodded his head in agreement.

“When it comes to design, the evolutionist inserts the word “apparent” before design. So even though the human body has every indication of being the result of an astonishingly complex design, as Emily our waitress seems to know, it only appears that way—it is not actual design--only “apparent design.”

“So now I am going to show you a statement made by the world’s most well-known atheist, Richard Dawkins from his book, The Blind Watchmaker. I put this in just for you Terry,” the professor laughed.

*Biology is the study of complicated things that give the appearance of having been designed for a purpose.* He references complexity, design and purpose yet adamantly clings to a random process as the cause. They couldn’t have been actually designed for a purpose? Nope, we can’t allow that.” Dawkins, R. *The Blind Watchmaker*, W.W. Norton & Company, New York, USA, p. 1, 1986.

Terry was cut to the core on that one. “Wow, I read Dawkins in college and kind of bought into it--but the way you present it here--it really does seem absurd.”

The professor simply nodded his head.

“Anytime evolution is challenged, academics get very indignant. You can see it whenever a school system wants to teach another view alongside evolution or even teach controversies within the field of evolution. They write angry letters to the editor and say: ‘Evolution is more than a theory—it’s a fact!’ However this statement is an enormous sleight of hand and you have to read between the lines to know what they are actually saying.

“When most people think of evolution, they usually think of the grand plan from bacteria to man. That is not what the evolutionist is referring to, he is simply asserting that *species change over time*. As we discussed earlier, no one disagrees with this. The only question is how much change occurs. Did the first bird really evolve into ten thousand different species including the hummingbird, the bald eagle and the penguin? The creationist simply questions the amount of change that can occur within a family of related species. The evolutionist assumes quantum leaps whereas the creationist says ‘show me the evidence, where are the fossil trails?’ Many science professors have become such unwitting propagandists that reasonable questions cannot even be raised without ridicule and reprisals.”

Terry was thinking about his own college experience and remembered how all the courses he took on microbiology, geology and astronomy all assumed an unquestioned evolutionary view. He was not a science major but had to take several classes as part of his undergraduate requirement.

The professor continued. “Here are the common proof points used to support evolution:

- Bacteria become resistant to drugs
- Insects become resistant to pesticides

“You read this all the time. In their mind it demonstrates the organism has changed—voila! Evolution! However, the reason they are now resistant is due to damaged DNA that no longer codes for the protein that was susceptible to the drug or pesticide. It does not reflect the addition of new genetic information. Every creationist agrees with principles of adaptation and micro-evolution. We have no problem believing that every organism has the ability to adapt to a hostile environment that results in minor changes to the organism. However, is this sufficient proof that all life on the planet evolved from a single common ancestor? Talk about a quantum leap of faith!”

Terry jumped in again. “I remember that from college. They were proof points of how evolution can be observed in the present because most everything else occurred in the past and can’t be observed.”

“Good point. Hold that thought because it will really come into play when we look at the scientific method,” the professor responded.

## Speciation

“I mentioned earlier about how there are many different species of killer whales. The creationist fully acknowledges that speciation does occur. How does it occur? When the genes of one population of animals differs enough from other members of its species that they cannot interbreed and produce viable offspring. How does this happen? Mostly through geographic isolation. A portion of a population gets separated and over time, the limited gene pool creates a new species. No creationist takes issue with this.”

“However, to believe that the whale evolved from a land animal with legs resembling a wolf or a bison is patently absurd to the creationist. Again, where is the proof? Show us the fossil trail.”

“How does the evolutionist arrive at these conjectures? By looking at *homologous structures*. They compare skeletal structures and look for similarities. They compare:

- Wing of a bird
- Wing of a bat
- Arm of man
- Leg of horse
- Fin of a dolphin

“They say, ‘Gee, don’t they look similar? That must be proof of common ancestry.’ However, could they be similar due to common design? There is a reason why buildings in a city or houses in a subdivision look similar—they are based on common design. Yet we are forbidden to consider it. Geneticists will point out how the genome of the mouse is 85% the same as the human and the ape is 98% the same. They assume the variance would occur through gradual mutations. However the fact the genomes are so similar is actually proof of common design!

“Let me give you a specific example and something we can all relate to--the automobile. Let’s compare the Ford Focus and the Lincoln Continental. These are vastly different cars with enormously different price tags yet look at the common denominators. Both have four wheels, power windows, steering wheel, speedometer, internal combustion engine, fuel injection, electronic ignition, disc brakes, shocks and much more. In fact you could probably say they are about 98% similar. Why are they so similar? They are based on a common design!

Based on common design, I would expect the DNA of the mouse would be more similar to the human than a sponge because the mouse is a mammal...we are both warm blooded, breathe with lungs, have mammary glands and more. I would also expect for the DNA of the ape to be even more similar because we are both primates.

“DNA is the code that governs all life. The DNA molecule was discovered in the 1950’s and the entire human genome was mapped by the year 2000. Now we know there are a vast number of proteins that operate as genetic switches allowing for certain genes to be switched on or off for various traits. The evolutionist believes it all occurs randomly and governed only by natural selection.



“It is as if they have discovered the music score of life and the DNA components are like the individual notes of the composition. Using this example, they assume over time, Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony would eventually write itself. Make no mistake, we may have discovered the notes, but God is the master composer of life.”

“Great examples!” said Brett. “The car analogy works well to show how we would expect common denominators if they were based on a common design. If the ape is like the Ford Focus then the mouse would be like a go-cart—very different but still with many similarities.”

“I like the music score analogy,” said Sarah. “I took piano lessons in middle school. Learning to play Beethoven was hard enough. I can’t imagine composing it.”

Terry just nodded his head in agreement as if taking it all in.

## **Hemoglobin**

“Remember I said the hallmark of life is seen in complexity, order and design. Since we are talking about DNA, I want to paint you a picture of the complexity involved.

“Everyone knows we inherit 23 chromosomes from our mother and the same from our father. A chromosome is simply a very long stretch of DNA that can be easily copied from one cell to another. The DNA is composed of four simple nitrogen bases denoted as A, G, C, and T. In a similar fashion, all computer software programs are composed of a binary code of 0 and 1. So the code may be simple but the resulting software program exceedingly complex.

“A gene is a stretch of DNA that has the instructions for a specific protein. Each chromosome has a different number of genes but there are around 20,000 genes in all. There are also Hox genes which govern the activities of other genes.”

“This is beginning to sound pretty complex already,” said Brett.

The professor nodded his head. “It gets much more intense. Look at this next slide.”

“Biological life requires twenty specific carbon based amino acids in various combinations. Each protein is composed of a string of these amino acids in a chain and varies in complexity depending on the task it is required to do. So, for example there are only 100 amino acids required to make insulin yet over 34,000 are needed to form various muscle proteins. Proteins are what do all the work. There are proteins that form the taste buds on your tongue which is why Emily our waitress has a job, and there are proteins that form your fingernails allowing you to hold your knife and fork. Every function of the body is performed by proteins.

“Now let’s look at a specific example; the HBB gene and the beta globin protein which is more commonly known as hemoglobin. The HBB gene is found on chromosome number 11 and is just one of over 1500 genes found on this chromosome. The entire chromosome is almost 135 million DNA letters long.”

“Good night!” Injected Sarah. “That is just one chromosome?”

The professor nodded his head and continued.

“In the middle of the chromosome are 1600 letters that comprise the HBB gene. There are 444 letters that provide the information for making hemoglobin. The rest of the letters provide specific instructions for what the protein is supposed to do, when to do it, where to do it and how much of the protein to make. This is called prescriptive information. It is literally the code for how to make the protein and what the protein is supposed to do.

“Now to sum it up. There are 3.2 billion letters in the entire strand of human DNA. The DNA is like a massive library of information and instructions. Using RNA, each gene goes to the library and retrieves the instructions necessary for how to assemble the amino acids for building the protein assigned to it. In the case of hemoglobin, it is 1600 characters. Every protein is different.

“Think about it. All I have done is relay the complexity involved in the development of a single protein within a single gene. Imagine the exponential complexity required for the healthy function of all 20,000 genes working together in perfect harmony with each other.

“Terry, if you want to believe in random chance and natural selection--that is up to you. I simply cannot go there. Francis Collins was the geneticist who headed up the human genome project that mapped the entire human genome. The project was completed in 2,000. In 2006, he published *The Language of God—A Scientist Presents Evidence for Belief*. Francis knows, perhaps more than anyone, that the astonishing complexity found in our DNA did not come about by a random process.”

Terry was silent, he looked numb but slowly refocused on the professor’s last comment. “I certainly see your point, professor. It is hard to reconcile this degree of complexity with a random process, even one supposedly guided by natural selection.”

“When Francis Collins published his book in 2006, he believed much of our DNA was “Junk DNA” as a result of the random process of evolution—even though he believed God somehow directed it (Theistic Evolution). However we now know there is no Junk DNA. We have made remarkable advances in our knowledge of individual genes. What geneticists have come to realize is how each gene is coded with specific information just like a software program. It is pure information. Information is NEVER random. When random things happen with software, it stops working!”

\* Starr, Barry Dr. "DNA Basics." *Stanford at the Tech Understanding Genetics*. Dec 16, 2008.  
<http://genetics.thetech.org/ask/ask293>

## **Chicken or the Egg**

“Now we come to the biggest conundrum of all for the evolutionist. Which came first, the chicken or the egg? I am referring to the DNA molecule. Even a single cell organism must be

instructed by DNA. Yet the DNA cannot exist outside the protection of the cell membrane. Oxygen is toxic. Unprotected DNA would oxidize and be destroyed. In fact, the DNA is found in the nucleus of the cell for maximum protection. Actually the real question that needs to be answered is; where is the rooster?"

Everyone laughed at that one.

"Now we enter the realm of science fiction. The evolutionist can't explain how life evolved on earth. DNA cannot exist much less come into being outside of a cell membrane. This is a big problem because all the instructions for the cell—including the cell membrane are in the DNA—so you must have DNA first. In order to get around this, scientists postulated the early earth atmosphere was methane and ammonia. However, today we know the earth has always had an oxygen and carbon dioxide atmosphere.\* Now what are they going to do? They enter the realm of pure conjecture. Many believe the first cells must have come from other planets on the back of meteorites and comets. Oh I get it. We can't explain how it evolved HERE—so it must have evolved THERE." Luskin, Cary. "Top Five Problems with Current Origin-of-Life Theories". *Evolution News*, December 12, 2012 [https://evolutionnews.org/2012/12/top\\_five\\_probl/](https://evolutionnews.org/2012/12/top_five_probl/)

Sarah jumped in. "That sounds really ridiculous."

"Yeah, and they have no idea how life evolved there either, so they haven't solved anything except kick the can down the road," added Brett.

"It is so absurd it's downright funny. Sir Francis Crick called it 'Directed Panspermia.' Carl Sagan, a famous astronomer and cosmologist must have been nervous about the 'directed' aspect so he coined 'Cosmic Panspermia.' I feel much better, don't you?"

"I know I do!" said Brett laughing.

"Terry, back to your point about observing things in the present. The evolutionist will always claim they are adhering to the principles of the scientific method but that is patently untrue.

"Here is an overview of the scientific method.

- We observe something happening in the present.
- We create a hypothesis and make predictions.
- We conduct an experiment to test the prediction--something that can be repeated by someone else.
- Based on the experiment, we either accept or reject the hypothesis.

Most every legitimate experimental hypothesis must be able to be falsified. It is simply an if/then statement. IF a teaspoon of Tabasco hot sauce is added to a pint of water THEN it will come to a boil faster than plain water. We conduct the experiment. It made no difference. The hypothesis has been falsified. If you can't falsify it, it is not a valid hypothesis.

“Most everything related to evolution happened in the past and cannot be observed. Therefore any hypothesis that cannot be falsified by experimentation is nothing more than conjecture—a guess.”

For instance, there is not one medical discovery even in the realm of biotechnology or genetic engineering that was discovered based on a hypothesis developed from an evolutionary prediction. Evolutionary biology has no impact on experimental biology. How can this be if evolution is the guiding force of life? Surely there must be some observational evidence of this guiding force responsible for all of life on this planet. But there isn't.

## **The Fossil Record**

“Somewhat based on the scientific method, Darwin assumed the fossil record would prove his theory to be true. He assumed thousands of variations or ‘transitional’ fossil forms would be found. In fact, so few have been found that ‘gradualism’ has been abandoned by many evolutionists. After 150 years there have been scant few if any fossils that are universally agreed upon by evolutionists themselves as truly transitional. An example of a transitional fossil shows the organism caught in the act of evolving, i.e. a giraffe with a short neck, an elephant with no trunk, a starfish with only three arms or a marsupial without a pouch. These transitions are never observed. Some claim that ‘intermediate’ fossils exist yet how can we know they are ‘intermediate’ and not just another species gone extinct? Has the lack of fossil evidence falsified Darwin’s grand plan? Of course not! Why? Because, as I said earlier, evolution is a religion—it is based on faith.

“Much study has been done on the Burgess Shale in British Columbia. The sudden appearance of over twenty different phyla or body plans has been called the “Cambrian Explosion.” These are complex organisms with eyes, nervous system, legs, fins, and much more. Some were vertebrates like fish others were invertebrates like a worm, some had a hard shell exoskeleton like a beetle and others were mollusks like clams. Their appearance in the fossil record shows no ancestors leading back to an earlier creature from which it evolved. This discovery is diametrically opposed to Darwin’s notion of slow gradual descent with tiny modifications branching off like a tree leading to increasing variety and complexity. Instead we see tremendous variety and extreme complexity just suddenly appear as if out of nowhere.

“Stephen J Gould was the leading paleontologist at Harvard an expert on the Burgess Shale said the following:

*The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology. The absence of fossil evidence for intermediary stages between major transitions, indeed our inability, even in our imagination, to construct functional intermediates in many cases, has been a persistent and nagging problem for gradualistic accounts of evolution.*

\*Gould, Stephen J. "Evolution's Erratic Pace," *Natural History*, vol. 86, May 1987, p. 14.

“However, did Gould throw in the towel on evolution? Not a chance! He invented a new theory called Punctuated Equilibrium—that everything was in a state of equilibrium for long periods of time when all of a sudden something happened to cause a rapid fire number of mutations---in different geographic areas—(‘stasis and sudden appearance’) but they happened so fast there was

no chance to leave a fossil trail. Isn't that convenient! So he eliminated the pesky problem that essentially falsified Darwin's theory i.e. the lack of transitional fossils."

"I never heard that in college either," said Terry.

"Yet it was Darwin who said 'nature does not proceed by leaps'. He acknowledged: "If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down" (Origin of Species, 1859, p. 158). Yet Gould's theory proposes massive sweeping leaps within a narrow span of time. Isn't it interesting how two theories of evolution can be so contradictory when dealing with the same observable facts?"

"Some text books may give brief reference to Gould but generally they don't want to confuse the poor little students. They want to paint a perfectly plausible view of origins based on the Darwinian model complete with pretty drawings to make it seem oh so real. Some may call it education, I call it propaganda."

"That's a little strong don't you think?" challenged Terry.

"Why? It doesn't conform to the scientific method. It can't be falsified. It is at best conjecture. Yet it is presented as 'proven science'. What would you call it?" The professor challenged back.

"That is a good question. I don't know. I have a hard time believing all these scientists are purposely deceiving us," Terry responded.

"Oh I didn't say purposely. Evolution is an ideology. For example, those who hold to a communist ideology totally believe it even though there is not one example of any country successfully implementing it. Ideology is a mysterious thing. It can completely overshadow common sense. Ideology is what the Nazis were all about. It was like a spell was cast over Germany. People got caught up in the ideology and believed in the rightness of it even though common sense should have told them otherwise. Evolution is an ideology that drives nearly every college in America—and you dare not challenge it if you want to keep your job as a professor, qualify for tenure, keep your coveted department chair, or maintain grant funding. This sad state of affairs was clearly revealed in the documentary, Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed, hosted by Ben Stein."

## **Mutations**

"Let's discuss mutations for a minute. One of the hallmark principles of Darwinism is that a mutation occurs that offers an advantage to the species thereby allowing it to survive. Thousands of experiments have been done on fruit flies because we can get multiple generations quickly. We have bombarded them with all kinds of radiation and toxic chemicals in an attempt to force a mutation that would transfer to the next generation. In every case where a mutation occurred, it was either harmful or deadly. In not one instance did any mutation result in anything that was a benefit to the species.

“Most experiments today are with bacteria. We can get a new generation in about ten minutes. Thousands of generations can be observed in a single year. Proteins are called molecular machines or biological engines. If mutations are going to bring about new life forms, it will happen at the genetic level with the development of new proteins. Yet in all our experiments, we have not witnessed the development of a new functional protein. Don’t you think this is a little problematic for theory that presupposes all life forms are the result of random mutations?”

Leisola, Matti and Witt, Jonathan. *Heretic—One Scientist’s Journey from Darwin to Design*, Discovery Institute Press, Seattle, 2018, P181-195

“It blows my mind that none of this is taught in the schools,” Sarah responded.

“I agree, it is a sad state of affairs,” said the professor.

“Let’s talk about the so-called ‘missing link’. This is also a sleight of hand by referring to it in the singular—the link from ape to man. The reason I call this a sleight of hand is because there is not ONE missing link but billions. Looking at the grand plan, to go from:

- First cell
- First fish
- First amphibian
- First reptile
- First mammal
- First MAN



“There are billions of missing links. Remember, all the mutations necessary to go from the first fish to man all require a gain of genetic function with increasing complexity and information. Random mutations do not create new genetic information leading to increasing complexity. In fact, Gain-Of-Function (GOF) mutations rarely if ever occur as demonstrated with the fruit fly and bacteria experiments.”

“You are certainly making it hard to hang on to what I had come to believe,” said Terry.

“The funny thing is that I am not asking you to believe what I believe. I only want people to think clearly and rationally—to step away from the ideology that drives evolution and apply common sense. I don’t claim to have all the answers. I just know propaganda when I see it.

“For instance, ask an evolutionist this question. Can you explain how the reptile evolved by small incremental changes into a mammal? They are radically different. Think of all the transitions required:

- From cold blooded to warm blooded—(a change in the entire metabolism)
- From scales to fur with sweat glands
- From egg laying to live bearing
- From egg nutrients to mammary glands
- Three chamber heart to four chambers

- Multiple jaw bones to a single jaw bone with hammer and anvil of the middle ear
- And more

“There is no credible evolutionary scenario that explains this transition through small minute mutations. What caused the transition anyway? It is not as if reptiles had to morph into mammals to survive, they both exist today.”

“That is a tough one, I admit,” said Terry.

“It gets worse,” said the professor.

“We have a slight problem with reproduction. In order for a new genetic trait to be transferred to the next generation...

- There must be two organisms
- Male and female
- At the same time
- In the same geographic location
- With the exact same genetic mutation
- They must mate and produce offspring
- Only then does it become a dominant gene transferred to following generations

“There are a few exceptions to this rule but most all possible mutations have to transfer to the next generation in this manner. Would anyone care to calculate statistical probabilities of this actually occurring?”

“Let’s apply this to mammals. The first mammal is said be an insectivore—similar to a rat. And from this first rat evolved the bear, the wolf, the lion, the elephant, the giraffe, the elk, the ape and man. How many perfectly timed accidental gain-of-function mutations are required for this to occur? Trillions? But we can’t stop there, what about fish, birds, insects and plants? How many more trillions are required? You do the math.”

“This is what you and I and your children are supposed to believe. That the extreme **VARIETY** of organisms all exhibiting **Complexity Order** and **Design** occurred through a random process with **NO Guidance**, **NO Direction**, **NO Plan** and **NO Purpose**. Does this seem even remotely plausible to you?”

“You got me on the ropes professor! I am about ready to throw in the towel. But I have one more question. Do you think the earth is only ten thousand years old?” asked Terry.

### **Age of the Earth**

“That is a great question. And the answer is—I don’t know. And to tell you the truth, I really don’t care. I know the young earth crowd is highly invested in this view and they seem to take most of the oxygen in the room on the origins debate. But there are many creationists who

support an old earth too. We all have the same problem as the evolutionists do...no one was there to observe what happened.

“There are different ways of measuring the age of the earth. The geologists say the earth is 4.5 billion years old based on radiometric dating of volcanic rock. Is that true? Uranium slowly converts to lead. By assessing the ratio between the two they assign the age. However, this measure can vary by up to a billion years depending on what part of the lava flow is being measured. How can that be?”

“According to the increasing salinity of the oceans, the earth is 60 million years old.

“According to the depletion of helium in the atmosphere the earth may be only two million years old. The point is, nobody knows.

“I don’t get hung up on this issue. Here is what I know, *Complexity Order and Design* did not come about through something as pathetically inadequate as *random chance and natural selection*. It is not necessary to know how old the earth is to know a massive amount of intelligence is required.

“Here is the REAL question. When it comes to the age of the earth...why do we only hear of the one view that gives a maximum age? We hear it like a drum beat...the earth is 4.5 billion years old again, again and again. Why? Because evolution takes a long-long-long-long-long time.”

Brett laughed at the way the professor dragged out the last line.

“More Bad News for Radiometric Dating”, TASC-Creation Science, 2004 [http://tasc-creationscience.org/other/plaisted/www.cs.unc.edu/\\_plaisted/ce/dating2.html](http://tasc-creationscience.org/other/plaisted/www.cs.unc.edu/_plaisted/ce/dating2.html)

Sarfati, Jonathan. "Salty Seas-Evidence for a Young Earth." Creation.com, December 1998. <https://creation.com/salty-seas-evidence-for-a-young-earth>

Vartiman, Larry. “The Age of the Earth’s Atmosphere Estimated by its Helium Content”. Institute for Creation Research, 1986 <http://www.icr.org/i/pdf/technical/The-Age-of-Earths-Atmosphere-by-its-Helium-Content.pdf>

Batten, Don. “Age of the Earth”. Creation.com, June 4, 2009. <https://creation.com/age-of-the-earth>

## **Magic**

“Is time the same as magic? Thomas Huxley known as Darwin’s Bulldog said:

*Given enough time...monkeys typing on typewriters could type out the complete works of Shakespeare.*

“Really? Complete with plot, characters, theme and dialogue? It is patently absurd. Add trillions of years and millions of monkeys and it’s never going to happen. The evolutionist ascribes a magical quality to time.”



“The DNA molecule is infinitely more complex than the works of Shakespeare! Lots of TIME does not mean *random chance and natural selection* will result in anything more than random change! The evolutionist believes in MAGIC.”

“I agree, that quote from Huxley is ridiculous. Seems that time is like pixie dust for the evolutionist,” responded Brett.

The professor laughed at that one.

“It reminds me of your Beethoven analogy...as if monkeys banging on piano keys would eventually come up with Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony. It is patently absurd,” added Sarah.

The professor nodded his head in agreement.

“Here is another one. George Wald was a Nobel Prize winner in medicine. This is what he said:

*Time is the hero of the plot.... Given so much time, the impossible becomes possible, the possible becomes probable, and the probable becomes virtually certain.*

“Really? The impossible becomes certain and all you need is time? Once again, sounds like time is a magical ingredient.

### **Theater of the Absurd**

“Now we enter the theater of the absurd. Stephen J. Gould who I mentioned earlier wrote a book called Wonderful Life—The Burgess Shale and the Nature of History. The science editor for USA Today wrote a book review. This quote really captures the religion behind evolution:

*One of the ways we have lived with Darwinism, and the knowledge that the biblical story of creation is at best a metaphor, is with the reassurance that Nature herself embodied a god-like plan, leading inevitably to ourselves. --USA Today, Nov 3, 1989*

“A plan? Sounds like intelligence to me. Oh I get it---it’s ok to believe that nature had a god-like plan but you can’t believe in God. This is a complete capitulation! He acknowledges that evolution without guidance, without direction, without a plan without a purpose doesn’t work! But he is not willing to ascribe it to God...only Nature...with a capital N.”

“I have already mentioned that evolution is a religion and this quote demonstrates their core belief—that somehow nature has a God-like plan—that there must be some invisible force, like gravity that causes life forms to evolve into increasingly complex organisms. However, this mysterious force has yet to be discovered or measured—it exists only as an article of faith.

Terry quoted a verse from REM’s hit song:

“That’s me in the corner, that’s me in the spotlight, losing my religion...”

Everyone laughed.

The professor was pleased. “That is a good religion to lose!”

“I am sure we are running late but I have one more concept I want to cover.”

Terry looked at his watch. “I can hang a little longer.” All agreed.

### **Purpose—The Key of Creation**

“I want to talk about purpose. This is also known as a **Teleological Argument**. I believe it poses the strongest evidence against evolution.”

“Everything exists on purpose. Look around this room—at everything. The table, glasses, plates, carpet, paint, lights, the clothes you are wearing, the pen in your pocket. From the simple to the complex, everything is here on purpose. The only thing here randomly is dust. Even the gum wrapper on the floor from a previous patron is not random. It exists because it fulfilled a purpose—to keep a stick of gum fresh. We understand this intuitively. Everything I mentioned exists because humans designed, engineered and manufactured it to fulfill a purpose. In fact, without a purpose: IT DOES NOT EXIST! Not in the world we create for ourselves. Yet when it comes to nature, we are supposed to abandon everything we have learned from our own experience—that the extreme variety and complexity of life is simply the result of random chance. Why should they be so different?

The professor pulled a yellow pencil from his coat pocket. “Behold the pencil! The simplest thing you can find. It has only five basic materials—wood, graphite, paint, a rubber eraser and a metal band. We know intuitively that it could never “evolve” by itself. If you put all materials in a pile and add a million years, it would never randomly produce a pencil. Why? Because the raw materials cannot determine their own purpose! Purpose is the direct result of intelligence. The pencil exists because man needed something to write with. Apply this principle to the cells within your body. They cannot determine their own purpose either. Who instructs the protein molecules to form a liver cell or a kidney cell? They serve different purposes. You can argue it is written in the DNA. Did the DNA write itself? Can something with a clear and specific purpose like a kidney, governed by genes packed full of specific information arise from a random process? Show me anything in the real world--happening in real time--where this random process can be observed. You can’t because it doesn’t exist.”

*If you put all materials in a pile and add a million years, it would never randomly produce a pencil. Why? Because the raw materials cannot determine their own purpose! Purpose is the direct result of intelligence.*

Terry jumped in. “I feel like I just got sprayed with a fire hose! What you just said is so powerful--so logical, there is almost nothing credible one can say against it. I am sure someone like Dawkins would try, but the tortured logic required would be laughable.”

“Sometimes it takes a fire hose to clear out the mental junk and debris we collect that become stumbling blocks to faith,” said the professor.

The professor was inwardly happy with how Terry was responding. In order for someone to consider faith, the basis of their unbelief must be challenged. This is precisely what the professor was doing—he was opening Terry’s eyes so he could consider faith with an open mind. Too many have succumbed to an ideology largely promoted through propaganda rather than a fair and objective evaluation of the facts.

“Continuing with the pencil analogy, adding complexity only makes the probability more absurd. If we can’t imagine a pencil evolving by itself--how about any of the modern technical gadgets we all use and enjoy such as a smart phone or a tablet?”

“Everyone look at your right hand.” They all held out their hand in front of them. “Your hand is one of the most complex instruments in the universe. In your hand you have 27 bones, 27 ligaments, 18 muscles, 40 tendons, over 400 blood vessels and a network of 7200 nerve endings attached to a main frame computer. Your hand is able to sense pressure, texture, heat, cold, to lift heavy objects, to perform fine motor movements and more. The hand can do manual labor like that of a pipe fitter or fine motor movements like that of a surgeon. Your hand is an astonishingly complex instrument.

“Now let’s look at the eye. Even Darwin had a hard time believing the eye developed by chance from a light sensitive spot on the skin—like a freckle. From a freckle we evolved eyes with stereoscopic vision able to perceive color and depth--complete with retina, pupil, cornea, optic nerve, tear ducts for moisture, muscles to turn and more?”

“Let’s look at the entire package. Your body consists of the following:

- Nervous system
- Circulatory system
- Skeletal system
- Respiratory system
- Reproductive system
- Immune system
- Digestive system
- Muscular system
- And several more!

“Consider that all these systems function within your body as an ordered biological structure, all working together in perfect harmony. This is called ‘*systemic interdependence*’ and they must all be in place for the organism to survive. Is it even possible to consider this all came about by random chance through small successive mutations?”

## **Plants**

“There is one more thing regarding purpose. Nothing shouts God’s direct involvement more than plants. The evolutionist would have you believe that all plants on earth evolved from algae. The oak tree evolved from algae? Are you kidding me?”

There are over 400,000 flowering plant species. Almost two thousand plants are edible for humans including fruits, vegetables, herbs, grains and nuts. So I want you to think about this in the context of evolution. Why did the banana tree or the pineapple plant or the tomato plant or corn, or potatoes evolve? What advantage did the plant gain that directed its evolution? Why would its fruit be of any benefit to the plant itself? Quite the contrary. Vegetation exists to provide food for the animal kingdom.

“How is it possible that two radically different life forms—plants and animals--evolved simultaneously? Many plants and animals are interdependent such as earth worms and honey bees. The purpose of the bee is to pollenate plants. The worm irrigates the soil. Such interdependence speaks of purpose from outside the organism. All the rich variety of trees for shade, flowers for beauty, grass for erosion control, and most of all, thousands of delicious fruits, vegetables and grains for our sustenance and enjoyment screams of special creation. Nothing points to divine purpose more clearly than the plant kingdom given to us by the Creator out of his love for all he created. It is no mistake the biblical account placed Adam and Eve in a garden. The entire world is a garden that is currently feeding over seven billion people. I challenge anyone to go to a farmer’s market—observe all the variety of fruits and vegetables and convince yourself that it all came about randomly from algae.”

“Good gracious, I never even thought about the plant kingdom from that perspective. The variety is astonishing. It really is a picture of God’s love for us,” said Sarah excitedly. She had always enjoyed gardening and now she knew why.

“Everything I have said today is just common sense. All it takes is a willingness to look at the facts from a different perspective. Something students are not allowed to do either in high school or college. This is a total tragedy and an even greater tragedy that more churches do not directly confront this falsehood. It is one of the greatest enemies of faith and yet so few are willing to challenge it. Personally I see evolution as a house of cards that will eventually collapse.

“I will close with this parallel. Not allowing both sides of the debate to be heard, is like going to trial without a defense attorney. Facing only the prosecutor, the jury could only come to one conclusion and you would be found guilty every time.

*Not allowing both sides of the debate to be heard, is like going to trial without a defense attorney. Facing only the prosecutor, the jury could only come to one conclusion and you would be found guilty every time.*

“Here is a real life example. There would be three Duke University Lacrosse players in jail right now if they weren’t able to put up a defense that cost their parents a fortune. The DA who was running for re-election withheld evidence to get a big win. The case was eventually dropped. The DA was disbarred and went to jail. This dramatic outcome occurred only because there was a fair hearing of the facts. There are professors in

colleges across the country who don’t allow a fair hearing of the facts and cause the jury, the students, to come to false conclusions that destroy faith. All I am saying is that there is strong evidence to support intelligent design yet students are not allowed to consider it much less discuss it in free and open debate.

“Terry, don’t beat yourself up for walking away from the faith when you were in college. You were never allowed to hear the other side of the argument. Now you have. I hope this allows you to move on with exploring the joys and wonder of creation and the promise of the Christian faith. No pressure...but I certainly hope you move in that direction.”

### **The Shroud**

“One last thought. How does all this tie in with the Shroud? If there is no God, then Jesus is not his Son and the Shroud cannot possibly be authentic. If there is a God, it stands to reason that he would be involved with his creation. The entire gospel stands on two legs. The first leg is creation. The second leg is redemption.

The Shroud is all about the cross. Why would God send his only Son to die on a cross? The only answer is love. John 3:16 sums it up: *For God so loved the world he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believes in him shall not perish but shall have eternal life.* One of the scientists called the Shroud a ‘love letter left behind for the analytical mind.’ I think it is a love letter for all mankind. Sadly, not everyone will open the letter. If you do open it, you’ll find a receipt inside that says ‘paid in full.’

“Thank you for this opportunity to share with you. Stay in touch and let me know if you have any questions.”

Terry was beaming, it was as if a cloud of doubt had been lifted off his shoulders. He felt a freedom he had never experienced before.

“Professor, I can’t thank you enough for spending your time with us,” Terry said with emotion and sincerity. Brett and Sarah echoed his words. It was time to leave. Everyone came in separate cars. Sarah lingered back at the booth. She had one more question for the professor.

### **Days of Creation—An Unveiling**

“Is there something else?” he asked.

“You covered all the bases. It was truly eye opening. But I wanted to know how you thought about the six days of creation in light of your position on the age of the earth?” she asked.

“As you know I don’t claim to know how old the earth is or how God did it. Some see the word ‘day’ as a literal day or as a thousand years or even an epoch of time. No one really knows.

“I have been wearing my science hat for most of our conversation today. However, to answer this question I have to put my theology hat back on. I must return to Hebrews 11:3 again—that *what we see did not come from what is seen.* It tells you that creation also involved the spiritual realm, and in fact started there first. I have a theory called ‘Project Earth’. I believe earth was in the works perhaps for millions of years in the spirit realm although there is no time in eternity. Finally, when all was ready, God told his Son it was time to manifest creation in the physical realm. Remember, Jesus is the Word made physical. He is the active force of creation as we read

in Colossians. *For in him all things were created: things in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible...all things have been created through him and for him. He is before all things, and in him all things hold together. 1:16-18*

“I have a hunch each day of creation was an unveiling in the physical of what had already been built in the spirit. So on day one God revealed light, day two he separated the waters above from the waters below allowing for land to emerge, on day three he unveiled the plant kingdom, on day four he unveiled the sun, moon and stars, on day five he unveiled all the fish and birds, on day six he unveiled the animals and finally man. Note how on day one, God created light but it was not until day four when the sun, moon and stars came into being. This is completely counter-intuitive, it must be highly significant. We know light comes from the sun and to a lesser degree the stars. If Moses wrote the story according to basic logic, God would have created the sun, moon and stars first followed by light. So why is it the opposite?”

“Even evolutionists believe in Adam and Eve. After all, there had to be a first man and a first woman. The only question is if they evolved or were created. The biblical account would suggest Adam and Eve came into being as adults in their prime—with *the appearance of age*. In other words, on day one, Adam appeared to be twenty years old. But he wasn’t, he was only one day old. I believe this could be a major clue. I admit to borrowing this concept from the young earth crowd, but it makes sense. Because evolutionists ascribe a magical quality to time, one of the biggest stumbling blocks for some people to believe in creation is the assertion that the universe is billions of years old. According to astronomers, the farthest star we can detect is about fourteen billion light years away. So theoretically it has taken at least that long for the light from that star to reach planet earth.

“However, if light was created first, how do we really know how old the star may be? If Adam and Eve were created with the appearance of age, perhaps the universe was created the same way. There is an unseen dimension, the spirit realm that factors into creation and we can never know how it all works together. Remember, what is seen did not come from what we see. This is my theory.”

“That is really insightful! I love the appearance of age concept.”

“I will end with this thought. The evolutionist would accuse me of believing in a fairy tale. Maybe so. Yet evolution is a fractured fantasy of its own. At the end of the day, it comes down to the battle of the fairy tales! Here is the tall tale of evolution: *In the beginning there was nothing and nothing became everything all by itself.*”

“Here is my version: *I believe creation was an unveiling of Project Earth built in the unseen realm of the Spirit and manifested in the physical realm through a process of progressive unveiling over six “days” (whatever measure of time a day may be). Creation is a manifestation of God’s love and his infinite personality as revealed through the majesty and wonder of all he has created.* This is my fairy tale. What’s yours?”

“I love it!” blurted Sarah

The professor was smiling. “Sarah, thanks for asking that important question. I don’t claim to be correct but I do have the right to my own opinion based simply on a different interpretation of the facts. Too bad students and faculty aren’t allowed the same liberty. So much for free expression and academic freedom. I taught religion and philosophy so I had a little more latitude. I pity the science majors where godless undirected evolution is the only view that can be considered.”

Emily came over one last time. The bill was already paid. “Is there anything else I can get you?” she asked.

“No, thank you. We were just leaving, and thanks for sharing your thoughts earlier...they were right on time,” said the professor.

“My pleasure,” she answered. “I can’t tell you how many times I wish I was a fly on a wall to hear all the fascinating conversations. But it probably wouldn’t be good to be a fly on a wall in a restaurant!” Emily laughed at her own joke.

“No, you’re probably right,” laughed the professor. “Best of success to you in school. Here is a little something extra for you. I know you are working hard.”

The professor handed Emily a twenty dollar bill. “Thank you so much!” responded Emily. “It’s for a good cause, I promise.”

“I have no doubt.”

The professor and Sarah left the restaurant together both inwardly happy knowing that God’s kingdom had been advanced today. Where is the kingdom? In the heart of everyone who believes.