

I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist

Session 4

1. Chapter 6: From the Goo to You via the Zoo

- a. Repeated observation tells us that only intelligent beings create messages; natural laws never do (pg. 138)
- b. Even Carl Sagan realized that human brains contain enough information to fill twenty million books. Question: if intelligent beings cannot create anything close to the human brain, why should we expect nonintelligent natural laws to do so?
- c. What about new life forms?
 - i. Darwinists still need to explain both the first cause (Big Bang), and the origin of the first life (biogenesis), before they are able to advance to a discussion of new, more complex life forms. They can't, but the theory of macroevolution persists nonetheless (pg. 139).
 - ii. Microevolution vs. Macroevolution
 1. Evolution by blind, nonintelligent forces is merely a hypothesis. As such, blind forces cannot make any selection, as they has no preferences.
 2. Survival of the fittest is a "tautology" – a circular argument that does not prove anything
 3. Defining "evolution" is the single greatest point of confusion in the creation-evolution controversy
 - a. Surviving bacteria always remain bacteria. They do not evolve into a new organism distinctly different from the parent organism
 - b. Natural selection has never been observed to create new types (pg. 141)
 - c. The Darwinist claim that small, micro changes within a living organism can be extrapolated to prove that unobservable macroevolution must have occurred to create the vast number of all living systems, in both plant and animal kingdoms has no evidence to support it. In fact, all the evidence we have has proven the opposite.
 - d. By failing to admit the critical distinction between microevolution and macroevolution, Darwinists dupe the general public into believing that small observables changes is also a viable mechanism to explain how all life originated from a single-celled first life.
 4. "Biochemical mutations cannot explain the large-scale changes in organisms that we see in the history of life." Jonathan Wells
- d. Five Reasons Natural Selection and Genetic Mutations Fail as an Explanation
 - i. **Genetic Limits:** (according to their kind)
 1. Intelligent dog breeding always produces dogs, nothing else
 2. Laboratory experiments with fruit flies always results in fruit flies
 3. Mules (close cousin breeding) are always sterile
 4. See table 6.1 (pg. 143)
 5. If intelligent scientists cannot break genetic barriers, why should we expect nonintelligent natural selection to have such capacity?
 - ii. **Cyclical Change:**

1. Changes within a species shift back and forth within a limited range to meet environmental changes that aid survival
2. Changes never result in new life forms or even permanent changes
3. Natural selection may aid in explaining *survival* of a species, but it offers no evidence for the *arrival* of a species

iii. Irreducible complexity

1. In order for a genetic mutation, using natural selection, to be beneficial for the survival or adaptability of the species, it must prove to be beneficial within a single generation.
2. If macroevolution hypothesizes that successive, multi-part mutations have come together as a beneficial change, then all the mutations must happen simultaneously and within a single generation in order for a selection to occur that gives preference to the new species
 - a. An irreducibly complex system is comprised of several well-matched, interacting parts that contribute to the basic function, wherein the removal of any one of the parts causes the system to effectively stop functioning
 - b. Single cells are irreducibly complex
 - c. The flagellum motor is irreducibly complex
 - d. The visual systems are irreducibly complex
 - e. Cars and mouse traps are irreducibly complex examples
3. The assertion of Darwinian molecular evolution is merely bluster (pg. 146, Behe).

iv. Nonviability of Transitional Forms

1. Transitional forms cannot survive the “survival of the fittest” standards hypothesized by natural selection
2. From reptiles to birds
 - a. Scales to feathers
 - b. Bones – from solid to hollow
 - c. Muscular structure to transition from ground to air maneuverability
 - d. Flight aerodynamics is a complex requirement not present in the reptile natural instincts

v. Molecular Isolation

1. Commonalities with DNA in living systems does not prove macroevolution.
2. If our protein structures were not compatible, the food chain that all living systems rely on would be impossible
3. Similarity in design is not proof of common ancestry
4. At the molecular level, there is no trace of the evolutionary transitions proposed by the theory. There are no transitions in the molecular record, only gaps between all species (pg. 151)

e. The fossil record

- i. A complete embarrassment for Darwinists. It confirms nothing for the theory
- ii. It does not reveal gradualism of development in the Darwinian tree of life
- iii. Most species exhibit no directional changes at all. They are today as they have always been in the observable record.
- iv. All life forms have a sudden appearance, fully developed into their final forms

- v. Without a favorable fossil record, some Darwinists have proposed “Punctuated Equilibrium” (Hopeful Monsters) where the mutations occurred so rapidly there was no record of the changes (pg. 152)
 - vi. There is no such thing as a “missing link” because the whole chain is nowhere to be found. The Tree of Life is a myth, not fact.
 - vii. Cambrian Record – biology’s Big Bang evidences the creation of all species, and is totally inconsistent with Darwinian evolution
 - viii. Ancestral relationships cannot be derived from the fossil record because 99% of the biology of an organism is contained in soft tissues which do not fossilize except under special conditions. There is also more recent discoveries that have found soft tissue in dinosaur fossils. Since soft tissue decays much faster than bone, these discoveries seriously challenge the notion that dinosaurs went extinct 65 million years ago.
 - ix. Anatomical similarities are irrelevant to discovering the truth about the theory of evolution at the molecular level. Without a molecular record, ancestral links cannot be established. Since we do not have access to a molecular record, the evidence Darwinists hope to find in the fossil record is useless anyway (pg. 154).
- f. Intelligent Design Alternative
- i. With natural selection and Darwin’s tree of life debunked as viable theories, the only other option is intelligent design. There is no third option between blind natural forces and intelligence as a cause.
 1. Science is now confirming intelligence as the most plausible reason for all cosmological and biological systems that exist today
 2. Intelligence provides the best explanation for what we observe. Appealing to Intelligent Design is not a “god of the gaps” copout used to mask ignorance. It is the best rational explanation that matches the evidence we have.
 3. Intelligent Design remains open to both intelligence and natural forces as explanations in the search for truth. Darwinists are not open to intelligence as a cause. This rejection of intelligence is based on bias, not facts (pg. 159).
 4. Intelligent Design is open to being proven false if evidence could ever be discovered that would disprove it. The Darwinian Theory and its proponents are not open to any competing theories or facts that disprove their hypothesis.
 5. Darwinists willfully ignore the positive, empirically detectable evidence for an intelligent being (pg. 158). They are letting their religion overrule objective scientific observation.
 6. No worldview is completely free of bias; so the claim that Intelligent Design is motivated by religious beliefs is not a valid objection to the hypothesis. Having personal beliefs, for or against a position, will never change observable facts.
 7. The conclusion of Intelligent Design flows naturally from the data itself – not from sacred books or sectarian beliefs (pg. 160) Michael Behe
 8. Darwinism must be rejected because it does not fit the scientific data (and never has). Intelligent Design does fit the observable data, and it should be accepted without any appeal to a religious text.
 9. Intelligent Design is often criticized because Darwinists claim imperfection in the finished product, and a perfect God would not make errors in design. But how can one determine what would be perfect without a knowledge of all the implications of modifying a living system to match the speculated ideal? This is a

self-defeating objection because it appeals to intelligence without invoking intelligence.

- g. Why is anyone still a Darwinist?
 - i. By admitting God, Darwinists would have to admit that they are not the highest authority of truth. In a secular, materialistic world, scientists are the new priesthood to whom the rest of the world pays homage and respect.
 - ii. Darwinists would lose their claim to having the highest authority in answering the basic questions in life (Introduction chapter). In other words, theologians, not scientist, would have to provide the ultimate answers for why the universe, and all that is in it, actually exists. This would fundamentally subordinate the position of science and scientists to theistic wisdom and power. Money, status and power over the general public would all be yielded by such an admission.
 - iii. Darwinists would have to admit that they no longer have the authority to define right and wrong for themselves if God is accepted. If there is no God, then everything is lawful, especially to those in power who desire to set their own standards, and then attempt to force everyone else to follow them.
 - iv. Sex and power are the motivators that underlie many of our most intense cultural debates, such as those about abortion and homosexuality. Too often people take positions in these debates that merely line up with their personal desires rather than taking the evidence into account (pg. 164).
- h. Conclusion
 - i. There are only two possibilities: either God created us, or we created God.
 - ii. An honest looks at the facts suggests theistic creation, not macroevolution is true.
 - iii. This isn't a battle of science vs. religion. It is a battle of good science vs. bad science
 - iv. Darwinists would rather suppress the evidence than allow it to be presented fairly.
 - v. Clearly, Darwinists lack the faith to believe that their theory will still be believed after our children see all of the evidence.