

Critical Analysis

Ever since 1925 when Clarence Darrow battled Williman Jennings Bryan during the infamous Scopes Trial in Dayton, Tennessee, evolutionists have been gradually indoctrinating students at every level of our educational system in the as yet unproven theory of macro- evolution. For the first 25 years following Scopes they demanded equal time and then about 50 years ago, they accomplished a virtual coup and completely took over the classrooms in every discipline of science.

Every time their theory was questioned they suppressed all debate. Now, thanks to the Ohio Board of Education, the time has come, and the opportunity has arisen, for the debate to begin anew. At ORT we have developed a series of Ten Questions which we would propose to the Darwinian evolutionists in the classroom so that a **critical analysis** of their theory of origins might be undertaken. This critique will be set forth utilizing universally accepted scientific principles and observations. Today I would briefly offer a glimpse at five of those Ten Questions.

What is your FIRST CAUSE?

The closest that any proponent of the macro-evolutionary theory of origins has ever come to an explanation of “first cause”, or the “ultimate cause,” of the universe_ is the so called “**Big Bang.**”

The **what** of the big bang that allegedly occurred some 20 billions of years ago, **that is** the elements that banged, or exploded, were **supposedly** a combination of energy and matter.

But that does not answer the question of 1st cause. What caused the matter and the energy to be there in the first place? The **First Law of Thermodynamics**, a natural law, is quite demanding in its proposition that the sum total of matter and energy can neither be created nor destroyed, and while they may be interchanged, the total amount of energy plus matter must remain constant. Thus the matter and energy that exploded **cannot have come about spontaneously through natural means.**

It has also been proposed that the matter and energy that went bang, has been existant_ **eternally**. The problem with that proposition is this. The Second Law of Thermodynamics, **the law of entropy**, teaches us that all things are wearing out or losing energy_ and furthermore, that **chaos replaces order** and **simplicity replaces complexity** in a system left to itself. Thus the matter and energy that went bang could not have been around for an infinite amount of time or it would have dissipated an infinite amount of time ago.

Observable examples of the 2nd Law at work include the fact that Boiling water cools off naturally_ thus losing potential steam energy. Water runs down hill_ thus losing mechanical energy its capacity to turn a water wheel that generates electrical energy. Wood rots, iron rusts, aluminum oxidizes and radioactive materials decay.

These are **observable** phenomena. True science after all **involves** observation.

An example of order becoming chaos could be illustrated by placing alphabet soup on the deck of an aircraft carrier such that it spells out the preamble to the US Constitution. It won't take much time for wind and wave (natural phenomena) to disrupt the order. Contrary wise scrambling, or tossing, those same letters randomly will never result in that same preamble.

I ask this question of you Dr. Macro evolutionist, when are you going to come up with a **first cause** that does not violate accepted **natural and observable** scientific laws?

What was the mechanism that resulted in the FIRST CELL?

Here again the 2nd Law, entropy poses a problem for the theory. The evolutionary scenario teaches that the first **orderly and complex** cell arose out of a **CHAOTIC** primordial soup of organic and inorganic chemicals and that it did so spontaneously when some natural phenomena stirred the pot, so to speak.

In other words **order arose out of chaos**. The randomly arranged molecules of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, sulfur, nitrogen, phosphorous, copper, zinc, etc. combined to form an **orderly array** amino acids, sugars, fatty acids and nucleic acids and then, **quite by chance** _proteins, fats and carbohydrates_ which were then assimilated autonomously into a cell wall, a nucleus and some cytoplasm_ complete with enzymes, DNA, mitochondria, RNA, and all of the complex self-replicating and protective mechanisms necessary for this cell to survive and propagate all life on earth.

Not only did **order** supposedly arise out of **chaos**, but **complexity** arose out of **simplicity**, and the **low energy** of the soup finally resulted in the **high energy production of the mitochondrium**. All of this flies squarely in the face of an observable law, the law of entropy. That is precisely why no one has ever been able to duplicate this theory in the laboratory; either by chance or by way of their superior **intelligence** and their intricately **designed** experiments. Furthermore that is why this has never been observed in nature.

I ask this question of you Dr. Macro-evolutionist, when are you going to **prove your theory, of spontaneous cell production**, with or without the use of intelligently designed experiments? You have had 150 years since Darwin gave you the marching orders. Where are the results?

What is the PROBABILITY that the first cell could have been spontaneously generated?

In order for a cell to function it needs a source of information. That information is contained within an accumulation of nucleic acids collectively called DNA, the major component of a cell's nucleus. There is a vast amount of information stored in DNA.

This substance is made up in the form of a doubly wound chain. The total component of DNA in an animal or human is called its "genome". The human genome has recently been found to contain a code of 4.5 billion letters. If that total component _of doubly wound helices of DNA_ were unwound and each part laid end to end, they would reach

from Miami, FL to Seattle, WA. One link in a chain of DNA is composed of 200 parts of oxygen, phosphorous, hydrogen, carbon, nitrogen and sulfur. Each piece must be placed in **just the proper order** for the nucleic acid link to function properly.

What are the odds that this will happen randomly? If one were to throw three blocks on the floor_ each containing the letter A, B, or C on each of its six sides_ the odds of the blocks landing in the order ABC, instead of some other order (BCA, BAC, CAB etc) are 1 out of 6. When adding a 4th block with the letter D_ the odds rise to 1 out of 24. Adding E_ the odds move to 1:120, F to 1:720. The odds of 200 things, or as in the case of DNA_ the 200 molecules in one link of the DNA chain_ aligning just right are 1 out of 10_{364} . 1 with 364 zeros trailing.

That is one link in a DNA chain. We have not even discussed RNA, the complex cell wall, the mitochondrium etc. Evolutionists have proposed that life arose spontaneously 3.5 billions of years ago. There are 10_{18} seconds in 4.5 billion years. The odds tell us that 10_{346} attempts per second for 4.5 billion years will finally

produce one link of DNA.

I ask you Dr. Macro evolutionist, have you given yourself enough time? Is there any possible way that your theory of origins could ever have enough time?

Speaking of time. When the first astronaut landed on the moon he was expected to step into cosmic dust up to his knees. That estimate was based on the accumulation of cometic dust over a period of 4.5 billion years on a satellite that has no atmosphere. In actuality, when Neil Armstrong took his “one small step” and “one giant leap” he got a small amount of dust on his boots.

The silence has been deafening regarding that erroneous estimate. It appears that the evolutionist has even less time than he thought.

What is your answer to the THE OXYGEN PROBLEM?

If oxygen is not utilized by a cell_ through the means of a

highly complex cytochrome oxidase system, the cell will be oxidized. Realizing_ that the first randomly produced cell_ might well have lacked that complex system, some evolutionists have proposed a primitive atmosphere devoid of oxygen_ but merely containing methane, hydrogen, nitrogen and CO₂.

The problem with that scenario is this. Without oxygen-O₂ there would have been no ozone_O₃ and without ozone the first cell burns up from cosmic radiation or ultraviolet radiation.

No matter how one proposes the environment of that first cell_ with or without oxygen_ its TOAST! Explain that to everyone's satisfaction Dr.Macro evolutionist!

How is a transitional life form FIT TO SURVIVE before it is fully developed into the next stage?

According to the theory of macro evolution, new species evolved by way of a series of mutations and natural selections. The mutations theoretically occurred within the

genetic structures inside the organism's nucleus and are brought about by various natural phenomena; such as cosmic, gamma, beta or X-radiations. The less fit organisms evolving from these mutations are then weeded out of the gene pool with only the fittest surviving.

Over the years, macro evolutionists have attempted to prove this theory by means of subjecting fruit flies to various gene altering phenomena. The results were disappointing in 99.9% of the cases_ since the flies either died or their off spring were either sterile or deformed. The remaining 1/10th of 1 % were merely fruit flies; no new viable species were ever produced.

In the evolutionary scheme of things_ consistently taught in the public schools_ reptiles supposedly evolved into one of two lines; birds or mammals. The process was insidious, taking 100s of thousands of years to accomplish. Now lets just imagine for a moment_ a snake that is destined by chance to become the progenitor of all birds. The DNA in that snake's ovaries is zapped by a cosmic ray_ it then mutates and the successive generations of off-spring begin to gradually develop_ over

an extended period of time_ both legs and wings. Imagine further that this reptile used to survive the schemes of its natural predators by darting down a hole in the ground; one that was a perfect_ but tight fit. Now just think of its chances for survival over the next ten, twenty or fifty thousand years, with partially developed appendages now protruding from this formerly lithe body, yet not developed sufficiently to allow the monster to run or fly.

I ask you Dr. Macro evolutionist, which was more fit to survive, the original or the partially formed mutant?

As I said earlier, we have many more questions to ask of the macro-evolutionist, but we will never get the opportunity without a mandate from concerned parents. Local boards of education are not merely going to call up the nearest proponent of ID and ask for the debate to begin. This call must come from the populace_ and until it does our hands are tied. Hopefully Eagle Forum and ORT working in concert can accomplish this goal.

Evolutionists shudder at the thought of ID being taught in the science classes. They **fear** a critical analysis of their

greatly flawed theory of origins. They have even propogated the lie that we proponents of ID want to replace the teaching of evolution with a religious myth.

We who frimly believe in the concept of ID have no such plans. We welcome the debate. Without two sides to a question **there can be no debate**. We have no fear because **we know** that we are right. The only thing that the macro-evolutionist has to fear is the truth. If they are so certain of their postion they should welcome the opportunity to debate and answer these reasonable questions.

In the 17th Century John Owen, a renowned Puritan theologian penned these words:

“The great principles of truth **are always** self-consistent, and **will always** shine through all of the inconsistencies of error.”

Thanks be to God and to the conserted efforts of many folks, we now have the opportunity to **shine that light of truth** in the class rooms of our Ohio schools .In doing so

we will be able to convince young people that they are not merely cosmic accidents, but are rather the result of a **Superior Intelligence** who has **designed** each of them for a specific purpose.

