

March 12, 2006 AM
#1322

Where Did Life Come From?

Maybe you saw the new article this past week. It was titled the Time Warp Family.

It read in part, "An extraordinary family who walk on all fours are being hailed as the breakthrough discovery which could shed light on the moment Man first stood upright.

Scientists believe that the five brothers and sisters found in Turkey could hold unique insights into human evolution.

The Kurdish siblings, aged between 18 and 34 and from the rural south, 'bear crawl' on their feet and palms.

Researchers have found a genetic condition which accounts for their extraordinary movement. And it could provide invaluable information on how humans evolved from a four-legged hominid into a creature walking on two feet.

Professor Nicholas Humphrey, evolutionary psychologist at the London School of Economics, visited the family twice. He said he thought the family had reverted to an instinctive form of behaviour encoded deep in the brain but abandoned during evolution.

He said: "...their unique genetic make-up...has produced an extraordinary window on our past. It is physically possible, which no one would have guessed from the modern human skeleton."

"However they arrived at this point, we have adult human beings walking like ancestors several million years ago."

I happened to show the article to someone this past week and their first response was, "This is a joke, right?"

Unfortunately it's not a joke at all. What I believe it shows is the extraordinary lengths some people will go to try and keep Darwin's theory afloat.

We're in the middle of a series in which we're tackling the hard questions that often keep people from having faith.

So far we've looked at the questions "Is it OK to doubt?" "Is it rational to believe in God?" and last week we asked "What about all the religions?"

What we've tried to establish each week is that it's not only OK to ask questions, it's absolutely necessary if we're going to discover truth.

The problem isn't that most people are asking too many questions. It's just the opposite. Most people don't ask enough good questions.

No where is that more true than in the issues of human origins.

Fortunately modern science is making such astounding discoveries that it's forcing people back to the drawing board to ask how is this all possible with out a designer?

Listen to Dean Kenyon briefly explain the complexity of the cell. (from Unlocking The Mystery of Life) 2:30 Minutes

Award winning astronomer Dr. Allan R. Sandage says, ""Many scientists are now driven to faith by their very work."

I believe that it's as we ask the hard questions about the origin of life and the complexity of living things that we're driven away from a naturalistic, materialistic explanation.

A new Zogby poll shows 69 percent of Americans believe public school teachers should present both the evidence for and against Darwinian evolution.

About 88 percent of Americans 18-29 years old were in support.

It's amazing to me how even the thought of criticizing Darwin from a purely scientific basis has been rejected by so many of the power brokers in the scientific and educational realms.

And here's the Catch22 we face: Studying the origins and development of man is to be done through scientific means. Science excludes the supernatural. So, even if the evidence points to a Creator we can't discuss that in the science classroom because the Creator would have to be God and we can't talk about God.

That's apriori reasoning. My mind's made up don't confuse me with the facts!

In fact, if you even try to talk about the striking weaknesses in Darwinian evolution you'll

be instantly branded as trying to sneak religion into the science classroom.

Is it true that science supports Darwinian evolution?

To date 514 doctoral scientists have now signed a statement publicly expressing their skepticism about the contemporary theory of Darwinian evolution.

Here's page 1 of 13 pages you can see at dissentfromdarwin.org.

The statement reads: "We are skeptical of claims for the ability of random mutation and natural selection to account for the complexity of life. Careful examination of the evidence for Darwinian theory should be encouraged."

Signers include 154 biologists, 76 chemists and 63 physicists.

Many are professors or researchers at major universities and research institutions such as MIT, The Smithsonian, Cambridge University, UCLA, UC Berkeley, Princeton, the University of Pennsylvania, the Ohio State University, the University of Georgia, and the University of Washington.

Whether we're talking about religion, science, education, philosophy; no area should be immune to critical thinking.

That's what we're trying to do this morning. Think critically about how we got here.

How did the human race end up on the planet in the shape we're in?

Are we products of a chance, mindless, purely mechanicalistic process or are we designed by an intelligent Creator who reveals Himself in all of nature?

As we've clarified each week in this series we're committed theists here, who believe that God created all that exists including human life and that the Bible gives us the accurate description of those events.

Just to see that from the Bible let's turn to Gen 1 pg 3

Read vs 1-5

The Bible doesn't try to explain God, it merely states His existence. He created all there is.

The rest of chapter 1 gives us the creative events on each of the 6 days.

On the sixth day God created something unlike anything else. **Read vs 26-27**

According to the Bible, God created humans in His image.

That's one option.

Nobel prize winning molecular biologist, Francis Crick, who co-discovered DNA was taken to church by his parents as a young boy. When he turned 12 he told his parents that was it. End of church. He later stated he preferred science to religious dogma. Crick was interested in two fundamental unsolved problems of biology. First, how molecules make the transition from the non-living to the living, and second, how the brain makes mind.

After years of study he realized the difficulty of imagining how a complex system like a cell could arise under pre-biotic conditions from non-living chemical components so he postulated directed pansperma.

That's the belief that micro organisms were sent here on unmanned space ships by highly evolved alien lifeforms to populate the planet.

Of course, there's no evidence for the theory of pansperma, just the unthinkable alternative that God might have created life.

Sir Arthur Keith was a Scottish anatomist and anthropologist, and was a leading figure in the study of Human fossils. Some of his published works were: *Human Embryology and Morphology*, *Ancient Types of Man*, *The Antiquity of Man*, *Concerning Man's Origins*, and *A New Theory of Human Evolution*.

Keith was being painfully honest when he wrote: "Evolution is unproved and unprovable. We believe it only because the only alternative is special creation which is unthinkable."

In his introduction to "Origin of the Species" Charles Darwin wrote: "For I am well aware that scarcely a single point is discussed in this volume on which facts cannot be adduced, often apparently leading to conclusions directly opposite to those at which I have arrived. A fair result can be obtained only by fully stating and balancing the facts and arguments on

both sides of each question.”

Saying life’s too complex to arise by purely naturalistic means so let’s guess that it came here on spaceships is not my idea of fully stating and balancing the facts.

Colossians 1:16 *“For by Him all things were created that are in heaven and that are on the earth...”*

Romans 1:20 *“For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made...”*

Psalms 102:25 *“Of old You laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Your hands.”*

Klaus Dose, *The Origin of Life: More Questions than Answers*: “More than thirty years of experimentation on the origin of life in the fields of chemical and molecular evolution have led to a better perception of the immensity of the problem of the origin of life on Earth rather than to its solution. At present all discussions on principle theories and experiments in the field either end in stalemate or in a confession of ignorance.”

Now just so we define our terms correctly let’s think about this.

Evolution actually has two sub-divisions: micro-evolution and macro-evolution

“Micro-evolution” is true to many extents. There are undeniably variations within the specific species of animals and plants.

For instance: there are more than 200 breeds of dogs.

Dairy cattle can be bred for improved milk production.

Bacteria can adapt and develop immunity to antibiotics.

In Genesis chapter 1 we’re told 8 times that things reproduce after their kind. Take note that God did not say there could be no changes within the family. It’s just that one kind won’t bring forth another different species.

No one would deny micro-evolution. Micro-evolution consists of changes within the specific species.

“Macro-evolution” is what Darwinists propound. . They claim that life began millions of years ago with simple single-cell creatures brewed in a gooey soup and then developed through mutation and natural selection into the vast array of plant and animal life that

populate the planet today.

There are some major problems, though, with macro-evolution.

For instance,

I. *There's A Lack Of Fossil Evidence For The Transitions Between Various Species Of Animals.*

Even Darwin admitted that the lack of these fossils "is perhaps the most obvious and serious objection" to his theory.

Steven Jay Gould, Professor of Geology and Paleontology at Harvard wrote in the journal *Paleobiology*, "The absence of fossil evidence for intermediary stages between major transitions in organic design, indeed our inability, even in our imagination, to construct functional intermediates in many cases, has been a nagging problem for gradualistic accounts of evolution."

Not only don't we have fossils of intermediate stages between species we can't even dream any up for most gaps. We can't even imagine the missing links, how they could function being half one thing and half another!

Writing in the journal "Natural History," Gould says, "All paleontologists know that the fossil record contains precious little in the way of intermediate forms; transitions between major groups are characteristically abrupt."

Here's the problem. If things evolved over a long time we would expect to find millions (not 1 or 2 "maybes") of examples of transitional forms. If reptiles evolved into birds like evolutionists claim, and it took millions of years to happen, we should have an enormous number of fossils of animals in the change time.

We don't.

But now if God created all things, and animals reproduce "after their kind" as the Bible says then we should expect to find just what the fossil record shows.

No transitional forms.

II. *The second problem for evolution (and there are lots) is what we call irreducible complexity.*

Certain systems can't be broken down into smaller yet functioning systems. Nothing

functions once you reach a certain point.

Michael J. Behe is Professor of Biological Sciences at Lehigh University in Pennsylvania.

His book, Darwin's Black Box has been internationally reviewed in over one hundred publications and has been named by National Review and World magazine as one of the 100 most important books of the 20th century.

Behe has presented and debated his work at major universities throughout North America and England.

Listen as he briefly explains irreducible complexity: *Unlocking The Mystery of Life: What Challenge Did Darwin Propose To His Own Theory? 1:20 Minutes*

If your still in Genesis look at Genesis 2, pg. 4 Read vs 7

Revelation 4:11 *"You are worthy, O Lord, To receive glory and honor and power; For You created all things, And by Your will they exist and were created."*

Genesis 5:1-2 Read

Isaiah 45:12 *"I have made the earth, And created man on it. I--My hands--stretched out the heavens, And all their host I have commanded."*

Isaiah 45:18 *"For thus says the LORD, Who created the heavens, Who is God, Who formed the earth and made it, Who has established it, Who did not create it in vain, Who formed it to be inhabited: "I am the LORD, and there is no other."*

If someone told you they could pick a winning multi million dollar lottery number and did you'd be impressed. Odds are 10(7). Suppose they did it twice in a row? One chance in a hundred thousand billion 10(14).

Odds of evolution are like someone randomly winning thousands of lotteries in a row.

The probability of a single cell forming by evolution through limitless time, particles and events has been calculated by the Swiss mathematician, Charles Eugene Guye. The odds one chance in 10(160). That means 10 multiplied by itself 160 times.

Statisticians define anything beyond 10(50) as beyond reason, essentially impossible or

absurd. Evolution is belief in spite of the fact that it's statistically absurd.

To quote Darwin again, "To suppose that the eye could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree."

That's not only true of the eye, it's true of every cell that makes up an eye. But again, it's exactly what we'd expect from an astonishing, extraordinary, incredible, phenomenal God.

III. *Another problem for macro-evolution is that runs counter to a scientific law called the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics*

The second law of thermodynamics, in a concise form, states that "the total entropy of any thermodynamically isolated system tends to increase over time, approaching a maximum value.

In thermodynamics, entropy is a measure of the amount of energy in a physical system that cannot be used to do work.

In simpler terms, everything moves toward disorder and randomness. Things tend to break down into the less-complicated rather than increase in complexity.

Pure bred dogs don't happen in the wild. It takes intelligent breeding. If we'd take our hands off all dogs, the mongrels would increase not the show winners.

My garden doesn't naturally grow vegetables, it naturally grows weeds.

The earth is slowing on it's axis. We use UTC now as the standard time reference. In the past 32 years scientists have had to add 21 seconds to (they call them leap seconds) to make up for the earth's loss of rotation speed.

Darwinian evolution says things are becoming more specialized and useful. There's no explanation of what's making them that way, but somehow reptiles evolved into birds, which is why they show you the birds flying in the last scene of Jurassic Park.

That means that reptile feet became wings, reptile bones became hollow, and cold blooded animals became warm blooded.

It's not happening, Archaeopteryx notwithstanding. Archaeopteryx is supposed to be the missing link between reptiles and birds.

Dr. Alan Feduccia, professor of Avian Evolution, Paleobiology at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, said: "Paleontologists have tried to turn Archaeopteryx into an earth-bound, feathered dinosaur. But it's not. It is a bird, a perching bird. And no amount of 'paleobabble' is going to change that."

There is no macro evolution taking place.

What does the Bible say? **Turn to Genesis 3 pg 5 Read vs 17-19**

Hebrews 1:10-12 10* And: "You, LORD, in the beginning laid the foundation of the earth, And the heavens are the work of Your hands. They will perish, but You remain; And they will all grow old like a garment; Like a cloak You will fold them up, And they will be changed. But You are the same, And Your years will not fail."

What would we expect to find if the Biblical description of God as Creator, man as rebel, God as judge is true?

Just what we have in biology as well as cosmology.

III. *There's another problem for macro-evolution
biggest problem of all;*

*that's what I believe is the
encoded information.*

Dr. Walter L. Bradley, who was professor of mechanical engineering at Texas A & M, now retired, points out that the only time we see written information, whether it be on a cave wall or in a novel, is when there's an intelligence behind it.

"In other words, what is encoded on the DNA inside every cell of every living creature is purely and simply written information. We use a twenty-six letter alphabet in English; in DNA, there is a four-letter chemical alphabet, whose letters combine in various sequences to form words, sentences, and paragraphs. These comprise all the instructions needed to guide the functioning of the cell."

"Each cell in the human body contains more information than in all thirty volumes of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. It's certainly reasonable to make the inference that this isn't the random product of unguided nature, but it's the unmistakable sign of an Intelligent Designer."

Here's Steven C. Meyer, Ph.D. Cambridge explaining why biological information can't be produced by naturalistic means. *Unlocking Mysteries 1:36 Minutes*

Richard Dawkins, one of the most influential evolutionists of our day, begins his book *The Blind Watchmaker* by stating, "Biology is the study of complicated things that give the appearance of having been designed for a purpose."

Francis Crick writes in his book *In What Mad Pursuit*, "Biologists must constantly keep in mind that what they see was not designed, but rather evolved."

At every avenue and at every turn life and the cosmos have the evidence of design stamped all over them.

The truth of the matter is that issues of origins and evolution are issues of faith, not just science.

We can't recreate the origin of life using the scientific method. No one has documented evolution using the scientific method.

What we have is two competing belief systems. You either have blind chance with incremental development or special creation.

The question was and always will be, "Where does the evidence lead us?"

Some people want to put God in the process of evolution but that one really fails. Not only does the fossil evidence deny gradual chance but in the end you've got to say that Jesus was wrong when He spoke of Genesis as fact.

If theistic evolution is true then God didn't create Adam, Adam and Eve didn't eat the fruit and fall, there's no curse, and Jesus isn't the last Adam.

Look with me at Rom 5 pg. 1003

Read vs 12-14

The question in Romans 5 is, "How could one man, Jesus, pay for the sins of the world?"

Here's the biblical explanation: One man Adam sinned and brought death on the whole world. The reason we know that is because everybody dies. Even before God gave His law people died.

The wages of sin is death and death has reigned since ADam.

But, verse 15... So one brings death and one brings life.

Read vs 16-18

One man, Adam, was disobedient to God and every person born since has inherited his sin nature. One man, Jesus, was obedient to the Father and gave His life for us. He substituted His own sinless body for our sinful bodies and took our condemnation at the cross.

We can't live a perfect life to please a perfect God. that's why we fall under His perfect judgment.

But Jesus could do it for us.

There either is a holy God or there isn't. There either was a man named Adam or there wasn't.

Jesus either died in our place as the Son of God or He didn't.

H. G. Wells, the English novelist, journalist, sociologist, and historian summed up the situation with these pointed words: "If all animals and man evolved... then there were no first parents, no Eden, no Fall. And if there has been no fall, then the entire historic fabric of Christianity - the story of the first sin and the reason for an atonement- collapses like a house of cards."

The English biologist, Jullian Huxley, in his book Religion Without Revelation says because we've gotten rid of our need for God through evolution "Operationally, God is beginning to resemble, not a ruler, but the last fading smile of a cosmic Cheshire cat."

Theism, specifically Christianity is a faith system. There plenty of evidence for it's truth, but ultimately it's a faith system.

Darwinian evolution is a faith system. Unproved and unprovable.

Which faith system do you think is more consistent with the evidence? Which faith system is a system of hope? Which faith system really brings freedom?

For me it's found in this: "For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son,

that whoever believes in Him should not perish but have everlasting life.' John 3:16