

EVOLUTION DEMOLITION SCRIPT

(2013-01-17 version)

By Mark D Champneys

Chapter 1

Are you banking everything on evolution?

Do you find that many of your life assumptions and decisions are built on the foundation of evolution as scientific fact?

Well, I suggest that you prepare yourself, because that foundation is about to be demolished.

Not long ago, I was challenged by a PhD evolutionist I know to read a book called *The God Delusion* by a famous atheist named Richard Dawkins. I took the challenge, and was not surprised to find that it was a very dark and angry book. They say that atheists have two things they want to communicate with people: #1 "There is no God." #2 "I hate Him." This describes Dawkins very well. It was actually more a philosophy book rather than a science book. And Richard Dawkins turns out to be a very poor philosopher. He spent a great deal of space in the book not dealing with science, but rather tearing down every weak religion in the world, and then lumping Christianity in with them. He proceeded to criticize the Bible, but it became painfully clear that he knows little about the Bible. He gave great emphasis to judging God, yet he does not believe in God, nor does he believe in any foundation for absolute morality with which to pass moral judgment on the God he doesn't believe in. I was stunned that the substance of the book was so empty and vacant.

I also heard of a follow-up book by Dawkins that was promoted with the claim that it would contain evidence for evolution, called *The Greatest Show on Earth*. So I read that too. Again, I found a lack of substance, that I'll talk about later on. I began to see why he refuses to debate with creationists.

Now if you'll look closely at the top of this book cover you'll see that Richard Dawkins is referred to as "the most formidable intellect in public

discourse." Wow! Who am I to disagree with such a man? No, I'm not here to say that I am smarter than Richard Dawkins. I am here to tell you that I am right! And truth trumps genius. This is a key concept that I want to convey.

Even Richard Dawkins acknowledges that living systems have the "appearance" of design. Yet, all you have to do is look at Dawkins and myself to realize that there are two radically different ways of looking at all this apparent design. Either everything came about by accident, or it came into being on purpose. Either it all happened by natural law combined with random chance, or it was carefully directed by an intelligent mind. Either these complex mechanisms are merely an illusion of design, or they really are designed. Honest people can disagree on this.

So, how am I going to demolish evolution right now? Constructing a building takes many months, but demolition can happen in a matter of minutes. Remember that I said that atheists like Richard Dawkins freely admit that living systems look designed. In fact, they will marvel over this "illusion." So it becomes evident to me, that God has already made His case, just as it says in Romans 1. But keep in mind that for the atheist, evolution is the only game in town. There is no rational basis for atheism without it. So demolishing evolution is the crucial first step to opening his eyes to the marvel of God.

Fortunately, this is rather easy because evolution is surprisingly unscientific. So my strategy is this: to explain in simple terms exactly what the evolution model actually is. When you get the concept, and understand the mechanism that evolutionists are proposing, it will fall of its own weight. And it will blow your mind that anyone ever believed it.

Do you remember the story of The Emperor's New Clothes? As the story goes, you will recall that there were two swindlers who pretended to be selling an invisible suit of clothes to the king. They claimed that wise men could see the beauty of the garment, but to a fool, the clothes were completely invisible. Although he saw nothing, the king did not wish to be seen as a fool, so he pretended to

actually see the non-existent suit. When the story was spread around, no one in the kingdom wanted to appear to be fools, so they also pretended to be able to see it.

It was proposed that the king wear the magic clothes in a grand parade through the kingdom. During the parade everyone continued to pretend that they could see the clothes on the king, except for one little boy, who asked, "Mommy, why is the king naked?"

Folks, this story is the basic idea of evolution demolition. We have a society of people who don't want to appear stupid, so they just buy into evolution without even understanding its simplest ideas. The Christian church is full of people who try to incorporate evolution into their theology for no other reason than that they will look uneducated if they don't. But evolution is a hoax. All it takes is for you to ask the simplest questions like the little boy at the parade, and you will demolish it.

If a little dog can pull back the curtain, so can you. Because... truth trumps genius.

CHAPTER 2

Now if you're going to be like the little boy at the parade, you need be willing to question the experts. The first question to ask, and one to be asked all along the way, is this: Do they really know, or is it speculation? Science is from a root word meaning "knowledge." The search for this knowledge begins with the scientist making a guess or speculation about a potential truth. Keep in mind that only a small portion of these speculations turn out to be verified later on by direct observation, or repeatable experiments. An expert is someone who's a better guesser than the next guy, but even the top experts make many more speculations than facts they confirm. Just like the best baseball player in the world gets far fewer hits than outs. Sometimes, scientists dishonestly pretend that their speculations are science, and then arrogantly expect us to accept them without verification. ["Back off man, I'm a scientist" clip] This is actually a real problem that is rampant in scientific circles, and becomes very

deceptive. In your own mind, it's essential that you sort out the real science from the speculations. Far too many scientists mix the two together for public consumption.

Here's a great example of what I am talking about from the cover of National Geographic in July of 2010. The sensational headline says "**4 Million Year Old Woman**" and you see what appears to be a very old skull. First of all, you should know that this is not a skull at all, but is a plastic computer simulation from a very few bone fragments. And even this speculated skull looks more like an ape than a woman to me. Secondly, they have no idea how old those few actual bone fragments are, because there is no radiometric method in science that can date fossils at four million years. Carbon-14 dating goes back thousands, not millions of years. And other radiometric techniques can only be applied to igneous rocks, not fossils. The 4-million year date is based entirely on the assumptions of evolution, and nothing more. So after a second look, this magazine cover looks much more like speculation than fact.

It's an even greater problem with reporters who write articles. Beware of articles where you read the words "scientists say..." or "experts say..." Or "140 million years ago..." You should be questioning all these kinds of unsupported statements. More often than not, such sweeping, unsupported, words are based on nothing more than the author's evolution-assumed belief system.

Some years ago when my daughter was in a biology course I thumbed through her biology textbook and I was stunned to read these words: "In fact, birds' feathers evolved from reptilian scales." Folks, do you know that with hundreds of thousands of fossils found, not one fossil has ever been found between a scale and a feather? There are zero facts to substantiate this speculation, and it is anything but science, yet we find such giant leaps of faith in science literature all the time.

CHAPTER 3

"Words mean things." As we deal with evolution it's important to ask: What do the words really mean that are being used?

The first word to clarify is the word “evolution” itself. I heard one evolutionist tell me that the meaning of evolution is simply “change.” Folks, this is not a helpful definition. Both creationists and evolutionists believe that things change. However we define evolution, we know it involves more than this.

One difficulty we need to overcome is that there are different kinds of evolution.

One of the most important kinds of evolution is known as abiogenesis. It has to do with how the first living thing came to be. This kind of evolution assumes that random chance and natural processes, somehow, brought the first life into existence from non-life; rather than by the intentional design of an intelligent mind. The popular idea is that billions of years ago, there was a primordial “goo” that happened to come together at just the right temperature, with lightening, and all the right chemicals and speculated gases to form amino acids. Amino acids would be important because they make up proteins which make up living tissue.

Back in 1953, the famous Miller-Urey experiment was done in an attempt to prove that simple amino acids could form by themselves naturally. It was boasted that the experiment was a success, but it was a grand failure on many levels. Like any mixture of amino acid molecules left to itself, half of those molecules in the mix had a backwards molecular structure. And these backwards amino acid molecules block the formation of functional proteins like a poison. Even worse, the by-products of the soup they made were even more toxic. So, if anything, Miller and Urey proved that if the amino acids found in living things formed by some natural means, this wasn't it. Thus, the experiment fell flat trying to jump the very first hurdle of many thousands of hurdles that would need to be jumped before the components for life could even exist, let alone assemble themselves, animate themselves, and reproduce themselves.

But here's the dirty little secret about abiogenesis. There is no theory in science for abiogenesis!

There is no serious model explaining how life from non-life could happen. None.

Oh, yes, there are scientists who have made unsupported guesses about how a particular component, such as the complex RNA molecule, mysteriously built itself. But unsupported guesses are as far as they ever get, because they can't even force that first step to occur artificially, let alone naturally.

Complex molecules would have to materialize before biological evolution could ever get started. But what is the mechanism? What is the model? There are impossibilities everywhere that have never been addressed. DNA is required to build proteins, but proteins are required to make DNA.

Or what about the ATP Synthase molecule made of thousands of atoms perfectly put together as a highly efficient proton-powered rotary engine? In one enzyme molecule! ATP Synthase is a relatively recent discovery by Boyer and Walker. And this hyper-complex molecule that manufactures energy currency (essential for any kind of life) had to form itself before evolution could even start. But how? It's a more amazing motor than anything ever designed by man, but it had to miraculously build itself without the benefit of any life form to build it.

On top of all this, there's not even a guess for putting millions of such parts together and “starting it up.” So with all the talk, and Star Trek episodes notwithstanding... I've got to ask a question: “What theory of abiogenesis? There is none.

What? You mean atheists like Dawkins, and TV personalities like Chris Matthews and Bill Maher who ridicule creationists for being superstitious simpletons, are, themselves, “betting the farm” on a complete fantasy without any science whatever? Yes. That's exactly what they're doing. The primary thing atheists “hang their hat on” is abiogenesis... and there's no such thing!

CHAPTER 4

For the sake of argument, let's assume that we didn't just demolish abiogenesis. Let's assume that somehow, the first living cell popped into existence, and so we need to discuss a second kind of evolution theory: Neo-Darwinism. Darwin never addressed the origin of life, but rather the origin of diverse species. This kind of evolution theory asks how simple life forms became complex life forms. Now it may surprise some to know that Darwin knew nothing about genetics. But today evolutionists have incorporated genetics into his theory, so now it's called "Neo-Darwinism." The idea is that life began as one simple cell which started the so-called tree of life, evolving and branching out into the many species we have today.

More importantly, Neo-Darwinian evolution is all about genetic information. As our understanding of the nucleus of the living cell has taken giant leaps over the last 40 years, we now know that in the development of living things information "runs the show" as Dr. Stephen Meyer puts it. The genetic instructions contained in a single human DNA molecule is beyond anything we previously would have imagined: three billion pairs of nucleobases in a single molecule. Each nucleobase itself is a small molecule, and functions like a letter in a 4-letter alphabet. That is equivalent to a library of approximately 10,000 books—all contained within one human DNA molecule. Somehow we went from zero to 10,000 books-worth of information... The obvious question is: where did all this information come from?

By the way, there's a word you should know that comes up frequently with regard to information. It's the word "genome." Genome is basically another word for genetic information. It's important to realize that it includes not only the instructions that control an organism, but also the hereditary information that may not be in use, but which will be passed down to subsequent generations.

Now, you are bound to hear neo-Darwinists using two other critical terms: micro-evolution and

macro-evolution. These two terms are very troubling. At best, they are misleading, and at worst patently dishonest. The reason I consider them to be so insidious is because of the assumptions behind them.

Micro means small scale, and macro means large scale. But when evolutionists frame the issue in quantitative terms like this, they are engaging in slight-of-hand. If we accept this trickery and then evidence for tiny genetic changes are presented, we will also have to accept that bigger changes can eventually accumulate. However, we're not talking about different amounts of genetic change. We are talking about different kinds of genetic change. The issue is the direction, not the scale. Small genetic changes are indeed occurring with virtually every new generation of an organism. This is called breeding. But these changes merely remix genetic information that already exists. This should be called horizontal evolution, not micro-evolution.

Evolutionists are suggesting that by adding together lots of instances of micro-evolution, we can assume that it ultimately results in macro-evolution. They expect to get a big glass of orange juice by crushing a lot of little apples. But what they call macro-evolution should really be called vertical evolution. As I said, the amount of change is not the point, but the direction. Vertical evolution must add bits of new ingredients, new information, to the genome. Not merely re-mix the old. Such new genetic information is what evolutionists have never shown us. When an evolutionist says they have evidence for genetic changes, it's always, always, always, merely a remixing of information that already exists in the genome. Sure, the mix of Darwin's Galapagos finch beaks changed back and forth between thick and pointed, as the food supply varied. So what! This is horizontal remixing of existing information, not anything new that wasn't already in the genome.

Even the tiniest amounts of vertical evolution have never been observed and confirmed. So here's the point: horizontal evolution isn't evolution, and vertical evolution isn't science.

CHAPTER 5

Before we examine the evolution model itself, we need to look at a couple of errors that evolutionists often make with word meanings.

Many people seem to equate the idea of natural selection with evolution. Even Richard Dawkins appears to make this mistake. Natural selection, also known as “survival of the fittest,” is a principle of natural breeding, but it is NOT synonymous with evolution. Creationists don’t disagree with natural selection. They disagree with evolution. Natural selection is one part of the evolution model, but the problem is with the rest of the model, not the natural selection part.

Natural selection simply means that weaker members of any given population tend to be the ones that die first, leaving the stronger members to be perpetuated into the next generation. Weak things die: A pretty obvious truth. But understand that natural selection is a destructive principle, not a creative principle. It’s all about death. Natural selection does not create viable information, but destroys non-viable information.

You also might take note that natural selection requires a reproductive system, since the process is all about what’s left to the next generation. So here’s a little question for evolutionists: How could the first reproductive system evolve, since natural selection couldn’t be operating yet? Hmmm?

Evolutionists tend to equate two other terms: intelligent design and creation. Intelligent design is a scientific hypothesis, like evolution. It says nothing about God or religion, but stops short of that. It simply says that genetic information comes from some kind of intelligent source, rather than a random source. All creationists are proponents of intelligent design, but all proponents of intelligent design are not necessarily Biblical creationists.

When evolutionists equate the two terms, it puts their bias and their fear on display. Intelligent Design is not a religious theory, but they fear that it will lead to the ultimate conclusion that they are accountable to their Creator. So in this sense,

Intelligent Design is as big a problem to them as Creation is. It’s not that these smart people can’t see the distinction. It’s that they won’t see the distinction.

The last word meaning I want to talk about is crucial to understand. Like natural selection, mutations are an important part of the evolution model. A mutation is an event in which genetic information is scrambled or damaged. A mutation can be caused by radiation, or poison, or other things that disturb the DNA code. A mutation is not good, but harmful, because it makes chaos out of order. It is a genetic accident that randomizes a portion of the information. Evolution has become such a part of our culture, that many people think mutations are productive things, but this is not true.

Let me show you what a mutation is not. Mutations do not create new genetic programming or add super-human powers to the genome. A mutation is a genetic accident. A portion of the design is ruined. And things don’t work quite the way they were intended. A real mutation is a very sad thing. Most of the time, making chaos out of order within the genome will kill. If the damage is minimal, it will only harm a portion of the code, as in this case of a baby born with three arms. But do not be misled. Mutations destroy information, they do not create it.

Biologists have been slow to pick up on something that information scientists now confirm: Every living cell contains thousands of tiny computers operating on the genetic and environmental information provided. These things are not like computers. They literally are computers.

Most of us have our own electronic computers with these things inside—a hard drive. Large amounts of information are stored on magnetic media, such as this. Do you have any idea what would happen if... [wait] ...do ya think? This is a perfect way to illustrate what a mutation does. Let’s say that I thought one of those software programs on the hard drive needed improving. So I took this magnet and touched it ever so slightly on

the hard drive in the exact spot where that program was located.

OK, so then let's try running the computer, to see if the software has any "new features." What do you think my chances would be? What if I tried it over and over billions of times? Would I ever get lucky? Is it even possible to help my computer with this technique? Mutations are damage. Informational "noise." They are not constructive for electronic computers, and not for biological computers either.

CHAPTER 6

Now that we've clarified important terms, let's find out exactly what the proposed evolution model actually is. How is this thing supposed to work? Let's find out where this staggering amount of genetic information comes from...

The proposed mechanism for generating new genetic information is:

Three things—natural selection operating on genetic mutations over millions and millions of years. Remember that natural selection selects between fit and unfit options. Weak things die, leaving the stronger organisms to carry on in the next generation. So, where do the options come from—that is, the alternate information options? Well, they're provided by accidents, you know, mutations, scrambling whatever information is already there, leaving a choice between a pre-existing genome and a damaged genome... for natural selection to choose between.

Common sense would suggest that damage generally results in a less fit genome. But evolutionists are optimistic, and are counting on that rare case where damage will cause information to materialize out of nowhere, just by getting extremely lucky during scrambling of the genetic coding. To be fair, they're not asking for a lot of new information—just a tiny bit at a time. But each tiny bit has to be coherent instructions that increase the function of the organism. Evolutionists acknowledge that each tiny bit of new information is extraordinarily rare. Therefore, they say that's why it takes millions and millions, even billions, of years to happen in a "macro" kind of

way. So you see that this is essentially a process of trial and error. Lots of trials and lots of errors.

Evolutionists depend on mutations to generate new information in their model. That part of the model is a huge problem. The stubborn fact is that no instance of a mutation making information has ever been confirmed—not even the tiniest increment. Never. Not once. There is not a single field observation, not a single lab finding, none. Re-combining existing information? Yes. Losing information? Yes. Mis-spelling words? Yes. But writing new programming? Never. Folks, adding brand- new information to the genome essentially is evolution. So if there is no evidence that this has ever happened, there is no evidence for evolution at all.

Richard Dawkins was questioned about this very issue in an interview. Take a look at how the most important of all questions completely baffled him.

[Advance after video]

We'll break away from the interview there, because, as you see, when Dr. Dawkins finally gathers himself to be able to continue the interview, his response is to tell us that we don't understand. And then he seems to grasp at excuses for why there are no such examples. It's interesting to look up this complete video on YouTube. You see all kinds of responses by evolutionists there, yet none of them answers the question at issue. Richard Dawkins, himself, posted a response, but in his post he still does not answer the question, even after unlimited time to review it and post a proper answer. Very telling.

Now, as I said, evolutionists freely acknowledge that it would be extremely rare for a mutation to add new information to the genome. OK... So, if it is rare, how long would we expect to wait for information to spontaneously create itself by mutation? [pause] Let me give you a hint.

[pause] That's right. Much, much, longer than millions and millions of years. In fact, much longer than billions of years. You know, it is interesting that evolutionists have come up with a very

detailed timetable for the development of various creatures. For example, 400 million years ago were fish, 100 million years ago were dinosaurs, and so on. I mentioned earlier that there is no radiometric technique for dating old fossils. So then, where did they come up with these time frames? I would think that if we know the odds of mutations making information, and using an estimate of the average time per generation, one could calculate the rate of evolution to find out how long all this would take. Except there is a problem. The odds of a mutation making information has never been declared by evolutionists. This make a calculation impossible. Which is exactly my challenge to my evolutionist friends. If you're going to pretend that there is a timeline, show me your calculation. Show me the numbers. There are none. Why? Well, for one thing, you can't divide by zero, and information scientists, such as Dr. Donald Johnson, tell us that the odds of anything random making new information is exactly zero. How can they be so sure?

CHAPTER 7

Because it is against a scientific law of the universe. In this presentation I will refer to it as the law of increasing randomness. It's the same law that says things will rust, wear out, wind down, break down, die, disperse, spread out, grow old, go from order to disorder, and from more information to less information.

University of Texas Mathematics Professor Granville Sewell explains that it is a mathematical law based upon probabilities over time. Basically the law states that as time passes, any given event will be drawn from a state of lower probability to higher probability. Since the passage of time itself continually expands the ocean of mathematical possibilities, a perpetual trend from order towards randomness is both a physical and a mathematical necessity.

The truth of this law can be illustrated by considering two video clips. Clip number one shows a wine glass being released and becoming a pile of glass. Clip number two shows randomly scattered glass shards assembling themselves into

a wine glass. Do I need to ask you which video clip is being played backwards? It is obviously the second clip. But what makes us so sure of this? Because of our everyday experience with the scientific law of increasing randomness. Each of us instinctively knows that when some glass is left to itself, a pile of glass shards is much more probable than a molded, symmetrical, purposeful, wine glass. Only a directed process that intelligently manufactures the wine glass will alter these probabilities and make the whole glass the more likely outcome.

Now, remember, the evolutionist is suggesting that scrambling nucleotides by way of mutation can spontaneously write coherent information. Not just a little bit of information, mind you, but 10,000 books, efficiently encoded in one DNA molecule. But what does scientific law have to say about leaving things to themselves over time? That's right! Increasing randomness. And the longer the time, the greater the randomness. After a billion years, what do you suppose these glass shards will look like?

In physics we have this law stated as the second law of thermodynamics, and disorder, also called entropy, is mathematically defined as a sum or a total within any given closed system.

Now, evolutionists respond very predictably with their "talking points" whenever the second law of thermodynamics is brought up. The way it goes is that, creationists are condescendingly told that we do not understand the second law. Then it is "explained" to us that the second law of thermodynamics only applies to a closed system, but that we have an open system, with the energy of the sun replenishing the biosphere of the earth through the process of photosynthesis. So what we have are evolution scientists trying to convince us that the second scientific law of the universe should be ignored where evolution is concerned.

With respect to my evolutionist friends: No one is above the law! Let me give you my top three reasons why evolutionists are wrong about the second law of thermodynamics.

Reason number three: Getting off on a technicality doesn't work with a law of the universe. The principle of increasing randomness applies everywhere. Remember, the law was originally tested and proven in an open system—our system.

Dr. Sewell explains that the laws of probability are not suspended simply because we have an open system. The only way that order can be contributed to an open system is if order “walks in the door,” as he puts it. Highly random sunlight brings no such order.

In the 2nd Law, the formula for chaos probability is a total, a sum—and a sum requires boundaries. This is the real reason the law mentions a closed system. So what if we simply change the system boundaries from this... to this? Now what's their excuse? You see, a “closed system” excuse is nothing but a smoke screen for ignoring a law of science. Do you doubt me? Then ask an evolutionist to describe the mechanism for a spontaneous increase of order within an open system. They have none.

Reason number two: Physics is not the only scientific endeavor where this law is found. Increasing randomness applies in all disciplines. In information science, particularly, we also have a defined law of increasing entropy, and the math is exactly the same—except for using variables concerning information instead of physics. Evolutionists have been completely neglecting information science. But information is precisely the issue inside the cell. The law of increasing randomness must be applied, not just to physical organisms, but to the genetic information itself. Information science says it is impossible—not merely unlikely, but impossible—for information to arise by itself over time, because time is the very thing that degrades information.

And the number one reason Evolutionists are not above the law: Only the intervention of design can suspend the natural trend of increasing randomness by introducing mechanisms that alter probabilities to a purpose. Keep in mind that creationists are not claiming that the second law of thermodynamics can never be suspended. We're

saying that it can only be suspended in the presence of design. Now, listen again to the excuse just given to us by the evolutionist: They say that sunlight replenishes the biosphere of the earth through photosynthesis. Photosynthesis? Photosynthesis is an incredible design embedded in plant DNA—amazing in its complexity. Sunlight strikes the chlorophyll in plants and creates energy and living plant tissue. Man has never been able to match such design. So what we have here are evolutionists invoking an existing design in plant DNA to prove that we don't need design. Does that make any sense? The real question is this: How do they think random sunlight without any other mechanism generated the photosynthesis programming in the first place?

CHAPTER 8

At this point we need to address the issue of probabilities. For the evolutionist, the massive size of the universe and the claimed long history of the universe solves the problem of unlikely odds. The latest information on the size of the universe, is 300 sextillion stars. This is 50 trillion stars for every man, woman, and child on planet earth. I am told that this translates to approximately 10 to the 80th power atoms in the universe. The length of time the universe has been in existence is currently claimed to be about 15 billion years. Both of these numbers keep changing, but let's go with this for now.

The logic is that even if the likelihood of mutations creating new information is very small, the universe has been around a long time. Eventually, we'll get lucky, right? And the universe is so big... Surely there are many planets out there which could support life, just like this earth. Right? We just happened to be the lucky planet, right?

[Wait for sound byte...] Aren't there lots of other class M planets like ours? Well, in a word... no. Let's consider the hundreds of essential characteristics or parameters for the earth that are in perfect balance. Here are a few of them: Mass of the earth, distance from the sun, size of the sun, size of our orbit, tilt on the earth's axis, speed of rotation of the earth, magnetic field, thickness of

the time, from one generation to the next. Infinite variation is possible by re-mixing existing genetic information. After all, Biblical creationists have always known that the genetics for the entire human race were contained in Adam and Eve, when the genome would have been virtually flawless. And re-mixing dominant and recessive genes over the generations has caused remarkable variation. The same is true in animals. For example, from the original wolves we've gotten all the different varieties of dogs. And the same with each kind that God created. Variation has also been caused by the loss of genetic information, whether by breeding or mutation. So, I agree with evolutionists about horizontal changes in the genome, and also downward changes in the genome. It is only upward changes, or new information in the genome that I'm saying is impossible.

The problem with all this agreement is that when I ask evolutionists for evidence of their position, all I ever get is proof of the kind of genetic change I already agree with. Richard Dawkins wrote his latest book, *The Greatest Show on Earth*, devoted entirely to evidence for evolution. But it was a book full of evidence for the parts of evolution I already agree with—and completely void of evidence for new genetic information arising by mutation. We don't need proof of horizontal or downward change. We need proof of upward change. That's what we've never seen.

CHAPTER 10

Any model in science can be evaluated by what it predicts, but many of evolution's predictions, like this, utterly fail.

For example: evolutionists spend a lot of time with fossils, because of what they expect to find. But the fossil record has been a surprise and a disappointment, especially to the top evolution experts.

Darwin predicted the fossil record would present a smooth and gradual transition from one kind of organism to another. Instead, we find sudden appearances of fully-developed organisms. You

need to understand that we're not merely looking for a missing link, but there should be thousands of links in a transitional flow. Instead, nothing like this has been found. There are no partially developed fossil feathers like they expected.

They expected to find a consistent, ubiquitous, geologic column all over the earth. The textbooks...make it look very clean. However, what we actually find on the earth is nearly always at great variance with this. We often find layers in the wrong order, missing layers altogether, or even inverted.

We would also expect that evolutionists would be discovering evolutionary pathways—or developmental sequences—to get from point A to point B. Evolutionists should begin to be able to tell us what some ancestors are for some of the modern-day organisms. This was the idea for the tree of life diagram. They ought to have some idea of what the trunk and branches are, but evolutionists have no confidence about any of this. One expert admitted that the only thing we observe are the tips of the branches. There is little agreement about the nodes or branches on this chart.

This is a very well-known diagram found in one form or another in many science textbooks, but it is little more than artwork. Do you realize that there's little agreement about which apes to place along this developmental sequence? At one time Piltdown Man was placed along this chart. For 40 years the bones were studied, and some 500 doctoral theses on Piltdown Man were written. After 40 years it was discovered that the bones were a complete fake, stained with tea to make them look old. I don't know if any of those doctoral degrees were revoked, but this sequence remains very uncertain among evolutionists.

Dr. Colin Patterson, senior paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History, was a famous evolutionist and author. He once asked a large gathering of fellow evolutionists at a meeting in New York, "Can you tell me anything about evolution, any one thing that is true?" In a room full of top experts, the room went silent. The

embarrassing truth of the matter is that evolutionists don't actually know what any evolution pathway is.

The moon is gradually moving away from the earth—an inch and a half further each year. Thousands of years wouldn't matter much. But if we rewind a few hundred million years, we have a huge problem. The moon would have been so much closer that the tides would have been enormous. So enormous that the oceans would have washed over the continents twice every day, eroding them away completely flat, very quickly, and covering every bit of land with water a mile and a half deep by now. But, strangely enough, the continents are still here. This is not difficult to calculate, and it is undeniable proof that a billion years of evolution is impossible.

The final prediction of the evolution model I want to mention here is a block-buster. Radioactive carbon is like an hour glass that is inside all living things. But once an organism dies, the sand in that hour glass begins to run out. This is called radioactive decay. Nothing on earth can stop it, and we know that Carbon-14 has a short half-life. So we also know that it's impossible for any trace of Carbon-14 to last more than 100,000 years after death.

Since evolutionists think fossils are millions of years old, they predicted that fossils cannot contain any trace of Carbon-14.

However, in recent years the accelerator mass-spectrometer (or AMS) has made it possible to measure trace amounts of Carbon-14.

Of course, many fossils are completely mineralized, with no traces of the original carbon, let alone radioactive carbon. Nevertheless, there is a great deal of un-mineralized fossil material being found, including such material as crude oil and coal, dinosaur bone marrow, and even diamonds.

So what do we find when these things are tested? If you haven't already guessed... Carbon-14 is present in all these things, even diamonds.

Testing labs all over the world are finding Carbon-14 throughout the fossil record, from top to bottom, even after carefully filtering out potential contamination. Perhaps you don't see the significance of this, but since the sand in every hour glass is still running, it is conclusive proof that everything, even the bottom of the Grand Canyon, is less than 100,000 years old! The millions-of-years people have been conclusively proven wrong, making evolution impossible. This one thing by itself, is enough to utterly demolish evolution.

But what about all the many natural indicators that the world is very old? Eric Hovind has offered an effective illustration of an important principle of evidence here. Consider a hypothetical case of a deteriorating wooden ship discovered on the bottom of the ocean. From this sunken ship divers recover a treasure chest full of coins. Most of the coins are gold and date back to the late 1700's, but among the coins in the bottom is an American half dollar with the date "1951." What does this mean? It means that, based on this evidence, we can be absolutely certain that the ship sank no earlier than 1951, regardless of how many older coins were found. Finding Carbon-14 in fossils is like finding a wind-up clock in that treasure chest that is still ticking. Fossils are much younger than they've been telling us, and now every AMS lab in the world has the proof.

CHAPTER 11

Richard Dawkins admitted that living things have the "appearance of design." But he thinks it's an illusion. Is it? How do we know design when we see it? There are a number of dead giveaways, but I want to focus on one undeniable way to identify intelligence.

We know that there is matter and there is energy, and there are natural laws. But there's something else that we all know exists: thought. Intelligent thought manifested in the form of messages carried by symbols. Messages don't come from any other origin except an intelligent mind. And we can be certain that something is a message when we find a code, or a language, or a symbol.

The simple definition of a symbol is a thing that represents something other than itself.

Here is an example of finding a symbol. Symbols always make us certain of an intelligent source because they carry a message.

Is this a real train, or a message?

Symbolic representations, even in the oddest places are unmistakable to us. Do you see how symbols make it an absolute certainty that intelligence is the source? Perry Marshall is a communications engineer who is an expert in information science, and he took note of this. He has pointed out that there's a difference between a naturally occurring pattern, like a snowflake; versus a symbol—because symbols, always represent something other than themselves. They communicate a message. And then he looked at this: the DNA molecule. And he realized that the information in DNA is a code, just like the computer programming code he was so familiar with. Your DNA is a symbolic coded representation of you! DNA is a language in every sense. It has an alphabet and words and sentences and chapters and syntax. It contains a message that is encoded, and is totally meaningless until it is decoded—exactly like any other message.

Many biologists have commented that DNA is a lot like software. Folks, DNA is not “like” software—It is software! DNA is not “like” a code—It is a code! DNA is not “like” a language—It is a language! In fact, if you read biology textbooks you will see that they openly refer to it as such. This truth is stunning. Imagine that you were stranded on an island where you thought you were alone. And then you found this message written in the sand. Would you have the slightest doubt that someone else was on the island with you? Perry Marshall puts it in the form of, what he calls “the atheist’s riddle:” Show me a message that did not come from a mind. The elaborate symbolic code stored in DNA should be a slap in the face to bring us to our senses. Somebody wrote that code!

The SETI program is a scientific search for extra-terrestrial intelligence. They point their radio

telescopes at the cosmos, listening for transmissions from outer space that indicate intelligence. What do they look for? Symbolic code.

If only biologists would use the same criteria that SETI uses to identify intelligence, and turn their radio telescopes pointing at outer space toward the nucleus of a living cell; and apply the same rules there. If we could reduce ourselves to the molecular level and enter the nucleus of any cell, we would see something more complex, more stunning, than anything ever engineered by man.

One of the first opportunities for us to get a glimpse of this amazing molecular machinery was through the use of computer animation by Illustra Media in 2002 in the video “Unlocking the Mystery of Life.” Here, in the nucleus of a cell, we see remarkable molecular machines translating DNA information to manufacture specific proteins. A former prominent evolutionist, Dr. Dean Kenyon, was quoted describing this animation in this way:

“This is absolutely mind-boggling to perceive at this scale of size such a finely-tuned apparatus (a device) that bears the marks of intelligent design in manufacturing. And we have the details of an immensely complex molecular realm of genetic information processing. And it's exactly this new realm of molecular genetics where we see the most compelling evidence of design on the earth.”

CHAPTER 12

The Truth Project asks the profound question of Christians: Do you really believe that what you believe is really real? Now that evolution has been demolished, there's no reason why evolution should ever be a cause for you to doubt again.

If you're a person who came into this more seriously persuaded by evolution... Well, I hope that you found this presentation respectful toward you, because I've been there too. I would venture to guess that you're trying to get a handle on the moment right now. Whatever you understand or believe about creation, you now know that evolution is an impossibility. The underpinning has

just collapsed beneath your world view, and you will never be the same. You, too, had noticed that “appearance of remarkable design,” but now you’re facing an “Ah Ha” moment, and the only alternative that remains is to face the fact that all that design is not an illusion after all. It really is designed.

(pause) The next logical step may take courage.

(pause) Is it really surprising that the Source of all existence has made Himself known?

[Creation Calls music video]

Richard Dawkins, I rest my case.