

INTELLIGENT DESIGN & EVOLUTION

Handout for Lesson 10 of *Thought Provoking Questions*

GOD SPEAKS

Gen. 1:1 In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.

Psa. 14:1 The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God.

Is. 45:18 For thus saith the LORD that created the heavens; God himself that formed the earth and made it; he hath established it, he created it not in vain, he formed it to be inhabited: I am the LORD; and there is none else.

Rom. 1:20 For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse.

Col. 1:16 For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him.

Heb 11:3 Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.

SCIENTISTS SPEAK

Renowned astronomer Robert Jastrow clearly states the choices: "Perhaps the appearance of life on the earth is a miracle. Scientists are reluctant to accept that view, but their choices are limited. Either life was created on the earth by the will of a Being outside the grasp of scientific understanding, or it evolved on our planet spontaneously, through chemical reactions occurring in non-living matter lying on the surface of the planet. The first theory places the question of the origin of life beyond the reach of scientific inquiry. It is a statement of faith in the power of a Supreme Being not subject to the laws of science. The second theory is also an act of faith. The act of faith consists in assuming that the scientific view of the origin of life is correct, without having the evidence to support that belief."

British astronomer Sir Fred Hoyle calculated the probability of spontaneous generation: "The likelihood of the formation of life from inanimate matter is 10 to the 40,000th power. . . It is big enough to bury Darwin and the whole theory of evolution. There was no primeval soup, neither on this planet nor any other, and if the beginnings of life were not random, they must therefore have been the product of purposeful intelligence." He further explains his position, using the example of a Rubik's cube: "At all events, anyone, even a nodding acquaintance with the Rubik's cube will concede the near impossibility of a solution being obtained by a blind person moving the cubic faces at random. Now imagine 10 to the 50th (that's a number 1 with 50 zeros after it) blind people, each with a scrambled Rubik's cube, and try to conceive of the chance of them all simultaneously arriving at the solved form. You then have the chance of arriving by random shuffling at just one of the many biopolymers on which life depends. The notion that not only biopolymers but the operating program of a living cell could be arrived at by chance in a primordial organic soup here on the earth is evidently nonsense of a high order." He illustrates the probability of spontaneous generation like this: "Supposing the first cell originated by chance is like believing a tornado could sweep through a junkyard filled with airplane parts and form a Boeing 747."

Dr. Colin Patterson, as chief paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History: "The adaptive value of the perfected structure is easily seen, but intermediate steps seem to be useless, or even harmful. For example, what use is a lens in the eye unless it works? A distorting lens might be worse than no lens at all. . . . How can the segments of an animal like the earthworm or centipede arise bit-by-bit? An animal is either segmented or it is not. The usual answer to such a question is that they are due only to the failure of the imagination."

Dr. William D. Stansfield of California Polytechnic State University states: "It is obvious that radiometric techniques may not be the absolute dating methods that they are claimed to be. Age estimates on a given geological stratum by different radiometric methods are often quite different (sometimes by hundreds of millions of years). There is no absolutely reliable long-term radiological 'clock.' The uncertainties inherent in radiometric dating are disturbing to geologists and evolutionists."

Richard Leakey, director of National Museum in Kenya and son of the famous paleontologist Louis Leakey: "Lucy's skull (*Australopithecus afarensis*) was so incomplete that most of it was imagination, made of plaster of Paris, thus making it impossible to draw any firm conclusion about what species she belonged to."

Pierre-Paul Grasse of the University of Paris and past president of the French Academy of Science, commented on the lack of evidence for evolution: "The deceit is sometimes unconscious, but not always, since some people, owing to their sectarianism, purposely overlook reality and refuse to acknowledge the inadequacies and the falsity of their beliefs."

Albert Fleishman, professor of zoology and comparative anatomy at Eriangen University, Germany, concluded: "The Darwinian theory of descent has not a single fact to confirm it in the reality of nature. It is not the result of scientific research but purely the product of imagination."

Dr. S. Lovtrup is emphatic in his analysis: "I believe that one day the Darwinian myth will be ranked the greatest deceit in the history of science. When this happens, many people will pose the question, 'How did this ever happen?'"