

## JOINT PAPER LAMBERT/PERKINS ON THEISTIC EVOLUTION

COMMENTS REGARDING THE SELF-CONTRADICTION OF THEISTIC EVOLUTION

### **Purpose: an examination of the theory of evolution's compatibility with science and Christianity**

[note to the reader: text emphasized in bold is intended for a verbal presentation]

**We are in a war, and as Christians we are in the front lines. The war is a spiritual one, in which we are fighting for human souls. Our opposition is the humanist camp, which already has achieved a position of dominance over our media, our schools, and our government.**

**One of the main battles in this warfare is over the general acceptance of evolution as factual paradigm of the origin of life. In this battle, our opposition has largely succeeded. Despite the claims of some Christians that Christianity and evolution are compatible, they are not. Committed Christianity, as noted by both Peter and Paul, demands the acceptance of Scripture as inerrant as to substance and as divinely inspired. Evolution directly undercuts Scripture and ultimately disposes of the necessity for God.**

**It will be the task of you, as the next generation of pastors and theologians, to restore to Christianity the wreckage visited upon the faith by those of their predecessors who lacked the understanding or the courage to speak out to the Christian community about the essential lie embodied in the theory of evolution, and of its great danger.**

**It is our prayer that this paper will encourage you to pursue a deeper understanding of the current battle now being waged between the adherents of design and the adherents of evolution, and thereby equip yourselves to participate with strength and courage in this very real battle between God and Satan.**

**In this paper, which presents condensed extracts from our book *The Self-Contradiction of Theistic Evolution*, we discuss the theory of naturalistic evolution. In its broadest sense, this theory embraces Darwin's theory of evolution, Neo-Darwinian evolution and in general all theories of the origin of life that propose that life originated without the necessity of a Designer.**

**Claims for evolution of this magnitude are generally associated with what is called ‘macroevolution’, which is distinct from ‘microevolution’.**

**Dr. Michael Behe has demonstrated that microevolution actually works, but only for the tiniest, most insignificant of changes, at the cost of huge amounts of time, and always at the cost of information loss.**

Claims for evolution of the magnitude sufficient to create life or even a new kind of creature are generally made under the heading of ‘macroevolution’. We will comment only in passing on the adaptive ability of living creatures that is described by some as ‘microevolution’, or the very small-scale evolutionary process by which living things undergo superficial changes in response to changes in their environments. An example of such changes are the modifications of coloring in some moths as a result of changes in environment, or the mutational changes to viruses and bacteria by which they evade measures taken by the immune systems of animals to ward off diseases.

It is a fact that evolution as proposed by Charles Darwin in his book *The Origin of the Species*, first published in 1859, does indeed work under some very limiting constraints. It has been demonstrated recently to work at the micro-evolutionary level by, of all people, Dr. Michael Behe<sup>1</sup>, the science professor who wrote the controversial book *The Edge of Evolution*. In that work he also demonstrated, on the basis of a detailed study of the interactive evolution of both malaria and the human body’s response to it, that micro-evolutionary changes occur at the cost of information loss. He further demonstrated the complete failure of Darwin’s theory and its more modern expressions to account for changes beyond one or at most two tiny steps. As we shall attempt herein to show, his demonstration of evolution’s failure is intellectually convincing. Indeed, it is more convincing than the so-called ‘proofs’ cited by evolution’s supporters of its supposed basis in fact. Moreover, Dr. Behe’s work is not a singular effort, but is supported by the works of a growing number of professionals in the fields of molecular biology, mathematics, and philosophy.

This paper focuses in general on the non-viability of macroevolution, or the inability of evolution to accomplish functionally beneficial large-scale changes in living beings, and particularly its failure to account for the generation of life from nonliving matter, and examines the impact of this finding on the Christian community. For the sake of brevity in the following work, we shall use the term ‘evolution’ with the understanding that we are referring to naturalistic macroevolution.

**In the following discussion, we will limit our discussion to macroevolution, under the shortened descriptor ‘evolution’.**

**The theory of evolution is precisely what this descriptor suggests: evolution is a theory. It is not a natural law like gravity, but merely a proposition. It is merely a proposition**

because it is unproven and unverified in accordance with the standard that science itself has erected for differentiating a law from a mere theory<sub>2</sub>.

More particularly, we intend to address the ultimate futility of attempting to reconcile evolution with Christianity. We claim instead that the term ‘theistic evolution’ is an oxymoron. Evolution is simply incompatible with Christianity as expressed in Scripture.

Informational literature in some quasi-official publications, including National Geographic Magazine, school textbooks, governmental placards located in National Parks and other popular tourist attractions, do indeed present evolution as fact. They do so in violation of that scientific standard. Every so-called ‘proof’ of evolution to date, including the numerous ‘missing links’, has subsequently been exposed as either an intentional fraud or a misapplication of scientific tools or knowledge<sub>3</sub>.

In 2 Thessalonians 2, Paul talks about the mystery of iniquity. In verses 8 through 12, he describes a grave indifference to the truth represented by the Word of God. Paul then indicates that because of this indifference, God will allow those who are infected with this attitude to be deluded even more:

*“And then shall that wicked one be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming. Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish, because they received not the love of the truth, that they may be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.”*

Evolution is just such a falsehood that is generally accepted as truth in today’s sophisticated, technology-embracing world, and it is glaringly overt in nature. God tells us in First Timothy Chapter 6:20 and 21 that such a condition will prevail in the last days. Moreover, the falsehood will be distinctly scientific in character, and it will even be accepted among some ill-informed Christians:

*“O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called. Which some, professing, have erred concerning the faith. Grace be with thee. Amen.”*

Peter sheds further light on the nature of this falsehood. According to Second Peter 3:3 and 4, the lie will involve a deep sense of the unpunctuated continuity of the earth and life within it, such as is embodied in the principle of uniformity. This principle embraces the notion of the great age of the earth, wherein all geological changes are of extremely modest proportions that produce measurable results only over vast intervals of time:

*“Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.”*

Interestingly, the principle of uniformity as expressed here by Peter represents such a necessity to the viability of Darwin’s theory of evolution that uniformity and evolution may be considered to be two halves of a common philosophy.

The reason why uniformity is so key to the viability of evolution is that evolution is an intrinsically weak process. The theory, in its vehement rejection of design of any sort, demands change unguided by thought, either human or otherwise. It relies on chance as the prime mover: the random process of tiny mutationally-driven changes, collectively summing to large-scale functional variations in living creatures, and even to the production of living creatures from nonliving matter. Given the readily-acknowledged extreme unlikelihood of even one ultimately beneficial mutation, the process demands for viability truly enormous quantities of time. This necessity, in turn, demands a uniformitarian view of the processes that have shaped the world we live in.

The problem with this is that, aside from its support of evolution, there is no logical justification whatever for the claim that uniformitarian processes governed the earth’s history. Demanding its validity is equivalent to demanding that the earth be flat, or that something is true merely because we wish it to be so. The ‘standard geologic column’ as developed out of uniformitarian presuppositions, does in fact exist in its entirety nowhere on earth. The fossil basis for its construction shows circular reasoning, proving nothing.

The theory of uniformity, as a matter of fact, has already been overtaken by the acceptance within the scientific community of facts that contradict it. These facts include the well-known discovery by the Alvarez team of the extinction of the dinosaurs by an asteroid impact event. The theory of uniformity had led the scientific community to categorically deny the possibility of a catastrophic event of that magnitude to have occurred. After being confronted with uncontestable proof that the event did indeed occur and was indeed of enormous proportions, the scientific community quite reluctantly backed off from its rigid stance in opposition to the reality of catastrophism. They made no effort to convey this radical change in position to the schools or to the public at large, nor did they consider or wish to address the implications of this change on evolutionary theory.

The two of us recently attended a Christian theological conference in which a keynote speaker discussed the place of evolutionary theory within the Christian worldview. This gentleman was quite enthusiastic about his subject, which of itself is commendable. But then he pursued his lecture with a heartfelt, even heroic, effort to accommodate the theory of evolution into the Christian paradigm. It became apparent that the speaker wasn’t addressing micro-evolution. He was speaking of macro-evolution, the kind by which life supposedly is generated out of non-life. Although the speaker cautioned his audience that he wasn’t a scientist, he went on to talk

about evolution as an accepted fact. Had he been more knowledgeable about his subject, he would have known that such is not the case. If, at the very least, he had been conversant with the latest developments in microbiology that more than suggest the exact opposite, then it would have been more appropriate for him to address the subject. As it stands, he was presumptuous for doing so. Moreover, he didn't have to be an expert in the field to be conversant regarding current knowledge in the field of the origin of life, for many books on the topic now are available which are accessible to any layperson of average intelligence. The only prerequisite for acquiring a decent working knowledge of the subject is a willingness to rise above the shallowest level of thought on the topic and a naïve acceptance of what self-proclaimed 'experts' say. This minimum level of understanding should be a prerequisite for any person who presumes to acquire a position of Christian leadership, to say nothing about attempting to expound on the subject. We shall attempt to furnish herein either this necessary minimum of understanding or provide the stimulus for the interested individual to acquire it elsewhere.

As we looked around at the attentive and trusting faces of his audience during that talk, many of whom were young and, we supposed, just beginning their careers as the next generation of Christian spokespersons, we became aggrieved at the thought of so many potential leaders apparently accepting this line of thought without criticism.

The Christian doesn't have to accommodate his understanding of the world to the theory of evolution, because despite the extensive hype about evolution put out by the superficial popular media, an increasing number of experts in the field of microbiology have themselves rejected the theory as an unworkable folly. In other words, to be blunt about it, science itself is backtracking away from the evolutionary notion, leaving the general public holding the bag of science falsely so called.

The intellectual retreat from evolution has been slow and quite reluctant, to be sure. Many scientists who privately reject the theory continue to espouse it publicly for the simple reason that they fear for their careers if they don't go with the flow. Eminent professors, despite the safety net of tenure, have lost their positions by politically being on the wrong side of this issue, as have competent scientists.

But more courageous souls are becoming involved in the issue, and their works quite thoroughly explain why the theory of macroevolution cannot work. Among these works are what are becoming classics in the genre: *Darwin's Black Box* and *The Edge of Evolution* by Michael Behe; *Intelligent Design* by William Dembski; *Reason in the Balance* and *Objections Sustained* by Phillip Johnson; *What Darwin Didn't Know* by Geoffrey Simmons; *Creation* by Grant Jeffrey; *Dismantling Evolution* by Ralph Muncaster; and the seminal work *Signature in the Cell*, by Stephen Meyer.

**In the discussion to follow, we shall briefly examine key demonstrations of the failure of evolutionary theory to perform the functional changes attributed to it by its proponents.**

## Evolution lacks the ability to anticipate

Naturalistic processes are, by intrinsic definition, non-intelligent<sub>4</sub>. A fundamental feature of non-intelligent processes is that they are unable to anticipate. They can't form *a priori* an objective or goal for a system. If a system function or feature doesn't yet exist, a non-intelligent process cannot envision it, for to do so demands intelligence.

Take, as a simple demonstration of the implication of this inability to anticipate on change within a living being, one of a very large number of examples in which evolution has claimed the ability to accomplish a sweeping functional change: that of a land animal that walks with the aid of legs who is eventually going to achieve the ability to fly. To accomplish this, its bones need to become hollow and highly efficient with respect to weight; it has to develop the keen eyesight unique to birds that is appropriate to its mode of hunting from the air; its bone structure, particularly in its chest, needs to be arranged to be a proper scaffold for its ligaments and muscles; its arms need to assume the shape of airfoils; it needs the lightness, shape, and variability of shape of feathers for fine control over flight; its respiratory system must become suitable for the demands of flight, which involve hefty changes from the comparable functions of a land animal; its balance mechanism must be revamped to handle flight attitudes; its entire nervous system must be altered to furnish the ability to control its airfoil surfaces; and, perhaps not least, it must acquire some pretty disgusting eating habits. **Each of these functional modifications involves very large numbers of changes that have to be coordinated in the proper sequence. This requirement for a large number of sequentially-supportive steps, all mutually compatible over a variety of different subordinate functions to the end of achieving flight, virtually demands the quality of anticipation or goal-setting which is the hallmark of a designer. As if that isn't contradictory enough of evolution, consider the implication of the large time scale evoked by most evolutionists to accomplish these changes. During the time frame over which these changes are supposedly accomplished, there will be of necessity several periods in which the unfortunate beast will be struggling with intermediate forms, such as arms that are developing into wings. In this transitional stage, the creature must continue to survive within its environment and to eat and mate. It must do so while suffering the disadvantage of limb that functions less well as an arm than it used to, and is not yet functional as a wing. At this stage, it is suited far more as a food source for some other less-advanced animal.** At the other extreme, some supporters of evolution who have come to understand such implications of large functional changes have proposed that such changes must have occurred quite suddenly. The 'punctuated equilibrium' offshoot of Darwinian evolution, first proposed by evolutionist Stephen J. Gould<sub>5</sub> attempts to avoid the consequences of prolonged transition periods. The problem with this notion's supporters is that in the process of forming their opinions, they also have avoided doing the math: the odds against all these coordinated modifications occurring all at once are so astronomically huge and the numbers against even one instance of such an event having taken place are so vast that they outweigh by an enormous margin all the time available even by the most far-fetched uniformitarian assumptions of the age of the universe.

**Dr. William Dembski did the math that evolutionists refrain from performing. In his book *Intelligent Design*<sup>6</sup>, he picked a real-life example of a well-investigated biological subsystem, the bacterial flagellum that Dr. Behe had made famous, and calculated the probability of its various components having been formed and assembled together by chance to implement the function of motation. The numbers are greater by a huge ratio than what outspoken evolutionist Richard Dawkins' admitted was an upper limit for the operation of chance. As quoted by Dembski, Dawkins had written:**

“We can accept a certain amount of luck in our explanations, but not too much. . .In our theory of how we came to exist, we are allowed to postulate a certain ration of luck. This ration has, as its upper limit, the number of eligible planets in the universe. . .We [therefore] have at our disposal, if we want to use it, odds of 1 in 100 billion billion as an upper limit (or 1 in however many planets we think there are) to spend in our theory of the origin of life. This is the maximum amount of luck we are allowed to postulate in our theory. Suppose we want to suggest, for instance, that life began when both DNA and its protein-based replication machinery spontaneously chanced to come into existence. We can allow ourselves the luxury of such an extravagant theory, provided that the odds against this coincidence occurring on a planet do not exceed 100 billion billion to one.<sup>7</sup>”

The number 100 billion billion amounts to  $10^{20}$ . Dembski imposes a far more generous upper limit for chance, 500 bits or  $10^{150}$ , which, as he notes, represents the number of *particles* (not planets) in the observable universe. Yet, he claims that the mere flagellum, a relatively simple subsystem within the scheme of life, is far more complex than can be embraced within 500 bits of information.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, just the DNA within the cell of that simple bacterium of which the flagellum is a component contains far more than 100 thousand base pairs<sup>9</sup>, that number representing the minimum size of DNA in the first living cell, according to evolutionists. Since each base pair position within the DNA chain can accommodate one of four base states, each position is equivalent to two bits of information. All together, then, the DNA itself represents at least two hundred thousand bits of information, or four hundred times the upper limit for chance.

**Dr. Michael Behe<sup>10</sup>, in his earlier work *Darwin's Black Box*, captured the essence of this need to anticipate that is so prevalent in living systems through the term he coined 'irreducible complexity'. A system that requires several parts all present, correctly configured for interaction, and working together to produce a specific well-defined function, to paraphrase Dr. Behe, is 'irreducibly complex'. If any of its necessary components is absent or improperly configured to make its contribution to the function, the function itself cannot be performed; all of the parts must be present and working together for the system to work at all. An irreducibly complex system, to continue to paraphrase Dr. Behe, requires so many mutually-supportive subsystems that the very existence of the top-level system without the input of anticipation is out of the question;**

yet the existence of such systems is so ubiquitous in living entities that such input must be acknowledged as having been present.

Dr. Behe's development of the notion of irreducible complexity is now several years old. A few years back, one of the more liberal bookstores (no longer in existence) carried more than one book that claimed, in a pro-evolution stance, to rebut Dr. Behe's notion. They did so by noting that in one of Dr. Behe's irreducibly complex systems, the flagellum that serves as the motive device of a bacterium utilizes a microbiological component that is virtually identical to the corresponding component of a completely different functional entity. "Foul!" the books cried at the perceived offense. The similarity of these components, to paraphrase the books, meant that they weren't unique to one specific function.

All but the most superficial of thought processes can see through the flaw in this line of reasoning. Dr. Behe never claimed uniqueness for the components of his irreducibly complex systems. That simply wasn't the thrust of his argument, which was to claim that all the components had to be present and working together for the system itself to work. Whether or not a component was borrowed from another system is irrelevant and misses the point; it's a shabby, logically sloppy red-herring argument that serves simply to throw the reader off-track from the real issue. We'll try to refrain from commenting further on how this kind of reasoning typifies the pro-evolutionist mindset, or the mindset of those who are taken in by their polemics.

### All life possesses a non-material element: an extremely complex software code

We shall turn next to an example taken from molecular biology to demonstrate the failure of evolution to account for the development of life from non-life. In this example, we consider the structure of the deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) molecule<sup>11</sup>, the story of our understanding of its structure and function which is of itself a real scientific thriller. Only recently has man acquired an understanding of the advantages of having a generalized multipurpose machine, the computer, whose functional qualities are defined not by its physical characteristics, its hardware, but rather by the instructions that are applied to it in software code. This code may assume a number of different possible forms. There is the 8-bit ASCII code (an acronym for American Standard Code for Information Interchange), for example, wherein each group of 8-bit binary characters represents an alphanumeric symbol, such as the letter 'G' or the numeral '5'. This binary-encoded alphabet is useful for communicating among humans, but machines have a language of their own. At the lowest level of machine language, the data is encoded in a form compatible with the computer hardware, wherein groups of binary characters ('0' or '1') represents specific instructions, like telling the computer memory to accept data immediately following the code and store it in a particular location. The medium by which the code was input to the computer started out as a sequence of stiff paper cards where the information was embodied in a pattern of punched holes. The



preferred medium then transitioned to tape, and after that data was stored on laser-readable discs.

**In its most straightforward functional context, the DNA molecule represents the purest, most compact and efficient structural embodiment imaginable of a chemically-implemented storage medium for software code. It reeks of anticipation, the creation of exquisitely complex order out of chaos.** Its very existence inspires the awe of someone monitoring a SETI screen, like Jodie Foster in the movie “Contact”, and suddenly viewing an intelligent signal from outer space.

**DNA has a skeletal backbone structure consisting of alternate sugar and phosphate molecules interconnected to form a chain of arbitrary length. The size of this chain for most animals is quite huge. Functionally it is similar to the magnetic tape medium for the storage of computer software. Embedded within two such chains is the actual software, in which each sugar-phosphate pair forms a nest for any one of four different hydrocarbon molecules from the following repertoire: adenine (labeled ‘A’), guanine (‘G’), cytosine (‘C’) and thymine (‘T’). An essential feature of these four chemicals is that they are always coded in pairs: A to T and C to G. On the surface, these pairs seem to represent just two possibilities, but in fact their physical reversal within the sugar-phosphate matrix adds another two possibilities. The four possibilities are: A-T, T-A, C-G, and G-C. An interesting feature of these pairs is that while A is of a different size than T, and C is of a different size than G, the two pairs are virtually identical in size, so that when one end of a pair nests on one sugar-phosphate chain and the other nests into the other sugar-phosphate chain, there is no distortion of the two-chain system due to size differences. Another interesting feature of the matrix is that the system has no preferential affinity for any one pair over another and no pair has an affinity for any other pair, rendering the system completely contingent, meaning that there is no bonding preference for any particular code pattern, a necessary feature of any true software encoding medium. Another key feature of the system is that it expresses chirality<sup>12</sup>, which means that while there are two equally-probable directions in which the sugar and phosphate molecules bond together, the life-supporting nucleotides may only be of the right-handed form. This requirement alone virtually eliminates the possibility that the first DNA string was formed by chance.**

**The dual-nucleotide chain, together with the specific arrangement of embedded pairs within it, form what can only be characterized as a highly-organized structure of software code. But it does more than make a machine perform a function, because first it contains the instructions to build the machine itself.** As software code, theoretically one could arrange the embedded pairs to form an ASCII code, which would then be able to represent anything in the English language through this DNA string, including a complete work of Shakespeare or, better yet, the Bible. The major difference between this chemical ASCII code and its binary equivalent would be the greater transmission efficiency of the DNA over the binary code. In

fact, a revised equivalent ASCII code could be formed out of just four characters instead of eight.

**Scientists haven't yet decoded a single DNA string. They haven't even come close. What they have done so far, impressive as that is, is to define the entire character sequence of human DNA, in all 46 chromosomes. But they have decoded the function of only a small portion of that sequence. What they have decoded is those portions of human DNA that are gene-specific, which represent but a tiny fraction of the entire string. Genes are sections of DNA code (subroutines, if you will) that specify and direct the manufacture of proteins. Even that portion of the overall decoding task is a major accomplishment, because the process by which a cell replicates a gene-specific portion in DNA into an RNA copy (RNA stands for ribonucleic acid), and then 'reads' the RNA code into the process that assembles the corresponding amino acids into another sequence representing a specific protein, is so startlingly high-tech that if one can instantly recognize a designer behind an intricate wristwatch or an automobile, the designer recognition for the process of protein manufacture is so over-the-top that only a person blinded by a God-denying agenda can possibly fail to perceive it.**

**As added complicating factors, the amino acids, which also express chirality in their natural states, must all be of the left-handed variety, and only twenty out of a possible eighty amino acids are useful components of proteins.**

**Then there's the 'chicken-egg' problem: proteins are manufactured from software instructions, but the software reader itself is a complex assembly of proteins. This situation implies that both the first software and the first hardware had to exist simultaneously. Given the enormous complexity of both, the odds against their simultaneous creation by chance alone are beyond astronomical.**

### **Complexity on top of complexity**

**On top of the enormous complexity of DNA and its interaction with RNA and the Ribosome protein to manufacture other proteins, and the chirality situation, there is another cellular mechanism beyond DNA, newly-discovered and possibly even more complex than DNA. This system, labeled the "epigenome", has been found so far to consist of three major subsystems<sup>13</sup>. One subsystem consists of the information embedded within the three-dimensional pattern of the microtubule structural girders that support the cell. Another subsystem is the tagging, or labeling, of various proteins, the histone spindles upon which DNA is wrapped, and selected cytosine characters within the DNA itself. The cytosine labeling is so important to the operation of the associated gene that it is sometimes referred to as "the fifth DNA letter". A third subsystem consists of the various amazing little protein machines that go around adding labels, removing labels, and reading them. It is thought that the process of adding and removing labels may be**

**directed by segments of DNA that were once considered to be “junk”, an erroneous concept that arose from evolutionary suppositions.**

In the early days of developing an understanding of the protein manufacture process, some of the scientists involved were rather arrogant about the role of those portions of DNA that weren't specifically associated with proteins. Being of the evolutionary persuasion for the most part (for many of them, their grant money and even their jobs depended on their loyalty to evolution), they considered the portions of DNA for which they could find no specific use to be “junk DNA”<sup>14</sup>, DNA that represented earlier stages of evolution and was no longer useful to and was ignored by the living system. Those who possessed this attitude were pruned back a bit by subsequent discoveries of uses that included error-correcting codes like checksum values, and sequence-control commands like punctuation marks. Further developments in the decoding of DNA await minds of sufficient genius to see more of the mechanisms in certain sections of DNA that God may have had specific uses for, like the processes associated with embryology and growth. We've often wondered whether God has put His own verbal imprint in a secluded section of code that some arrogant scientist has relegated to “junk DNA”. A delightful example might be a segment in direct, in-your-face ASCII code that says “In the beginning was the Word, and. . .”

**The discovery of what DNA is and does gave us an understanding of life that simply wasn't accessible to Sir Charles Darwin or his contemporaries. Actually, this one insight has only been available to us for a few short decades, and it changes everything, particularly as we can only now view its implications in the context of some other very recent technological developments, including the structure of the computer and the development of information science, the understanding of which occurred simultaneously with our understanding of DNA.**

A string of DNA is nothing more nor less than software code. If we had the ability to create our own string of DNA and manipulate the coding pairs to insert them in the sugar-phosphate matrix in the sequence that we ourselves specified, we could create an ASCII-encoded version of any book we wished to. If we could then develop a machine that could accept this chemical information and read its contents, we could insert our encoded string of DNA and the machine would then print the book we had chemically encoded, or, better yet, display it on a screen like a Kindle reader. As an information storage medium, our encoded strand of DNA would be the most compact device available.

**The essence of life is information**

**In speculating how we ourselves might employ this basic element of life, we have naturally extracted the essence of what DNA represents: pure information. Philosopher/Mathematician William Dembski came to that same conclusion several years ago, and successfully applied the principles of information science to life itself and from that synthesis developed the first principles of an exciting new mathematical discipline centered on the information-richness of life. In his book *Intelligent Design*<sup>15</sup>, Dr. Dembski develops a theoretical model for naturalistic evolution in terms of the operation of chance on natural laws. He then develops a means of scrutinizing a living system to distinguish a naturalistic process from the input of design. He does so by means of a flowchart that he labels an explanatory filter. If, in this flowchart, a system is observed to be ‘contingent’, which means that it is capable of forming a variety of equally probable patterns, then its examination passes down to the next criterion; otherwise, the pattern is taken to be a predetermined necessity, like the formation of crystals, and the design hypothesis is rejected for this system. The next criterion is complexity. If the system is sufficiently complex, then its examination passes down to the third criterion; otherwise, its existence may be ascribed to chance and the design hypothesis is again rejected. The third criterion is specification. If the system exhibits the quality of specification, meaning that it serves to fulfill an identifiable and useful function, then it may be considered to have been brought into existence through design; otherwise the design hypothesis is again rejected. In all cases where the design hypothesis is rejected, the existence of the object is ascribed to a naturalistic process, either necessity or chance.**

**Dembski then continues to flesh out the practicality of this model by placing the complexity criterion on the firm footing of mathematical probability theory. In doing so, he transforms the expressions dealing with probabilities into information-theoretical terminology, in effect equating odds to bits of information. Having performed that translation, Dr. Dembski offers a quite generous cutoff point, as we had noted earlier, of 500 bits of information which, he assumes with considerable justification, would be acceptable to all reasonable people. A system so complex as to represent over 500 bits of information, he claims, can exist only by the aid of design. He inserts the value of 500 bits of information into his complexity criterion, thus reducing its evaluation to a straightforward and repeatable computation.**

Dembski pursues the issue of complex specificity by noting that naturalistic evolution can be expressed as the operation of chance on natural laws, Dembski applies his contributions to information theory to the development of an information-theoretical proof of the inability of chance acting on laws of nature to create complex specified information. He formally states it as his Law of Conservation of Information as follows: “Natural laws are incapable of generating complex specified information<sub>16</sub>”. He states three corollaries as immediate consequences of this law: “1) The complex specified information (CSI) in a closed system of natural causes remains constant or decreases. 2) CSI cannot be generated spontaneously, originate endogenously or organize itself . . .3) The CSI in a closed system of natural causes either has been in the system eternally or was at some point added exogenously. . .4) In particular any closed system of

natural causes that is also of finite duration received whatever CSI it contains before it became a closed system.”

While Dembski’s Law of the Conservation of Information appears more akin to a version of the First Law of Thermodynamics (conservation of matter and energy) than the Second Law, its corollaries are actually closer to the Second Law. One controversial argument between design advocates (formerly labeled as creationists) and evolutionists was the use of the Second Law of Thermodynamics, which stated in one version that all natural processes tended to disorder. The design advocates (including us) would periodically trot out this energy-based law as a proof that the order intrinsic to life represented a reversal (and violation) of the Second Law. The evolutionists would consistently respond to this charge by declaring that the Second Law applied only to closed systems. Open systems, they claimed, permitted the input of energy (such as radiation from the sun), which negated the effect of the Second Law. While we recognized this as somewhat of a red-herring argument, we didn’t come up with a refutation that clearly addressed the open system issue. The beauty of Dembski’s expression of the Law of Conservation of Information is that for any attempt to evoke the possibility of an open system, the immediate implication of the external input of information is the presence of a Designer.

**Dr. Dembski performs the evaluation as directed by his explanatory flowchart on actual living systems by observing whether it exhibits contingency, then mathematically evaluating the information complexity of the system and by observing whether the quality of specificity is present. If the system passes these hoops, then he concludes that a designer was involved in its existence. He has applied this procedure to several living systems, concluding that some of them exhibit unmistakable evidence of design.**

**This very brief overview of DNA represents the tip of the iceberg regarding what scientists have discovered about the intricacy of living creatures at multiple levels from top level functions on down to machine operations at the molecular level. The references cited earlier provide much more detail, some of it of a spectacular nature. They, too, cite further references that the interested person may wish to pursue.**

Many of the amazing processes associated with living systems also can be viewed via the Internet, simply by Googling on an appropriate topic, such as ‘DNA’, ‘DNA replication’, ‘cell replication’, ‘prokaryotic cell structure’, ‘eukaryotic cell structure’, ‘RNA’, ‘ribosomes’, ‘gene transcription’, and ‘protein manufacture’ to give just a few examples. One cannot view this information without obtaining a sense of awe at the complexity of life’s most basic processes.

We have discussed just a few problems out of the very many difficulties with evolution that any objective pursuit of the truth of the matter must address. Among the ones we have touched on here are Dr. Behe’s notion of irreducible complexity, Dr. Dembski’s notion of the conservation of information, the chirality obstacle, and DNA’s immense complexity as well as its feature of embedded software code.

**As we've hinted before, there is a rather substantial political element to the issue of the viability of evolution. This element confirms the role that "believing what we want to" plays in the acceptance or rejection of the idea of evolution. It also has led to outright deception.**

### **Evolution's glaring frauds**

Although he preferred the since-discredited Lamarckian mechanism of the inheritance of acquired characteristics over Darwin's natural selection, one of Darwin's contemporaries, the German zoologist and biologist Ernst Haeckel (1834-1919)<sub>17</sub>, not only helped to popularize Darwin's theory in Germany, but had furnished a notion of his own that both strengthened Darwin's position and increased its popularity. This concept borrowed from Etienne Serre's earlier proposals and from Darwin's concept of homology, which, according to Darwin, was "that relation between [body] parts that results from their development from corresponding embryonic [body] parts<sub>17</sub>." The point here is that in seeing the same similarities between embryonic and adult body parts among various life forms, **Darwin perceived embryonic development as representing a history of speciation. Haeckel picked up on this notion, formalizing it in his famous Biogenetic Law that "ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny". Stated in layman's terms, the law expresses the notion that the various stages of embryonic development (ontogeny) revisit the history of evolutionary change (phylogeny). He went so far as to create a number of drawings that expressed his law in pictorial form. Generations of students throughout the world have been exposed to these pictures, which include a stage of human development marked by what are supposedly gill slits.**

**The pictures themselves long ago have been exposed as frauds, Haeckel having doctored the transcription from source object to painting to emphasize features that promoted his "law". Furthermore, his "law" has since been rejected in its entirety, modern science having exposed his "gill slits" as something else altogether and his ideas in general as oversimplifications of more complicated patterns in embryology. In Chapter 5 of *Darwin on Trial*<sub>17</sub>, Phillip Johnson succinctly states the problem:**

"Describing the facts of embryology to be 'second to none' in importance for his theory, he remarked that the early embryo is 'a picture, more or less obscured, of the progenitor, either in its adult or larval state, of all members of the same great class.' Any exceptions to this rule of early embryonic resemblance, Darwin believed, could be explained as adaptations of larval stages to differing environments. Since a larva must compete for food and survive predators, it might be modified by natural selection, even though later stages would be unaffected.

"This statement is tied to the basic logic of the Darwinian understanding of homology. If similarities inherited from an ancestral form are traceable to common developmental processes and common genes, it is logical to expect these ancestral features to be generated early in the process of embryonic development. The differing organisms in a single group (like vertebrates)

should start out in life as relatively similar organisms and then form their differing features later. As with Haeckel's law, the picture is so pleasing that generations of biology students have been taught it as fact.

“Unfortunately for the theory, however, the facts do not fit so neatly into the theoretical preconception. Far from providing the simple confirmation that [modern evolutionist Dr. Douglas J.] Futuyma suggests, the embryonic patterns generate a monumental puzzle for the theory. Although it is true that vertebrates all pass through an embryonic stage at which they resemble each other, in fact they develop *to* this stage very differently (italics in the original). After a vertebrate egg is fertilized, it undergoes cell divisions and cell movements characteristic of its class: fishes follow one pattern, amphibians another, birds yet another, and mammals still another. The differences cannot be explained as larval adaptations, since these early stages occur before larvae form and thus are apparently not exposed to natural selection. Only by ignoring the early stages of development can one fit Darwin's theory to the facts of embryology, but it was precisely the early stages that Darwin claimed were the most significant!” [Exclamation in the original.]

**The same fraudulent picture emerges from the evolutionary presentation of the so-called ‘fossil record’. ‘Evolutionary science’ continues to teach our children and the public that the fossil record demonstrates the viability of evolution by confirming: first, that the ‘tree of life branches out from a single base ancestor to the many varieties that are observed today, producing many intermediate and transitional forms along the way; second, that the fossil record ‘proves’ the existence of many transitional forms. It does not; instead, the actual observations and facts disprove those very same claims.**

**The tree of life that is supposed to branch outward from a simple beginning has never been found. Nor will it ever, as what has been found instead throughout the earth is a phenomenon that is called the Cambrian Explosion<sup>18</sup>, wherein multiple fully-formed species emerged from one stratum to the next, the previous stratum being almost entirely void of life.**

**The glaring discrepancy between the fossil record as Darwin envisioned it and its actual state was touched on earlier. But Darwinists have been so misleading about this issue that it deserves more of our attention. The public at large has been and continues to be subjected to periodic announcements by the pro-evolution media that a new and exciting ‘find’ has confirmed the existence of a transitional form, just as Darwin had predicted all along. Then, when the latest of such ‘finds’ has been discredited as fraudulent, a period of grace ensues wherein nothing is said either way about it. Eventually after the passage of sufficient time for the public to forget about the issue entirely, some popular magazine will scream out that a new and conclusive ‘find’ has proven Darwin right. Time-Life and the National Geographic Magazines are major offenders in this regard, but there are many others who are willing to follow suit.**

The late Dr. Grant Jeffrey supports Phillip Johnson and others who have assessed the claims of Darwinists about the fossil record and have concluded that they are not only in error, but intentionally so. According to Dr. Jeffrey<sup>19</sup>,

“There is no fossil evidence to support evolution. Many Christians and Jews who have been troubled by the claims of evolution will be astonished to discover that the evolutionists knew all along that there was *no* fossil evidence in support of evolution. Yet, many textbooks and teachers boldly declared that the fossils proved evolution to be true.

“After a century and a half of claims by evolutionists that just a little more time would produce the necessary fossil evidence of the missing links between species that would confirm the theory of evolution, we find there is an astonishing and *total lack of fossil evidence* to confirm any indisputable transitional forms, or ‘missing links,’ that must exist if the theory of evolution were actually scientifically true. However, in over one hundred and fifty years of a massive global search by scientists that has catalogued over one hundred million fossil specimens in museums and laboratories, they have failed to discover a single ‘missing link’ fossil. If the evolutionists were intellectually honest, they would have abandoned evolution long ago.

“In 1859, Charles Darwin acknowledged that the utter lack of fossil evidence for these missing links between one species and another provided ‘an unanswerable objection’ to the theory of evolution. However, Darwin assumed that the search for fossils that would establish the truth of evolution was just beginning and that, given sufficient time and effort, scientists would soon discover the millions of transitional fossils required to prove that one species gradually transformed itself by natural selection into a new species.”  
[Italics in the original.]

Jeffrey goes on to say that “To date, though, every species discovered in the fossil record appears perfectly formed. Paleontologists have never discovered a fossil showing a partially formed species or a partially formed organ.<sup>20</sup>”

He furnishes detailed accounts of a number of supposed ‘missing links’ between ape and man, all of which were subsequently exposed as outright frauds. They are listed below.

With the help of untrained convicts, fossilized bone fragments of what came to be called Java Man were dug up in 1891 on the Indonesian island of Java. On the basis of nothing more than a fragment of a skull cap, three molar teeth and a bone fragment of a thighbone, the director of the find, Dr. Eugene Dubois, identified the fossils as belonging to *Homo erectus*, a humanoid three quarters of a million years old. Attempts to confirm his claims uncovered the following facts: the thighbone fragment was identical to that of a modern human; the skull cap was found forty-six feet away from the other fragments; there was no logical reason to associate the skull cap with the thighbone.



**Pittdown Man I and II were supposedly discovered in 1912 and 1917 at the Pittdown quarry in England by amateur geologist Charles Dawson. In 1953, after over forty years of unquestioning acceptance of these findings as genuine, the skulls, after being examined by more modern techniques, were found to be intentional frauds. The skull described by Jeffrey was a composite of skull fragments of modern man and orangutan jaw. Worse, the bones had been dyed with bichromate of potash to make them appear ancient. Although evolutionists generally agree that Pittdown man was an outright fraud, they don't speak much about this incident.**

**Nebraska Man was found in 1922 in western Nebraska by Professor Harold Cook. His find was supported by Dr. Henry F. Osborn, head of the American Museum of History, who touted the find as finally representing the evidence linking chimpanzees, Java Man and modern man. The Java man, as noted above, was since exposed as fictitious. So was Nebraska Man, whose supposed existence was used as evidence in the famous 1925 Scopes evolution trial. The problem was that the 'evidence' amounted to a single tooth, around which very imaginative evolution-minded artists created a picture of how they wished a missing link to look. It gets worse: the tooth was later found to have belonged to an extinct pig. The same fiction applies to the Southwest Colorado Man, another 'evolutionary discovery' that also turned out to have been based on a mere tooth, this one belonging to an ancient horse.**

**In 1932 another supposed missing link, Ramapithecus, was found in Africa. This 'discovery' amounted to nothing more than some fossilized teeth, which were later found to belong to the modern orangutan. Here again, evolutionists generally acknowledge this 'discovery' to be false.**

**Dr. Jeffrey also notes that the same kind of problems attend the discovery of 'Lucy' in 1974. In this case, Professor Richard Leakey claimed that 'Lucy' was an ape-like creature who walked upright. However, the lengths of the forearm fossils found in the vicinity strongly suggest that 'Lucy' walked on all fours like any other ape-like creature. Even Dr. Leakey admitted to exercising a large amount of imagination to create a picture from a few bone fragments. What puts the lie to these excursions of the imagination is that in many, if not all, cases there is actually no logical reason to assume that the fragments belong to a single creature.**

**Even with such a shady history of attempting to create missing links where missing links didn't exist, the evolutionists continued to pull the wool over their own eyes as well of those of their associates and an all too-trusting public by trotting out Peking Man, Neanderthal Man, and Cro-Magnon man in a dismal and apparently desperate attempt to justify their system of belief. All three of these, it turns out, were nothing more nor less than fully human, a fact quite reluctantly admitted by the community of evolutionists.**

If the history of evolutionists' attempt to find the missing link between ape and man has yielded nothing more than a sordid collection of frauds, perhaps they can fall back on the find in Australia of an archaeopteryx fossil<sup>8</sup>, this creature supposedly representing a link between reptiles and birds.

Perhaps not. At least not in honesty. The notion that this bird represents a transitional form came from its teeth, which are unusual in a bird and more usual to a reptile. Everything else about this fossil shows absolutely nothing contradictory to what constitutes a bird. The unusual feature of teeth is not so unusual after all, considering that some reptiles have no teeth while other fossils of birds do, and other strange creatures, like the duck-billed platypus, exist that are not considered to be missing links.

But what about the dinosaur-bird so highly publicized by the National Geographic magazine, who artistically (and fictionally) portrayed a baby dinosaur with feathers and claimed that birds belong to the family of bipedal dinosaurs.

Even the community of evolutionists was taken aback by this hasty conclusion. Jeffrey quotes Professor Storrs Olson, curator of birds at the Smithsonian in the following condemnation:

“National Geographic has reached an all-time low for engaging in sensationalistic, unsubstantiated, tabloid journalism. . . It eventually became clear to me that National Geographic was not interested in anything other than the prevailing dogma that birds evolved from dinosaurs.<sup>21</sup>”

### Irreconcilable differences between evolution and Christianity

A disagreeable problem with the theory of evolution is that it undercuts Scripture. Scripture itself, being the Word of God, is one very substantial pillar of the Christian faith. Paul (2 Timothy 3:16) and Peter (2 Peter 1:20, 21) both declared Scripture to have come from God, so a Christian takes the written Word lightly at the peril of his own soul. Nobody can deny that in claiming evolution to be compatible with Scripture, the person who does so must necessarily lose something vital to the reverence of the God who is defined by that Scripture. The creation epic and the fall of man are seen in a more distant, indirect light. *Did God really say that?* the evolutionist questions. The timing of creation is met with skepticism. *Did God really say that?* The introduction of death into God's creation with the fall of man – *well, maybe what God really meant was. . .* Man may have fallen at one time, but since then he's been evolving into something better (on his own, with the helping hand of chance).

Quite apart from a consideration of God, the dating scheme currently accepted within the secular world suffers from some profound intellectual and suppositional errors. Yet while there are glaring logical difficulties with the dating scheme, there is a possibility that even

in the face of the falsehoods the assumption of a very great age of the earth and life upon it may be reconciled with Scripture by interpreting the first few verses of Genesis 1 as permitting a large time gap between a previous era in earth's history and a reconstruction into its present form. Other interpretations involving large time periods assume that each 'day' of creation was considerably longer than twenty four hours, furnishing another convenient path for reconciling Scripture with the secular paradigm of the earth's age.

On the other hand, there is no possible way that the theory of evolution can be reconciled to Christianity. Where, precisely, do evolution and Christianity clash? The specific issues presented below are but a partial listing of the most obvious areas.

As we've already noted, evolution undercuts the notion that Scripture is inspired by God and inerrant. Evolution places the development of man as progressing upward, rather than downward as Scripture strongly implies, and makes light of the Genesis account of creation.

Evolution fosters a fully materialistic mindset. Evolution places a premium on materialism, refusing to countenance the introduction of anything beyond chance and atoms in the development of life. This emphasis on the material world so intrinsic to evolution has thoroughly permeated our society, promoting hedonism and selfishness, whereas it represents the exact opposite of a major theme of Christianity, the rejection of the material world in favor of the spiritual realm. Jesus Himself said (John 18:36)

*“My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now my kingdom is not from here.”*

Paul continually emphasized the greater importance of the spiritual realm over the material world. A representative passage is 1 Corinthians 2:9-14:

*“But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, except that spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, no the spirit of the world, but the Spirit who is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spirituall discerned.”*

Evolution requires more faith in the secular paradigm than in God and Scripture. The enormous complexities and interdependencies of life recently uncovered by science are so contradictory to the causal explanations of evolution that those who embrace evolution must do so on faith alone, ignoring their own intellects and common sense. Moreover, they have suspended normal standards of proof, which for evolution are nonexistent, and have disregarded the numerous outright frauds associated with the futile search for the proof of evolution. Such individuals must place more stock in current 'science' than in God, believing without reservation that if eminent people say something must be true, that it must be true. Regarding this issue of secular faith, William Dembski says it well in reminding his readers that the Intelligent Design approach to the origin of life is not only more compatible by far with Scriptural theology, but is of itself a more up-to-date and intellectually satisfying alternative to evolution:

“Unlike full-blooded Darwinists, however, the design theorists’ objection to theistic evolution rests not with what the term *theistic* is doing in the phrase ‘theistic evolution’ but rather with what the term *evolution* is doing there. The design theorists’ objection to theistic evolution is not in the end that theistic evolution retains God as an unnecessary rider in an otherwise perfectly acceptable scientific theory of life’s origin and development. Rather their objection is that the scientific theory which is supposed to undergird theistic evolution, often called the neo-Darwinian synthesis, is itself problematic.

“The design theorists’ critique of Darwinism begins with Darwinism’s failure as an empirically adequate scientific theory, not with its supposed incompatibility with some system of religious belief. This point is vital to keep in mind in assessing intelligent design’s contribution to the creation-evolution controversy. Critiques of Darwinism by creationists have tended to conflate science and theology, making it unclear whether Darwinism fails strictly as a scientific theory or whether it must be rejected because it is theologically unacceptable. Design theorists refuse to make this a Bible-science controversy. Their critique of Darwinism is not based on any supposed incompatibility between Christian revelation and Darwinism. Instead they begin their critique by arguing that Darwinism is *on its own terms* a failed scientific research program – that it does not constitute a well-supported scientific theory, that its explanatory power is severely limited and that it fails abysmally when it tries to account for the grand sweep of natural history<sup>22</sup>.”

Perhaps the most devastating problem of all in attempting to accommodate evolution into Christianity is a rather subtle one that doesn’t outright deny the existence of God. The clash between evolution and Scripture, however, need not be in-your-face obvious; after all, Satan is known to be subtle. This very real and pervasive problem is the unavoidable perception in the minds of evolutionists that the distance between God and His creation renders Him irrelevant to our daily lives. Evolution does not require the existence of God, particularly the God of Scripture. Beyond that, at best it removes God from the forefront

of creation to a remote location in the very background and slaps His hands away from creative details, whereas Scripture as a whole presents God as in much more intimate connection with His creation. The kind of remoteness between God and man implicit in a belief in evolution demands an indifference of God toward us and of us toward God. Moreover, it trivializes the conscious disobedience of man that led to the entrance of sin and death into the world. Yet more, it renders insignificant the major theme of Scripture, both Old and New Testaments, that Jesus came in the flesh and died on the cross to reconcile mankind to God.

Most of the Christian world, as a matter of fact, assumes that an hour spent on Sunday getting preached to fulfills all the obligations that one might owe his God. Devoting the remainder of the week (including Sunday afternoons) to self is perfectly acceptable to those who choose to include evolution in their world view, for in doing so they aren't distancing themselves from their "God" any more than He has distanced Himself from them. How far indeed is that attitude from the commandment of Jesus in Matthew 22:37 and 38 to love the Lord our God with all our hearts, souls and minds! How tragically remote is that attitude from even considering Jesus to be our Lord!

#### NOTES:

1. Dr. Michael J. Behe, *The Edge of Evolution*, Free Press Division of Simon and Schuster, 2007pp. 188-190, 233, 234
2. Dr. Phillip E. Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, InterVarsity Press, 1993, pp. 71-100
3. Dr. Michael J. Behe, *The Edge of Evolution*, Free Press Division of Simon and Schuster, 2007pp. 188-190, 233, 234; Dr. Grant R. Jeffrey, *Creation*, Frontier Research Publications, 2003, pp. 191-212
4. Dr. Phillip Johnson, *Defeating Darwinism by Opening Minds*, InterVarsity Press, 1997, p. 15
5. Stephen Jay Gould, *Time's Arrow, Time's Cycle*, Harvard University Press, 1987
6. Dr. William A. Dembski, *Intelligent Design*, InterVarsity Press (IVP Academic), 1999
7. *ibid.*, p. 167 (quoting from Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, Norton, 1987, pp. 139, 145, 146)
8. *ibid.*, pp. 166, 178
9. Ralph O. Muncaster, *Dismantling Evolution* Harvest House Publishers, 2003, p. 131
10. Michael Behe, *Darwin's Black Box*, Free Press, 1996
11. Stephen C. Meyer, *Signature in the Cell*, HarperOne imprint of Harper Collins, 2009, pp. 240-252; Ralph O. Muncaster, *Dismantling Evolution* Harvest House Publishers, 2003, pp. 124-129

12. Meyer, *Signature in the Cell*, pp. 206, 207; Muncaster, *Dismantling Evolution*, pp. 131-136
13. Thomas E. Woodward and James P. Gills, *The Mysterious Epigenome*, Kregel Publications, 2012, p. 68
14. Meyer, *Signature in the Cell*, p. 367
15. Dembski, *Intelligent Design*
16. *ibid.*, pp. 170-174
17. Phillip Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, pp. 71-74
18. Vance Ferrell, *The Evolution Cruncher*, Evolution Facts, Inc., 2001 pp. 420-425
19. Dr. Grant R. Jeffrey, *Creation*, Frontier Research Publications, 2003, pp. 191-212
20. *ibid.*, pp. 193
21. *ibid.*, pp. 197, 198
22. Dembski, *Intelligent Design*, pp. 109-112