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The Bible declares in Genesis 1:1, “1 In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.” And then it goes on to state that God created plant life, then animal life and finally man.

A vast majority of scientists don’t agree with those statements. They are emphatic that we no longer have to believe in the existence of a Creator because they know how life came into being. They are absolutely certain that simple forms of life came into being spontaneously from inanimate matter which then evolved into complex forms of life.

Which is true? Did God create everything or did all life evolve by itself?

Evolutionists attempt to show how life began by describing a hypothetical distant past. They theorize that after the earth formed, it gradually cooled and had an atmosphere of simple gases such as hydrogen, nitrogen, ammonia, carbon dioxide, with little or no oxygen. This type of atmosphere was subject to electrical discharges of energy from lightning resulting in the formation of elementary amino acids.

The elementary amino acids accumulated in the primitive oceans to reach the consistency of a hot diluted soup. At the same time, somehow all the chemicals necessary for the formation of proteins from amino acids were also formed from the basic gases and accumulated in the soup. Then by random combinations, the elementary amino acids in this pre-biotic soup formed proteins. When all the conditions were just right, by a lucky accident single celled life emerged from the proteins that had formed in the soup. Once single-celled simplest life forms emerged, over a very long time through very gradual natural processes they evolved into ever more complex forms of life, and finally into man. The process of moving from simple single-celled life to higher forms of life took place over millions and millions of years in tiny incremental changes.

Let’s go over the steps in this process. In the first step, evolutionists assume matter always existed, governed according to well-defined laws of physics, chemistry, biology and mathematics. In the second step, the molecules of gases through the action of energy such as lightning combined to form amino acids. These amino acids accumulated in a type of ocean of hot soup. Then the amino acids combined to form all the proteins necessary for life. Somehow all the other chemicals that constitute the simplest single-celled organisms also existed along with the randomly formed proteins. Then in the third step, when conditions were just perfect, through a lucky accident, the proteins combined to produce the first simplest form of life, the single-cell living organism. In the fourth step, these simple single-celled creatures progressively evolved in tiny increments over millions of years into higher and better adapted forms such as fish, amphibians, reptiles, mammals and eventually primates such as apes, chimpanzees, and finally man.

For evolution to be true, each of these four steps in the chain had to take place. If it can be shown that it was impossible for even one of these steps to have taken place, evolution will stand proved as a false theory. Otherwise we no longer need to give the biblical account any credibility.

Let’s look at what some scientists who interpret the evidence truthfully have to say about the possibility of the four steps of evolution to have taken place.

***Has Matter Always Existed?***

In step one, evolutionists assume that matter has always existed, or came into existence by itself. Their theory begins with an existing universe, operating harmoniously according to laws of physics, chemistry, mathematics, biology, mass, motion and energy. Scientists observe these laws working predictably and flawlessly. We all experience the effects of gravity and know that it is a consistently functioning universal law.

Human experience also tells us that for laws to continue to function they must also be sustained. It requires continuous use of power to sustain the laws. That demands a Sustainer of the laws of the material universe. Human governments enact laws. Those laws are monitored and enforced by punishing violations by use of force or power. The same applies to the laws of the material universe. They are sustained by power.

Evolutionists also assume that matter has always existed? How reasonable is this assumption? Here is what scientists have discovered.

Till the early 1900s, most astronomers thought that any motion of the galaxies was just random drift. Then astronomer Edwin Hubble discovered that the universe was expanding outward everywhere he looked. Other astronomers and physicists then confirmed Hubble’s observations and conclusions. It was a sensational discovery.

John D. Barrow, professor of astronomy at the University of Sussex, England, explores the meaning of this discovery in his book *The Origin of the Universe.* He writes: “This was the greatest discovery of the twentieth-century science, and it confirmed what Einstein’s general theory of relativity had predicted about the universe: that it cannot be static. The gravitational attraction between the galaxies would bring them all together if they were not rushing away from each other. The universe can’t stand still.

“If the universe is expanding, then when we reverse the direction of history and look in the past we should find evidence that it emerged from a smaller, denser state – a state that appears to have once had zero size. It is this apparent beginning that has become known as the big bang” (1994, pp. 3-5).

The conclusion the astronomers reached was that what they were observing was the result of an incredible event that had hurled matter and energy outward in all directions from the locus of the event which they termed the “big bang.” In other words, they were observing the effects of the event that began the universe.

This discovery shook the scientific world. Robert Jastrow, founder of NASA’s Goddard Institute for Space Studies and former professor of astronomy and geology at New York’s Columbia University writes: “Few astronomers could have anticipated that this event – *the sudden birth of the Universe* – would become a proven scientific fact, but observations of the heavens through telescopes have forced them into that conclusion” (*The Enchanted Loom: Mind in the Universe*. 1981, p. 15, emphasis added).

He continues: “The seed of everything that has happened since in the universe was planted in the first instant…It was literally the moment of creation” (*Journey to the Stars: Space Exploration – Tomorrow and Beyond*, 1989, p. 47).”

What scientists had discovered was in fact recorded in the very first verse of the Bible, Genesis 1:1: “In the beginning God created the heaven[s] and the earth.”

There is further solid scientific proof that matter has not always existed, that it came into being at some specific time.

Discovery and studies of radioactivity have proved that there has not been a past eternity of matter. Uranium is a radioactive element with an atomic weight of 238. Through alpha decay, it gives off a helium atom with an atomic weight of 4. With two more alpha decays (and beta decays), the product left is radium. Radium thus is the end product after uranium 238 has lost three helium atoms. Then decay continues in radium. The final product of the process of radioactive decay is the stable element lead. The half-life of radium is about 1600 years, and the half-life of uranium 238 is 4.46 billion years.

What this means is that radioactive elements which are in existence today have not been in existence long-enough to have run their course to disintegrate into lead. If these elements had always existed in the past, they would have long ago run their course. Since these elements exist today, this means that at one time in the past they did not exist. Thus we have scientific proof that matter has not always existed. It was brought into existence at some specific point in time.

Some evolutionists would have us believe that matter came into existence at some time by itself. Is it rational to believe that matter came into existence by blind chance? How can something come into being of itself from nothing? And then how can that something start governing itself by astonishingly fantastic, precise, predictable, flawless laws? There has to be a cause for every effect. Nothing comes into existence by itself, and from nothing. The sum total of our human experience cries against this utterly foolish assumption.

We see then that the evolutionist starts out with a proven false assumption to build his theory. Matter has not always existed, and it did not create itself by blind chance out of nothing. Therefore, the first step in evolution did not take place, and matter and the universe were in fact created.

***Proteins Necessary for Life Formed By Chance?***

The proponents of evolution want us to believe that the second step in the evolutionary process is that the gas molecules present in the atmosphere combined to form amino acids through discharges of electric energy from lightning. (Of course, based on their first assumption, these gas molecules have always existed, which we have proved to be false.) These amino acids accumulated in a pre-biotic hot soup. Then random combinations in the ocean of pre-biotic amino acid soup formed all the proteins, enzymes and other molecules necessary for life.

How probable is it that random combinations of amino acids will produce the required proteins to form the simplest single-celled living organism? Fortunately astronomers, mathematicians and other scientists have made probability calculations that give us a good idea of how likely it is that the required proteins can be produced by random combinations of amino acids.

Before delving into the probability calculations, it would be worthwhile to understand the structure and functioning of a single cell.

Michael Denton, a molecular biologist and senior research fellow at the University of Otago in New Zealand, describes how scientists viewed the cell in Darwin's day with a magnification capability of only hundreds of times with their best technology. They saw "a relatively disappointing spectacle appearing only as an ever-changing and apparently disordered pattern of blobs and particles which, under the influence of unseen turbulent forces, [were] continually tossed haphazardly in all directions" (Evolution: A Theory in Crisis, p. 328).

But today, this is how the cell is viewed.

"To grasp the reality of life as it has been revealed by molecular biology," writes Dr. Denton, "we must magnify a cell a thousand million times until it is twenty kilometers in diameter and resembles a giant airship large enough to cover a great city like London or New York. What we would then see would be an object of unparalleled complexity and adaptive design.

"On the surface of the cell we would see millions of openings, like the port holes of a vast space ship, opening and closing to allow a continual stream of materials in and out. If we were to enter one of these openings we would find ourselves in a world of supreme technology and bewildering complexity. We would see endless highly organized corridors and conduits branching in every direction away from the perimeter of the cell, some leading to the central memory bank in the nucleus and others to assembly plants and processing units.

"The nucleus itself would be a vast spherical chamber more than a kilometer in diameter, resembling a geodesic dome inside of which we would see, all neatly stacked together in ordered arrays, the miles of coiled chains of the DNA molecules…

"We would wonder at the level of control implicit in the movement of so many objects down so many seemingly endless conduits, all in perfect unison. We would see all around us, in every direction we looked, all sorts of robot-like machines. We would notice that the simplest of the functional components of the cell, the protein molecules, were astonishingly complex pieces of molecular machinery, each one consisting of about three thousand atoms arranged in highly organized 3-D spatial conformation.

"We would wonder even more as we watched the strangely purposeful activities of these weird molecular machines, particularly when we realized that, despite all our accumulated knowledge of physics and chemistry, the task of designing one such molecular machine—that is one single functional protein molecule—would be beyond our capacity…Yet the life of the cell depends on the integrated activities of thousands, certainly tens, and probably hundreds of thousands of different protein molecules" (pp. 328-329).

This is a molecular biologist's description of just ONE cell which cannot be seen with the naked eye. There are about 10 TRILLION (10,000,000,000,000) brain, nerve, muscle, bone, hair and more than 200 other types of cells in the average human body.

Now as complex as the cell is, the tiniest living organisms are even far more intricate. Sir James Gray, professor of Zoology at Cambridge University is quoted as stating: “Bacteria [are] far more complex than any inanimate system known to man. There is not a laboratory in the world which can compete with the biochemical activity of the smallest living organism” (Marshall and Sandra Hall, *The Truth: God or Evolution?*, 1974, p. 89).

To understand how complex the tiniest living things are, consider the *R. coli* bacterium, one of the tiniest unicellular living creatures in nature. It contains about 2,000 genes, each with around 1,000 enzymes (which are organic catalysts that speed up other chemical reactions). An enzyme is made up of a billion nucleotides, each of which is the equivalent of a letter in the chemical alphabet. These nucleotides are instructional code which enable the enzymes to instruct the organism how to function and reproduce. The DNA information in the single tiny *R coli* cell is “the approximate equivalent of 100 million pages of the Encyclopaedia Britannica” (John Whitcomb, *The Early Earth*, 1971, p. 79).”

After understanding how astonishingly complex single-celled creatures are, we can look at some probability calculations to see if the enzymes necessary to form these creatures could be produced by random chance. Enzymes are catalysts that speed up the production of proteins in the cell. Most of the enzymes are proteins themselves, though not all of them.

In proteins, amino acids have to be arranged in a particular sequence in the right quantities and structures. If any specific amino acid is out of place, the amino acid molecules do not form the protein molecule. The simplest protein molecule consists of 50 amino acids whereas more complex ones contain thousands.

What is the probability of an average-sized protein molecule composed of 300 amino acids, containing 20 different types of amino acids being formed by random combinations? These 300 amino acids can be arranged in 20300 or 10390 different ways. (This is a tremendously huge number, consisting of 1 followed by 390 zeros.) Of all these possible arrangements, only one forms the required protein molecule. The other amino-acid chains are not part of living things and could potentially be harmful to them.

But that is not the end of it. To produce a protein, all the amino acids have to be left-handed. The probability of an amino acid being left-handed is one half. Therefore for all 300 amino acids to be left-handed, the probability is 1 in 2300, which is equal to 1 in 1090. In addition, for all the amino acids to form a chain, they must be united together in a chemical bond called a “peptide bond.” The probability of two amino acids combining together in a peptide bond is about 50%. Therefore, the chance of 300 amino acids combining together in a peptide bond is 1 in 2299 or nearly 1 in 1090. The total probability then of 300 amino acids of 20 different types randomly combining together to form the average sized protein is obtained by multiplying all the probabilities, which is 1 chance in 10570, (570 is obtained by adding 390, 90 and 90).

To get a perspective on this number, consider that a probability of less than 1 in 1050 is considered by mathematicians to be a complete impossibility (Alan Hayward, *Creation and Evolution: Rethinking the Evidence From Science and the Bible*, 1985, pp. 35-37). Another mathematician, Sir Arthur Eddington estimates there are no more than 1080 atoms in the universe (Francis Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe*, 1982, p. 70).

To get a feel for these numbers, consider the difference between the probability numbers 1050 and 1056. The probability represented by 1056 is one millionth the probability represented by 1050. Similarly the probability represented by 1059 would be one billionth the probability or chance represented by 1050. Now consider: if an event with one chance in 1050 is considered to be impossible, then what is the likelihood of an event taking place with a probability of one in 10570? That event simply cannot take place. Thus it is impossible for one average sized protein of 300 amino acids from 20 different types of amino acids to form by random combinations.

The same probability for even the simplest protein of 50 amino acids forming by chance is 1095, again totally out of the realm of possibility.

Harold F. Blum, an evolutionist scientist, states that "The spontaneous formation of a polypeptide of the size of the smallest known proteins seems beyond all probability." (W. R. Bird, *The Origin of Species Revisited*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Co., 1991, p. 304).

The above probability was calculated for an average sized protein. But there are other giant protein molecules, with thousands of amino acids that are all required to produce even the simplest single-celled living creatures. The probability of those proteins forming by chance is that much more remote. Each and every one of these proteins (about 2,000 of them in all) is a part of the simplest, single-celled living organism.

Now let us take it to the next step. It was seen that one of the tiniest single-celled living creatures, the *R* *coli* bacterium, has some 2000 genes, each with around 1,000 enzymes (which are mainly different types of proteins). These enzymes would be composed of about 2,000 different types of proteins. What are the odds that the enzymes needed to produce this simplest of living organisms could form through random combinations of amino acids by chance? Astrophysicists Sir Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe have calculated the probability as one chance in 1040,000 (that is 1 followed by 40,000 zeros). If it is impossible for even one average sized protein to form by chance, or even the simplest protein to form by chance, there is absolutely no chance that 2,000 proteins required for producing the simplest, tiniest living creature will form by random combinations of amino acids. Hoyle and professor Wickramasinghe concluded that the possibility of life arising as theorized by evolutionists is “an outrageously small probability that could not be faced even if the whole universe consisted of organic soup” (*Evolution from Space*, 1981, p. 24).

That, however, is not the end of the story. One of the simplest, tiniest single-celled living creatures is much more than the 2,000 proteins required to produce it. In addition to the proteins, a cell also consists of nucleic acids (the DNA and RNA, the instructions for the living organism on how to function), carbohydrates, lipids (or “fat,” but more formally defined as a substance such as a fat, oil or wax that dissolves in alcohol but not in water; important part of living cells), vitamins, and many other chemicals. But just having all these molecules together in one place does not make a cell. They all have to be arranged together in specific quantities and structures to perform the required functions.

Michael Behe writes about the functions each cell performs: “The “simplest” self-sufficient, replicating cell has the capacity to produce thousands of different proteins and other molecules, at different times and under variable conditions. Synthesis, degradation, energy generation, replication, maintenance of cell architecture, mobility, regulation, repair, communication – all of these functions take place in virtually every cell, and each function itself requires the interaction of numerous parts.” (*Darwin’s Black Box*, The Free Press printing, 2003, p.46).

All the molecules don’t just arrange themselves together in the cell by random combinations to perform all these functions. The probability of all these structures forming in the same cell has not been added to the calculations by Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe. Really how remote can it get beyond the impossible?

Let reactions of other scientists when faced with such probabilities suffice. Chandra Wickramasinghe comments:

“The likelihood of the spontaneous formation of life from inanimate matter is one to a number with 40,000 noughts after it...It is big enough to bury Darwin and the whole theory of evolution. There was no primeval soup, neither on this planet nor on any other, and if the beginnings of life were not random, they must therefore have been the product of purposeful intelligence” (Fred Hoyle, Chandra Wickramasinghe, *Evolution from Space*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 1984, p. 148.)

William Stokes, an American geologist, writes in his book *Essentials of Earth History*, that the probability is so small "that it would not occur during billions of years on billions of planets, each covered by a blanket of concentrated watery solution of the necessary amino acids." (Quoted in W. R. Bird, *The Origin of Species Revisited*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Co., 1991, p. 305).

Sir Fred Hoyle comments on these improbable numbers:

“Indeed, such a theory (that life was assembled by an intelligence) is so obvious that one wonders why it is not widely accepted as being self-evident. The reasons are psychological rather than scientific.” (Sir Fred Hoyle, Chandra Wickramasinghe, *ibid*., p. 130).

*Conclusion*: the second step of evolution that proteins spontaneously formed out of oceans of soup of amino acids could not have happened. It is utterly impossible.

But this inevitable conclusion does not prevent the evolutionists from continuously inventing ever more irrational arguments to muddy the debate. They claim that all the proteins don’t have to be produced sequentially for evolution to have taken place. They could have been produced simultaneously. But that argument has no leg to stand on. We have already seen that even a single average sized protein could not have formed by chance. The probability of that happening is way out of the realm of possibility. And the probability of a more complex protein with 2,000 amino acids that would also be required would be 103,800. Again way out in the realm of possibility for just one single protein out of the hundreds, or even thousands that would be required to produce a single cell.

Next, all the protein molecules must be formed in the same place simultaneously, if we are to work with that argument. If they are formed in different places of the ocean, that is of no value in forming a living cell, because the cell must be formed from all the proteins, nucleic acids and other chemicals together. So they must all be produced in one place, one next to the other. For that to happen, the probabilities would be no different from the probabilities calculated by Sir Hoyle and professor Wickramasinghe.

Another foolish argument has been put forth that life did not originate into the simplest single-celled organism, but into some pre-forms that finally combined to form the simple, tiny living unicellular creature. Michael Behe has in his book, *Darwin’s Back Box*, explained that these tiniest, simplest single-celled living organisms are “irreducibly complex.” This means that they cannot function if any part of them is missing. The cell would not be living but dead if any part is missing. All parts had to have been produced simultaneously as part of the organism. According to the argument these pre-forms were not living creatures. They presumably were blobs of protein. But again, we have seen that even the simplest protein could not have formed by chance.

If these intermediate blobs of protein were somehow produced, they certainly were not self-replicating because they were not life. So they would simply disintegrate through natural decay, just like dead carcasses. There would be no mechanism for their replacement as in living things.

Answers.com provides some half-lives of proteins within living human beings. It says: “Proteins are continuously degraded and replaced even in the mature adult, and the half-life is used as a quantitative measure of this ‘dynamic equilibrium’. The values of half-life of different proteins range from a few minutes [and all these are necessary for producing a single-celled living organism] or hours for enzymes which control the rate of metabolic pathways, to almost a year for structural proteins such as collagen. The average half-life of human liver and serum proteins is 10 days, and of the total body protein, 80 days.”

The life of the proteins within a living entity is prolonged because of the life processes at work within the body of the entity. Proteins outside a living organism would degrade much faster. Indeed, that is what happens at death. Thus even if proteins could have somehow formed, they would have been destroyed unless they were part of a living organism.

Some have tried to question Sir Hoyle and professor Wickramasinghe’s probability calculations. But all they have shown is that those calculations were optimistic. And that can be done simply by making some additional stringent assumptions. Hoyle’s and Wickramasinghe’s calculations were simply more conservative, and illustrated the point that the probability of life forming by random combinations of amino acids is way out of the realm of possibility. We have already seen in our discussion that additional issues can be brought into the calculations such as all the other chemicals contained in a cell besides proteins. This would make the probability of the cell being produced by blind chance even more unlikely.

The evolutionists cannot find fault with Michael Behe’s concept of “irreducibly complex” as he applied it to cells. So they just accuse him of hijacking the term from information science to attack his credibility. Only the most gullible would fall for such peripheral, irrational accusations that have no bearing on the issue.

But why are evolutionists taking aim at Hoyle and Wickramasinghe (H&W) and Michael Behe? Because H&W with their pioneering work, have convincingly, mathematically destroyed the argument of evolutionists for origin of life by blind chance. And Michael Behe’s concept of “irreducibly complex” as applied to single-celled organisms is necessary to show that all the 2,000 or so proteins would be required to produce the tiniest, simplest single-celled organism. Even if a few are missing, the organism dies.

Even Richard Dawkins, professor of Zoology at Oxford University, a diehard evolutionist has admitted that, “the essence of life is *statistical improbability on a colossal scale*. Whatever is the explanation for life, therefore, *it cannot be chance*. The true explanation for the existence of life must embody the very antithesis of chance.” (Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmake*r; 1986, p. 317, emphasis added).

Muddying the waters using mathematical arguments is an old trick of the critics. They know that less than 1% of the world’s population will understand these mathematical probability calculations. So they can put forth any clever but irrational mathematical argument against the calculated probabilities or the methods used to arrive at them or state different assumptions and they can create doubts in the minds of 99% of the population. That is why they have been able to keep the world hoodwinked for decades. But those who understand probability and statistics know that their criticisms are dishonest and arguments irrational.

The probability calculations were a major factor in actually leading to the conversion of the author from atheism to Christianity.

The conclusion therefore, is that none of the proteins, the building blocks necessary for life could have been produced by chance. Life did not originate as the evolutionists theorize. The second step in the process of evolution is an impossibility. Life simply did not evolve by chance or lucky accident.

***Proteins Formed the First Living Cell Through a Lucky Accident?***

According to evolutionists, once all the necessary proteins had formed by chance, and all the chemicals necessary for life had accumulated, when all the conditions were just perfect, then through a lucky accident the first simplest single-celled living creature was formed. This according to them is the third step in the process of origination of life and evolution. How possible is it that this step could actually happen?

According to this step, life originated from non-living matter. But this concept is contrary to one of the most basic laws of nature: *the law of biogenesis*, according to which, *life can come only from preexisting life*.

Throughout nature there is abundant proof of the daily working of the law of biogenesis. No fact of science stands more conclusively proved. Evolution has not been able to provide a shred of evidence to disprove this law.

Researchers have tried to create life in the laboratory. They succeeded in producing a few amino acids by sending an electric spark through a mixture of gases. Even for this purpose, they chose a mixture of gases (methane and ammonia) that were not representative of the atmospheric environment that contains carbon dioxide, hydrogen, nitrogen, and water vapor. When experiments were repeated by other scientists using gases representative of the environment, no amino acids were created. But even if amino acids could be created in a laboratory, the scientists have never been able to create life. They have not even demonstrated the remotest possibility of life forming out of chemicals, even all the right chemicals in perfectly controlled conditions for an indefinite period of time.

Even with the advanced technology available to us today, scientists have managed to create only a handful of chemicals needed for organisms to live. They have never even been able to arrange all components necessary for life in anything resembling the simplest, tiniest single-celled organism, much less a living one.

Sir Fred Hoyle again commented on life forming out of inanimate matter: “If there were a basic principle of matter which somehow drove organic systems toward life, its existence should easily be demonstrable in the laboratory. One could, for instance, take a swimming bath to represent the primordial soup. Fill it with any chemicals of a non-biological nature you please. Pump any gases over it, or through it, you please, and shine any kind of radiation on it that takes your fancy. Let the experiment proceed for a year and see how many of those 2,000 enzymes (proteins produced by living cells) have appeared in the bath. I will give the answer, and so save the time and trouble and expense of actually doing the experiment. You will find nothing at all, except possibly for a tarry sludge composed of amino acids and other simple organic chemicals.” (*Earth*, "Life's Crucible", February 1998, p.34).

We all know and feel the effects of the law of gravity. Because of it no one will jump down from the top of the World Trade Center Tower in New Yrok to try to prove that the law is not in effect. The law of biogenesis is a similar universal law. Life can come only from preexisting life. Man simply cannot create life from non-life. Neither can blind chance. Only a living Master Designer and Planner, the original Source of all life, could have created it.

We can, therefore, conclude that the third step in the theorized process of origination of life is an impossibility. It cannot happen.

Let us now look at the theorized fourth step in the process of evolution.

***Did Complex Life Forms Evolve From Simple Life Forms?***

In the fourth step, evolutionists would have us believe that once formed by a lucky accident, the simple single-celled creature gradually and progressively evolved through tiny increments over millions of years to higher, better-adapted forms of life such as fish, amphibians, reptiles, mammals and eventually primates (apes) and man.

When Charles Darwin proposed his theory in the mid-19th century, he anticipated that fossil discoveries would provide convincing evidence in support of his ideas. He predicted that countless transitional forms would be found in the fossil record. Science writer Richard Milton writes that to prove Darwin’s theory, the missing links to be found “included every part of the animal kingdom: from whelks to whales and from bacteria to Bactrian camels. Darwin and his successors envisaged a process that would begin with simple marine organisms living in ancient seas, progressing through fishes, to amphibians – living partly in the sea and partly on land – and hence on to reptiles, mammals, and eventually the primates, including humans” (Richard Milton, *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, 1997, p. 253).

Geologist Carl Dunbar states: “Although the comparative study of living animals and plants may give very convincing circumstantial evidence, fossils provide the only historical, documentary evidence that life has evolved from simpler to more and more complex forms” (*Historical Geology*, Dunbar, 1960, p.47).

First of all, let us be clear about one thing: comparative study of living animals cannot provide proof that they evolved. All living creatures are still living because they have survived so far and are suited to their environment, and we cannot prove that they are evolving because in the short time we have to observe them in our life times, we will not notice any changes in them. To assume that one currently living creature evolved into another living creature is not proof. It is baseless conjecture, because all these living creatures are still living. If they evolved from one to the other, then higher level transitional forms should still be living. Evidence of that is nowhere to be found in the world. Circumstantial evidence obtained from comparative study of living animals, therefore, cannot be convincing. It cannot be proof of evolution. Thus according to evolutionists, the fossil record with countless transitional forms is the only way to convincingly prove that life evolved from simpler to more complex forms of life.

Evolutionists arrange fossils in various arrangements that purport to show that evolution took place. Do you know that any set of objects of a particular type can be arranged in a way that would indicate that they evolved, when in fact no evolution took place? For example take footwear of different kinds such as thong flip flops, sandals, sneakers, leather dress shoes, leather shoes that reach mid-way to the calf and finally leather boots that reach almost till the knee. Ask a group of students to arrange them from simple to more complex, following the rules of evolutionary taxonomy. They will probably arrange them in the order they were named above. The different pairs of footwear would be arranged in a way which would imply that they evolved, when in fact they did not. Just like this exercise, various fossil arrangements purporting to show that evolution took place have no basis in reality.

Thus comparative study of living animals cannot be used as proof of evolution.

Without wasting any further time, let us see what scientists say about the fossil evidence.

First of all, Darwin himself was troubled by the fossil record as it failed to support his theory. “…Why, if species have descended from other species by fine gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms?...Why do we not find them imbedded in countless numbers in the crust of the earth?” (*Origin of Species*, 1958 Masterpieces of Science edition, pp. 136-137).

He wrote, “The number of intermediate varieties, which have formerly existed, [must] be truly enormous. Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and serious objection which can be urged against the theory” (*ibid*. pp. 260-261).

Darwin, however, was convinced that later discoveries would fill in the gaps in the fossil record of transitional species. Now after a century and a half what does the fossil evidence indicate?

First of all, let us see how complete the fossil record is. Michael Denton, a medical doctor and biological researcher writes: “…when estimates are made of the percentage of [now] living forms found as fossils, the percentage turns out to be surprisingly high, suggesting that the fossil record may not be as bad as is often maintained” (*Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, 1985, p. 189).

He goes on to explain that “of the 329 living families of terrestrial vertebrates [those with backbones such as mammals, birds, reptiles and amphibians] 261 or 79.1 percent have been found as fossils and, when birds (which are poorly fossilized) are excluded, the percentage rises to 87.8 percent” (Denton, *ibid*. p. 189).

This means that almost 88 percent of the varieties of mammals, reptiles and amphibians found living on the earth have been found in the fossil record. Have any transitional forms been found among these? “…Although each of these classes [fishes, amphibians, reptiles, mammals and primates] is well represented in the fossil record, as of yet *no one has discovered a fossil creature that is indisputably transitional between one species and another species*. [The disputed ones over the years have been exposed to be deliberate frauds.] *Not a single undisputed ‘missing link’ has been found* in all the exposed rocks of the Earth’s crust despite the most careful and extensive searches” (Richard Milton, *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, 1997, pp. 253-254, emphasis added).

Harvard University paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould admits that the “extreme rarity” of evidence for evolution in the fossil record is “the trade secret of paleontology.” He further acknowledges that “the evolutionary trees that adorn our textbooks have data only at the tips and nodes of their branches [meaning apes and man himself in the assumed evolution of man, with no transitional forms]; the rest is inference, however reasonable [which in fact is illogical reasoning], not the evidence of fossils” (“Evolution’s Erratic Pace,” *Natural History*, May 1977, p. 14, emphasis added).

Is this ‘trade secret of paleontology’ shared with others? Francis Hitching, member of the Royal Archaeological Institute writes: “Reading popular and even textbook introductions to evolution…you might hardly guess that they [fossil gaps] exist, so glibly and confidently do most authors slide through them. In the absence of fossil evidence, they write what have been termed “just so” stories. A suitable mutation just happened at the crucial moment, and hey presto, a new stage of evolution was reached” (*The Neck of the Giraffe: Darwin, Evolution and the New Biology*, 1982, pp. 12-13).

If Darwin’s theory were true, the fossil record would contain innumerable transitional creatures such as invertebrates with various stages of partially developed backbones, fish with primitive legs, reptiles with elementary wings and so on at various stages of development. But no such creatures exist. They are completely absent from the fossil record.

*Conclusion*: fossil evidence does not support evolution. In fact, this lack of evidence unequivocally disproves evolution. The fourth step in evolution, that life evolved from simpler life forms to more complex life forms did not occur. Man did not evolve.

***What the Fossil Record Really Proves***

If traditional evolutionary theory were true, the fossil record would have the following features:

* Simpler life forms would gradually appear.
* Simpler life forms would gradually evolve over time into more complex life forms.
* There would be numerous transitional links between different kinds of creatures such as fish and reptiles, and reptiles and birds.
* These transitional creatures would have partial features such as new limbs, bones and organs in various stages of development.
* The less complex life forms would become extinct. For example, if chimpanzees evolved into man, then there is no logical reason why chimpanzees should still exist. All should have evolved into man.

On the other hand, if the biblical account of creation is true, the fossil record would have the following features:

* Complex life forms would suddenly appear.
* Complex life forms would multiply “after their kinds” (Genesis 6:20), but with limited variety within those kinds. All the varieties and species of animals within the kind would be able to interbreed.
* There would be no transitional links between kinds of creatures.
* There would be no creatures with partial features such as new limbs, bones and organs; all parts would be complete and fully functional.
* Various kinds of creatures would continue to co-exist.

After years of study and research, what does the fossil record show? It contains all the features predicted if the biblical account of creation is true.

Conclusion: IT IS IMPOSSIBLE FOR LIFE TO HAVE EVOLVED!

We have seen that diehard evolutionists like Richard Dawkins have admitted that life could not have originated by chance. Why then do others keep putting forth irrational criticisms of Hoyle & Wickramasinghe’s probability calculations for formation of all the proteins necessary for producing the simplest living organisms by random combinations of amino acids? Evolutionist paleontologists like Harvard’s Stephen Gould and many others have admitted that the fossil record has not provided evidence for evolution. Why then do they continue to preach evolution?

Will these irrational arguments and criticisms ever end? Not until Satan (the true source of them) remains the ruler of the earth. He and his agents do not seek the truth. Their goal is deception, for Satan deceives the whole world (Revelation 12:9). They will continue to invent arguments against creation by an all-wise God without end. But H&W with their pioneering work have destroyed the argument of the evolutionists for good, as many honest scientists have acknowledged.

God anticipated these criticisms and described the mindset of Satan’s agents through the apostle Paul: “For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. 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: because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imagination, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools.” (Romans 1:18-22).

Creation is proof of the existence of God, and these evolutionist scientists know it. They too see that proof in the creation. But because they do not want to acknowledge God, they will continue to invent arguments without end to deceive people into believing otherwise. The account of how life came into being in Genesis 1 is the only true account.

Most of this information is provided in the United Church of God booklet titled “*Creation or Evolution: Does it Really Matter What You Believe*?” You may order your copy, read online or download it free of charge without any obligation at www.ucg.org