

Video Transcript: Evolution Versus Creation: Why Evolution is Wrong

Slide 2: Introduction

In the previous video in this series, I argued that evolution is as much a faith-based belief as the creationist view.

I noted that evolution has never been observed in thousands of years of domestic breeding, is not evident in the fossils, and has never been reproduced in the laboratory.

By contrast, special creation is consistent with the observations of the world in which we live. All that has ever been directly observed is a well-designed universe governed by immutable laws.

In this video, I provide a summary of the key scientific evidence against the theory of evolution and in support of the creationist view as the best explanation for the origin of life.

Slide 3: Matter Cannot Arise Out of Nothing

Evolution requires that matter created itself out of nothing. This is simply not possible. There are no physical laws that we know of by which something can create itself out of nothing.

If there was ever a time when there was truly nothing, there could never be anything – R. C. Sproul.

The fact that the universe exists at all is testament to the existence of a powerful and intelligent Creator who is greater than, and external to, the Creation itself.

By faith we understand that the universe was formed at God's command, so that what is seen was not made out of what was visible (Hebrews 11:3).

Slide 4: Order Cannot Arise Out of Disorder

No physical laws have been identified to support the notion that chaos can transform itself into order. The law of entropy states the reverse – that any complex system will naturally tend towards disorder unless external energy is input to maintain the system or build it up.

By contrast, the Bible reveals that it was God who filled darkness with light, emptiness with creation, and formlessness with a myriad of wondrous forms.

And it was God who cursed his creation because of the sin of mankind:

For the creation was subjected to frustration, not by its own choice, but by the will of the one who subjected it, in the hope that the creation itself will be liberated from its bondage to decay and brought into the glorious freedom of the children of God (Romans 8:20-21).

Slide 5: Life Cannot Arise From Non-living Matter

Nothing in biology or chemistry indicates that life can arise spontaneously from non-living matter.

To their chagrin [scientists] have no clear-cut answer, because chemists have never succeeded in reproducing nature's experiments on the creation of life out of non-living matter. Scientists do not know how that happened ... Scientists have no proof that life was not the result of an act of creation – Robert Jastrow (astronomer and evolutionist).

Life is a property of organisation, not matter. It is having all the right molecules arranged in exactly the right way in exactly the right quantities and at exactly the right times that transforms mindless matter into a living organism.

The creationist model holds that God is the designer and builder of all living things.

Slide 6: Living Things Are Too Complex

Even the simplest, single-celled organisms are extremely complex.

For a start, the DNA and RNA molecules required to store and transfer genetic information are themselves astonishingly complex, and beyond anything that could be produced by random-chance chemical reactions.

But there are many other complex structures and components in living cells, each with its own specific function.

And all this cellular “machinery” works together in a precisely organised way to carry out the chemical processes needed for life. If any one component is missing, the cell will die.

Slide 7: Living Things Are Too Complex

The same is true of the larger components of an organism, such as the eye. Unless all the parts of the eye existed from the outset, it would not function properly, and therefore would have no survival value.

The eye appears to have been designed; no designer of telescopes could have done better ... It is hard to accept the evolution of the human eye as a product of chance; it is even harder to accept the evolution of the human intelligence as the product of random disruptions in the brain cells of our ancestors – Robert Jastrow (astronomer and evolutionist).

The high degree of complexity in living things required to ensure their survival means that life could not have evolved by a gradual process of transformation from simple to complex, since complexity is required from the outset.

Irreducible complexity points to intelligent design.

Slide 8: Random Processes Cannot Create

Random processes are not observed to create increasing order and complexity. Instead, the observation of life is that random processes tend to break things – they don’t create complexity, they destroy it!

An accident, a random change, in any delicate mechanism can hardly be expected to improve it. Poking a stick into the machinery of one’s watch or one’s radio set will seldom make it work better – Theodosius Dobzhansky.

For evolution to create a single useful feature, not one accident but a whole series of them would be required. Furthermore, each subsequent accident would have to add something useful to the previous ones in order to transform very simple things into very complex things.

The probability of life originating from an accident is comparable to the probability of the unabridged dictionary resulting from an explosion in a printing shop – Edwin Conklin (biologist).

Slide 9: Time Does Not Help

The evolutionary formula is:

$$\text{time} + \text{matter} + \text{chance} = \text{life.}$$

But time does not help to create complexity.

For one thing, it does not increase the chances of creating order out of chaos. Any order derived by an accident at any point in time could just as easily be lost with ongoing time.

In an ever changing random-chance process, nothing exists to ensure that any order created is subsequently retained as a basis for increasing order and complexity.

Furthermore, the enormously complex features evident in life require all the various components to be present at the same time in order to function properly. A half developed eye, for example, is completely useless, and has no survival value at all.

Slide 10: Time Does Not Help

In this sense time is the *enemy* of evolution, since it demands impossible numbers of highly improbable accidents to occur at the same time and in the correct order.

If one is not prejudiced either by social beliefs or by a scientific training into the conviction that life originated [spontaneously] on earth, this simple calculation [the mathematical odds against it] wipes the idea entirely out of court – Sir Fred Hoyle and Prof. Chandra Wickramasinghe (astronomers).

Slide 11: Biology Does Not Indicate Evolution

The numerous examples in biology of complex and sophisticated features and behaviours, such as the various types of eyes and methods of communication, do not indicate development from simple forms.

The consistent evidence is that there are no simple forms, or precursory steps, from which even relatively simple features could have arisen while remaining useful and functional.

The numerous examples of symbiosis (organisms that live in partnership with each other) also point to design in creation.

Symbiotic relationships not only exist between “intelligent” organisms, but also between insects, bacteria and plants. These behaviours could not arise by chance, but must have been designed into the organisms from the outset.

Slide 12: Biology Does Not Indicate Evolution

The numerous examples of so-called “parallel evolution” in which completely different species are supposed to have developed similar features or skills on different evolutionary paths also contradict the random-chance premise of evolution.

It is not reasonable to conclude that the improbable accumulation of accidents to create some useful feature in one species also occurred independently, but at a similar time, in other species.

It is much more reasonable to accept the creationist view of there being a common designer who has elected to use common design features in different organisms.

The observation of biology is that living organisms are the product of specialised design, and not random-chance evolutionary processes.

Slide 13: Natural Selection Is Not Evolution

It is well known that natural selection helps to ensure the survival of species against changing environmental conditions.

However, natural selection has never been observed to produce new kinds of creatures.

It has only ever been observed to produce variations within existing kinds – merely shifts in population.

The evidence from experiments is that natural selection encourages existing genetic potential to emerge (i.e., the variability is already in the gene pool), but does not give rise to new genetic information.

Scientists also now recognise the difficulty of defining “fitness”. Survival depends on far more factors than just strength or aggression. For example, beauty, isolation, cunning, caution, size, and, more often than not, sheer luck are important factors.

Slide 14: Genetic Mutations Do Not Help

Genetic mutations are mistakes that occur when the DNA molecule is being copied during reproduction.

They are fairly rare, but are certainly real, and have been observed to cause changes in traits.

However, they have never been observed to create new traits, which would require new genetic information to be added to the DNA.

In regard to speciation, genetic mutations are either “neutral” or “destructive”.

Neutral mutations simply rearrange existing genetic information to produce variations within existing kinds, but never give rise to new information which could lead to new features or new kinds of creatures.

Destructive mutations result in deformities, diseases, impairments, and over-specialisation, all of which result from a *loss* of genetic information.

Slide 15: Genetic Mutations Do Not Help

Studies have also shown that cells manufacture special enzymes to repair genetic damage to DNA.

While variations in the DNA of the offspring are successfully achieved by the shuffling of genetic material from the parents, variations due to genetic mutations are resisted.

This is because accidental changes are more likely to result in negative outcomes which do not favour an organism’s chances of survival.

Another critical flaw with appealing to genetic mutations as a primary agent of change, is that they presuppose special creation.

Mutations point back to creation because they are only changes in already existing genes.

This begs the question: “Where did the genes come from in the first place so that they could be subject to change?”

Slide 16: Life Requires Pre-existent Information

Information is an essential prerequisite for everything that exists in the universe, along with matter and energy.

All three – information, matter and energy – must have existed at the outset for the universe to exist at all.

For example, plants grow by using sunlight, water, and carbon dioxide because their DNA contains instructions for the use of these energy sources. In the same way, mouse DNA contains all the instructions needed for the proper functioning of a mouse. There is nothing in its DNA that will allow it to function as some other kind of creature.

Information requires an intelligent prime source. It cannot arise by itself even if matter and energy are already present.

By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, their starry host by the breath of his mouth (Psalm 33:6)

Slide 17: The Fossil Record Supports Special Creation

If evolution is true, then the fossil record should contain countless examples of simple life forms gradually appearing and transforming into more complex ones.

For special creation to be true, we would expect to find complex life forms suddenly appearing in the fossil record with variations within kinds, but no transitional links, and no partial body features; all parts complete.

After more than 150 years of intensive investigation, the fossil record overwhelmingly supports special creation, and contradicts evolution.

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 could be urged against the theory – Charles Darwin.

Slide 17: The Cosmos Appears to be Designed

Perhaps the clearest and simplest evidence for special creation is the marvellous design we see in the world around us.

The myriad wonders of plants and animals, of the sky and the sea, of planets and galaxies, of atoms and molecules – all of these things point to an intelligent and purposeful Creator.

This is not a statement of religion, but of simple observation.

No building, or car, or computer was every created by random-chance processes. Instead, enormous amounts of intelligence went into the making of them. Yet they are all very simple compared to a human being, or an eye, or the chemical machinery in a living cell.

It is not reasonable to conclude that things made by people require intelligent design while the much more sophisticated things of nature do not.

Slide 18: Conclusions

The theory of evolution does not stand up to critical examination. It is a creation myth which eliminates the need for a Creator. But the observational evidence does not support evolution.

The creationist view is still the most rational and realistic explanation for the cosmos. All that has ever been directly observed is a well-designed universe governed by immutable laws.

The most logical interpretation is that behind the cosmos lies an intelligent, purposeful, and powerful designer and law maker, the God of the Bible.

For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities – his eternal power and divine nature – have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse (Romans 1:20).