

Seven Absurdities of Evolution

Many Christian leaders have defected, choosing to believe in evolution rather than taking the creation account in Genesis literally. Many think they are doing this for scientific reasons, if so, I hope reading this will cause them to reconsider.

1. In the "Big Bang", nothing went Bang!

The *New York Times* 5/22/01: "Nevertheless, most cosmologists, including Dr. Guth and Dr. Linde, agree that the universe ultimately must come from somewhere, and that **nothing is the leading candidate.**"

AND

A scientist at www.big-bang-theory.com says, "Discoveries in astronomy and physics have shown beyond a reasonable doubt that our universe did in fact have a beginning. Prior to that moment there was nothing; during and after that moment there was something: our universe."

To believe that the universe comes from nothing is not being scientific. Evolutionists will not allow intelligent design into the classroom because it is unobservable, and un-testable, yet neither is this. The real question is; is this a statement of faith or gullibility?

2. If it takes a star to make a star, how did we get the first star?

According to the theory of evolution, the big bang created a universe full of hydrogen. Through gravitational attraction, the hydrogen came together to form the first generation of stars. This theory fails to recognize that it takes a celestial body several times larger than the earth to have enough gravitational attraction to contain the hydrogen.

Read how a 2007 college textbook describes how stars are born.

Theoretically, stars are born from swirling clouds of hydrogen gas in the deep space between other stars. [...] These clouds consist of random, swirling atoms of gases that have little gravitational attraction for one another because they have little mass. Complex motions of stars, however, can produce a shock wave that causes particles to move closer together and collide, making local compressions. Their mutual gravitational attraction then begins to pull them together into a cluster. (Bill W. Tillery, *Physical Science* 7th edition)

Tillery does not explain how and what kind of complex motions stars can make, or how the first complex stars were born without this help. Without the preexistence of huge celestial bodies (stars), other stars cannot form from hydrogen anymore then the helium will stay bound together after you pop a balloon.

3. Where do the heavy elements come from?

Fusing light elements (like hydrogen or helium) will release energy. Cosmologists believe this is why stars shine. However, to fuse elements heavier than iron, you will need an external source of energy. Where does the external energy to create the heavier elements come from? It is only a statement of faith to believe that the heat

generated from gravitational contraction is powerful enough to fuse the potential energy into plutonium or uranium.

4. Life in a test-tube?

No, the Miller-Urey experiment in 1952 took methane, ammonia, hydrogen and water, added a spark and created two amino acids. It did not create any DNA or the complex system necessary to read DNA. The experiment did not create proteins or the equipment to fold the proteins into useful structures necessary for a living cell. Even with intelligence, a controlled environment and chemicals man cannot create life. Miller-Urey experiment created more problems for evolutionists than it solved, but you are not supposed to know that.

5. Mutations do not create an increase in information.

Nature has variations and mutations. But mutations mean a scrambling of preexisting information. There is no increase in information. Experiments on fruit flies did create a new four-winged fruit fly. The fact remains that the fruit fly already contained all the information in its DNA to create this extra set of wings. The harmful mutation (the fly could no longer fly) simply put an extra set of wings in the wrong place. Because it cannot fly with four wings, genetic mutations will cause the information for flight to actually be lost. In time, even if you reversed the mutation that caused the four wings, it would no longer be able to fly.

6. The problem of irreducible complexity.

Remove one piece from a mousetrap and it will cease to function, that is because it is an irreducibly complex system. It must have a spring loaded hammer, a platform, and a catch to work as a mousetrap. Nature has many irreducibly complex systems. A simple example is the human cell. For the first replicating human cell to have evolved it must have contained DNA. Before the DNA could be useful to give "life's instructions" to the cell, it must be copied into "messenger RNA". It must also contain "transfer RNA" to bring the amino acids to match the DNA. In addition the cell must have an internal station to connect amino acids, a ribosome, and an internal energy generator, the mitochondria. The mitochondria must have an external system that can transport oxygen and carbon dioxide to and from the cell. The cell also needs cytoplasm, internal fluid and cytoskeleton to keep from collapsing. While this picture of the cell is grossly over simplified, the fact remains that the cell could not have evolved piece by piece over a long period of time. Without every one of these systems in place and fully functioning the cell will die. For something as complex as a cell to evolve, it would take a miracle.

7. The most irreducibly complex system

There is no earthly machination that can create a soul. Scientists have created artificial intelligence, yet they cannot create a soul that has understanding, that feels joy and other emotions. It is in choosing evolution and rejecting the Intelligent Designer, that you are putting at stake this irreducibly complex system.

Wrapping up

Even if you disagree with one of these arguments, that will not solve your problem. All seven of these points (along with many others) need a rational explanation before evolution can become a scientific fact, rather than just a *Statement of Faith*.