

Five Barriers to Belief in Evolution

Abstract

There are at least five grand barriers to the logical acceptance of the theory of evolution. Only an overwhelming faith in atheism can overcome these logical barriers.

1. The beginning of life and common descent
2. DNA – its existence
3. DNA – self correction
4. Sexual reproduction, including mating selection rituals
5. Evolution requires a nearly infinite number of mass extinctions

There are at least five grand barriers to any logical acceptance of the theory of evolution. Only an overwhelming faith in atheism, scientism, and materialism can overcome these logical barriers.

1. The beginning of life and common descent

The beginning of life

We should begin by observing that the evolutionists have no plausible explanation for the origin of life. They simply conclude that, since there is life on this planet, there had to be some origin of life sometime, somewhere, but the best they can do is to say that it probably happened on earth sometime in the past 4 billion years. They have no explanation as to the conditions under which this could have happened.

We should also observe that at least ever since the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species* in 1859 scientists have been trying to create life in the laboratory, but without any success. Some vaguely biochemical precipitate in the bottom of a flask is the best that anyone has claimed. The enormous sophistication in biochemistry that has occurred since the discovery of DNA in 1953 has not helped, but rather has made the problem of explanation more difficult. It was first thought that cells were a simple blob of protoplasm, but more recent science has shown individual cells to contain tens of thousands or even millions of complex subcomponents.

Apparently, it is common knowledge among microbiologists that the only proteins which are suitable for use in life mechanisms are all "left-handed." One of the big problems with the "spontaneous generation of life" experiments is that the generic "lightning in a bottle" kinds of reactions produce equal numbers of left-handed and right-handed proteins. Introducing a single right-handed protein into a biochemical structure would thus ensure that it could never become part of life as we know it today.

Darwin believed avidly in spontaneous generation, meaning that he believed that billions of new lifeforms came into existence every day from such simple things as soil, manure, rags, etc. For him, there was no problem about the origin of life, but only the question of how life differentiated itself into multiple species. To him, the only question was "How could a rat become a giraffe?" Later Darwinists have tried to sweep that "spontaneous generation" absurdity under the rug, but they still have no replacement explanation.

Louis Pasteur was a serious scientist who conducted some careful experiments during Darwin's life. He made a great contribution to the preservation of food products by showing that once the various microscopic lifeforms had been killed through heating, they did not recur unless they were reintroduced through some kind of contamination. Darwin would not accept the conclusions of Pasteur, but insisted that, since all the components of life were there in the liquid, they would surely reunite themselves into lifeforms, given enough time. Darwin has been shown to be wrong on this a nearly endless number of

times, but, since they have no alternative, his followers today still believe in the magic of spontaneous generation.

Common descent – the biological Big Bang theory

The concept behind the "common descent" theory is that all life of any sort descended from a single instance of a living organism coming into existence on this planet.

This biological Big Bang theory is exactly like the physics-related Big Bang theory, in which all of the nearly infinite features of the entire universe were specified and determined by a single point-sized speck of super-matter that exploded to become and determine the entire universe. That speck of super-matter is unknown and, conveniently, unknowable. The physics-related Big Bang theory is nothing more than a way to hide our massive ignorance of the nature and history of the universe, while pretending to be extremely smart – a rhetorical ploy, a Jedi mind trick, to fool and control the scientifically ignorant masses, and to keep them from suspecting that the wizard behind the curtain is nothing but a charlatan.

Similarly, the rhetorical purpose of this biological "Big Bang" is to cover all of our biological ignorance exactly like the physics "Big Bang" which is meant to cover all our ignorance concerning physics and the universe. In both cases it is nothing more than a clever but deceptive way to make our ignorance into a psychological weapon – an illusion, a bit of sleight-of-hand. It is also perfectly analogous to the Christian *ex nihilo* "from nothing" argument. It is another matter of extreme faith, really a way to avoid all the hard questions by lumping them all together and making up a good story about them like the many other myths and legends societies have produced to explain the unexplainable.

Apparently, the evolutionist rhetoricians consider it more advantageous to stick with the pure Immaculate Conception biological Big Bang (informationally empty) theory rather than get off into the weeds of dealing with any particular more detailed explanations. For example, there is good evidence of perhaps 50 separate beginnings of unique body types and lifeforms in the Burgess Shale.¹ However, this has at least two uncomfortable logical consequences. It makes it look like spontaneous generation is a common event. If it is so easy to do, why can't they replicate it today in the laboratory? OR, it makes it look like there might be a designer who has a kit of techniques and structures who can generate unique new lifeforms at will. Countering that intelligent design inference and argument is the whole purpose of atheistic theorizing, so it cannot be supported or even mentioned in public lest the Christians make some rhetorical gains.

2. DNA – its existence

The DNA molecule was first discovered in 1953. Since then, scientists have tried to unravel its staggering complexity. Everyone agrees that DNA requires the complex and perfect arrangement of at least 6 billion bits of information, which is about the equivalent of 2000 large and complex textbooks, at least for humans.⁴ So one could easily sense that having life and complete DNA all happen at the same time is extremely unlikely or impossible – not one chance in a trillion trillion trillion. But one chance event would still not be all that significant, if all the right information and instructions were not present to not only establish life but to maintain it in all its stages. How does DNA become imbued with all the detailed instructions of how to make the eye of a human child grow from 75% of adult size to adult size, while maintaining all appropriate functions? It would take more zeros than we could write down to guess at the number of false attempts it would take by trial and error to first establish the perfect eye, and then establish the perfect maintenance regime.

One conclusion scientists have reached, probably quite reluctantly, is that in order to have any kind of a creature, the complete DNA for that creature must first be constructed in some way. The information precedes the creature. In other words, if one is contemplating a change from one existing species to some small modification to that species, the only way that can happen is for the DNA structures to be changed first by some mutation process. (There have been theories propounded at various times that a living organism can change its own DNA, and thus its progeny, through its own experience and behavior. If true, this would certainly speed up the "descent with modification" process. However, there is no evidence that this happens.)

That "information first" requirement is an extreme constraint on what "descent with modification" can accomplish. There is only an extremely small bandwidth for these changes to occur. And in nearly all cases, mutations to DNA are detrimental to the creature. There is a whole field of medicine which studies the damaging mutations to skin cells, for example. In other words, peoples' skin cells do not typically get better through mutation.

Notice that in all of this, there is no serious attempt to explain where DNA came from. All their calculations about mutations start with the assumption that full-blown DNA, in all its complexity, already exists. How might an ancient creature analyze itself thoroughly, on every level, including instinctive behavior, and then embed all that information in a strand of DNA so that it could then divide its DNA and reproduce? This is not something that can be explained by gradual random change.

3. DNA – self correction

Most DNA structures for large creatures have at least three layers of built-in self-correction protocols.² One might guess from this that one of the underlying assumptions of life is that it should be as stable as possible. I have read that creatures such as the alligator and crocodile have remained unchanged for millions of years. I recall reading one study of trilobite fossils that covered a 3-million year period. Only one tiny change was noticed over that rather long time period -- an increase of one in the number of ridges that appear on its body.

In another study using E. coli bacteria, a period of 30,000 generations was studied over about 20 years. That might be equal to 1 million years in human generations. The only change noted in that study was an apparently new ability to use a certain substance as food. A new enzyme made this possible. However, I don't believe it was clear whether that enzyme was randomly and spontaneously developed to deal with this new situation, or whether this was an inherent feature of the E. coli bacteria which only made itself manifest in a stress situation.

The lesson from these two studies is that changes in creatures over time are extremely slow and tenuous. Evolutionists often blithely speak of enormous numbers of discrete changes in species that take place over time periods of less than 1 million years. Apparently this only occurs in their fertile imaginations, because the real world does not show evidence of changes happening that quickly.

With its godlike powers of prescience, the random process of evolution would surely want to make it easy for creatures to morph into something else. Surely it would have realized that if you have three or more layers of protection against damage and mutation to DNA components, that will make it extremely difficult to develop new species. Why would evolution act so strongly against its own interests? "A house divided against itself cannot stand." (added 8/14/2012)

4. Sexual reproduction, including mating selection rituals

Advocates of evolution would have a much simpler time of it if we found that all life forms on the planet reproduced asexually. One amoeba subdividing itself into two amoebas is a fairly simple process, which also means that the change in a single creature through some form of mutation can immediately be passed on to the next generation of that creature type.

However, the mere fact that most multicellular creatures reproduce sexually is another enormous barrier to the evolutionary theories of "descent with modification." If a single mutated creature is born in a population, and that mutation is to be preserved, that creature must mate with a creature of the opposite sex which also has that same mutation. Otherwise, it is extremely likely that the mutation will go nowhere at all. But what are the chances of two of these creatures in a large, perhaps worldwide population ever meeting up for mating and reproduction? Obviously, the chances of such an encounter are extremely small.

There is also the interesting problem of getting past the mating ritual process which occurs for many

species. During the mating ritual, the creatures examine each other in various ways, with the emphasis on each side of the equation making the optimum mating choice. If a newly mutated creature is noticeably different from all the others, that would make it highly unlikely that he or she would be chosen as a mate by any other creature. Even if the two mutated creatures, one of each sex, were to meet, the instinctive mating ritual process would probably cause them to eliminate the other. It seems highly unlikely that one would see synchronized mutations which change physical characteristics while also making changes to the instinctive mating patterns of that creature.

5. Evolution requires a nearly infinite number of mass extinctions

The basic logic of "descent with modification" is that once a mutation occurs, and it proves to be an improvement in some way, then all the other creatures of a similar type must be eliminated. Supposedly this elimination occurs because of the natural superiority of the new creature as that creature takes over the niche and drives out all the others.

But let's think for a moment what that actually means. If we have a large creature like a whale, and some small evolutionary improvement occurs, and somehow that improvement survives the many barriers, including the sexual reproduction barriers, unless we are to have an infinite series of slightly different whale species, there needs to be a mass extinction of potentially millions of whales of the old "inferior" type.

In the first place, these mutations are extremely unlikely to happen unless there is already a large population of a particular species. And then as soon as one of these mutations occurs, all the other creatures of that type must be quickly eliminated. So we necessarily have millions of these creatures to be disposed of. First of all, that is unlikely to happen unless the advantage of the new creature is quite extreme. And if it does happen, and we have many thousands of cycles of nearly complete extinctions of species, as the "descent with modification" process grinds on, we would also expect to see enormous evidence of these regular mass extinctions. If we had enough whale bodies to fill the Atlantic Ocean or to cover the entire Earth one or two bodies deep, this is something we might have noticed in our study of archaeology and paleontology. In fact, for this "descent with modification" process to be an accurate description, it is necessary for this regular mass extinction to happen millions of times for millions of species. In other words, we should expect most of the mass of our Earth to be made up almost entirely of the bones and other remains of large creatures. Our "fossil record" should be so overwhelming as to possibly threaten the existence of any later large multicellular creatures.

The "worldwide" nature of the necessary extinctions also adds some troubling difficulties. If we are only considering one creature operating in a very small and isolated niche, such as a small island in the Pacific, then perhaps this "descent with modification" might work, assuming that small niche can be completely taken over by the new "superior" creature. (But note that we have the other problem here, that there may not be enough of a population of that particular creature available for those mutations to occur and the sexual reproduction barriers and other barriers to be overcome.)

But what happens with whales who might roam the entire oceans of the world, or the rats and cockroaches which seem to inhabit almost every known space on the planet? It is simply impossible to expect this large number of widely scattered creatures to all be terminated within a reasonable time so that a single species can keep its evolutionary progress intact. It is far more likely that we should expect to see thousands or millions of microscopically graduated sub-species within every larger species.

What happens if we try to apply this thinking to humans? Do we see a single human type which controls all the planet, or do we see hundreds or thousands of different variations in size, color, etc.? Obviously, it is the latter. We can conclude from this that we did not have a series of worldwide mass extinctions of all competing humans in the past. That is what would be necessary for us to have a single type today.

And yet, physiologically, there are extreme similarities among these various sub-species. Do we insist that in the past there were in fact millions of mass extinctions of humans worldwide, so that some of the tiniest details of physiology are common to all humans, or are we willing to consider for a moment that

there was originally a well-designed human which had all the necessary microscopically detailed physiological features, and then we see today what are relatively minor variations from that "intelligently and completely designed" first human. Trillions of dead carcasses hang in the balance.

My favorite example is the ability of the human body to adapt for a deficiency of salt. Apparently, without enough salt, the blood volume is not as large as it should be. So to keep the blood pressure up, the body generates a hormone which constricts the blood passageways to adapt for the lack of salt. Now, is someone going to tell me that this highly refined mechanism for adapting to a deficiency of salt was perhaps developed by some group of people living in the Sahara desert, and then those people gave rise to the death and replacement of all other people on the globe so that this one tiny feature became a worldwide fact of physiology? Just propagating that one tiny feature worldwide would probably have required the deaths of many millions of humans. Likewise, the propagating of any other such tiny feature worldwide would have the same effect of necessarily causing the deaths of millions of humans. If we have thus had hundreds of billions of deaths of humans worldwide as part of the evolutionary process of "descent with modification," then we should be in the situation of having to clear away mountains of bones in order to build a house, much like we might clear a forest to make room for our living space.

In summary, if descent with modification is the driving force of the creation of all species, then we should see either a nearly infinite continuum of species variation (a nearly complete collection of living fossils), or a nearly infinite number of bones (an enormous dead fossil record). We see neither, indicating that the overwhelming bulk of species are the result of individual, unique design for a specific purpose such as the domesticated dogs, horses, cows, and chickens, that so well meet the needs of humans. Isn't it "lucky" that there are large creatures like cows that are designed to eat grass and are not meat eaters (threatening humans)? How convenient for humans.

Other general and rhetorical considerations

The many definitions of science

The advocates of evolution are continually changing the definition of "science" to meet the needs of their argument of the moment. Most people think of "science" as being the careful observation and measurement of things found in the physical world, such as measuring the force of gravity to four decimal places. The evolutionist rhetoricians often take advantage of this basic assumption of people and misuse it for their rhetorical and political purposes.

The bureaucratic definition

For example, in the famous Dover case, the ACLU lawyers defending the extreme evolutionist position concerning the curtailing of freedom of speech in the science classroom argued that nothing can be "science" unless it has been approved and published by that very small group of people who control the scientific journals. Of course this would mean that the writings of Isaac Newton and Galileo and Marconi and Darwin himself could never be considered "science" because they published books on their topics without passing their materials through at least one of the editorial boards of a small group of scientific journals. This is obviously an absurd level of censorship to be given the current self-interested arbiters of what is "science." That is always what is wrong with any current paradigm of science: the old men holding bureaucratic power in a scientific field must first die before the differing ideas of younger men can be seriously considered.

The polling definition

A variation on the "no journal, no science" bureaucratic argument might be called a political or "beauty contest" definition. Sometimes when advocates of evolution speak of "science," they mean the current opinions they believe are held by the majority of scientists. Of course, real "science" is not determined by a polling process. It is only determined by actual experimentation and careful measurement. It is quite possible for the opinions of the majority of working scientists to be completely wrong, as it has been so often in the past. That is the very definition of a "paradigm shift" in science, when a certain set of assumptions that has controlled scientific activity are shown to be wrong. Of course, when evolution advocates speak of "science" in this opinion-poll definition of science, they always state it as though every

last living scientist on the planet agrees with them in a monolithic way, and the issue is settled for all time. In fact, of course, it is easy to find many thousands of working scientists who do not agree with the evolutionist position on many points. Covering up this diversity of opinion amounts to fraud and manipulation and even bullying. To keep the playing field level in discussions of evolution, the opponents of evolution ought to challenge these spurious and deceptive definitions of "science" whenever they arise.

Too much, too little, just right

There is one important piece still missing from the evolution theory, and that has to do with the actual force and range of evolutionary activity. In one breath the evolutionists will say that there are no limits to the power of evolution, no logical difficulty that it cannot overcome. In another breath they will say that there are a host of things it cannot accomplish. And in the third breath, they will claim that evolution has the wisdom and ability to get everything "just right."

Of course, these kinds of general claims cannot all be true at once. If there are no limits to the range and power of evolutionary forces, then we should see on the Earth examples of every conceivable and possible life form, all at once, rather than the mere 10 million species we see today. Why would any species ever disappear, if a tiny modification in its features or behavior could save it? There are plenty of places on the earth suitable for being inhabited by dinosaurs, so why are those niches not full of dinosaurs, along with what other life forms may be there today? There are a certain limited number of diseases which have threatened men throughout time. Why don't we see a nearly infinite number of these disease organisms waiting to attack humans and all other large creatures? Why are we spared the difficulty of having to fight off thousands of these creatures rather than just a handful?

Malaria is an interesting example. It seems somewhat arbitrary that this lethal organism should be so limited in its ability to spread worldwide. Mosquitoes and warm-blooded animals are found at every latitude to form a hosting system. There seems no particular logical reason why a small adaptation of the malaria organism and the mosquitoes should not be able to overcome any minor weather limitations.⁴

The evolutionists seem to be arguing with *Candide* that the world we have is "the best of all possible worlds," and there could be none better from an evolutionary standpoint. It is suspiciously convenient that their computations of the range and power of evolutionary forces just happen to coincide with what actually exists on the Earth. When some scientists have tried to establish through experimentation the actual range of change open to evolutionary forces, others have resisted hysterically any attempts to establish any limits.⁹ This is apparently one point at which dogma and experimentation are not able to coexist.

Junk DNA or extra complexity?

I don't know if it's current, but there have been times in the past when the amount of data storage space in the human DNA molecule has been thought to be excessive, with perhaps 90% of the molecule serving no known purpose. It is likely that this "extra" DNA is devoted to all the many maintenance functions required to support any particular observable feature. However, if the "junk DNA" hypothesis is correct, we might wonder if the DNA molecule which we possess was actually designed for or originated with a creature with 10 times our complexity, and we have descended and/or degenerated from that more complex form. Perhaps we should be looking for that more complex form rather than being so self-centered as to think that man today is the highest form. I mostly mentioned this issue to help open up the mind to other possibilities than that limited set of possibilities encompassed within the current thinking concerning evolution. We already have too much "just so" reasoning going on, which is really rationalization in nature rather than truly analytical.

A fascinating body structure – "Evolve that"

"The trochlea of superior oblique is a pulley structure in the eye. The tendon of the superior oblique muscle passes through it."³ This unique structure allows a muscle near the back of the eye to rotate the eyeball through the use of a force-reversing pulley. Theoretically, the changes brought about by evolutionary mutation and descent with modification must be random and incremental in nature while remaining useful at all times. This means that a particular structure might have one purpose at one time and another purpose in another time. However, it stretches credulity to the breaking point to imagine how

one could incrementally establish a structure like the tendon of the superior oblique muscle and the related trochlea or pulley, with changing useful purposes along the way. It all looks so purpose-built, that imagining an intermediate stage where it performs an intermediate function truly does boggle the mind. "Evolve that" seems like a reasonable challenge to lay at the feet of the evolutionists, meaning they need to supply a plausible series of steps for the development of this feature, preferably supplying evidence of the reasonableness of each step along the way.

The source of morality

Rather than seek after the highest moral learning that man has found or constructed, through the work of prophets, philosophers, historians, legal scholars, etc., the evolutionists have a strong tendency to look to the animal and physical world for moral guidance. The behavior of groundhogs, primates, and chemical bonding patterns, as in DNA genes, may take precedence over the moral observations and reasonings accumulated by men over millennia from multiple sources. One might guess that those who are interested in evolution would be interested in evolution of all types and on all levels. But their devotion to atheism, scientism, and materialism seems to also draw them to reject every field of human learning except physical science and speculations on physical science. Their monomaniacal devotion to physical science can make them seem willfully ignorant of much that is important to human life. Perhaps it is nothing more than a kind of narrow guild mentality where they become unable to apprehend the world except in terms of their craft and profession. Their narrowminded partisanship is not an endearing quality.

Making a personal choice

Some people would say that it's okay to believe in theism and atheism at the same time, to compromise between religion and evolution, perhaps accepting a little bit of each. But it is not too difficult to see the logical problem there.

There are those who would say that religion and evolution are different kinds of information so they needn't be consistent, and one can believe one thing in one realm and another thing in another realm. That seems to be mostly an argument invented by the atheists/evolutionists to "soften up" their religious opponents using some salami tactics.

But here is the problem with that: either there is a Christian God who has arranged for there to be life after this, or there isn't, as asserted by the materialist atheists/evolutionists. Either there is a God who is powerful enough to resurrect us instantly, a feat at least as complicated as evolving man in the first place, according to evolution, or there isn't. Either God helped create this earth and the life that is on it, or he didn't. Some would note the difference between theism and deism: with deism, one might admit that there was a God a few billion years ago who had something to do with getting the earth and its life going and then has not been back since, as opposed to theism which assumes there is a powerful living God who hears and answers prayers and continually affects our lives.

How do you pick and choose and mix-and-match among these different possibilities?

Some people choose to compromise between theism and atheism by saying that perhaps God used the process of evolution to create life on earth. If God chose evolution over direct creation, there seem to be 3 possible explanations: 1) God did not have the knowledge to do it any other way, 2) God did not have the power to do it any other way, 3) God had nothing better to do, so he decided to spend billions of years overseeing and influencing the development of every microscopic protein and enzyme that makes up life in all its forms.

Since many religions believe that we were created in the image of God, it seems likely that God would have the knowledge of how to build a body like the one he possesses, so the "lack of knowledge" option seems foreclosed. If this is the same God that had the power to create the heavens and the earth, and perform many other smaller miracles, then creating a living creature, however complex, would not seem too difficult for him. If this is the God that had the power to instantly heal bodies and bring the dead back to life and can cause the instant resurrection of himself and other people, then choosing to oversee the

creation of bodies through evolution, usually at a pace too slow to even measure, seems like an unlikely option.

I assume that most atheists/evolutionists would simply laugh at the mental gymnastics that some of those who profess religion go through to reconcile their belief in religion with the claims of "science" and atheism/evolution. I suppose everyone wants to be on the winning side of that argument, and if religion seems to be losing to the encroaching secularism/atheism/scientism/materialism, there is a temptation to slowly adjust to the perceived changing tide, however illogical that gradual change may be.

Final comments

Atheists who are willing to accept all of these extremely difficult barriers to the operation of evolution, should at least realize that they have gone far beyond anything that science can tell them, and that they are in fact operating on faith in their religion at least to the extent that Christians operate on faith in their religion. The scorn and ridicule with which atheists often treat "ignorant" Christians is clearly not based on any known science, but merely their own arrogance and sanctimony. Christians should be prepared to challenge them when they cross the line into phony claims of superior knowledge.

Most outrageous are the atheists' efforts to take over the public school system and use government funding to proselytize and propagate their religion. Every effort should be made to level that playing field, especially. They have nothing but bluster and bullying to back up their rhetorical claims. Their politicization of science is more likely to damage the progress of science than to aid it. By requiring that a student's entrance into science studies begin with a pagan ritual of assent to evolution's dogma and illogical philosophy is likely to keep out many talented students who see life and knowledge more broadly.

I think it is quite interesting that honest, logical atheists are willing to reject the creation myths or fairytales which more politically motivated atheists are happy to accept and impose on others. A logical atheist might reject any Christian and creationist explanations of creation, but would be just as quick to reject the fantastic fabrications from the proselytizing atheists.⁵

Endnotes

¹http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Burgess_Shale_type_fauna. Gould, Stephen Jay, 1989, *Wonderful Life: The Burgess Shale and the Nature of History* (New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Co.)

²Kunkel, Thomas A., "DNA Replication Fidelity," *The Journal of Biological Chemistry*, Vol. 279, No. 17, Issue of April 23, pp. 16895–16898, 2004.

³See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trochlea_of_superior_oblique.

⁴Behe, Michael J., *The Edge of Evolution: The Search for the Limits of Darwinism* (New York: Free Press, 2007)

⁵Stove, David and Kimball, Roger, *Darwinian Fairytales: Selfish Genes, Errors of Heredity, and Other Fables of Evolution* (New York, Encounter Books, 2007)