

suggest that such objects were just the products of time and chance. Design is everywhere. It would never enter our minds that metal, left to itself, would eventually form into engines, transmissions, wheels and all the other intricate parts needed to produce an automobile!

This “design argument” is often associated with the name of William Paley, an Anglican clergyman who wrote on this topic in the late eighteenth century. He is particularly remembered for his example of the *watch and watchmaker*. Comparing a stone and a watch, he concluded

that the watch must have had a maker; that there must have existed, at some time and at some place or other, an artificer or artificers, who formed it for the purpose which we find it actually to answer; who comprehended its construction, and designed its use.

Paley thus believed that just as the watch implied a watchmaker, so too does *design* in living things imply a *Designer*. Although he believed in a God who created all things, his God was a Master Designer who is now remote from His Creation, not the personal God of the Bible.

Today, however, a large portion of the population, including many leading scientists, believe that all plants and creatures, including the intelligent engineers who make watches, cars, etc., were the product of an evolutionary process—not a Creator God. But is this really a defensible position?

Do Living Things Show Evidence of Design?

The late Isaac Asimov (an ardent anti-creationist) said, In man is a three-pound brain which, as far as we know, is the most complex and orderly arrangement of matter in the universe.

It's much more complex than the most complicated computer ever built. Wouldn't it be logical to assume that if man's highly intelligent brain designed the computer, then the human brain was *also* the product of design?

Scientists who reject the concept of a Creator God agree that all living things exhibit evidence of design. In essence, they accept the design argument of Paley, but not Paley's Designer. Dr. Michael Denton, a non-Christian medical doctor and scientist with a doctorate in molecular biology, said:

It is the sheer universality of perfection, the fact that everywhere we look, to whatever depth we look, we find an elegance and ingenuity of an absolutely transcending quality, which so mitigates against the idea of chance...

Alongside the level of ingenuity and complexity exhibited by the molecular machinery of life, even our most advanced artifacts appear clumsy. We feel humbled, as neolithic man would in the presence of twentieth-century technology...

It would be an illusion to think that what we are aware of at present is any more than a fraction of the full extent of biological design. In practically every field of fundamental biological research, ever-increasing levels of design and complexity are being revealed at an ever-accelerating rate.

Dr. Richard Dawkins, holder of the Charles Simonyi Chair of Public Understanding of Science at Oxford University, has become one of the world's leading evolutionist spokespersons. His fame has come as the result of the publication of books, including *The Blind Watchmaker*, which defends modern evolutionary theory and claims to refute once and for all the notion of a Creator God. He states the following:

We have seen that living things are too improbable and too beautifully “designed” to have come into existence by chance.

There is no doubt that even the most ardent atheist agrees that design is evident in the animals and plants that inhabit our planet. If Dawkins rejects “chance” in design, what does he put in place of “chance” if he does not accept a Creator God?

Who—or What—is the Designer Then?

Design obviously implies a designer. To a Christian, the design we see all around us is totally consistent with the Bible:

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth (*Gen 1:1*). For by Him [Jesus Christ] were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him, and for Him (*Col 1:16*).

However, evolutionists like Dr. Richard Dawkins, who admit the design in living things, reject the idea of any kind of a Designer/God. In reference to Paley, Dawkins states:

Paley's argument is made with passionate sincerity and is informed by the best biological scholarship of his day, but it is wrong, gloriously and utterly wrong. The analogy, between telescope and eye, between watch and living organism, is false.

Why? It's because Dawkins attributes the design to what he calls “blind forces of physics” and the processes of natural selection (survival of the fittest). Dawkins writes:

All appearance to the contrary, the only watchmaker in nature is the blind forces of physics, albeit deployed in a very special way. A true watchmaker has foresight: he designs his cogs and springs, and plans their interconnections, with future purpose in his mind's eye.

Natural selection, the blind, unconscious, automatic process which Darwin discovered, and which we now know is the explanation for the existence and apparently purposeful form of all life, has no purpose in mind. It has no mind and no mind's eye. It does not plan for the future. It has no vision, no foresight, no sight at all. If it can be said to play the role of watchmaker in nature, it is the blind watchmaker.

Dawkins does, however, concede that

the more statistically improbable a thing is, the less can we believe that it just happened by blind chance. Superficially the obvious alternative to chance is an Intelligent Designer.

Nonetheless, he rejects the idea of an “Intelligent Designer” and instead offers this “answer”:

The answer, Darwin's answer, is by gradual, step-by-step transformations from simple beginnings, from primordial entities

sufficiently simple to have come into existence by chance. Each successive change in the gradual evolutionary process was simple enough, relative to its predecessor, to have arisen by chance.

But the whole sequence of cumulative steps constitutes anything but a chance process, when you consider the complexity of the final endproduct relative to the original starting point. The cumulative process is directed by nonrandom survival. The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate the power of this cumulative selection as a fundamentally nonrandom process.

Basically, then, Dawkins is doing nothing more than insisting that natural selection and mutations (mistakes or changes in genes) together provide the mechanism for the evolutionary process. He believes these processes are “nonrandom” and “directed.” In reality, this is just a sophisticated way of saying that *evolution* is itself *the designer*!

Does “Natural Selection” Produce Design?

Life is built on information. This information is contained in that molecule of heredity, DNA, which makes up the genes of an organism. Therefore, to argue that natural selection and mutations are the basic mechanisms of the evolutionary process, one must show that these processes *produce the information* responsible for *the design* that's evident in living things.

Anyone who understands basic biology recognizes, of course, as Darwin did, that natural selection is a logical process that one can observe. However, natural selection only operates on the information that's already contained in the genes—it does *not* produce *new* information. Actually, this is consistent with the Bible's account of origins, in that God created distinct “kinds” of animals and plants, each to reproduce after its own “kind” (*Gen 1:11,12,21,24,25*).

It's true that one can observe great variation in a “kind” and see the results of natural selection. For instance, wolves, coyotes and dingoes have developed over time as a result of natural selection operating on the information found in the genes of the wolf/dog “kind.” But the point is that *no new* information was produced—these varieties of dogs have resulted from a rearrangement, sorting out and separation of the information in the original dog kind. One “kind” has never been observed to change into a totally different “kind” with information that previously did not exist! Without intelligent input to increase information, natural selection will not work as a mechanism for evolution. Dr. Michael Denton confirms this when he states:

It cannot be stressed enough that evolution by natural selection would be like problem solving without any intelligent guidance, without any intelligent input whatsoever.

Without a way to *increase* information, natural selection will not work as a mechanism for evolution. Evolutionists would agree with this, but they believe that mutations somehow provide the new information for natural selection to act upon.

Can “Mutations” Produce New Information?

Actually, scientists now know that the answer is “no!” Dr. Lee Spetner, a highly qualified scientist who taught information and communication theory at Johns Hopkins University, makes this abundantly clear in his scholarly and thoroughly researched book *Not by Chance*:

In this chapter I'll bring several examples of evolution, particularly mutations, and show that information is not increased... In all the reading I've done in the life-sciences literature, I've never found a mutation that *added* information. All mutations that have been studied on the molecular level turn out to *reduce* the genetic information and not to increase it.

The NDT [neo-Darwinian theory] is supposed to explain how information of life has been built up by evolution. The essential biological difference between a human and a bacterium is in the information they contain. All other biological differences follow from that. The human genome has much more information than does the bacterial genome. *Information cannot be built up by mutations that lose it. A business can't make money by losing it a little at a time.*

Evolutionary scientists have no way around this conclusion that many scientists (like Dr. Spetner) have now come to. Mutations do *not* work as a mechanism for the evolutionary process. Spetner sums it all up as follows:

The neo-Darwinians would like us to believe large evolutionary changes can result from a series of small events if there are enough of them. But if these events all *lose* information, they can't be the steps in the kind of evolution the NDT is supposed to explain, no matter how many mutations there are.

Whoever thinks macroevolution can be made by mutations that lose information is like the merchant who lost a little money on every sale but thought he could make it up in volume...

Not even one mutation has been observed that adds a little information to the genome. That surely shows that there are not the millions upon millions of potential mutations the theory demands. There may well not be any. The failure to observe even one mutation that adds information is more than just a failure to find support for the theory. It is evidence *against* the theory. This seriously challenges the neo-Darwinian theory.

This is also confirmed by Dr. Werner Gitt, a director and professor at the German Federal Institute of Physics and Technology, in answering the question, “Can new information originate through mutations?”

This idea is central in representations of evolution, but mutations can only cause changes in *existing* information. There can be no increase in information, and in general the results are injurious. New blueprints for new functions or new organs cannot arise; mutations cannot be the source of new (creative) information.

So if natural selection and mutations are eliminated as mechanisms to produce the information and design of living systems, then another source must be found. But there are even more basic problems for those who reject the Creator God as the source of information.

More Problems!

Imagine yourself sitting in the seat of a 747 airplane and reading about its construction. You are fascinated by the fact that this flying machine is made up of six-million parts—but then you realize that not one part by itself flies! This could be rather disturbing if you were flying along at 500 miles per hour at 35,000 feet! You could be comforted, however, by the fact that even though not one part of an airplane flies, when it’s assembled as a completed machine, it flies!

We can use construction of an airplane as an analogy to understand the basic mechanisms of the biochemistry of cells that enable organisms to function.

Scientists have found that within the cell, there are thousands of what can be called “biochemical machines.” For example, one could cite the cell’s ability to sense light and turn it into electrical impulses. But what scientists once thought was a simple process within a cell, such as being able to sense light and turn it into electrical impulses, is in fact a highly complicated event. For just this one example alone to work, there have to be numerous compounds all at the right place and the right time in the right concentration—or it just can’t happen. In other words, just as all the parts of a 747 need to be assembled before it can fly, so all the parts of these “biochemical machines” in cells need to be in place or they can’t function. And there are literally thousands of such “machines” in a single cell that are vital for it to operate.

What does this mean? Quite simply, evolution from chemicals to a living system is *impossible*. Scientists now know that life is built on these “machines.” Dr. Michael Behe, Associate Professor of Biochemistry at Lehigh University in Pennsylvania, describes these “biochemical machines” as “irreducible complexity”:

The *simplicity* that was once expected to be the foundation of life has proven to be a *phantom*; instead, systems of horrendous, irreducible complexity inhabit the cell.

The resulting realization that *life was designed by an intelligence* is a shock to us in the twentieth century who have gotten used to thinking of life as the result of simple natural laws. But other centuries have had their shocks, and there is no reason to suppose that we should escape them.

To illustrate this further, consider swatting a mosquito. Then think about this question—why did the mosquito die? You see, the squashed mosquito has *all* the chemicals for life that an evolutionist could ever hope for in some primeval “soup.” Yet we know that nothing is going to evolve from this mosquito “soup.” So why did the mosquito die? Because by squashing it, you *disorganized* it!

Once the “machinery” of the mosquito has been destroyed, then the organism can no longer exist. At a cellular level, there are literally thousands of “machines” that need to exist before life ever becomes possible. This means that evolution from chemicals is *impossible*.

Evolutionist Dawkins recognizes this problem of needing “machinery” to start with when he states:

A Xerox machine is capable of copying its own blueprints, but it is not capable of springing spontaneously into existence. Biomorphs readily replicate in the environment provided by a suitably written computer program, but they can’t write their own program or build a computer to run it. The theory of the blind watchmaker is extremely powerful given that we are allowed to assume replication and hence cumulative selection. But if replication needs complex machinery, since the only way we know for complex machinery ultimately to come into existence is cumulative selection, *we have a problem*.

A problem indeed! The more we look into the workings of life, the more complicated it becomes, and the more we see that life could not arise by itself. Not only does life require a source of information, but the complex “machines” of the chemistry of life must be in existence *right from the start!*

A Greater Problem Still!

Some scientists and educators have tried to get around the above problems by speculating that as long as all the chemicals that make up the molecule of heredity (and the information it contains) came together at some time in the past, then life could have begun.

Life, though, is built upon information. In fact, in just one of the trillions of cells that make up the human body, the amount of information in its genes has been estimated to fill at least 1,000 books of 500 pages of typewritten information. Scientists now think this is hugely underestimated.

Where did all this information come from? Some try to explain it this way: imagine a professor taking all the letters of the alphabet, A-Z, and placing them in a hat. He then passes the hat around to students of his class and asks each to randomly select a letter.

It’s easy for us to see the possibility (no matter how remote it seems) of three students in a row selecting B then A and finally T. Put these three letters together and they spell a word—BAT. Thus the professor concludes, given enough time, no matter how improbable it seems, there is always the possibility one could form a series of words that make a sentence, and eventually compile an encyclopedia. The students are then led to believe that *no intelligence* is necessary in the evolution of life from chemicals. As long as the molecules came together in the right order for such compounds as DNA, then life could have begun!

This may sound like a logical argument, but there is a basic, fatal flaw in this analogy. Think about it! The sequence of letters, BAT, is a word to whom? An Englishman, Frenchman, German or Chinese? It’s a word only to someone who knows the language. In other words, the order of letters is meaningless unless there is a language system and a translation system already in place to make the order meaningful!

In the DNA of a cell, the order of its molecules is also meaningless, except that in the biochemistry of a cell, there is a language system (other molecules) that makes the order meaningful! Without the language system, DNA is meaningless, and the language system without the DNA wouldn’t work either. The other complication is that the language system that reads the order of the molecules in the DNA is itself specified by the DNA! This is another one of those “machines” that must already be in existence and fully formed or life won’t work!

What Then is the Source of the Information?

One of the things we know for sure from science is that information *cannot* arise from disorder by chance. It *always* takes (greater) information to produce information, and ultimately information is the result of *intelligence*. Therefore, the huge amount of information in living things must originally have come from an intelligence, which had to have been far superior to ours.

Are we to believe that matter has eternally existed, or came into existence by itself for no reason, and then, by itself, matter was arranged into information systems?—which is *against everything observed in real science!* Or did an infinite Being, the God of the Bible, the source of infinite intelligence, create information systems for life to exist?—which *agrees with real science!* If real science supports the Bible’s claims about an infinite Creator God, then why wouldn’t all intelligent scientists believe it?

Well, if one believes in God, the God of the Bible, who created us, this would mean that He owns us, and has every right to tell us what to do! And this is something the natural man doesn’t want to accept.

Christianity is not blind faith as some think. In fact, it is the evolutionists who deny the Creator who have the blind faith. They have to believe that information can arise from disorder by chance, which goes against real science. The Christian faith, though, is a logically defensible faith. This is why the Bible makes it very clear that anyone who does not believe in God is “*without excuse*”:

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 (*Rom 1:19,20*). ■

—Adapted from the writings of Ken Ham

Is There Really a God?

In our everyday experience, just about everything seems to have a beginning. In fact, the laws of science show that even things which look the same through our lifetime, such as the sun and other stars, are running down. The sun is using up its fuel at millions of tons each second—since it cannot last forever, it had to have a beginning. The same can be shown to be true for the entire universe.

So when Christians claim that the God of the Bible created all the basic entities of life and the universe, some will ask what seems a logical question: “Who created God?”

The very first verse in the Bible declares: “In the beginning God...” There is no attempt in these words to prove the existence of God or imply in any way that God had a beginning. In fact, the Bible makes it clear in many places that God is *outside* of time. He is eternal, with no beginning or end—God is infinite.

Is it logical, though, to accept the existence of such an eternal being? Can modern science, which has produced our technology of computers, space shuttles and medical advances, even allow for such a notion?

What evidence would we expect to find if there really is an infinite God who created all things as the Bible claims? How would we even recognize the hand of such an omnipotent (all-powerful) Creator?

The Bible claims that God knows all things—He is omniscient. Therefore, He is *infinitely intelligent*. To recognize His handiwork, one would have to know how to begin to recognize *the evidence* of the works of *His intelligence*.

How Do We Recognize the Evidence of Intelligence?

Why do scientists become so excited when they discover stone tools together with bones in a cave? The stone tools speak of intelligence! The scientists recognize that these tools could not have designed themselves—they are a product of intelligent input. Thus, the researchers rightly conclude that an intelligent creature was responsible for making these tools.

In a similar way, one would never look at the Great Wall of China, the Capitol building in Washington, D.C., or the Sydney Opera House in Australia and conclude that such structures were formed from explosions in a brick factory!

Neither would anyone believe that the presidents heads carved on Mt. Rushmore were the products of millions of years of erosion! We *can* recognize design, the evidence of the outworkings of intelligence. We see man-made objects all around us—cars, airplanes, computers, stereos, houses, appliances and so on. And yet, at no time would anyone ever