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Abstract: Materialists claim that Evolution is a fact. They even go so far as to say “Evolution Explains Everything.” But can this be verified by empirical science? We examine some of the secular science statements made in the last few decades in which these scientists propose new natural explanations for 1) the origin of our universe, 2) the origin of first life, and 3) the origin of complex life (Darwinian Evolution). We think of Evolution, Creation, and Intelligent Design when it comes to origins. The doubts that Darwin expressed about his theory more than 150 years ago in his book on “The Origin of Species” have still not been resolved in favor of Evolution. Many secular scientists have now resorted to pseudoscience in their attempts to rescue the Theory of Evolution and explain origins of the universe, first life, and complex life. These are three impossible hurdles that materialism did not, cannot, and will not overcome with today's pseudoscience. The origins explanations by materialists are only "just-so" origins stories. They have failed in the past, are failing now, and will fail in the future. Our experience is that ordered systems require information (e.g. machines, computers, programs) which requires an intelligent mind. The information in the design of the universe, first life and complex life is orders of magnitude greater than systems designed by man. All effects have a cause. The universe was caused and fine-tuned for life by an intelligent mind. The materialist's explanation is based on unverifiable assumptions which are based on other unverifiable assumptions. Life consists of (material) mass and energy plus (immaterial) information. First life can only be caused by an intelligent mind. Scientists agree that abiogenesis did not happen (Pasteur), is operationally impossible (in the lab), and is mathematically impossible by random chance. Complex life forms can only be caused by an intelligent mind. All materialist explanations using Neo-Darwinian Evolution have been shown to be pseudoscience. God is the first cause and the infinite Intelligent Mind.
Introduction

Secular scientists claim that Evolution is a fact. They even go so far as to say “Evolution Explains Everything.” But can this be verified by empirical science? We examine some of the secular science statements made in the last few decades in which these scientists propose new natural explanations for 1) the origin of our universe, 2) the origin of first life, and 3) the origin of complex life (Darwinian Evolution). We think of Evolution, Creation, and Intelligent Design when it comes to origins. The doubts that Darwin expressed about his theory more than 150 years ago in his book on “The Origin of Species” have still not been resolved in favor of Evolution. Many secular scientists have now resorted to pseudoscience in their attempts to rescue the Theory of Evolution and explain origins.

Their explanations include such proposals as the Big Bang, Inflation, Quantum Fluctuations, Gravity, and the Multiverse for the origin of the universe. The origin of first life requires a primordial soup, self-replicating complex molecules, enzymes as catalysts, cells, and an energy source. What evidence do these secular scientists offer for all of these elements being available at the right time and in the right environment to produce first life? Where and how do they claim that life started if not on Earth? – Volcanoes? Hydrothermal Vents? Mars? Panspermia? Directed Panspermia? There are many different dictionary definitions for the word Evolution. What definition do these secular scientists use to show that Evolution is a fact and that the diversity and complexity of life forms that we see in nature can be explained by Neo-Darwinism, i.e. by mutations, natural selection, and common descent?

We see that the explanations offered by these secular scientists are not what we have historically accepted as normal science – empirical science and the use of the scientific method. Many of the secular explanations are shown to be pseudoscience, now sometimes referred to as post-normal science, a concept that goes beyond the assumptions that science is certain and value-free. New atheists such as Dawkins, Hawking, Krauss and Stenger are masters at hijacking the traditional definition of science in support of their secular agendas of naturalism/materialism.
1. **Today's News Headlines**

The main stream media (MSM) has been very diligent about announcing presumed evidence for the "proof" that our universe originated by means of the Big Bang. For example, here is what they reported on March 17, 2014:

- Space ripples reveal Big Bang's smoking gun, *NY Times*.
- Observations confirm ‘inflation’ of early universe to cosmological sizes in early instant, *National Geographic*.

Where and how did first life originate? The MSM is quick to report on new scientific findings that appear that they might be able to shed some light on this issue. Here are two recent such "findings."

- Life on Earth *may have* come from Mars on an asteroid, a scientist has claimed as he says it is the explanation for an unusual rock, *The Telegraph*, 8/28/13.
- … how the first organisms on Earth *could have* become metabolically active. … speculate how primitive cells learned to synthesize their organic components - the molecules that form RNA, lipids and amino acids. … suggest an order for the sequence … that led to the origin of life, *Science Daily on 4/25/14*.

The Neo-Darwinian theory (a hypothesis really) of Evolution depends on first life already existing and supposedly explains the origins and diversity of the complex life forms that we observe today. Reading the news headlines over the last decade we are told the following.

- Nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of evolution, *Theodosius Dobzhansky*.
- Evolution is a *fact*, *Richard Dawkins*.
- *Natural selection* accounts for the “apparent design” in life, *Richard Dawkins*. 
✓ Non-coding DNA is "junk DNA", Many evolutionists.

How have these statements by the secular scientists turned out today? A young Christian writer, Dan Greenup, published a book "Generation Why?" answering the question "Why am I here?" Here is what he had to say - "I hate to break it to you, but you’ve been lied to. Shocking right? From elementary school on, we were all told that the universe created itself by chance, non-living chemicals formed into a living organism with complex genetic information and that through natural selection, this organism grew more complex over millions of years. What’s wrong with this account of history? Well none of these unproven assumptions are supported by scientific observation."

2. What Is Science?

With that as background let us go back and look at what we mean by science. Science is the search for truth, knowledge discovered by empirical experimentation, observation and objective investigation. Discovery uses the scientific method first described by Francis Bacon. We also refer to this as operational science. Experiments can be run repeatedly to test a theory which can be verified or falsified. In the study of origins we must use origins science since we cannot test origins events which by definition are not repeatable, and therefore not verifiable or falsifiable. So we use forensic science (as used by criminologists to solve a crime without witnesses) to look at the evidence for the origins events that must be interpreted based on unprovable assumptions.

However, materialists/naturalists have changed their definition of science to one in which a supernatural explanation is not allowed. Naturalists define science as "A belief denying that an event or object has a supernatural significance; specifically, the doctrine that scientific laws are adequate to account for all phenomena." Materialists define science as "A belief claiming that physical matter is the only or fundamental reality and that all organisms, processes, and phenomena can be explained as manifestations or interactions of matter."
3. What Makes Science Possible?

Dr. Jonathan Sarfati, chief scientist with Creation Ministries International, explains that science is only possible because God created the universe with certain fixed laws of nature. He documents these six principles as:

- There is such a concept as objective truth, e.g. John 14:6
- The universe is real, e.g. Gen. 1
- The universe is orderly, 1 Cor. 14:33
- We can study God’s Creation
- Man has both material and immaterial aspects, Gen. 35:18; Matt. 10:28
- Man can reason since we are made in God’s image, Gen. 1:26.

Science is only possible because the laws of nature are fixed.

4. What Is Pseudoscience?

The Oxford dictionary defines Pseudoscience as "Beliefs/practices mistakenly regarded as being based on the scientific method." One should be aware of the common signs of Pseudoscience such as 1) an emphasis on confirmation rather than refutation, 2) the use of vague or untestable claims, 3) the lack of testing by others, 4) the suppression of dissent, 5) misleading language, and 6) attacking the character of the questioner.

In this paper we identify three impossible hurdles for Naturalism/Materialism. There are other hurdles, but these three all have to do with major origins, those of the universe, first life and complex life forms. The origin of the universe must address the origin of matter, energy, galaxies, stars, planets, and other astronomical bodies. The naturalist must be able to identify the first cause that resulted in the effects that we observe in our universe. The origin of first life must address the issue of how living organisms can come from non-living matter. The naturalist must be able to show that abiogenesis is possible and has been observed. The origin of complex life forms assumes the success of the first two origins before the third origin could lead to the diversity and complexity of life forms that we observe today. From a naturalist point of view this requires that Neo-Darwinian Evolution (Macro-Evolution) be
possible and demonstrable.

We show in this paper that Naturalism/Materialism has failed to clear these three impossible hurdles in the past, cannot explain how to clear them today, and will fail to clear them in the future because the mathematical probabilities are too small (much less than 1 in 10^{50}), making them operationally impossible. Our human experience is that the complexity of the effects of each of these origins requires a cause, e.g. the use of an Intelligent Mind outside of the effect. Our experience is also that the magnitude of the information and the complexity of the programs required to bring about the effects implies an intelligent designer.

5. What Do We Mean by Origins?

By origins we mean beginning from nothing. The law of cause and effect is a law of nature that has never been falsified. There are really only two means of origins, Creation or Evolution. We define Creation as recorded in the first chapter of Genesis where God spoke everything into existence in six days, including man in His image on the sixth day, and then resting on the seventh day. All plants and animals were created and reproduced according to their kinds. We define Evolution as everything appearing from the explosion (Big Bang?) of a singularity (nothing?) plus some Neo-Darwinian mechanisms (mutations, natural selection, and common descent) from the first living cell to the complexity and diversity of living organisms observed in our universe today. Evolution is sometimes described as molecules to man, particles to people, or goo to you.

6. Some Past Examples of Pseudoscience

We have many examples of what was declared to be science in the past but turned out not to be true and really was pseudoscience. Some of the more dramatic examples were (and still are) the fossil record, human origins, Haeckel's embryos, vestigial organs, claims made at the Scopes Trial in 1925, and the other icons of evolution identified by Dr. Jonathan Wells in his book by the same name - Icons of Evolution.

In the 6th edition of his book, The Origin of Species, Charles Darwin wrote
"Why 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 is the most obvious and serious objection which can be urged against the theory." Darwin expected that paleontologists would find the missing links in the fossil record as evidence for the veracity of his theory over the next century or so. However, as documented by Dr. Duane Gish in his two books on this topic "'Evolution' The Fossils Still Say NO!"

The question about human origins is of special interest to man. A number of fossils have been promoted as possible, even probable, intermediate links between ape-like creatures and man over the last 150 years. These include Neanderthal man, Piltdown man, Nebraska man, Ramapithecus, and Lucy. However, they have all been debunked 50 years or so after they were found. More recently, Ida, Homo Naledi, and now the oldest Homo Sapiens fossils discovered in Morocco are claimed to be the missing links. Further analysis by paleoanthropologists have shown that none of these fossils pass the test. Even the famous Lucy, which still appears in secular school textbooks, is merely an extinct ape.

"Haeckel's Embryos" has been promoted as an icon for far too long in secular school textbooks. The embryos shown represent 5 of the 7 vertebrate classes. Haeckel omitted two classes of vertebrate (jawless and cartilaginous fishes) entirely, and half of the embryos are mammals - thus using a biased sample. Darwin justified his theory of Evolution largely on the "evidence" of Haeckel's drawings. Unfortunately for Darwin, his drawings were shown to be fake as early as in the 1890's, but they still appear as "evidence" in some school text books today. "Haeckel's Embryos" was used as one of the major proofs of Evolution by Darwin - it turned out to be fraudulent.

Vestigial organs or structures that do not appear to have any function were claimed by evolutionists to be left over from an evolutionary ancestor and therefore provided evidence for evolution. In 1893 Wiedersheim provided a list of 86 human organs that he considered to be "vestiges." Since then doctors and scientists have
shown that they all have a purpose, are fully functional, and cannot be considered to be vestiges. Many of the 86 vestiges, including the appendix and tonsils, turn out to be part of the human immune system.

Six "scientific evidences" for Evolution were presented at the famous Scopes Trial in 1925, including Haeckel's forged embryo drawings. These so-called "scientific evidences" have now been totally discredited. Neanderthal man has been shown to be fully human. Piltdown man was another fake fossil that joined an ape jaw to a man's skull cap to make it appear to be a transitional fossil. The artist drawing of the Nebraska man was based solely on a fossilized pig's tooth and showed an upright hairy human-like creature. The peppered moth was an important part of the Evolution exhibit shown at the Scopes Trial, but the color of the moths changed with changes in the level of pollution in the area of England where they lived - the moths remained moths despite changes in their color.

Much of this "evidence" still remains in some school text books although admitted to be faulty. This is all documented in Jonathan Wells' book *Icons of Evolution*.

7. **Pseudoscience Today In Origin of the Universe**

Materialists tell us that the origin of the universe came about by solely material processes and the existence of the universe can be explained by the Big Bang (BB) theory. Is this logical? Does that answer the question of the cause? We know that every effect must have a sufficient cause. They had to give up on the idea that the universe always existed because the second law of thermodynamics tells us that the universe is gradually losing useable energy. However, the validity of the BB theory depends on many assumptions that cannot be proven. What existed beforehand and what caused it to begin? Where did this matter/energy source come from because it requires the same physical laws that exist today? It had to start from nothing - nothing became everything without a cause.

The BB theory was first proposed in 1948 and got its first significant support in 1964 with the discovery of Cosmic Microwave Background Radiation (CMBR) that
had been predicted for it, and not by the competing "steady state" theory. But the BB theory still had a "Horizon Problem" because of the uniform temperature measurements throughout the universe.

Alan Guth tried to explain this with his Theory of Inflation at the beginning of the BB. But what started inflation that requires expansion of the universe at many orders of magnitude greater than the speed of light? And what caused inflation to stop suddenly a small fraction of a second later? The Theory of Inflation was also "invented" to answer the Flatness problem - it did not. Scientists thought they had found proof for cosmic inflation with polarization in the CMBR and announced this with great fanfare on March 17, 2014. However, by May 12, 2014 they had to admit that there could be other causes for the phenomena. Back to square one. Science shown to be pseudoscience in less than 2 months. The announcement no one wanted to hear: The most exciting astronomical discovery of 2014 has vanished.

CMBR also creates the Smoothness Problem since we actually see a universe that is clumpy, not smooth, i.e. it has denser regions that should attract material to produce the structure that we see today. But these inhomogeneities would have had to be fine-tuned. Probes do not find support for this in the temperature differences in the CMBR. The data predicted by the BB theory are not verified. A faster expansion of the universe is required and this shows further problems with the BB theory. The unknown concepts of dark matter, dark energy and string theory are now also being invoked to explain the BB theory.

Stephen Hawking tried to explain the Big Bang as the cause of the universe in his book The Grand Design. But he assumed the existence of a singularity, the law of gravity, and random quantum fluctuations. Where did these come from if there was nothing at the beginning? Another physicist, Lawrence Krauss, even tried to explain how everything came from nothing in his book, A Universe From Nothing. But he had to assume a quantum vacuum, which has the same problem as that of the eternal universe.

Astrophysicist Richard Lieu is quoted as saying "Cosmology is not even
astrophysics: all the principal assumptions in this field are unverified (or unverifiable) in the laboratory ... because the universe offers no control experiment, i.e. with no independent checks, it is bound to be highly ambiguous and degenerate."

Cosmologists have become "comfortable with inventing unknowns to explain the unknown."

Materialists are far from being able to explain the origin of the universe using known and verified scientific concepts. They rely on conjectures and unverifiable assumptions. Multiverses have been proposed to get around the fact that our universe appears to be fine-tuned to support life, but they are based on unverifiable assumptions and do not address the fact that the parameters of one universe cannot be observed or measured from another universe. This is really pseudoscience. It reminds us of Ptolemy's geocentric model of our solar system introduced in the 2nd century AD that finally had to be abandoned in the 17th century when it became apparent that the heliocentric model explained our universe much better.

8. Pseudoscience Today In Origin of First Life

How did first life originate? Greek philosophers had assumed that spontaneous generation of life from non-life was possible 2500 years ago. We now know that life cannot come from non-life, i.e. that abiogenesis is impossible. Redi (1668), Spallanzani (1750), Virchow (1858), and Pasteur (1864) demonstrated this by experimentation. The law of biogenesis has never been falsified. Various hypothesis have been proposed over the last 150 years on where and how first life might have originated. The Miller experiment in 1953 was thought to have demonstrated this. However, more careful examination of the experimental results showed otherwise. Other experiments run in the lab today also show that abiogenesis is operationally impossible. According to Hoyle, "the chance of obtaining the required set of enzymes for even the simplest living cell is 1 in 10**40,000," a probability so small that it has been considered to be operationally and mathematically impossible.

The ingredients for living cells include amino acids (proteins), DNA/RNA components, lipids (cell membrane), and handedness (chirality) - left-handed amino
acids, right-handed sugars (backbone). Catalysts are also needed to speed up the processes by orders of magnitude. Proteins are required to produce proteins. We have a chicken and egg problem - which comes first? DNA? RNA? or proteins? This is an intractable problem for which materialist have no solution. As Sir Karl Popper, a philosopher of science says "Thus the code cannot be translated except by using certain products of its translation. This constitutes a baffling circle; a really vicious circle, it seems, for any attempt to form a model or theory of the genesis of the genetic code."

The Miller experiment in 1953 made certain assumptions about the early earth's atmosphere which turned out to be incorrect. The actual experiment required design by an intelligent mind and the removal of contaminants as the experiment was run. It produced a mixture of amino acids - both right-handed and left-handed - amino acids that did not constitute the components of a living cell. Proteins in a cell consist of specific sequences of 20 different left-handed amino acids.

Darwin surmised that "It is often said that all the conditions for the first production of a living organism are now present, which could ever have been present. But if (and oh! what a big if!) we could conceive in some warm little pond, with all sorts of ammonia and phosphoric salts, light, heat, electricity, etc., present, that a proteine (sic) compound was chemically formed ready to undergo still more complex changes, at the present day such matter would be instantly absorbed, which would not have been the case before living creatures were found." Darwin's idea was tested in hot little puddles associated with volcanoes, hot acidic waters with clay, hydrothermal vents, seafloor water heated by volcanic activity, etc. CMI killed Darwin's idea "The available evidence from the field and the laboratory is not amicable to the theory that life began with the accidental assembly of a self-replicating molecule."

So then secular scientists turned their attention to panspermia involving either life formed on other planets accidentally or directed panspermia. This moves the problem to another planet but does not solve the problem. Testing on land and in the
ocean has shown that abiogenesis is impossible in a pond, vent or volcano. Panspermia presents another set of problems for which no solutions exist. Life by undirected natural causes has been shown to be impossible in the past, not occurring in the present, and indeed impossible according to mathematical probability. The statistical probability that organic structures and the most precisely harmonized reactions that typify living organisms would be generated by accident is **zero**.

9. **Pseudoscience Today In Origin of Complex Life**

The origin of complex life depends on the origin of both the universe and the origin of the first living cell. Despite the fact that there is no evidence that their origins were possible by materialist means, Neo-Darwinian evolution is accepted as a fact and Darwinist evolutionist Theodosius Dobzhansky insists that "Nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of evolution." Richard Dawkins argues that Natural Selection accounts for the "apparent design" in life. Yet none of their unproven assumptions are supported by scientific observations.

The transitional fossils that Darwin predicted would provide the proof for his theory of Evolution have still not been found. The Cambrian layer in the geological column contains fossils of most Phyla known to man and only soft-bodied organisms are found in the pre-Cambrian strata below it. The number of species fossilized in higher geological layers decreases in each higher layer. These findings all speak against the theory of Evolution.

Darwin predicted that fossils would show changes in the fossil record over the years. Yet we find that the life forms of living organisms appear to be largely the same as that of the fossils of organisms that are supposedly millions of years old. The patterns we see in the fossil record besides stasis include large morphological gaps between life forms and the absence of clear ancestors and lineages. Stephen Gould tried to explain this away by promoting his theory of punctuated equilibrium. But his theory has since been debunked after more analysis.

With the discovery of the irreducible complexity and specified complexity of the living cell, and the information encoded within the DNA/RNA molecules of all
plant and animal cells, it became obvious that life consists of more than matter - mass and energy. Information is the key to life. The four information components of code, meaning, action, and purpose mirror the requirements for communicating information between senders and receivers.

Evolution scientists know they have a problem explaining how Evolution supposedly supports common descent via random mutations and natural selection. Suzan Mazur, a journalist, wrote a book on The Altenberg 16 meeting of 16 Evolutionists in Austria in 2008 to discuss the questions that they had about Evolution mechanisms. Mazur interviewed many prominent Evolutionists who contend that natural selection is based on politics, not science. She quotes Lynn Margulis who "sees natural selection as neither the source of heritable novelty nor the entire evolutionary process and has pronounced neo-Darwinism ‘dead’ since there’s no adequate evidence in the literature that random mutations result in new species.”

Then there is the myth of "Junk DNA", a term coined in 1972 that claims the vast majority of the genome (~98%) does not code for proteins, does not serve any useful biological purpose, and is in fact comprised of evolutionary remnants. This fallacious argument was used by many prominent Evolutionists as late as 2009. However in 2012 the ENCODE project was completed producing an encyclopedia of DNA elements, including non-protein-coding DNA. This exposed the myth of "Junk DNA" once and for all time as pseudoscience.

The first comparison of the human and chimp genomes by secular scientists claimed that the genome sequences were about 98.8% the same. However, this conclusion was based on incomplete sequencing. Later studies that included previously omitted data showed that the genomes were only 86.7% the same, with one study showing only 65% similarity. The human and chimp DNA were found to be so different from each other that the number of different base pairs could never be explained based on measured rates of mutation.

10. In Summary
As we see from the evidence for the means of origins presented by the secular scientists, their evidence is based on pseudoscience, their beliefs, and not on objective operational science. For the means of origin of the universe, we see more pseudoscience being considered. Just look at the article published by Ellis and Silk in Nature magazine on June 5, 2005, for example. They ask the question - do physicists need empirical evidence to confirm their theories? Apparently not anymore. Supersymmetry, string theory, and the multiverse are offered as cases in point.

For the means of first life's origin, Bill Nye the Science Guy can only offer this explanation. "When you have a portion of the population that doesn't believe in [Evolution], it holds everybody back. Evolution is the fundamental idea in all of life science. ... And I say to the grown-ups, if you want to deny Evolution and live in your world that's completely inconsistent with everything we observe in the universe, that's fine. But don't make your kids do it because we need them. We need scientifically literate voters and taxpayers for the future. We need engineers that can build stuff, solve problems". He ignores the science facts and still believes abiogenesis is supported by the Miller-Urey experiment, and human/chimp DNA differences are less than 2% according to the article published by Evolution News on March 20, 2015 by Casey Luskin of the Discovery Institute.

For the means of the origin of complex life, we get this from an article in Evolution News published on June 8, 2015. "Biology largely retains its faith in the unguided Darwinian mechanism, despite mounting evidence against its power to generate complex life forms." AP News published an article on May 27, 2015 entitled "fossils show new human forerunner" that supposedly shows a second human ancestor lived in about the same area and time frame as Lucy’s species", researchers said. But not everyone agrees." Again science is untethered from evidence.

We are getting into post-normal science where facts are uncertain, values are in dispute, stakes are high, and decisions are urgent. Global Warming (GW) and Macro-Evolution are two modern examples of this. Scientists are ready to embrace theories devoid of evidence. Disputes in post-normal science focus … on the process of
science – who gets funded, who evaluates quality, who has the ear of policy. … The UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is a classic example of a post-normal scientific activity.

True science is possible because of the laws of nature that are fixed by God. [Jer. 33:25.] The universe was created by God and was fine-tuned for life - the origin of the universe requires a Designer. First life can only be created by God - the origin of life requires a Designer. All complex life was created by God. True science has shown us that life consists of (material) mass and energy plus (immaterial) information - the origin of complex life forms requires a Designer. The Evolution gaps are only filled by just-so Evolution stories. They have failed in the past, fail now, and will fail in the future.

Dr. Laurence Krauss, a well-known atheist, reminds us that the Ethos of Science requires 1) open questioning, 2) no authorities, 3) honesty, 4) transparency, 5) reliance on evidence, 6) understanding uncertainty, 7) peer review, and 8) testability. Only then can we make the world a better place by burying myth, superstition, and dogma and fanatical certainty. Free from Pseudoscience! If only Krauss would listen to his own advice. Scripture clearly tells us that we are to test everything and hold fast what is good. [1 Th. 5:21].
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