

# Evolution 101

## Lesson 2

We have learned that micro-evolution is an undisputed fact of science. Macroevolution though is a highly controversial metaphysical belief that involves unnatural, speculative processes, outside the domain of physics and chemistry. Religion is also a metaphysical system, outside and beyond the domain of physics and chemistry. Since both macroevolution and humanists deny the role of God in the creation of the universe and Christianity affirms it, both systems of belief are metaphysical and equally religious.

Robert Browning, the English poet, understood this when he wrote, "*We first find that great things are made of little things and little things are lessening until at last comes God behind them.*" The poet meant that the laws of physics and chemistry can explain the present *operation* of the cosmos but cannot explain its *origin*. Most scientists reject the poet's choice of God as the First Cause in favor of their own metaphysical system of macroevolution, laws of science notwithstanding.

### Schools Pick Winners in Religion

It is noteworthy to observe that there are religious systems today that embrace macroevolution or that the world is self-existent: Buddhists, New Age, Hindus, atheists, pantheists and all other non-Bible-based religions. They all view the cosmos as self-existent. Carl Sagan, the world-famous astronomer stated it as, "*The cosmos is all there is, ever was or ever will be.*" This means that the cosmos is eternal, without beginning or end. Now that Dr. Sagan is on the other side, he really knows for sure if the cosmos is "*billions and billions of years old.*"

The government schools teach macroevolution dogmatically, exclusively and without dissent. Therefore, they sanction and endorse all religions of the world, including atheism, except those based on the Bible. In other words, our government is picking winners in religion in spite of the protection given religion in our First Amendment.

### Teaching Creationism Not Needed

Teaching scientific creationism in our public schools, not the Bible version, would be an acceptable alternative model of origins. The preferred solution would be simply teaching *all of the scientific evidence, both positive and negative*, about macroevolution. In spite of the unconvincing assumptions by the evolutionists that the earth is billions of years old and that macroevolution actually happened or is even possible, there is no empirical proof for it.

This writer has offered over the years a reward of \$10,000 to the person who can provide empirical proof for macroevolution. No scientist has ever come forward to file a claim. This is not surprising but it does dramatize just how little hard scientific evidence there is in support of macroevolution. However there is a wealth of scientific evidence that refutes macroevolution. A summary of several evidences will make the point.

**1. The Law of Cause and Effect** declares that every effect requires a competent cause and the effect cannot be greater than its cause. Nothing, for instance, cannot be the cause of something as postulated by Big Bang advocates. A person is a living, feeling and thinking effect and must have been caused by at least a living, feeling and thinking cause. No cause other than parents has ever been observed to produce offspring. Parents of one kind have never been observed to produce offspring of a different kind. Lifeless chemicals cannot cause the greater effect of a living cell that in turn causes millions of even greater effects to cause people. This one law of science, not a speculation, is sufficient to nullify all speculation about evolutionism. But there is much more.

**2. The First Law of Thermo-dynamics** declares that the matter and energy of the universe is constant. This means that the processes of science (physics, chemistry, etc.) are non-creative and non-destructive and cannot explain their own existence. These processes can neither increase nor decrease the matter and energy content of the universe. We observe the vast effect of matter and energy in our universe but no competent cause for it. This law demands an Uncaused First Cause not bound by the laws of science to explain the origin of matter and energy unless, of course, the universe is eternal and did not need a cause as claimed by the evolutionists, atheists and the non-Bible-based religions of the world. The graphic below pictures the First Law superposed with the idea of macroevolution.

The horizontal parallel lines represent the unchanging quantity of matter and energy of the universe. The upward diagonal line represents the assumed increase in order and complexity in the universe by evolutionary processes. If evolution is true, time's arrow points upward.

**3. The Second Law of Thermodynamics** disputes the point that the universe may be eternal or self-existent or that order and complexity of natural systems increased via macro-evolution.

This law declares that every energy transformation (applying the brakes on your car, for example) will result in a loss of some energy in the form of heat. This heat radiates out into space to be lost forever though not destroyed in compliance with the First Law. This means that the universe is running down like a spring-wound clock. It is becoming less ordered and complex and eventually will reach a state of equilibrium when all of the stars turn dark and when all energy in the universe will be at the same low level. The universe will have suffered a heat death. This

law demonstrates that the universe is degenerating downward, becoming less orderly and not evolving upward as claimed by the evolutionists.

The following graphic shows the Second Law (diagonal line) superposed over the First Law (horizontal lines). The Second Law clearly shows that time's arrow points downward, not upward as evolutionists claim. Both cannot be true.

Equilibrium has not arrived, so the universe is not dead and cannot be eternal. It must have had a beginning. Since it had a beginning and could not cause itself according to the First Law, a transcending metaphysical process must have caused it. At least, the God of the Bible is a possibility. Why, then, should our government schools endorse the beliefs of the Buddhists, Hindus, pantheists and atheists that the universe is eternal or self-existent to the detriment of the Bible-based religions?

**[www.FineTunedUniverse.com](http://www.FineTunedUniverse.com)**