

## **The Theory of the Big Claim**

*The gaping holes in evolution theory*

Marvin Pirila, Northland Watch

May 27, 2018

When one weighs the merits of the theory of evolution, macroevolution to be exact, they find a lot of gaping holes. If every animal is evolving traits to improve its survival, wouldn't a time come when the increased survival rates of all species lead to strict vegetarianism? For example, if a fox is dependent on rabbits for survival and the rabbit learns to avoid capture, the fox would naturally have to turn to another source of food. Provided that every animal is evolving, becoming a plant eater seems to be the only route.

Rather than go extinct, evolutionists would have us believe the fox would develop another means of survival or needing to radically change, become another species altogether. Proponents of macroevolution (species becoming other species) suggest that if a trait would be convenient, it just magically happens. Sure, they say it happens over millions or billions of years, but the concept is the same. I can imagine the first fish that was gazing upon the shoreline wanting to take a stroll on land and see what's happening there. With his desire and that of numerous generations of like-minded fish, he swims into shallow waters and his underside brushes up consistently against the sand. Eventually, this habit results in legs forming and viola, the day arrives that a fish is born with legs and hops onto shore as a frog. Now he can breathe oxygen directly, which is also magically there out of need, and still can take to water. Suddenly he has the best of both worlds.

We need to back it up a bit to put things into context. It was a miracle that the fish was there, evolving through a series of specie changes that originated from a supercharged pool of 'special chemicals' that sprung into life from an electrical charge. The Big Claim starts here but neglects to talk about the numerous variables that came before it, like the existence of special chemicals and the ability to sustain life once it appeared.

The Big Bang was a dagger of sorts to evolutionary claims because it pointed to an exact moment in time when the earth was created. At the same moment the planets were set into place, the perfect proportions of oxygen, hydrogen, and carbon appeared, and yet, there was still no life. There was no life until the supercharged chemical event. Yes, from rock and a pool of 'secret sauce', our existence is attributed. When they say we evolved from apes, what they really mean is that we evolved from the special chemical brew. The next time you are drinking a V-8, just imagine that if you zapped it with some electricity, life may emerge. It has never been shown, but hey, many people believe it, so it must be true.

The law of biogenesis states that life can only come from life, which evolutionists confess, well except for the first instance. There is the problem. When the argument of cause and effect is imposed, what explains the first instance? What explains the Big Bang setting the planets perfectly in place, producing the perfect proportion of chemicals allowing life, and leaving us with the universally accepted scientific laws? Scientific laws are borne out of exactness. The laws of gravity are universal, the orbit of the earth around the sun is elliptical, yet precise in its path, the moon is set just right to control the tides, etc. The

point is that out of randomness, we got scientific laws that are not random at all. Everything is there from the first moment, lacking scientific reasoning.

If the Big Bang was a random collision of planets or an implosion of one very large planet, a person with logic would assume that randomness would prevail – planets (rocks) would burst out randomly, and not settle into an established orbit. If you fractured a rock, you would get smaller pieces of the same rock.

Macroevolution fails simply on its irreducibility. Simply defined, it means that a cell cannot be further reduced to a prior evolutionary form. There is a place where there must be the first form that seemingly appears out of thin air. Scientists argue while they can't explain it yet, one day they will. This first cell, contained within the first host they claim, proceeded to undergo transitional change, through multiple generations, to produce our numerous species.

The cell poses a second problem for evolutionists, information. Within a cell is the DNA (information) that predetermines what traits the host life will have. The complexity of the 3-billion-letter code inside our cells led Professor Anthony Flew, one of the world's most famous atheists, to conclude that God exists based on DNA evidence. "What I think the DNA material has done is that it has shown, by the almost unbelievable complexity of the arrangements which are needed to produce [life], that intelligence must have been involved in getting these extraordinarily diverse elements to work together."

For example, the bird is often used to depict this issue. A bird has DNA that determines what it can look like, what type of bird it is, and how it will survive. A bird has always produced birds, some looking different from the first, but nonetheless a bird. Any different traits would simply have been recessive genes that aren't seen in every generation, but nonetheless were there all along.

Cell Theory states in part, "...cells are the fundamental unit of structure and function in all living organisms, that all cells come from preexisting cells, and that all cells contain hereditary information necessary for regulating cell functions and for transmitting information to the next generation of cells." It begs the question, if cells come from preexisting cells, where did the first cell originate? Even in the first cell, you see the incredible complexity of a 3-billion letter code.

The fossil record shows small changes in birds, but they are always birds. There is no instance where the fossil record shows a transition to another species. There have been numerous cases of fraud and misrepresentation by scientists hoping to persuade others that evolution is proven. Real evidence, however, destroys their argument. The many attempts of fraud point to the desperation they feel in proving their theory. As scientists, their job is to simply follow the evidence and draw conclusions from the findings.

If there was ever a case of fake news, evolution is it. The purpose seems to be nothing more than to discount God and His Creation. A creationist would simply point to the first instance, scientific laws, the many different species (all lacking transitional forms), and the biggie, information. Information can only come from intelligence and is not derived from evolution. You can improve teaching methods, but you are still working with the intelligence already inherent in the person. Hence, an unborn child already has all the information (DNA) that determines what talents he or she will have, as well as their build, gender, height, etc.

Why would anyone buy the weak arguments of evolutionists? Then again, we have a lot of flat-earth believers, so just about anything is believable to a lot of people.