

# Darwin's Black Box—What Evolutionist's Don't want you to know.

(Compiled from Michael Behe's book Darwin's Black Box)

By B. D. Tate

Darwin knew that his theory of gradual evolution by natural selection carried a heavy burden. He said,

***"If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down."***

For decades and even a few centuries, our scientific community has been making sure that Darwin's theory doesn't break down. They have been touting authoritatively, pounding the pulpit harder so to speak, to make sure that everyone understands that evolution is a fact, **not to be questioned with**. Recently, I heard the report from a renowned university professor of biology that anyone wishing to come to his university with any other foundation than evolution, need not apply. It is understood that no true scientist can ever allow an account for the world with any explanation other than natural causes. This understanding is called the **"Rule."**

Science fundamentally is a game. It is a game with one overriding and defining rule—Rule No. 1:

*Let us see how far and to what extent we can explain the behavior of the physical and material universe in terms of purely physical and material causes, without invoking the supernatural. In other words, science must invoke only*

*nature causes, and explain by reference only to natural law.* (Richard Dickerson a prominent biochemist)

**\*This rule is not scientific**, it wasn't discovered in a laboratory; it wasn't the result of chemical reactions in a test tube; it isn't testable at all—**it is a philosophy**. True science is not about establishing the truth and then proving it, it is about **following the “...evidence wherever it leads, with no artificial restrictions.”** (M. Behe, pp. 243)

*“Many people, including many important and well-respected scientists, just don't want there to be anything beyond nature.”* (M. Behe, pp. 243)

What many scientists do in explaining beyond the hard science before them, **is interpret and bring to the table their own personal expectations and views**. Such efforts do not prove anything; they only offer their **best guess**. If taken further then their best guess becomes **a story**. A story told with great passion, great intellect, or great conviction, is still a story (The ancient Greeks practiced the same thing). The majority of scientists have been influenced by such story telling, that the truth is not being uncovered. When someone has already decided what he or she believes, we call that a **biased view**. When a biased view is exposed to evidence only what they are looking for is generally seen; other contrary or confused or mysterious evidence will not be recognized, seen, or dealt with, it will be ignored.

**The Biased View:** Often scientists are touted as being unbiased, objective, and fair minded; supposedly, basing everything they know and teach on facts. They claim authority in their teachings because of this objectiveness. Yet, the

number one rule is to eliminate the supernatural from any explanation of our world. **This is not objective but a pre-established bias against alternative explanations for the evidences produced.**

Let's be forth right about scientists and anyone else for that matter: **everyone is biased** about what they are looking for, what they expect, and what they believe. No one is able to detach themselves from preconceived ideas. Therefore, to argue that someone is unbiased is wrong thinking. I like what Ken Ham said from Answers in Genesis, *"It's not that we are looking for some unbiased view point, no. What we are doing is examining which bias is the best bias to be biased with."*

Richard Dawkins wrote, *"That anyone who denies evolution is either ignorant, stupid or insane."* Does that sound unbiased? Rather it sounds **intolerant and restrictive** of free thought. **He isn't suggesting he is demanding agreement.** When the arguments are weak people tend to attack people. **When the facts are not forth coming, the propaganda is.**

## **What Do You Know of Evolution that is a Genuine Fact?**

Ask yourself a question: *"What do you know of evolution that is a fact?"* Surprisingly, with all of the decades of research, with all of the money spent, with all of the thousands of scientists involved in studying evolution all around the world; there is not one undisputed fact known today that validates evolution! **Not one.** Let me give you some examples:

- 1) **The fossil record** (which is reported to be one of the strongest areas of evidences for evolution)

shows no evidence of evolution now or in the past. There has never been found one transitional form of one creature turning into another. Harvard Paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould: ***"The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology. The evolutionary trees that adorn our text books have data only at the tips...of their branches; the rest is inference...not the evidence of fossils...in any local area, a species does not arise gradually by the steady transformation of its ancestors; it appears all at once and fully formed."***

- 2) **The Geologic Column**, which is reported to be showing us, the past in millions of years layer by layer, it better understood in rapid disposition. Each layer is supposedly older as we descend the geologic column. The actual geologic column with all of eras named that adorns our textbooks **does not exist** anywhere on the earth. It is a fabrication. Creation explanations of the existence of the geologic column are far more convincing. For example, why is there **no erosion** between layers, which surely would have occurred over millions of years? Why are there many **polystrata fossils** like tree trunks that span "millions of years" from one layer to another? Furthermore, why are millions of **fossils in massive graveyards** all around the world actually showing they were **buried suddenly**? Many of them are in the throes of death, completely maintained, some giving birth, others with food in their mouths, some having just swallowed its prey, many complex and simpler forms of life all together? Why does the

geology of our earth show that everywhere land is it has at **one time been under water**, from the valleys to the highest mountains? Why is it that **no force exists today** to explain how mountains arose, the continents shifted, and the ocean bottoms sunk? **Only catastrophe can explain what we see today.**

- 3) **The Age of the Earth** is said to be millions if not billions of years old. The Evidence used for this comes from *radioactive materials*. **None of these dating methods are precise**, none of them agree, none of them are consistent, they are all reflecting ages all over the spectrum from thousands of years to millions, but it is only the millions of years that are accepted. **There are over 100 ways to measure the age** of the earth and many of them reflect thousands of years. **If one of them is right**, that makes all the old dates suspect at best. No one was there, no human being really knows. What fuels such ages is *the need for massive amounts of time* to explain life gradually arising out of some primordial soup (from which after millions of years, a simple form of life in a step-by-step process evolved into life, as we know it). **Evolution is not shown in hard scientific evidence to be occurring anywhere we look, but it is adamantly affirmed to have happened where we cannot look.** This is not science; **this is a belief system**, a philosophy, even a religious conviction.
- 4) **Natural Selection** is supposed to be the force behind the evolutionary development of life on earth. The major problem with natural selection or **its by-**

**product mutation** is that these processes do not and **cannot provide for an increase of information**. There needs to be an increase in (information) the gene pool for any form of life to become more complex. Natural selection can only account for variety within a species where the gene pool or information already exists. Mutations have shown that this same information can from time to time be reshuffled, **but nothing new is added**. Furthermore, mutations are 99% harmful and cause the form of life to become less efficient.

- 5) **The Laws of Thermodynamics** are well established and agreed upon worldwide for many centuries now. They can be shown, tested, and repeatedly seen. The first law basically say that all things left alone are tending to wind down and go into disorder. The second is that **there is nowhere to be seen in our universe where matter and energy are being produced**—everything is in a constant state nothing new is being added. These laws **fly in the face of evolution's basic tenants**. Evolution says things left alone are increasing in energy and complexity; things are moving forwards and upwards. Evolution must have an energy source that is increasing that is why astronomers are projecting and conjecturing deep space star formations. These are places where energy is supposedly increasing. In our world these evolutionary principles do not exist.

**The real problem is:** As long as evolution can change its tenants, its foundations, which it has over and over again, and as long as we keep **what it is teaching above the real testable specifics**, it will continue to thrive. The death of evolution occurs when we get to the details.

## **Darwin's Black Box**

In his book **Darwin's Black Box**, Michael Behe does an outstanding job of bringing the details of life to light. The black box refers to our scientific knowledge going from the large-scale anatomy of life to its smallest details. Evolution has always claimed that as we get closer to the smallest details we see will less and less complexity; that the simple cell is simple. That the properties involved are not elaborate but basic stuff that comes from a primordial soup of our past. In his book he builds and displays openly for anyone to see that life is not only **compoundingly complex, but also irreducible**. What this means is that **step-by-step evolution is impossible** at the smallest levels of life. All of the components to life, and they are enormous, must be in place, in the right order, in the right sizes, shapes, and amounts; for it to work. As biochemistry has come to the forefront of scientific knowledge about life, it has also brought with it an **unexplainable existence in evolutionary terms**. We may understand how something works in the molecular levels **but that in no way means we understand how it came to be**.

When we finally were able to examine the very foundations of life and open the Black Box, **we have discovered a whole city of machines within the cell. The list of operations happening in the cell is mindboggling: there is manufacturing, transporting, receiving, managing, energy transfer, communications, cellular switches,**

**cables, pulleys, solar power, electrical processes, cells that swim, cells that copy themselves, ingest food, in short a series of highly sophisticated molecular machines are controlling every cellular process.** Thus the details of life are finely calibrated, and the machinery of life enormously complex.

These biochemical machines operate thousands of processes in each cell and there are millions of cells in living forms. The complexity compounds again and again. Evolutionists have envisioned that these complex machines could have come into being through a step-by-step process, but when science looks at the complexity, **there are no steps just huge divides.** The gaps between the steps of evolution and reality are so huge that we are now looking elsewhere for the explanation of the origin of life.

California geneticist John Endler:

*“Although much is known about mutation, it is still largely a “black box” relative to evolution. Novel biochemical functions seem to be rare in evolution, and **the basis for their origin is virtually unknown.**”*

Another Scientist reports:

*“There is a considerable gap in neo-Darwinian theory of evolution, and we believe this gap to be of such a nature that **it cannot be bridged with the current conception of biology.**”*

## **The Issue is Irreducible Complexity in Nature!**

**Definition:** *“A single system composed of several well-matched, interacting parts that contribute to the basic function,*

*wherein the removal of any one of the parts causes the system to effectively cease functioning."*

*"Evolution is very possibly not, in actual fact, always gradual. But it must be gradual when it is being used to explain the coming into existence of complicated, apparently designed objects, like eyes: For if it is not gradual in these cases, it ceases to have any explanatory power at all. **Without gradualness in these cases, we are back to miracle, which is simply a synonym for the total absence of explanation.**" (Richard Dawkins)*

## **The Mousetrap:**

The parts of the mousetrap: the base, the stick, the spring, the clips, the arm, the trip apparatus, not only must exist at once, but they must be in proper relationship to each other. The parts must be put in proper sizes, made up of the proper materials, and the trap must be set up with bait. Leave anything out and it doesn't function, **and if it doesn't function at the molecular level it dies.** You can have all but one and it ceases to function, have all but two or three, and it ceases to function. You can have the wrong size, shape, amount, placement, and it ceases to function. This example of molecular structure is too complex even with the humble mousetrap for chance to explain how it came to be. Now we must enormously compound the issue with the realities of the basis of life.

**The Black Box opened:** we must consider proteins and amino acid links. A protein has 50 to 1000 amino acid links. In each link there are 20 different amino acids. In this they are like words, which come in various lengths with just 26 letters. Each amino acid has a different shape, function, and property. These protein and amino acid links form into many different

shapes within a cell. As they chemically react and respond, the links attach, travel, unattached, and so on, to bring about thousands of chemical transactions in a cell to produce life. The cell's work requires teams of proteins. **These teams mean a thousand times more complexity than the mousetrap scenario.** The more we look into this irreducibly complex cell, the more one moves **from even the remote possibility of chance.**

These minute machines must be coordinated, trained, purposed, and cooperated, with a thousand other protein teams. The mathematical chance of these biochemical machines coming to be on their own **all at once is astronomical!** (The number is beyond our comprehension it is something like  $1 \times 30$  to the tenth power for just one protein amino acid link and there are thousands) However, someone must know the step-by-step process by which these teams evolved for evolution to be true, but a search of the professional literature proves **that nobody knows!**

*"As the number of irreducible complex systems increases the inability to explain them by evolutionary step-by-step processes, skyrockets!"* (Michael Behe)

Evolutionary writings are constantly being filled with statements like: **it appears, is born, springs forth, is unleashed, is apparently designed, is signaled, is activated, is controlled, perfected by evolution; and so on...**all of these statements are **miracles being covered up by evolutionists;** because they have no explanation for them. These terms do not explain the step-by-step process; they merely relate what is going on.

In essence, **evolution is given credit for anything they can't explain.** This is no different from those who believe in God, and by so doing, give credit to God for everything explainable and unexplainable.

Klaus Dose:

*"More than 30 years of experimentation on the origin of life in the fields of chemical and molecular evolution have led to a better perception of the immensity of the problem of the origin of life on Earth rather than to its solution. At present, all discussions on principal theories and experiments in the field either end in stalemate or in a confession of ignorance."*

**\*For example:** One of the major problems for proteins to form in amino acid links is the **presence of water.** Water breaks down all links and chains. Water dissolves all connections and since water is where life is supposed to have begun—**this is major roadblock!**

## **The Missing Papers Tell the Story!**

**There are missing papers!** There are missing papers in the Journal of Molecular Evolution (JME)! A thorough investigation of not just JME but all professional & scientific papers published in the last century has shown an absolute **silence on how life began.** In other words, no one is writing on the subject because no one has any answers.

Michael Behe writes:

*"How did the photosynthetic reaction center develop? How did intramoecular transport start? How did cholesterol biosynthesis begin? How did retinal become*

*involved in vision? How did phosphoprotein signaling pathways develop? **The very fact that none of these problems is even addressed, let alone solved, is a very strong indication that Darwinism is an inadequate framework for understanding the origin of complex biochemical systems.***" (PP. 176)

**No papers** were published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences PNAS that proposes detailed routes by which complex biochemical structures might have developed. Surveys of other biochemical journals show the same result: sequences upon sequences, but no explanations. (MB, PP. 178)

*"The absence of papers on the evolution of biochemical structures in the journals **just about kills any chance of there being a book published on the matter.**"* (MB, PP. 178)

*"The fact is: There has never been a meeting, or a book, or a paper on the details of the evolution of complex biochemical systems."* (MB, PP. 179)

**\*What we have then is the word "evolution" that is used as a wand to wave over mysteries, a miracle otherwise being discounted for the lack of any explanation.** (Michael Behe)

A survey of 30 biochemical textbooks used in major universities over the past generation shows that many textbooks ignore evolution completely.

*"Many students learn from their textbooks how to view the world through an evolutionary framework they do*

*not learn how Darwinian evolution might have produced any of the remarkably intricate biochemical systems that those texts describe.”(MB PP.183)*

Why is this important? It is **publish or perish that is why**. It is “Put up or shut up” in the slang.

There are two ways people can know something:

- 1) **Through personal experience**. Through tests, experiments, life realities, you saw it, did it; all by direct contact, one can know something.
- 2) **By authority**. We rely on some source of information, believing it to be reliable.

All scientists rely on authority for almost all of their scientific knowledge, either by personal experimentation or by some authoritative professional journal that has been supported and evaluated by others. Published works must contain pertinent evidences, provide relevant support, and be scrutinized by peers. **No one can claim authority by some mere statement of proposed truth.** (PP. 185)

## CONCLUSION:

Since no one has ever tested, experimented, and proved evolution, especially molecular biochemical evolution, **no one has knowledge first hand.**

And since no one has ever published a paper, or book, or even held a meeting to show the step-by-step processes by which evolution produce complex biochemical systems, **no one has authority to claim evolution is true.**

THEREFORE, MOLECULAR EVOLUTION IS NOT BASED ON SCIENTIFIC AUTHORITY! **It is based on story telling.**

*“If a theory claims to be able to explain some phenomenon but does not generate even an attempt at an explanation, then it should be banished.”(MB PP. 186)*

**What is left? Intelligent Design:** We are back to the Bible and God as the creator being just as scientifically legitimate as any evolutionary theory.

*“The straightforward conclusion is that many biochemical systems **were designed**. They were designed not by the laws of nature, not by chance and necessity; rather, they were planned. Life on earth at its most fundamental level, in its most critical components, is the product of intelligent activity.” (MB. Pp.193)*

*“**If there is not a gradual route** to their existence or production—design is evident when a number of separate, interacting components are ordered in such a way as to accomplish a function beyond the individual components. The greater the specificity of the interacting components required to produce the function, the **greater is our confidence in the conclusion of design**.”(MB pp. 194)*

The result of these cumulative efforts to investigate the cell—to investigate life at the molecular level—is a loud, clear, **piercing cry of design!** The scientific community is not celebrating what they all realize, but instead a curious, embarrassed silence surrounds the stark complexity of the cell. Why, because on the other side of design there is a **label called God.**

\*\*\*90% of people around the world believe in God.

Religion itself is the originator of science, yet, scientists insist on anything but God, **after all it is the rule!**

The idea with evolution is that the entire universe with all of its complexities simply popped up from nowhere out of nothing a quantum fluctuation from nonbeing to being—and without a cause. **Now that's blind faith!**

The Bible tells us plainly in Romans 1:20:

*“For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse,”*

Irreducible complexity within the cell has **been identified as an enormous roadblock for evolutionary thinking**. With all of the other areas of evidence from the **fossil record, the geologic column, the laws of thermodynamics, natural selection and mutation**, for example, also not validating evolution, **why should anyone abandon the testimony of scripture?** In fact, to the open mind, these areas of investigation point more and more towards Intelligent Design, a Creator, and the Redeemer of mankind.

## **What evolutionists don't want you to know!**

They don't want you to know **that they don't know how our world came to be, and will not accept an answer that points to God or any supernatural cause**. If this is the case, and it is, why should we believe their story telling just because they put on a white jacket and claim objectivity? **They**

**are not unbiased; they are not letting the evidence lead them, why should we let them lead us?** The Bible is a faithful witness to time past, the causes and situations of the present and prophetic picture of the future. The Bible claims to be the Word of God, a revelation from God to us. **There has never been an archeological find, a hard scientific result, or detail found that has contradicted the testimony found in it.**

What we have in our hands with the Bible is more verifiable than evolution could ever hope to be. There are **double standards** of course when it comes to embracing the Bible or evolution. **For us to embrace the Bible we have to be convinced that all of it is correct; for us to embrace evolution, we need only claim for some part of it to be correct.** Thank God that with the Bible He had given us a text with absolute certainty of its inspiration and accuracy—***all of it is correct!***

Recommended Reading:

- 1) **Scientific Creationism**, by Henry M. Morris, Master Books, CR 2001
  - 2) **In the Beginning was Information**, by Werner Gitt, Copyright 2001
  - 3) **Refuting Compromise**, by Jonathan Sarfati, Ph.D., Master Books, Copyright 2004
  - 4) **Big Argument: Does God Exist?** John Ashton & Michael Westacott, 24 scholars Explore How Science, Archaeology, and Philosophy Haven't Disproved God., Master Books, Copyright 2006
- AnswersinGenesis.Com*** Website is an awesome resource...