

What Are the Odds?

Sir Fred Hoyle, a British mathematician and astronomer, was quoted as saying, "The chance that higher life forms evolved is comparable with the chance that a tornado sweeping through a junk yard might assemble a Boeing 747 from the materials therein." (24) Mr. Hoyle, of course, realized his tongue-in-cheek remark was an understatement to say the least. Chances are really much better for that new 747 than for the case of evolution. As we begin to sift through the numbers, we begin to see just what logical

possibilities do and do not exist for the universe to evolve from the "way back when" to the "here and now".

First, we must realize that science has abused its freedom in moving the age of the earth as far as seems necessary for its cause. What used to be thought of as millions of years for evolution to take place has now grown to billions of years. Now it seems that the 4.6 billion of a few years ago will soon be backed up as far as 20 billion years, or maybe more. Each time the scientist becomes overwhelmed with the detailed complexity of God's creation it sees the need to turn back the clock even further. They need this time to make their theory work. After all, which is the average person more likely to believe: that the entire universe came about in billions of years, or that it suddenly appeared in less than a week. Today we can't

even get mail from one part of town to the other in less than a week.

Dr. Henry Morris of the Creation Science Research Institute has done some extensive research into the probabilities of "random chance". He carefully calculated the possibility of accidently arranging 200 parts into perfect order through the means of simple chance selection. Since there are 200 bones in the human body, this should give us some idea of the complexity of putting together a simple structure like the human skeleton by mere chance. There are, of course, many ways the bones could be assembled, in fact there are about 10(375) possible ways (that's a 1 followed by 375 zeros). In other words there is only one possibility in 10(375) tries to correctly put together all the bones in the skeleton and still have your toes in the right place and your shin in your leg and not your neck. Granted you could get lucky and do it on the first try but that is rather unlikely. How many possibilities is 10(375)? Perhaps we could better see it this way: suppose you would attempt one skeleton alignment every second, and that you started 10 billion years ago. To date you would have attempted only 10(18) times (not to mention you'd be pooped from working at a rather dizzying pace). Hardly enough time!

Let's give the evolutionist some more time to work. Suppose we tried a billion combinations every second for 30 billion years. This would still not even get you to half of the

trials you might need.

The irony of this ridiculous estimating is that so far we have only worked with a structure of 200 pieces. Consider the following: The cerebral cortex of the human brain contains over a billion cells, all arranged in proper order! Each of the cells contains countless messages that must be in certain order for the brain to function properly. Now we are no longer talking about 200 components. Now we must put together billions of components in proper orderall by random chance. How many years do you suppose that would take? Mr. Hoyle estimated that the probability of life originating by random chance was one in 10(400,000). It is estimated that the simplest type of protein molecule that could be called "living" is made of at least 400 amino acids which are each made of four or five chemical elements which in turn are made of a special arrangement of protons, electrons, and neutrons. Marcel Golay has predicted it would take 10(450) chances to duplicate just one of these molecules. R.L. Wysong has further calculated the probability of forming proteins and DNA (the code-bearing "brains" of each cell) for the smallest self-reproducing entity to be 10(167,626).(9) Notice that once the

Creator is removed from the creation, there is simply no way that even the first and simplest

form of life could have come about.

PERHAPS THINGS DEVELOPED THROUGH MUTATIONS The evolutionist will argue that this was a lengthy process that was a result of trial and error through mutations. A mutation is a sudden change in an offspring that was not present in the parent. The changes are always small, and they are passed along to the next generation such as a rose bush which has a white stripe on its red blossoms or an albino squirrel. Scientists know, however, that mutations are nearly always harmful to the offspring with the chance of a beneficial mutation coming about less than one in every 1000 mutations. To think that these mutations will result in a more complex system that can reproduce into the next mutation is even more absurd.

PERHAPS THEY DEVELOPED THROUGH NATURAL SELECTION Natural selection, or the survival of the fittest, was Darwin's dream. He believed that those creatures with the greatest advantage over lesser animals would possess the best possibility of survival. We are well aware that this does take place. If we would place both a tropical guppy and a sturgeon in the waters of northern Canada we can probably assume which would stand the better chance of survival. The only problem is that survival of the fittest has never produced a new species.

One can add and subtract and multiply and divide the numbers any way possible. We can add hundreds of billions to the numbers we already have but the truth is that mathematics does not lie. According to any sense of probability, evolution did not happen. God's creation

still boggles the human mind. Its complexity is nothing short of awesome!

READING BETWEEN THE LINES

Discuss the following quotation by Scott Huse from his book "The Collapse of Evolution":

"Someone has stated that the probability of life arising by mere chance is comparable to the probability of a monkey typing a perfect unabridged dictionary. If we concern ourselves only with the letters (disregard the punctuation, capitalization, accent marks, numbers, spaces, etc.), we find that we need to accidently select about 35 million letters in correct sequence." (24)

LET'S TALK

1. Why do evolutionists avoid discussion of probability?

2. How important is the study of probability in discussing evolution?

3. Why have things gotten to the point that by adding more time to the equation scientists are actually making their case for evolution worse?

WORDS FROM THE CREATOR

| 2. How vast are God's thoughts as mentioned in Psalm 139:17,18? | | |
|---|----------------------------------|--|
| | | |
| . Why should all scientists | express the words of Job 42:2,3? | |