

科学家如何谈论进化论

What Scientists Say About Evolution

By 海明 Hai Ming

Translator: Xiao Bing

Chinese Simplified Copyright © May 1999, Hai Ming

Ambassadors for Christ
P. O. Box 280
Paradise, PA 17562-0280 USA

Web Site: <http://www.afcinc.org>

The modern theory of evolution is largely attributed to Charles Darwin who published his book, On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection in 1859. From 1922 through 1953, Alexander Oparin, a Russian biochemist, and J.B.S. Holdane, an English biologist added what has been called the Oparin-Holdane hypothesis. This theory deals with the origin of life by chemical evolution in a "prebiotic soup" composed of methane, ammonia, hydrogen and water vapor in a reducing (little or no free oxygen) atmosphere. Although several slight changes in the "prebiotic" or "primordial soup" have been suggested, we could summarize the idea of evolution as generally taught in biology texts today, as follows:

prebiotic soup >> "Simple" >> "Complex"
Chemicals >> amino acids >> polymers/RNA/DNA >> single cell >> plants
and animals >> plants and animals >> ape >> man

Three major ideas are always present:

1. simple >> complex (i.e., non-living >> living)
2. a very long period of time
3. no design (i.e., random, chance, or "natural processes")

As a recent college biology text has observed...

Proof of evolutionary theory, in the rigorous sense of an experimental verification or demonstration is impossible for several reasons. The most important reason is that evolution is a historical phenomenon.¹

Also, evolutionist and scientist, Colin Patterson, Ph.D., has stated:

We must ask whether the theory of evolution by natural selection is scientific or pseudoscientific (metaphysical)...taking the first part of the theory, that evolution has occurred, it says that the history of life is a single process of species-splitting and progression. This process must be unique and unrepeatable, like the history of England. This part of the theory is therefore a historical theory about unique events; and unique events are, by definition, not part of science, for they are unrepeatable and so not subject to test . . .²

This means that evolution is not a fact but a hypothesis not proven by science. However, we can look at the evidence and see if the facts seem to support the idea of evolution or not. This is the purpose of this booklet-to compare the evidence with the hypothesis. When one does this, one finds several discrepancies between the facts of science and the hypothesis of evolution. Five major problems are listed below.

1. Lack of Evidence for Prebiotic Soup

There is a growing body of evidence that the early earth's atmosphere was not reducing and not composed of the materials proposed by Oparin, Holdane, etc. Dr. Robert Shapiro, an evolutionist and biochemist, has a whole chapter titled "The Spark and the Soup" in which he discusses "the myth of the prebiotic soup."³ Drs. Thaxton, Bradley and Olsen have summarized the problem as follows:

...in the atmosphere and in the various water basins of the primitive earth, many destructive interactions would have so vastly diminished, if not altogether consumed, essential precursor chemicals, that chemical evolution rates would have been negligible. The soup would have been too dilute for direct polymerization to occur. Even local ponds for concentrating soup ingredients would have met with the same problem. Furthermore, no geological evidence indicates that an organic soup, even a small organic pond, ever existed on this planet. It is becoming clear that however life began on earth, the usually conceived notion that life emerged from an oceanic soup of organic chemicals is a most implausible hypothesis. We may therefore with fairness call this scenario "the myth of the prebiotic soup."⁴

进化论的现代理论主要归功于达尔文 (Charles Darwin) 于 1859 年所发表的《物种起源》一书。从 1922 年至 1953 年, 生物化学家奥裴林 (Alexander Oparin), 和英国生物化学家赫戴纳 (J.B.S. Holdane) 增加了奥裴林—赫戴纳假设。这一理论试图用化学进化论的方法解释“生物前液”中的生命起源的问题, 这里的生物前液是由甲烷, 阿摩尼亚, 氢和水蒸汽组成的。虽然人们曾建议略微不同的“生物前液”或“原生液”, 但我们可以将其进化论的理论, 按照今天公认的生物学教科书中所传授的内容总结如下。

化合物 (生物前液) → 氨基酸 → 聚合物 / RNA / DNA (蛋白质等) → 单细胞 → (“简单的”) 植物和动物 → (“复杂的”) 植物和动物 → 猿 → 人 其中三个主要的思想总是出现的:

1. 简单 → 复杂 (无生命 → 有生命)
2. 一个相当长的时期
3. 没有设计 (随机的, 凭机会的, 或靠 “自然过程的”)

但正如最近的一本大学生物教材论述到: “进化论理论的证明, 在试验验证和演示的严格意义上是不可能的, 这里有几条理由, 其中最重要的原因, 是因为进化是一种历史现象。” [1]

另外, 进化论学家和科学家派德森 (Colin Patterson) 博士指出:

我们必须首先问自然选择的进化理论是科学还是伪科学 (形而上学) ……。以该理论的第一部份为例, 当时进化论已经出现, 该理论认为生命的历史是一个单一的物种分裂和发展的过程。这一过程必须是唯一的和不可重复的, 正如英格兰历史一样。因此理论的这段话是关于独特事件的历史理论, 而独特事件, 根据其定义不是科学的一部分, 因为它们不可重复而且无法置于实验中。[2]

这段话的意思是说进化论不是一个事实, 而是一个没有被科学验证的假设。不过我们可以来看看证据, 看事实是否看上去象是支持进化论的假设。此乃这篇文章的目的——比较证据与假设。比较之后, 人们会发现, 在科学事实和进化论假设之间, 有不相符的现象。以下列出五个主要问题:

1. 生物前液的存在缺乏证据

不断增加的证据表明, 早期地球的环境不是还原性的, 也不是由奥裴林, 赫戴纳等所假设的物质所组成的。进化论学家和生物化学家莎比罗 (Robert Shapiro) 博士在他所着的以《火花和液》为题的一整章中讨论了“生物前液的奥秘。” [3] 泰克森 (Thaxton) 布莱里 (Bradley), 和奥尔森 (Olsen) 博士将其问题总结如下:

在原始地球的大气和不同的水域中, 许多破坏性反应会广泛地破坏合成生命所必须的化合物, 以至于化合物进化的速度几乎可以忽略。对于直接聚合反应所发生的液体就太稀了, 即使在局部的水塘中, 浓缩液的配料也会遇到同样的问题。更进一步而言, 没有任何地质证据证明一种有机液, 哪怕是一个小有机的池塘, 曾经在这个地球上存在过。形势正趋于明朗, 尽管生命在地球上产生, 但是那通过所认为的生命从有机物的海洋中产生的想法, 是最不可思议的假设。因此, 我们可以以公平的态度称这一剧情为『生物前液的奥秘』。[4]

It should be noted that the reason the reducing prebiotic mixture was selected in the first place was that only it could have possibly produced the organic material needed for the chemical evolution of life. Geologists in the 1920's did not produce fossils showing such a prebiotic soup which then led to the Oparin-Holdane hypothesis.

2. Lack of Transitional Fossils

Scientists agree that we have fossils of the major types of plants/animals. However, since evolution states that change from one type of plant/animal to another type occurred very slowly, we should find many fossils of transitional or intermediate life forms. For example, according to the theory of evolution, reptiles became birds over a long period of time. We should, therefore, find fossils of several animals between reptiles and birds. What do we really find? None! Actually, Darwin knew this problem and said so: "*Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory.*"⁵ However, he thought that as we found more fossils we would find these transitional forms. What have we found so many years later? Let the scientists speak. Evolutionist and paleontologist David Raup, Ph.D.:

Darwin...was embarrassed by the fossil record, ...we are now about 120 years after Darwin and the knowledge of the fossil record has been greatly expanded. We now have a quarter of a million fossil species, but the situation hasn't changed much...We have even fewer examples of Evolutionary transition than we had in Darwin's time.⁶

Evolutionist geologist and paleontologist Stephen Gould, Ph.D.:

"The absence of fossil evidence for intermediary stages between major transitions in organic design, indeed our inability even in our imagination, to construct functional intermediates in many cases, has been a persistent and nagging problem for gradualistic accounts of evolution."⁷

In fact, Dr. Gould calls this lack of evidence of transitional forms a secret well-kept from those in the general public (apart from those in paleontology): "The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology."⁸ Dr. Michael Denton, (also an evolutionist) has said, "Without intermediates or transitional forms to bridge the enormous gaps which separate existing species and groups of organisms, the concept of evolution could never be taken seriously as a scientific hypothesis."⁹

3. Sudden Appearance of Complex Life Forms (esp. in the lowest geological layers).

We could summarize the evolutionary position on geology and life forms as follows:

1) The earth's surface is composed of several layers, with the oldest at the bottom moving up to the youngest layer on top.

2) Since the simplest life forms are the oldest they appear in the lowest layer and gradually change through the layers to the complex life forms in the top level(s).

This means that the ancestral form of each life form should be in the layer below it and the lowest layers should have the 'simpler' life forms. However, what do the rocks tell us? Let the scientists speak.

Fred Hoyle, Ph.D. and Chandra Wickramasinghe, Ph.D.:

The problem for biology is to reach a simple beginning...the tendency is to imagine that there must have been a time when simple cells existed but when complex cells did not. ...this belief has turned out to be wrong. ...Going back in time to the age of the oldest rocks... fossil residues of ancient life-forms in the rocks do not reveal a simple beginning. Although we may care to think of fossil bacteria and fossil algae and microfungi as being simple compared to a dog or horse, the information standard remains enormously high. Most of the biochemical complexity of life was present already at the time the oldest surface rocks of the Earth were formed.¹⁰

应该注意到,起初人们选择还原性生物前混合物的理由,是因为只有它才可能产生生命化合物进化所需的有机物质,二十世纪二十年代的地质学家,没有找到表明这一生物前液存在的化石,这样就导致了奥裴林—赫戴纳假设。

2. 中间型化石的缺乏

科学家们一致同意,我们拥有了主要种类的动、植物化石。然而由于进化论声称由一种动、植物到另一种动、植物的变化是十分缓慢的,我们应该能发现许多的过渡型或中间型化石。例如,根据进化论,爬行动物经过很长的时间才变成鸟类,因此我们应该找到几种介于爬行动物和鸟类之间的动物化石。我们真的找到了什么吗?什么也没有!实际上达尔文知道这个问题,因而他说,“地质学的确没有显示出任何这样一个细致渐变的生物链,这也许是可以用来反对我的最明显的和最让人悲伤的反驳。”[5]然而他想随著越来越多的化石被发现,我们应该能找到中间型化石。这么多年后,我们又发现了什么呢?让科学家来说话。罗普(David Raup)博士,一位进化论学家和化石学家说:

达尔文为化石的记录所尴尬。我们现在是在达尔文一百二十年后,化石记录的知识大大扩展,我们现在有二十五万个化石物种。但形势并没有多少改变。……甚至于我们现有的进化样本,比达尔文时候的还要少。[6]

进化论地质学家和古生物学家哥德(Stephen Gould)博士说:

在生物设计的重大转换间的中间型化石的不存在,以及在许多情况下,即使是在想象中,我们对建立功能性中间态确实束手无策,对于渐变的进化论来说,一直是持续的恼人问题。[7]

事实上,哥德博士称这一中间型证据的缺乏成了一只对一般公众(除了对古生物学家外)保守得很好的秘密:“化石记录中转换型的极度缺乏,持续成为古生物学家的贸易秘密。”[8]但顿(Michael Denton)博士(也是位进化论学家)说过,“若是没有中间或转换型,来填补现有物种和生物群的巨大鸿沟,进化论的概念永远也不会被认真地当作科学假定。”[9]

3. 复杂生命形式的突然出现(尤其是在最低地质层)

我们可将生命的进化形式或在地层中的位置总结如下:(1)地壳由几层组成,最古老的在最下面,由下至上,最年轻的在最上面。

(2)因为最简单的生命形式是最古老的,他们出现在最低层,在各层中逐渐改变,一直到最表层的复杂生命形式。

这意味着每一生命形式的祖先应该在该层以下,最低层应该有最简单的生命形式。然而岩石告诉了我们什么呢?让科学家来发言。赫尔(Fred Hoyle)博士和威克拉马辛(Chandra Wickramasinghe)博士:

对于生物学来说,问题是证明一个简单的开始。人们倾向于认为必有一个时期,其间简单细胞存在而复杂细胞则不存在。这一想法被证明是错误的。让我们从时间上回到最古老的岩石层。古老生命形式,在岩石中残留化石并不显示一个简单的开始。尽管我们或许会认为石化了的细菌,海藻,微生物真菌于狗或马相比是简单的。但它们的信息标准却维持在极高水平。在地球最古老的表面岩石形成时,大多数生命的生化复杂性已经出现了。[10]

Take the trilobite for example. *"These animals first appeared at the beginning of the Cambrian period approximately 570 million years ago."*¹¹ The Cambrian layer is characterized by a tremendous variety of fossilized life forms. However, the layer below it, the Precambrian, contains almost no fossils (bacteria, algae, etc.) and certainly nothing that could have remotely given way to a trilobite because the trilobite is a very complex little animal with organs, exoskeleton, etc. Consider the trilobite eye...

*"At least two types of eyes are distinguishable in the trilobites...The holochroal or compound eye consists of touching hexagonal calcite lenses which may number from 100 to more than 15,000."*¹²

Anyone who has ever seen or held a trilobite realizes that they are very complex creatures. Could they have come directly from a spore, a bacterium or algae? What is such a complex animal doing in the very bottom of the fossil record? We observe again and again this fact that the plants/animals appear in the fossil record abruptly, with no ancestors and fully formed, just as in the Cambrian record (where we also find jellyfish, starfish, mollusks, etc.). To summarize I would like to quote evolutionist Michael Denton (Ph.D. in molecular Biology and M.D.):

It is still, as it was in Darwin's day, overwhelmingly true that the first representatives of all the major classes of organisms known to biology are already highly characteristic of their class when they make their initial appearance in the fossil record ...The mollusks for example,...are all highly differentiated when they burst into the fossil record...the strata lain down over the hundreds of millions of years before the Cambrian era, which might have contained the connecting links between the major phyla, are almost completely empty of animal fossils...The story is the same for plants. Again, the first representatives of each major group appear in the fossil record already highly specialized and highly characteristic of the group to which they belong...Like the sudden appearance of the first animal groups in the Cambrian rocks, the sudden appearance of the angiosperms is a persistent anomaly which has resisted all attempts at explanation since Darwin's time. The sudden origin of the angiosperms puzzled him...Again, just as in the case of the absence of pre-Cambrian fossils, no forms have ever been found in pre-Cretaceous rocks linking the angiosperms with any other group of plants... The same pattern is true of the vertebrate fossil record. The first members of each major group appear abruptly, unlinked to other groups by transitional or intermediate forms. ...The virtual complete absence of intermediate and ancestral forms from the fossil record is today recognized widely by many leading paleontologists as one of its most striking characteristics.¹³

4. Non-Living Cannot Become Living By Natural Processes

Evolution says that simple things became complex, that non-living chemicals (macromolecules) became living cells with DNA by chance. Is that even possible? Do scientists observe anything like that today? Can we even synthesize living matter in a laboratory using high-tech lab equipment, computers, etc., and lots of design? The answer is no, no, and no. Fred Hoyle, Ph.D. and Chandra Wickramasinghe, Ph.D., both evolutionists, explain why this is not possible.

Life cannot have had a random beginning... the trouble is that there are about two thousand enzymes, and the chance of obtaining them all in a random trial is only one part in $(10^{20})^{2,000} = 10^{40,000}$, an outrageously small probability that could not be faced even if the whole universe consisted of organic soup. If one is not prejudiced either by social beliefs or by a scientific training into the conviction that life originated on the Earth, this simple calculation wipes the idea entirely out of court,...the enormous information content of even the simplest living systems...cannot in our view be generated by what are often called "natural" processes...For life to have originated on the Earth it would be necessary that quite explicit instruction should have been provided for its assembly. There is no way in which we can expect to avoid the need for information, no way in which we can simply get by with a bigger and better organic soup, as we ourselves hoped might be possible a year or two ago.¹⁴

以三叶虫为例。“这些动物首先出现在寒武纪时期约五十七亿年前”，[11]寒武纪地层以其极广泛的生命种类化石为特点，然而在该层下，前寒武纪，却几乎没有化石（细菌海藻等），可以肯定没有别的可以让位于三叶虫，因为三叶虫是一种非常复杂的小动物，具有器官外骨骼等。让我们来考查三叶虫的眼睛，“至少在三叶虫中，有两种眼睛是有区别的，全色的或复眼，由互相接触的数目在100至15,000之间的六边形方解石透镜组成。”[12]

任何人曾见过或碰过它的，都会意识到它是十分复杂的生命体，它们可能会从孢子、细菌或真菌进化来吗？这一如此复杂的生物，在化石的最底层干什么呢？我们一次又一次地观察到这一事实，即动/植物在化石记录中突然地出现，没有祖先，且完全成型，正如在寒武纪的记录里的那样（那里我们也发现了水母，海星，软体动物等）。为了将其加以总结，我想引用进化论学家但顿的话（分子生物学博士和医学博士！）：

仍然象在达尔文时代一样，具有压倒优势的事实是，所有生物学所知的生物体主要类别的首批代表，当它们在化石中首次出现时，均已具有其高度的类别特征。以软体动物为例。当它们在化石中蹦出来的时候，均已高度分化了。躺在寒武纪时代前几亿年的岩层，或许能提供主要生物门的连接环节，但其中几乎完全没有动物化石。对于植物来说，也是同样的遭遇。其次，出现在化石记录中各主要植物群的首批代表，都已高度专门化，并具有所属群的特征。正像第一批动物群在寒武纪岩石中的突然出现，被子植物的突然出现是一反常，它顽固地抗拒了自达尔文时代以来的一切解释尝试。被子植物的突然出现困扰著他。再次，正如前寒武纪化石的空缺，在前白垩纪岩石中没有找到任何连接被子植物和其它类别植物的中间环节。同样的情形发生在脊椎动物化石中。每一主要类别的第一批成员突然出现，不由任何中间态连接…。事实上，中间态和祖先态在化石记录中的完全缺乏，作为一个最让人吃惊的特征，被许多古生物学带头人所认同。[13]

4. 自然过程不能使无生命变为有生命

进化论说机会使简单变成复杂，无生命的化合物（大分子）变成带有DNA有生命的细胞。这是可能的吗？现今的科学家观察过任何这样的事实吗？我们能在实验室里靠高科技仪器，计算机等，以及许多的设计合成生命体吗？答案是否，否，否！赫尔博士和威克拉马幸博士，两位进化论学家，解释了为什么不可能：

生命不可能无规则地开始…。麻烦在于大约有两千个西每，在一次无规则的实验中，得到所有西每的几率是十的四万次方分之一，这是十分令人恼怒的无法面对的微小机会，即使整个宇宙充满了有机液。”如果人们不由社会信仰或科学训练导致的对生命在地球上起源的判决产生偏见，那么这一简单的计算则将这种想法从法庭上完全抹除…。从我们的观点来看，即使是最简单的生命系统，以其所具有的巨大信息量，也不可能由通常所说的自然过程产生。生命要在地球上产生，必须有非常明确的指令来提供生命体的组合。…。我们无法回避对于这一信息的需求，我们亦无法靠更大更好的生物液来轻松地绕过它，如同我们一两年前所期望的那样。[14]

Hubert Yockey, Ph.D, an expert in molecular biology, information science and mathematical probability (and an evolutionist), stated: "*the building blocks...do not spontaneously make proteins, at least not by chance. The origin of life by chance in a primeval soup is impossible in probability...A practical person must conclude that life didn't happen by chance.*"¹⁵

Nobel Prize winner, strong evolutionist and biochemist, Francis Crick, Ph.D, recently concluded:

*An honest man, armed with all the knowledge available to us now could only state that in some sense, the origin of life appears at the moment to be almost a miracle, so many are the conditions which would have had to have been satisfied to get it going.*¹⁶

To summarize this point, I would like to quote Dr. Michael Denton again from a chapter he titled The Puzzle of Perfection:

The intuitive feeling that pure chance could never have achieved the degree of complexity and ingenuity so ubiquitous in nature has been a continuing source of skepticism ever since the publication of the Origin of the Species; and throughout the past century there has always existed a significant minority of first-rate biologists who have never been able to bring themselves to accept the validity of Darwinian claims...perhaps in no other area of modern biology is the challenge posed by the extreme complexity and ingenuity of biological adaptations more apparent than in the fascinating new molecular world of the cell,...To grasp the reality of life as it has been revealed by molecular biology, we must magnify a cell a thousand million times until it is twenty kilometers in diameter and resembles a giant airship large enough to cover a great city like London or New York. What we would then see would be an object of unparalleled complexity and adaptive design. On the surface of the cell we would see millions of openings like the port holes of a vast space ship, opening and closing to allow a continual stream of materials to flow in and out. If we were to enter one of these openings we would find ourselves in a world of supreme technology and bewildering complexity...Is it really credible that random processes could have constructed a reality the smallest element of which-a functional protein or gene-is complex beyond or own creative capacities, a reality, which is the very antithesis of chance, which excels in every sense anything produced by the intelligence of man?¹⁷

5. No Valid Mechanism

Science is about process and explaining how things happen. For evolution to be credible it must explain how one plant/animal changes into another plant/animal. As most of us know, Charles Darwin proposed natural selection (sometimes called 'survival of the fittest') as the mechanism of change. However he later became uncertain about natural selection as the mechanism of evolution, gave in to the weight of scientific evidence and abandoned it in the 6th edition of his book, The Origin of Species (see Randall Hedtke, The Secret of the Sixth Edition, Vantage Press, 1983). We now know natural selection moves in the direction of preserving the species, not changing it to another. As evolutionist Dr. Colin Patterson said, "*No one has ever produced a species by mechanisms of natural selection. No one has ever gotten near it.*"¹⁸ Well-known evolutionist Niles Eldridge, Ph.D., a curator of the American Museum of Natural History in New York City has also stated, "*natural selection...does not work to create new species.*"¹⁹ Another proposed mechanism for evolution has been mutations, which are actually genetic accidents. ("*All mutations seem to be in the nature of injuries...*")²⁰

约克 (Hubert Yockey) 博士，一位分子生物学、信息科学和数学几率专家（也是进化论者）说，“至少蛋白质不是凭机会自发产生的，从几率上来说在原始液中靠机会产生生命是不可能的。… …一个讲究实际的人，必将得出生命不是从几率中开始的结论。” [15]

诺贝尔奖获得者，一位坚决的进化论者和生物学家科瑞克 (Francis Crick) 博士最近总结道：

一位诚实的人，以我们目前所有的知识所武装，只能说从某种意义上，生命起源的出现，要以如此众多的条件去满足它的实现，几乎是个奇迹。 [16]

为总结这点，我想再次引用但顿博士《完美的困扰》一章中的话：

自从《物种起源》发表以后，关于由纯粹的机会不可能达到自然界中随处可见的复杂和智慧的直觉，一直是怀疑论连续不断的来源。在过去的世纪中，始终存在著少数一些生物学家，他们从来不能使自己接受达尔文陈述的正确性。… …与使人极感兴趣的细胞分子世界相比，由于生物适应的极其复杂性和机敏性，也许没有任何现代生物学的领域，能象进化论那样受到更加明显的挑战。… …为了掌握生命的实际情形，如分子生物学显示的那样，我们必须将细胞放大十亿倍，直到它的直径是二十公里，象一个巨大的飞船，足以覆盖象伦敦或纽约那样大的城市。

我们将看到的是一个具有无可比拟的复杂和适应性设计的物体。在细胞的表面，我们将看到百万多个开口，象巨大的空中飞船的出口，其开关可让液体连续地流进流出。如果我们进入其中一个进出口，我们会发现自己正置身于一个极高科技和复杂到让人困惑的世界中。… …是否真的可以相信，随机的过程可产生现实，一个最小的元素，其复杂性超出我们自身创造力的功能性蛋白质或基因，一个超越了所有意义上人类的智慧，正好与机会论相反的现实？ [17]

5. 没有合理的机制

科学是有研究过程的，它解释事情如何发生。进化论要可信，它必须解释一种动、植物是如何转变到另一种动、植物的。众所周知，达尔文提出了自然选择（有时被称为适者生存）作为变化的机制，然而他后来对于自然选择作为进化的机制是不肯定的，由于科学证据的重要性，他在自己书的第六版《物种起源》（见兰德赫可 (Randall Hedtke) 所着的《第六版的秘密》，由 Vantage 出版 1983 年）中放弃用它作为进化的机制。我们现在知道自然选择是朝着保护物种而不是将其变为其它物种的方向进行，正如进化论学者派德森博士说，“没有人靠自然选择制造出物种，没有人曾接近过这个目标。” [18] 著名的进化论学家厄尔德 (Niles Eldridge) 博士、纽约的美国自然历史博物馆馆员也说过，“自然选择不产生新的物种。” [19]

另一个曾被建议的进化机制为基因突变，实际上它是基因事故。（“所有基因突变似乎存在于导致伤害的性能中。”） [20]

Radiation and mutation expert Dr. H.J. Muller had said:

There is no single instance where it can be maintained that any of the mutants studied has a higher viability than the mother species...A review of known facts about their ability to survive has led to no other conclusion than that they are always constitutionally weaker than their parent form or species, and in a population with free competition they are eliminated... Therefore they are never found in nature (e.g., not a single one of the several hundreds of *Drosophila* mutations), and therefore, they are able to appear only in the favorable environment of the experimental field or laboratory...²¹

Let's go back to the evolutionist scenario of reptiles (which are vertebrates) becoming birds, and consider the change which would have had to occur in their lungs. Here is Dr. Denton's discussion of this:

The evolution of birds is far more complex than the above discussion implies. In addition to the problem of the origin of the feather and flight, birds possess other unique adaptations which also seem to defy plausible evolutionary explanations. One such adaptation is the avian lung and respiratory system."

In all other vertebrates the air is drawn into the lungs through a system of branching tubes which finally terminate in tiny air sacs, or alveoli, so that during respiration the air is moved in and out through the same passage.

In the case of birds, however the major bronchi break down into tiny tubes which permeate the lung tissue. These so-called parabronchi eventually join up together again, forming a true circulatory system so that air flows in one direction through the lungs. ...Just how such an utterly different respiratory system could have evolved gradually from the standard vertebrate design is fantastically difficult to envisage, especially bearing in mind that the maintenance of respiratory function is absolutely vital to the life of an organism to the extent that the slightest malfunction leads to death within minutes. Just as the feather cannot function as an organ of flight until the hooks and barbules are coadapted to fit together perfectly, so the avian lung cannot function as an organ of respiration until the parabronchi system which permeates it and the air sac system which guarantees the parabronchi their air supply are both highly developed and able to function together in a perfectly integrated manner."²²

Can natural selection or mutations explain the thousands (millions) of genetic changes that would have to take place exactly at the same time for a reptile to become a bird? Does this hypothesized change in lungs (and feathers, etc.) even agree with what we know is true about the nature of mutations? Evolutionist Dr. Pierre-Paul Grasse', former president of the French Academie des Sciences and the scientist who held the Chair of Evolution at the Sorbonne in Paris for twenty years has clearly stated the problem:

The opportune appearance of mutation permitting animals and plants to meet their needs seems hard to believe. Yet the Darwinian theory is even more demanding: a single plant, a single animal would require thousands and thousands of lucky, appropriate events. Thus, miracles would become the rule: events with a infinitesimal probability could not fail to occur. ...There is no law against day dreaming, but science must not indulge in it.²³

This lack of a credible explanation for how evolution could happen has been highlighted by Dr. Michael Behe in his recent book, *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution* (New York: Free Press, 1996).

Charles Darwin himself stated in *The Origin of Species*, a type of test that could be applied to his idea of evolution:

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.

放射学家和基因突变专家莫勒 (Heribert Nilsson) 博士说过:

在研究过的所有例子中,没有一例表示一个基因突变体可以具有比母体更高的生存性。… …对于突变体生存本能的回顾,只能导致这样的结论,即他们总是比父母辈的形态或物种在结构上更弱,在自由竞争的环境中他们被淘汰。… …因此自然界中从来找不到他们(比如从几百个果蝇的基因突变中找不到一个),他们只能存在于实验田或实验室的有利环境中。[21]

让我们回到进化论学家关于爬行类动物(脊椎动物)变成鸟的剧情中,考虑它们肺中可能发生的变化,但顿博士在这里讨论如下:

鸟的进化远比以上讨论所隐含的复杂。除了羽毛和翅膀起源的问题以外,鸟拥有其它独特的适应性,而这些否定了似乎有理的进化论解释。其中一个适应性是鸟类的肺和呼吸系统,在所有其它脊椎动物中,空气被吸进肺部通过支气管,最后到达细小的气泡或肺泡。在呼吸过程中空气经过同样的通道双向流动,然而在鸟的体内,主要的支气管分成渗透在肺组织中的细管,这些所谓的准支气管,逐渐地再次合并在一起,形成一真正的循环系统,这样,空气向一个方向流动。对于这样一个完全不同的呼吸系统,它怎样能逐渐演化到标准的脊椎动物是令人极其难以想象的。尤其得记住,呼吸功能的维持对于器官的生命来说,生死悠关到这样的程度,以至于一点微小的变化失误就会在几分钟内导致死亡。正如羽毛只有等到钩和须完全协同进化,彼此配合完美,才能发挥飞翔的功能,鸟类的肺也只有到能保证给支气管供气的,渗透在肺中的准支气管系统及气泡系统高度发达了,能够在完美集成的形式下共同发挥功能了,才能正常工作。[22]

自然选择或基因突变,能解释在爬行动物转变到鸟的时期可能发生的成千(上百万)的基因变化吗?这一假想的肺变化是否符合我们确知的基因突变的特性呢?前法国科学院院长,在巴黎,索波涅担任进化学主席二十年的进化论学家保罗 (Pierre Paul) 博士曾清清楚楚地陈述了这一问题:

似乎难以相信基因突变的并巧出现,能满足动物和植物的需要,然而达尔文理论要求的更高,单的植物,单的动物需要成千上万这样幸运和恰巧的事件,这样神迹成了规则:具有无穷巧合的事件不可能不出现。… …没有法律禁止梦想,但科学不能沉迷于其中。[23]

米歇尔拜赫博士在他最近的一书《达尔文的黑盒子:生物化学对进化论的挑战》(New York: Free Press, 1996)中着重强调了人们缺乏对进化如何发生的可信解释。

查尔斯。达尔文自己在《物种起源》一书中说,这一验证可被用来检验他的进化论:

如果我们能证明,任何一个现存的复杂生物不可能由许多的连续的渐变产生,我的理论就会崩溃。

Considering this idea, Behe said he asked himself, "What type of biological system could not be formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications? Well, for starters, a system that has a quality that I call irreducible complexity." (From a talk to biologists at the University of South Florida in Tampa, Florida). He means that these systems are made up of many parts that interact in complex ways, and all the parts need to work together. Unless all the other parts are also present, a single part has no useful function. Behe shows that such irreducibly complex systems are too inter-related to have been built up slowly step-by-step and, therefore, point to design not gradualism. As a practical example of this (that everyone knows), he uses the mousetrap which must have all parts fully-formed and in place to work. Then in his field of biochemistry he gives examples such as the chemical chain reaction that makes vision possible, the mechanism for blood clotting, tiny electric "motors" of cilium, etc. All of these are irreducibly complex.

In the above-mentioned lecture Behe summarized the problem:

As you search the professional literature of the last several decades, looking for articles that have been published even attempting to explain the possible Darwinian step-by-step origin of any of these systems, you will encounter a thundering silence. Absolutely no one—not one scientist—has published any detailed proposal or explanation of the possible evolution of any such complex biochemical system.

Thus, Behe shows that at the molecular level the modern evolutionary theory fails Darwin's own test; he summarizes:

To Darwin, the cell was a "Black box"—its inner workings were utterly mysterious to him. Now, the black box has been opened up and we know how it works. Applying Darwin's test to the ultra-complex world of molecular machinery and cellular systems that have been discovered over the past 40 years, we can say that Darwin's theory has "absolutely broken down."

So, in summary, here again are five major problems with the theory of evolution.

1. Lack of Evidence for Prebiotic Soup
2. Lack of Transitional Fossils
3. Sudden Appearance of Complex Life Forms (esp. in the lowest layers)
4. Non-living Cannot Become Living by Natural Processes
5. No Valid Mechanism

CONCLUDING REMARKS

1. Much has been written and spoken by evolutionists to the effect that evolution is happening today but so slowly that we cannot observe it. What is the difference between that idea and this: the reason we cannot observe evolution happening today is that it's not taking place. Is one conclusion more valid than the other? The second idea is the simplest solution that fits the data. The only reason a person would choose the first idea is that he already has a belief (faith) that evolution is happening. Is this scientific?
2. Evolutionist writers and speakers have also used the small variations within types of plants/animals (sometimes called "microevolution") as proof of evolution. However, "*Microevolution (small changes or variations) involves small-scale biological changes only (e.g., color, size). Microevolution does not produce new genetic information; it only reshuffles existing genes. The gene pool remains constant.*"²⁴ Evolution (or "macroevolution") is about one plant/animal changing into another plant/animal and microevolution simply cannot be used in any way to explain or prove it, as Darrel Kautz has clearly stated:

People are misled into believing that since microevolution is a reality, that therefore macroevolution is such a reality also. Evolutionists maintain that over long periods of time small scale changes accumulate in such a way as to generate new and more complex organisms... This is sheer illusion, for there is no scientific evidence whatever to support the occurrence of biological change on such a grand scale. In spite of all the artificial breeding which has been done, and all the controlled efforts to modify fruit flies, the bacillus escherichia (e-coli), and other organisms, fruit flies remain fruit flies, E-coli bacteria remain E-coli bacteria, roses remain roses, corn remains corn, and human beings remain human beings.²⁵

考虑到这一想法,拜赫说他问自己:“什么样的生物系统不能由许多连续的渐变产生?对于起始生物,这是一个具有被我称之为复杂性不可简化的系统。”(在台帕,佛罗里达,南佛罗里达大学对生物学家的讲话)。他的意思是说,这些系统是由许多有复杂的相互作用的部件组成,而且所有的部件必须一起工作。除非所有的部件都在,否则单一的部件不能工作。拜赫指出,这样一个不可简化的复杂系统,其内部紧密相连,不可能一步步地建立起来。他用众所周知的扑鼠器作为例子,扑鼠器必须在所有零件完好无缺的情况下才能工作。在生物化学的领域中,他给出使视觉成为可能的链式反应,凝血机制以及纤毛的微“电机”等作为例子。这些都是复杂性不可简化的。

在上述提到的讲座中,拜赫总结了这一问题:

当你研究过去几十年的有关专业文献,寻找发表过的哪怕是试图解释达尔文渐变起源的文章,你会遇到惊人的沉默。绝对没有人,没有一位科学家发表过关于这些如此复杂系统可能发生进化的详细假设或解释。这样,拜赫表明在分子学水平上,现代进化论使达尔文败在自己提出的实验检验中。他总结道:对达尔文来说,细胞是个黑盒子,其内部的运作对他来说完全是个谜。现在黑盒子已经被打开,我们知道它是如何运作的。将达尔文的实验应用到过去四十年来发现的分子和细胞系统的超复杂世界中,我们可以说达尔文的理论“完全崩溃了。”

因此,作为结论,我们再次列出进化论的五个主要问题:

- 1.生物前液的存在缺乏证据。
 - 2.中间型化石的缺乏。
 - 3.复杂生命形式的突然出现(尤其在最底地质层)。
 - 4.自然过程不能使无生命变成有生命。
 - 5.没有合理的机制,总结及评论。
1. 进化论学家著说众多,其达到的效果是说进化论正在进行,但速度太慢,以至于我们不能观察到它。这一思想与这样的想法,即我们之所以看不到进化的进行是因为它没有发生,有什么差异?一个人之所以选择第一个想法,是因为他相信进化正在发生,这是科学的态度吗?
 2. 进化论作者和发言者也将在动、植物同类中的微小变化(有时称为“微进化论”)作为进化的证明,“然而微进化(小的变化和变异)只涉及小范围的生物改变(例如颜色,尺寸等)微进化不能产生新的基因信息,它只能重组已有的基因,基因池仍保持常数。”[24]进化论(或“宏观进化论”)是关于一种动、植物转变成另一种动、植物的理论。微进化简直就不能用来解释或证明它。如考兹(Darrel Kautz)博士清楚地说过,“人们被误导以致相信由于微观进化是真实的,从而宏观进化也是现实。进化论者坚持认为经过足够长的时间,小范围的改变逐渐积累到一个地步,以致于产生新的复杂的生物,这只是幻想。因为没有任何科学证据支持这样大范围的生物改变。对于人们所作的所有人工繁殖,所有的改进果蝇,衣可拉(E-coli)细菌和其它生物体的努力来说,果蝇依然是果蝇,衣可拉细菌依然是衣可拉细菌,玫瑰依然是玫瑰,玉米依然是玉米,人依旧是人。”[25]

3. When one reads the writings of evolutionist writers as well as high school and college biology texts, etc., you continuously read words (describing the process of evolution) like "we think that", "scientists believe", "may be", "could be", "might be", etc. Although the language of science (at the hypothesis level) should certainly contain words like these, they seem strangely out of place in a discussion coming from the point of view that evolution is a proven fact accepted by all knowledgeable scientists. (Please see quote below in comment #6)

4. Imagine that you are in Stockholm, Sweden and a member of the Nobel Prize committee for science. Scientist Mr. A applies for the Nobel Prize with evolution as his topic and the following conversation occurs:

You: Do you have any evidence that this has happened in the past?

Mr. A: No, I'm sorry I don't have.

You: Well then, do you have any evidence it's happening now, in the present?

Mr. A: Actually, I don't. The answer is no.

You: Mr. A, science is about giving explanations for phenomenon. Could you please tell us how evolution takes place, that is, how one plant/animal changes into another plant/animal?

Mr. A: Well you see, we used to think natural selection, then mutation, and, well, now...I just don't know...

Would you vote to give Mr. A the Nobel Prize?

5. It should be noted that the whole process of evolution has a problem from the statistical point of view. Carl Sagan (an evolutionist) and other prominent scientists have estimated the probability of man evolving to be 1 chance in 10 followed by two billion zeroes.²⁶ However, according to Borel's law, anything beyond 1 chance in 10 followed by 50 zeroes is impossible.²⁷ Therefore, the incredibly small probability of evolution means it is, in reality, impossible.

6. Although Christian scientists with Ph.D.'s in related fields have long pointed out the scientific problems with evolution, I have tried to quote almost entirely from non-christian evolutionists who have noted the same errors (though they may not have abandoned the idea altogether). It is not hard to find such material written by evolutionists exposing the theory of evolution (actually, the real problem is condensing it because there is so much). More and more world-class scientists, once very strong evolutionists, are abandoning or criticizing it as the data becomes more and more overwhelming and clear in pointing away from evolution. I would like to close with a quote from Colin Patterson, Ph.D., Senior Paleontologist, British Museum of Natural History, London:

Last year I had a sudden realization—for over 20 years I had thought I was working on Evolution in some way. One morning I woke up and something had happened in the night, and it struck me that I had been working on this stuff for 20 years and there was not one thing I knew about it. That's quite a shock to learn that one can be so misled so long. Either there was something wrong with me or there was something wrong with the Evolutionary theory. Naturally, I know there is nothing wrong with me, so the last few weeks I've been putting a simple question to various people and groups of people. Question is: Can you tell me anything you KNOW about Evolution? Any one thing? Any one thing that is true?

I tried that question on the geology staff at the Field Museum of Natural History and the only answer I got was silence. I tried it on the members of the Evolutionary Morphology Seminar in the University of Chicago, a very prestigious body of Evolutionists, and all I got there was silence for a long time, and eventually one person said, "I do know one thing-it ought not to be taught in high school."²⁸

3. 当人们读到进化论著作及高中和大学生物教科书时，他们会连续读到这样的词汇（在描述进化过程时），象“我们认为”、“科学家相信”、“也许”、“可能”、“也许曾”等。虽然科学的语言在假设的层次上应包含这些词汇，但它们出自于一个为所有博学的科学家所接受的已证实的理论，则似乎很奇怪。（参见第五点评论的引用语）

4. 设想你在瑞典的斯德格尔摩，是一位诺贝尔奖科学委员会的成员，科学家甲先生以进化论作为他的题目申请诺贝尔奖，以下是你们的谈话：

你：你是否有证据证明这些在过去发生过？

甲：对不起，我没有。

你：那好，你有什么证据证明现在正在发生呢？

甲：事实上，答案是否定的。

你：甲先生，科学是给出现象作解释，你能否告诉我进化是怎样发生的？就是说动、植物是如何从一种变到另一种？

甲：嗯，你瞧，我们过去认为是自然选择，然后是基因突变，现在吗……我我不知道。

你将会给甲先生投诺贝尔奖的一票吗？

5. 应该注意的是，整个进化论的过程有一个统计学的错误，卡尔塞根 (Carl Sagan) (进化论学家) 和其他著名科学家估计人类进化的概率是十的二百万次方分之一。[26] 然而，根据保瑞 (Borel) 的定律，任何低于十的五十次方分之一的概率都是不可能的。[27]

6. 虽然在相关领域有博士学位的基督徒科学家长期以来一直指出进化论中的科学问题，我这里引用的完全是非基督徒进化论学者的话，他们也注意到同样错误（虽然他们，也许还没有完全放弃进化论的思想）。找到由进化论者暴露出来的这些书面资料并不难（事实上问题在浓缩，因为这样的材料太多了），随著越来越多的清楚表明偏离进化论的，并具有压倒优势的数据的出现，越来越多的曾经是坚决的进化论者的世界级科学家正在抛弃或批评它。我想引用派德森博士、伦敦大不列颠历史博物馆资深古生物学家的话作为总结：

去年，我突然有了个醒悟，在二十年间，我一直以为我在以某种方式为进化论工作。那天晚上发生了一些事，我一早醒来。我在这上面工作了近二十年，没有一件事是我知道的，这使我受到打击。我如此震惊地发现，一个人可以如此长久地误入歧途。或者是我出了毛病，或者是进化论出了毛病，自然我不认为我有毛病，因此过去的几个星期之内，我试图向不同的人或人群问一个简单的问题，就是你能告诉我有关进化论你知道多少？有没有一件是真的？我向自然历史地矿博物馆的地质学家询问，我所得到的答案是沉默。我试着向芝加哥大学的进化形态学讲座的听众，一群极有声望的进化论学者询问，我所得到的长久的沉默，最后有一个人说，”我知道一件事，就是在高中不应教进化论。[28]

Bibliography

- 1** Barret, Abramoff, Kumaran, Millington, *Biology*, (Prentice-Hall,1985) p.750.
- 2** Colin Patterson (Ph.D.), *Evolution* (London: British Museum of Natural History, 1978) pp. 145-146.
- 3** Robert Shapiro, (Ph.D.), *Origins: A Skeptic's Guide to Creation of Life on Earth* (Simon & Schuster, 1986), pp.98-117.
- 4** Charles Thaxton (Ph.D.-Chemistry), Walter Bradley (Ph.D.-Material Science), Roger Olsen (Ph.D. Geochemistry), *The Mystery of Life's Origins.. Reassessing Current Theories* (New York: philosophical Library, 1984) p.66 (emphasis added)
- 5** p. 292, first paragraph of Chapter 9, "On the Imperfection of the Geologic record", of *The Origin of Species* (emphasis added).
- 6** David Raup (Ph.D.-Harvard University), "Conflicts Between Darwin and paleontology", *Field Museum of Natural History*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (January 1979) p.22 (emphasis added).
- 7** Stephen Gould (Ph.D.-Ardent Evolutionist and professor of Geology and paleontology, Harvard University), "Is a New and General Theory of Evolution Emerging?", *Paleobiology*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (January 1980), p. 127 (emphasis added).
- 8** Stephen Gould "Evolution's Erratic pace", *Natural History*, Vol.86, No.5 (May 1977), pp. 13-14 (emphasis added).
- 9** Michael Denton (Evolutionist, Ph.D.-Molecular Biology, and M.D.), *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (Adler & Adler, 1986) p. 158.
- 10** Fred Hoyle and C. Wickramasinghe, *Evolution From Space* (London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1981), p. 8,70 (emphasis added).
- 11,12** Geologic Chart "What is a Trilobite?", Black Hills Institute of Geologic Research, 1989.
- 13** Michael Denton, *Evolution* pp.162-165
- 14** Fred Hoyle and C. Wickramasingh, *Evolution From Space*, pp. 148,24,150,30,31 (emphasis added).
- 15** Hubert Yockey, Ph.D., *Information Theory and Molecular Biology*, (Cambridge University Press 1992), p.257.
- 16** Francis Crick and L.B. Orgel (1973), "Directed panspermia", *Icarus*, 19: 341-46.
- 17** Michael Denton, *Evolution*, pp.326-328.
- 18** Colin Patterson, interview on the subject of Cladistics, British Broadcasting Corporation Television (March 4, 1982).
- 19** Niles Eldridge, Ph.D,"An Extravagance of Species (The Diversity of Fossil Trilobites poses a Challenge to Traditional Evolutionary Theory)", *Natural History*, Vol.89, No.7 (July 1980) p.46 (emphasis added).
- 20** C.P. Martin, "A Non-Geneticist Looks at Evolution", *American Scientist*, Vol.41, No. 1 (January 1953), pp. 100,103 (emphasis added).
- 21** H.J. Muller, "How Radiation Changes the Genetic Constitution", *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, Vol. 11, No. 9 (November 1955), p.331 (emphasis added),
- 22** Heribert Nilsson, *Synthetische Artbildung* (Lund, Sweden: Verlag CWK Gleerup, 1953), p.1212,1186.
- 23** Michael Denton, *Evolution*, pp. 210-212, (drawings also from this book).
- 24** Pierre-Paul Grasse', Ph.D., *Evolution of Living Organisms* (New York: Academic press, 1977) pp.88,103, (emphasis added).
- 25** Paul Taylor, *The Illustrated Origins Answer Book* (Eden Communications, 1995, p.84).
- 26** Darrel Kautz, *The Origin of Living Things* (10025 W. Nash St, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53222, 1988), p.6 (emphasis added).
- 27** Carl Sagan, et.al., *Communication with Extraterrestrial Intelligence* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press) pp. 45-46.
- 28** Emile Borel, *Probabilities and Life* (New York: Dover, 1962) Chapters 1 and 3.
- 29** Colin Patterson, Ph.D., Unpublished transcript of keynote speech at the American Museum of Natural History, (New York City: November 1981), (emphasis added).

