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In the field of philosophy, there is a law of logic known as the Law of Excluded Middle, which says that every proposition is either true or false. This law is fundamental to classical logic and is often expressed as: “A proposition cannot be both true and false at the same time.”

In biology, the Law of Biogenesis states that all living things are produced from pre-existing living organisms. This principle is also known as the Law of Recapitulation and is closely related to the concept of descent with modification.

Virchow “recognized that all cells come from cells by binary fission” (“Definition...,” 2006). In essence, what happened in the past is repeated in the present. This is the essence of the Law of Biogenesis and the Law of Recapitulation.

In the words of the McGraw-Hill Dictionary of Scientific and Technical Terms, “biogenesis” is the “development of a living organism from a similar living organism” (p. 239, emp. added). In the words of Stephen Meyer, whose doctoral dissertation at Cambridge University was in origin-of-life biology, “From ancient times, humans have known a few basic facts about living things. The first is that all life comes from life, Omne vivum ex vivo. The second is that when living things reproduce themselves, the resulting offspring resemble their parents. Like produces like” (2009, Ch. 5, emp. added).

Rudolf Virchow

The position is that there are of course lots of cases where you can say without hesitation: “It is a lion, it is a horse, it is a man or it is not a man.” But it is, it seems to me, a consequence of evolutionary theory that species shade off into one another. Hence when you are confronted by marginal cases, you cannot say whether the human or this is not definitively human (p. 25, emp. added).

So, there are creatures that are neither human nor non-human! As Warren stated in his rebuttal, such an illogical position denies the firmly established Law of Excluded Middle. As long as a “human” is precisely defined, everything is either human or not human. It is logically impossible to be neither human nor non-human.

The more Warren pressed Flew on this matter, the more illogical Flew was required to become in order to hold cells from breaking down.

In his final speech on the first night of the debate, Flew shocked the audience when he stated: “About whether I have met anyone who was not unequivocally either human or non-human: yes, I am afraid I have. I have met people who were very senile. I have also met people who were mad.... Can we say that these former people are people any longer?” (p. 65).

Senile and mad people are non-humans? There are several problems with such a position. First, common sense dictates that such people are human. Second, as long as “human” is precisely defined, the Law of Excluded Middle still applies. Third, Flew tacitly (certainly unconsciously) acknowledged that the “senile” and “mad” are actually human by using the word “people” in colloquial English. If Flew sincerely admitted his unwillingness to concede God, Flew moved into the realm of irrationality. He stated that such people may be considered non-human. He does not say that they are neither human nor non-human. “Can we say that these former people are people any longer?” He therefore admitted, unwittingly, that any being can be defined as human or non-human, even if its definition of a human is a ridiculous one. [NOTE: Flew’s examples (i.e., senility and madness), even if they were erroneously conceded as legitimate examples of Darwinian evolution, were actually counterproductive to his case, since they would only illustrate that degeneration occurs in evolution, rather than progression.]

The bottom line is that every being is either human or non-human. In order for evolution to be true, a non-human had to give rise to a human at some point in the past—either by transformation or birth. Based on the scientific evidence, neither is possible.

And yet, there is no other option for the evolutionist, unless he contends that the first human just popped intact into existence spontaneously—either by a fairy or like a mythical dwarf springing from the ground. And yet this assertion would violate the First Law of Thermodynamics (cf. Miller, 2013), the Law of Biogenesis (cf. Miller, 2012), and, of course, reason itself. Life comes from life of its own kind. Period.

Even the evolutionary textbooks admit as much. Concerning the reproduction of living organisms, Prentice Hall’s textbook, Life Science, states: “Another characteristic of organisms is the ability to reproduce, or produce offspring that are similar to the parents. For example, robins lay eggs that develop into young robins that closely resemble their parents” (Coolidge-Stolz, et al., 2005, p. 35, emp. added). Robins make robins. There may be small differences in color, height, beak size, etc. However, the offspring is still a robin—not a shark and not a hawk. Evolutionary theory is not in keeping with the scientific evidence. However, the biblical model, once again, is in perfect harmony with the scientific evidence. God, the Being Who wrote the Law of Biogenesis, created life (Genesis 2:7, Acts 17:25) and made it to produce after its kind (Genesis 1:11,24).
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But hasn’t genetics proved that evolution can happen through genetic mutations? Gregor Mendel is known to many today as the “Father of Genetics” (Constance, 1976, p. 42). His work led to the series of genetic principles known as “Mendel’s laws” (Davis and Kenyon, 1989, p. 60). After his work was published in the Transactions of the Natural History Society of Brabant, his work was left essentially untouched and unknown for some 35 years, until other well-known geneticists conducted research which cited his. One of those—Hugo de Vries, a Dutch evolutionary botanist—is credited with having discovered the existence of genetic mutations (“Hugo de Vries,” 2013).

The Law of Biogenesis’ claim that life reproduces according to its kind, while arguably macroscopic in its application to biogenesis, is in keeping with the evidence at the genetic level as well. It provides further support for that important concept: life reproduces according to its kind. Darwin’s theory of evolution has, itself, evolved over the decades. With further scientific investigation into the legitimacy of Darwin’s theory, time, and again, evolutionists have been forced to admit that Darwinian evolution cannot do what they previously thought it could. It never completely lines up with the evidence. The alleged evolutionary timeline, therefore, must be revised with new data as to when various animals lived in the distant past; the order of evolutionary development is endlessly revised; new theories attempting to explain why various animals developed particular body parts are constantly being developed. The theory of evolution evolves.

And truly, the evolution of evolution is not a process that has been in effect for only a few decades. Evolution itself did not originate with Charles Darwin. Forms of evolution have been considered for millennia, at least as far back as the 600s B.C., with Thales and his Milesian school and the Ionian school (Conford, 1957). And for millennia, those ideas have had to be continually revised to attempt to stay in keeping with the latest scientific understanding. While it is true that one should expect scientific theories to be revised to a certain extent over time—revisions amounting to fine-tuning—the evolutionary model is not merely revised. It periodically requires complete overhauls in broad, fundamental areas of the theory that evolutionists had previously proclaimed as established fact (cf. Thompson, 1981; www.apologeticspress.org). The late, distinguished astronomer Sir Fred Hoyle, co-founder of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, said that evolutionists seem to accept the idea that all forms of life came about from previously existing, less complex life, starting with a single cell one celsius. But while natural selection might filter the unfit from a given population, it is not capable of creating anything—especially species that are not only complex, but more complex than their ancestors. John Sanford, starting with a single cell one celsius. But while natural selection might filter the unfit from a given population, it is not capable of creating anything—especially species that are not only complex, but more complex than their ancestors. John Sanford, co-founder of the “Creation-Micro-Synthesis,” and control engineer Werner Gitt, information scientist, professor, and control engineer Werner Gitt, information scientist, professor,

For many people, including many biologists, evolution is like a magic wand. There seems to be no limit to what one can imagine it accomplishing. This extremely naïve perspective toward natural selection is pervasive… [Natural selection is not a magic wand but is a very real phenomenon, it has very real capabilities and very real limitations. (2008, p. 46, italics in orig.). Scientists have realized today that Darwin was wrong. Natural selection alone would not suffice to cause evolution to occur. Evolutionary paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould of Harvard University once explained, "The essence of evolution...natural selection is the creative force of evolutionary change. No one denies that selection will play a negative role in eliminating the unfit. Darwinian theories require natural selection to work well...[and] Evolutions recognize today that they cannot even claim that natural selection could create the fit. (2005, pp. 825-826, emp. added)."

Bottom line: evolutionists have realized that natural selection cannot provide the mechanism required for evolutionary change. Enter neo-Darwinism, the version of Darwinism followed by today’s evolutionists. Neo-Darwinism, also known as the “Primary Axiom” (Sanford, 2008), attempts to revive Darwinism by contending that natural selection coupled with genetic mutations—random DNA accidents—provide the mechanism for evolution to occur. In the words of molecular and cell biologist Jonathan Wells of the Center for Science and Culture at the Discovery Institute in Seattle, "It was not until the 1950s that Darwinian evolution and Mendelian genetics were combined in what became known as the neo-Darwinian synthesis. According to neo-Darwinian theory, traits are passed on by genes that reside on microscopic thread-like structures in the cell called chromosomes, and new traits arise from accidental genetic mutations (2011, p. 18, emp. added)."

According to neo-Darwinism, random mutations could accidentally create new species over time, and natural selection could eliminate the unfit ones, leaving the better, more evolved species over time.

Concerning neo-Darwinism, molecular biologist John McFadden wrote, “Over millions of years, organisms will evolve by selection of mutant offspring which are fitter than their parents. Mutations are therefore the selective cause of the variation that Darwin needed to complete his theory of evolution. They provide the raw material for all evolutionary change” (2000, p. 65, emp. added). Years ago, George Gaylord Simpson and his co-authors said, “Mutations are the ultimate raw materials for evolution” (1957, p. 430). One genetics textbook put it this way: “Mutations constitute the raw material for evolution; they are the basis for the variability in a population on which natural (or artificial) selection acts to produce new species” (2011, p. 33, parenthetical item in orig.).

Is it true that mutations can provide the raw material and mechanism for Darwinian evolution to occur over millions of years? Do mutations eliminate the need for a supernatural Source to explain the origin of species?

Creating Information: A Prerequisite for Evolution

Revealing a theory of origin, and cellular designer and doctoral graduate of Cambridge University. In his book on the origin of genetic information, he discussed one of the greatest discoveries of the 20th century—the structure of the DNA molecule by James Watson and Francis Crick. He noted that “when Watson and Crick discovered the structure of DNA, they also discovered that DNA stores information using a four-character chemical alphabet. Strings of precisely sequenced chemicals called nucleotide base pairs store and transmit the assembly instructions—the information—for building the crucial protein molecules and machines the cell needs to survive” (2009, Ch. 1).

Information is packed into our genes, and its transfer during reproduction is critical. Without the transfer of information, there would be no such thing as life. Information scientist, professor, and control engineer Werner Gitt, retired director of the Information Technology Division at the German Federal Institute of Physics and Technology, noted that,

The concept of “information” is not only of prime importance for information technologies and communication techniques, but it is a fundamental quantity in such wide-ranging sciences as cybernetics, linguistics, biology, history, and theology. Many scientists therefore unjustly regard information as the third fundamental entity alongside matter and energy (2007, Ch. 3).
Take Home This Super-Duo 2013 Bound Volumes

Discovery: Christian Evidences Magazine for Kids

Reason and Revelation:
Twelve issues containing articles such as: Have Synthetic Biologists Created Life From Non-Life?; Can Quantum Mechanics Produce a Universe from Nothing?; Zero Energy Balance and Universes Popping Into Existence; Were the Founding Fathers “Tolerant” of Islam?; Why is Belief in God Natural to Mankind?; God’s Just Destruction of the Canaanites; “Can God do Everything?” What About “Out-of-Body Experiences”?; Turmoil in Scotland Over A.P. Books; In Science We Trust, and many more.

Remember to SAVE the Earlier Volumes
Discovery 1999-2011 $7.00 ea.
R&R 1998-2011 $6.00 ea.

Order today by calling 1-800-234-8558 or by visiting www.ApologeticsPress.org/webstore

Super-Duo Take Home this 2013 Bound Volumes

Discovery
Reason and Revelation

$14.00 * Plus shipping
$12.00 * Plus shipping

Taxes apply in Alabama

230 Landmark Drive, Montgomery, Alabama 36117
www.apologeticspress.org
Meyer argues that “[o]ur actions would have to be created—at the beginning of the life scenario—without any parent” (1990, p. 170). In the book, "A mutation doesn’t produce major new raw material. You don’t make a new species by mutating the species... That’s a common idea people have; that evolution is due to random mutations. A mutation is not the cause of evolutionary change" (1980, emp. added). A mutation does not produce new raw material (Sanford). Meyer likens the genome to an instruction manual for making human beings. In his analogy, letters correspond to nucleotides, words correspond to small clusters of nucleotides, which combine to form genes (the chapters of our manual), which combine to form chromosomes (the volumes of our manual), which combine to form the whole genome (the entire library)" (2008, p. 2, italics in orig.). In the printing, re-typing, or digital copying of a book, errors—or mistakes—will sometimes appear when you examine the finished product. For example, individual words could be garbled—a few letters of a word could be changed to other letters, termed codon errors in genetics. Duplication could occur—the idea that words, sentences, and even entire paragraphs could be duplicated somewhere within the book. Translation could occur—where sections from one part of the book are moved and inserted elsewhere in the book. Deletion could occur—where segments of the book are simply lost. Though these kinds of errors or mistakes—or mutations—and other errors or mutations can occur, no new matter can be added to the book. No new information has been added to the book. A mutation does not produce major new raw material.  
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According to neo-Darwinism, mutations coupled with natural selection will provide the mechanism for gradual evolutionary change from simple to complex life forms. Mutations, however, do not add new information to the genome. They simply change what is already present in the genome. Nevertheless, some argue that duplications, polyplody, and symbiogenesis add information to an individual’s genome and could provide the mechanism by which Darwinian evolution could occur. Is there any legitimacy to this line of reasoning?

Duplications are mutations that generate nucleotides or chromosomes, and in that sense, they add two times the same information to the genome in those areas in which they occur. Notice, however, that duplication of material content does not mean that additional information is added, but rather this self-replicating process is already present in the genome. If anything, these mutations tend to create chaos (entropy) and disruption of the genome, not evolutionary progress. In the words of population geneticist John Sanford of Cornwall University:

It is widely recognized that duplication, whether within a written text or within the living genome, destroys information. Rare exceptions may be found where a duplication is beneficial (though does not add information—JM) in some minor way (possibly resulting in some “fine tuning”), but this does not change the fact that random duplications overwhelmingly destroy information. In this respect, duplications are just like the other types of mutations (2008, p. 194, emp. added).

But what about sexual polyploidization (which is common in plants)—where the uniting of an unreduced sperm with an unreduced egg results in all of the information from both parents being combined into a single organism? In such cases, Sanford explains, there is no gain in information within that single individual. But there is no more total information within the population. The information within the two parents was simply pooled” (p. 195). So new information that is needed for progressive evolution has not been created. Inter-kind or macroevolution has not occurred.

Symbiogenesis theory results in a similar effect. Some evolutionists believe that two separate, symbiotic organisms (e.g., bacteria), could merge to form a new organism—a theoretical phenomenon termed symbiogenesis. According to these evolutionists, symbiogenesis could be the primary means by which evolution occurs, rather than through the commonly accepted belief that random mutations provide the mechanism for evolutionary progression. Lynn Margulis explains that in symbiogenesis, “[c]ertain sets of genes, indeed whole organisms each with its own cell wall, are acquired and incorporated by others” (Margulis and Sagan, 2002, p. 12). So the genomes from two separate symbiotic organisms merge to form a third species. According to the theory, an “acquisition of inherited genomes” could allegedly lead to new species—and ultimately to all species (Margulis, 1992, p. 39).

But even if we irrationally granted that to be possible, (1) merging two entirely separate, functioning genomes into one organism could hardly be deemed a positive phenomenon on a universal scale. Rather, it would be the opposite. Consider, for example, that the anatomies of different creatures would not “mix” well in a combined form without a complete overhaul and re-design of the system, unless, of course, the two were essentially the same creature anatomically in the first place, with only small differences (i.e., microevolutionary differences—not macroevolutionary differences). If the two were similar enough to be compatible, it cannot be argued that macroevolution has occurred, and macroevolution is required by the naturalistic position (2). As with polyploidization, symbiogenesis merely pools previously existing genomic information. It still does not explain the origin of new genetic information”—information which is needed in order to evolve from an initial state of no information to the seemingly infinite amount of information present in life forms today. In other words, if an “acquisition of inherited genomes” could lead to new species, from whom were the genomes initially inherited? A genome-less organism? How could a genome be inherited from an organism without one? Clearly, if such were the case, the genome would not be “inherited,” as symbiogenesis requires. The possibility of uninherited inherited genomes is self-contradictory, and obviously, an evidence-less proposition. (3) And further, implicit in symbiogenesis theory is the fact that there would have had to initially exist separately fully functional genomes, rich in genetic information, that could somehow merge to form new species. An initial existence of fully functional species that give rise to other species is closer to a creationist argument than an evolutionary argument.

Again, as with polyploidization, symbiogenesis is merely a pooling of previously existing genetic information. It is far from being the creation of new genetic information. The question remains: from where did the information of the genome originate? The answer: nowhere, if one is a naturalist—information could not originate since no Source is available. And yet the information had to come from somewhere. Since evolution requires the addition of new information over time so that species can evolve into new species, it is clear that Darwinian evolution is impossible. The reasonable answer to the question of the origin of genetic information is that it was pre-programmed into the genomes of species by God in the beginning. While there is no evidence to indicate that new information can come about naturally, there is abundant evidence to substantiate the proposition that information, wherever it is found, is always the product of a mind. Why not stand with the evidence God exists? Creation is true.
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With the advent of a new year, we are happy to offer to our readers the completed 2013 bound volumes of our two monthly magazines. These bound volumes enable the articles contained therein to remain relevant far beyond the time period during which they were authored. The bound volume of *Reason & Revelation* for 2013 contains articles on such topics as: The Historicity of Job; Have Synthetic Biologists Created Life From Non-Life? Can Quantum Mechanics Produce a Universe from Nothing? Were the Founding Fathers “Tolerant” of Islam? Why is Belief in God Natural to Mankind? God’s Just Destruction of the Canaanites; What About “Out-of-Body Experiences”? The Imprecatory Psalms; Political Correctness and “Bashing”; Dealing Fairly with Alleged Bible Contradictions; In Science We Trust; and more. As always, this beautifully bound annual collation contains all 12 issues for the year, as well as an author/title index and an attractive cover. The bound volume sells for $12. Previous volumes from 1998-2012 are still available at $6 each. See the advertisement in the Resources section of this issue for further details.

We also would like you to know that the 2013 bound volume of *Discovery*, our monthly magazine on Scripture and science for children, now is available for $14. During 2013, *Discovery* contained articles on such timely topics as: Biogenesis; Suffering; Design in Animals; Evolution & Natural Selection; Vestigial Organs; Miracles & the Bible; Acts of Worship; Design of the Eye; Plants; Jewish Days, Feasts, & Festivals; Mutations; and others. We also have in stock bound volumes from 1999-2012 for $7 each.

Please be aware that for both *Discovery* and *Reason & Revelation*, whenever the bound volumes go out of print, they are gone forever; we do not reprint them. So be sure to order your copies soon.

Bound volumes of *Reason & Revelation* and *Discovery* make extremely useful additions to personal, church, or school libraries. They also make valuable gifts for youngsters, men who are attending a preacher-training school, or students in college (especially those majoring in either Bible- or science-related fields). Why not consider giving a single volume (or, better yet, an entire set) to someone for their future study and edification?
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