

## Missing the Obvious Implication

Kyle Butt, M.A.

The November 2004 *National Geographic* article titled “Was Darwin Wrong?” was a rather feeble attempt to bolster a decaying belief in the theory of evolution. A major refutation of the various pieces of “evidence” presented in the article was posted on our Web site soon after the article was published (see Thompson and Harrub, 2004). Yet, just one page before the article defending Darwin, *National Geographic* dealt an unintentional blow to the theory of evolution, although it seems the editors completely missed the logical implication of the research presented.

In an article titled “Who’s Driving?,” Joel Achenbach, a *Washington Post* staff writer, reported on a race that took place in March of 2004. The winner of this unusual race was to receive one million dollars in prize money. The race course consisted of a 142-mile trek through the Mojave Desert that had to be completed in ten hours.

Reporting the results of the vehicles’ performances would at first appear catastrophic. “One had its brake lock up in the starting area. Another began by slamming into a wall.... One flipped.... One went a little more than a mile and plunged through a fence” (Achenbach, 2004, p. 1). Yet, when it is understood that there were no drivers in these robotic vehicles, the race results appear almost humorous. In fact, the vehicle that successfully maneuvered the farthest went a whopping 7.4 miles “before it ran into a berm, and the front wheels caught on fire.” Obviously, the ability to send an unmanned device across the desert proved much more difficult than at first anticipated.

One of the men who helped build two of the vehicles commented: “You get a lot of respect for natural biological systems.... Even ants do all these functions effortlessly. It’s very hard for us to imitate that and put it into our machines.” The author of the article then contrasted the vehicles to a two-year-old toddler, explaining that the “autonomous vehicles, despite being loaded with lasers, radar, stereoscopic cameras, gyroscopes, advanced computers, and GPS guidance, had trouble figuring out fast enough the significance of obstacles that a two-year-old human recognizes immediately.” Achenbach then concluded that the toddler “is more advanced, even in diapers, than any machine humans have devised.”

Let’s put this into perspective. Several extremely intelligent individuals put their heads together to design thirteen vehicles equipped with state-of-the-art gadgets and gizmos that cost thousands of dollars, and which are feats of intellectual genius in and of themselves. These intelligently designed vehicles were given the challenge of traversing the Mojave Desert, and the best-performing vehicle made it a mere 7.4 miles. The author of the article then concluded that a two-year-old toddler is more advanced than any “machine humans have devised.” And yet the article on the next page purports to explain that this toddler arose via no intelligence, by a series of random mutations and chance processes over millions of years.

Is not the implication of Achenbach’s statement about the toddler obvious? If intelligent humans cannot design a machine that even begins to approach the abilities of a toddler, what does that imply? It implies that whoever designed the toddler maintains an intellect that is far superior to the combined total of all human intellect.

The psalmist wrote, “I will praise You, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made; marvelous are Your works, and that my soul knows very well. My frame was not hidden from You, when I was made in secret, and skillfully wrought in the lowest parts of the earth” (139:14-15). In a poetic description of God’s creation of the psalmist in the womb, the phrase “skillfully wrought” brings to light the ingenuity and design of God’s creative process in the formation of every individual human ever born. It is no wonder that humans outstrip every humanly designed machine that will ever be produced. What else would one expect from the Master Builder whose thoughts are higher than human thought as the heavens are higher than the Earth (Isaiah 55:9)? Yes, Darwin was woefully wrong, as was the article attempting to defend his position. And, ironically, one of the major pieces of evidence disproving Darwin’s theory was presented just one page before the lengthy article that attempted to prove it.

### REFERENCES

- Achenbach, Joel (2004), “Who’s Driving?” *National Geographic*, 206[5]:1, November.  
 Thompson, Bert and Brad Harrub (2004), “National Geographic Shoots Itself in the Foot—Again!”, [On-line], URL: <http://www.apologeticpress.org/articles/2644>.



**Q** Has Satan always existed or is he a created being? If created, was he made evil or did he become evil?

**A** Although the Bible says little about Satan's beginning, we know that Satan is a created being. Unlike God, Satan is **not** omnipotent (1 John 4:4; cf. Luke 22:41), omnipresent (cf. Job 1-2; 2 Corinthians 4:4; Luke 4:6; Revelation 20:1-10), or eternal (cf. Deuteronomy 33:27; Psalm 102:27). Furthermore, in speaking of Jesus, Paul wrote: "For by Him **all things** were created that are in heaven and that are on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers. All things were created through Him and for Him" (Colossians 1:16, emp. added). Thus, the Bible teaches that Satan is one of God's created beings. He had a beginning just like everything else that exists other than God.

But just because God created Satan, does not mean that He created him as an evil being. Rather, God created him good, and then Satan **chose** to become evil. The Bible indicates that Satan was one of the angels who lived in heaven, but he (along with other angels) rebelled against God. Peter said that "God did not spare the angels who sinned, but cast them down to hell (*tartaros*) and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved for judgment" (2 Peter 2:4; cf. Jude 6). Since the Bible also refers to the devil as "the ruler of demons" (Matthew 12:24), and speaks of "the devil and his angels" (Matthew 25:41), it is logical to conclude that the devil is the leader of a group of rebellious angels that will eventually spend eternity in hell.

Eric Lyons

IN THE NEWS

Harvard University has launched an ambitious project designed to ascertain how life began on Earth. Known as the "Origins of Life in the Universe Initiative," the university has promised the researchers several years of seed money, and has asked the team to plan for a new faculty and a collection of multi-million-dollar facilities. David R. Liu, a professor of chemistry and chemical biology at Harvard, explained: "[M]y expectation is that we will be able to reduce this to a very simple series of logical events that could have taken place with **no divine intervention**" (Cook, 2005, emp. added).

Unbelievable! What a change has come over this "Ivy League" institution of higher learning. The Founders of Harvard would be outraged and heartsick. The original constitution of Massachusetts articulated plainly their view regarding the origin of life: they believed in the God of the Bible and the truth of the Christian religion. The constitution read:

Article I. Whereas our wise and pious ancestors, so early as the year one thousand six hundred and thirty-six, laid the foundation of Harvard College, in which university many persons of great eminence have, **by the blessing of God**, been initiated in those arts **and sciences**, which qualified them for public employments, both **in church** and state: and whereas the encouragement of arts **and sciences**, and all good literature, **tends to the honor of God, the advantage of the Christian religion**, and the great benefit of this and the other United States of America—it is declared, that the President and Fellows of Harvard College...shall have, hold, use, exercise and enjoy, all the powers...which they now have or are entitled to have (*Constitution...*, emp. added).

The 1636 rules of Harvard included the following declaration:

Let every student be plainly instructed and earnestly pressed to consider well **the main end of his life and studies is to**

**know God and Jesus Christ** which is eternal life (John 17:3) and therefore to lay Christ in the bottom as **the only foundation of all sound knowledge and learning**. And seeing the Lord only giveth wisdom, let every one seriously set himself by prayer in secret to seek it of Him (Prov. 2,3). Every one shall so exercise himself in **reading the Scriptures** twice a day that he shall be ready to give such an account of his proficiency therein (as quoted in Pierce, 1833, p. 5, emp. added).

The Founders of Harvard believed that the central purpose of life is to follow the Word of God and Christ. They believed that all knowledge and learning depend upon this central pursuit. They believed that the Bible was the ultimate source of wisdom and knowledge. They therefore believed that life—rather than emerging by evolutionary processes over millions of years—was created by God, the Creator. They never would have dreamed that at the school they created a multi-million dollar project would one day be launched for the expressed purpose of ascertaining the origin of life. They surely never could have predicted the extent to which the university they created has strayed from its original purpose and principles. If they were alive today, they no doubt would insist that the faculty be dismissed or the university's doors be closed.

REFERENCES

*Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts*, [On-line], URL: <http://www.mass.gov/legis/const.htm>.  
 Cook, Gareth (2005), "Project on the Origins of Life Launched," *Boston Globe*, August 14, [On-line], URL: [http://www.boston.com/news/education/higher/articles/2005/08/14/project\\_on\\_the\\_origins\\_of\\_life\\_launched/](http://www.boston.com/news/education/higher/articles/2005/08/14/project_on_the_origins_of_life_launched/).  
 Pierce, Benjamin (1833), *A History of Harvard University* (Cambridge, MA: Brown, Shattuck, & Co.).

Dave Miller

