

REFUTING EVOLUTION

1. Review from last time...
 - a. Positive arguments
 - b. Defending the faith
 - c. Science and faith...
 - i. Did not finish my last lecture...
 1. The five discoveries that point us towards God...
 2. We have already covered two of them and we will cover the other three in the next few weeks...
 3. I also did not get to Galileo...
2. Introduction
 - a. Matt grew up believing in God and going to church. During his freshmen year at WSU his biology professor stated emphatically that evolution was a fact. After a few semesters, he realized that nearly all his professors viewed all of life through the lens of evolution.¹ By the middle of his senior year he converted to Darwinism. Evolution seemed to make sense of nearly everything for Matt.
 - b. Best-selling author Daniel Dennett describes evolution's far-reaching explanatory power when he writes,
 - i. "Little did I realize that in a few years I would encounter an idea—Darwin's idea—bearing an unmistakable likeness to universal acid: it eats through just about every traditional concept, and leaves in its wake a revolutionized world-view, with most of the old landmarks still recognizable, but transformed in fundamental ways."²
 - c. Evolution made God superfluous for Matt and Daniel Dennett. Within 9 months Matt stopped going to church.
 - d. Julian Huxley came to the same conclusion. He wrote,
 - i. "Darwin's real achievement was to remove the whole idea of God as the creator of organisms from the sphere of rational discussion."³
 - e. Several years later Richard Dawkins famously wrote,
 - i. "Although atheism might have been logically tenable before Darwin, Darwin made it possible to be an intellectually fulfilled atheist."⁴
 - f. Furthermore, Dawkins believes that anyone who does not believe in evolution is an idiot. He wrote,
 - i. "It is absolutely safe to say that, if you meet somebody who claims not to believe in evolution, that person is ignorant, stupid, or insane (or wicked, but I'd rather not consider that)."⁵

¹ Nancy Pearcey, *Total Truth: Liberating Christianity from its Cultural Captivity* (Wheaton Illinois: Crossway books, 2004), Chapters 7-8.

² Daniel Dennett, *Darwin's dangerous idea: Evolution and the Meanings of life* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995), 63.

³ John Blanchard, *Evolution Fact or Fiction* (Webster New York: Evangelical Press, 2002), 28.

⁴ Mark Driscoll, *Doctrine: What Christians should believe* (Wheaton Illinois: Crossway books, 2010), 98.

- g. Are Dawkins, Huxley, and Dennett right? Should we embrace evolution?
 - i. No! As a matter of fact, evolution is increasingly untenable for people who love science.
 - ii. By the way, evolution does not destroy belief in God.
 - 1. Evolution can't explain where the universe came from.
 - 2. Evolution can't explain the universe's fine tuning.
 - 3. Evolution can't explain where Darwin's "warm little pond" came from.
 - 4. At best, evolution can't explain how God brought about life!!!
 - iii. To prove that evolution should be rejected I will
 - 1. Define evolution (section one).
 - 2. Critique evolution (section two).

1. Section one- Defining Evolution

- a. Unfortunately defining evolution is not easy since evolution means different things to different people.⁶ There are at least four definitions of evolution.
 - i. First, evolution refers to the fact that **things change over time**.
 - 1. Hardly anyone disagrees with this definition.
 - ii. Second, evolution sometimes refers to **microevolution**.
 - 1. Microevolution teaches that minute changes occur over time within a species.
 - 2. Dog breeders have known this for centuries.
 - 3. Grudem writes,
 - a. "Small developments within one species, so that we see flies or mosquitoes becoming immune to insecticides, human beings growing taller, or different colors and varieties of roses being developed."⁷
 - iii. Third, evolution sometimes refers to **macroevolution**.
 - 1. Macroevolution teaches that minute changes over time create new species.⁸
 - 2. Macroevolution is synonymous with the theory of evolution.
 - 3. The National Association of Biology Teachers (NABT) describes the theory of evolution by writing,

⁵ Phillip Johnson, *Darwin on Trial* (Downers Grove: Illinois, 1993), 9.

⁶ Jay. W Richards, "Squaring the circle," in *God and Evolution*, ed. Jay w. Richards (Seattle: Discovery Institute, 2010), 18. (For a further discussion of the different definitions of evolution refer to this book).

⁷ Grudem, W. (2020). *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Second Edition, pp. 352–353). Zondervan Academic.

⁸ Michael Behe, *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution* (New York: Free Press, 1996), 14.

- a. “The diversity of life on earth is the outcome of evolution: and unpredictable and natural process of temporal descent with genetic modification that is affected by natural selection, chance, historical contingencies and changing environments.... Natural selection.... has no specific direction or goal, including survival of species.”⁹
4. It works like this,
 - a. “In modern Darwinian evolutionary theory, the history of the development of life began when a mix of chemicals present on the earth spontaneously produced a very simple, probably one-celled life form. This living cell reproduced itself, and eventually there were some mutations or differences in the new cells produced. These mutations led to the development of more complex life forms. A hostile environment meant that many of them would perish, but those that were better suited to their environment would survive and multiply. Thus nature exercised a process of “natural selection” in which the differing organisms most fitted to the environment survived. More and more mutations eventually developed into more and more varieties of living things, so that from the very simplest organism all the complex life forms on earth eventually developed through this process of *random mutation and natural selection*.”¹⁰
 5. The theory of (macro) evolution boldly claims that *all* living things descended with modification from one living organism, as the result of natural selection.
 6. Speaking of natural selection, Daniel Dennett writes,
 - a. “This was Darwin’s great idea, not the idea of evolution, but the idea of evolution by natural selection.”¹¹
 - b. Darwin believed that natural selection, not God, is responsible for every living thing on planet earth.
 - c. What exactly is natural selection? Natural selection is nothing. In other words, it is a blind, unguided, and purposeless process that describes survival of the fittest. Some animals survive because of their advantageous traits. Such traits are passed on to their offspring allowing them to survive.
 - d. Eventually, given enough time, chance, and mutations, new species emerge.

⁹ C. John Collins, *Science and Faith Friend or Foes?* (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway books, 2003), 257.

¹⁰ Grudem, W. (2020). *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Second Edition, p. 353). Zondervan Academic.

¹¹ Dennett, 42.

e. The randomness of natural selection led paleontologist George Gaylord Simpson to write,

i. “Man is the result of a purposeless and natural process that did not have him in mind.”¹²

7. Until the end of the 19th century natural selection drove the theory of evolution.

- a. But some started to doubt natural selection’s ability to create the diversity of life on planet earth.
- b. Something more was needed to explain evolution’s power.
- c. Along came Gregor Mendel’s groundbreaking work in genetics.
- d. Because of Mendel’s work the Neo-Darwinian synthesis was born.

iv. **The Neo-Darwinian synthesis**, which is the fourth definition of evolution, claims that natural selection alone cannot explain the diversity of life, but natural selection working with genetic mutations can.

1. One author writes,

- a. “Neo-Darwinism became the reigning paradigm for most of the twentieth century.”¹³
- b. I will discuss Neo- Darwinism more below.

2. When I use the term neo-Darwinism, I am simply referring to what most people today refer to as evolution or Darwinism.

3. Neo-Darwinism argues that natural selection and genetic mutations work together to create new species.

b. We have looked at evolution, microevolution, macroevolution (the theory of evolution), and Neo-Darwinism.

i. Again, during this lecture, I will use macroevolution, the theory of evolution, Darwinism, and Neo-Darwinism synonymously.

ii. Now that I have defined terms it is time to provide a critique of evolution.

2. Section two- critiquing Evolution!

a. Evolution has many problems.

- i. I will describe nine.
- ii. So many good resources to dig deeper...

b. Problem one, evolution cannot explain the origin of life.

i. This is the subject of chemical evolution.

¹² Ann Gauger, Douglas Axe, and Casey Luskin, *Science and human Origins* (Seattle: Discovery Institute, 2012), 9.

¹³ Kenneth D. Keathley and Mark F. Rooker, *40 Questions about Creation and Evolution* (Grand Rapids Michigan: Kregel Publishing, 2014), 325.

1. Chemical evolution refers to the creation of the first life forms.
 2. Biological evolution refers to the creation of new species from the first life forms.
- ii. Most of us were taught that life emerged from non-life when lightning struck a warm little pond billions of years ago on earth's prebiotic surface.

1. Image of the Stanley Miller experiment???

2. This is often called chemical evolution or abiogenesis.
 3. In 1953, Stanley Miller "proved" chemical evolution when he created amino acids by charging a test tube with electricity.
 4. This was meant to simulate what happened when a prebiotic pond was struck by lightning millions of years ago.
 5. There are at least three good reasons to reject chemical evolution.
- iii. **First, one should reject chemical evolution because the atmospheric conditions in earth's earliest history were much more hostile to the creation of life than Miller predicted.**

1. Lee Stroebel writes,

- a. "Science magazine said in 1995 that experts now dismiss Miller's experiment because 'the early atmosphere looked nothing like the Miller-Urey simulation.'"¹⁴
- b. Even if life spontaneously emerged in a warm little pond, evolutionists still must answer two critical questions. Where did planet earth come from? And more fundamentally, where did the universe come from? Evolution cannot answer these fundamental questions since evolution (natural selection and gene mutation) only operates on living things.

iv. **Second, one should reject chemical evolution because non-living things cannot produce information.**

1. For a long time, scientists assumed that the earliest life on planet earth was very simple (non-complex). As a result, it seemed plausible that the earliest life forms emerged from non-living chemicals.
 - a. We now know that even the simplest life forms cannot be produced without following incredibly complex instructions from their DNA.

¹⁴ Lee Stroebel, *The Case for a Creator* (Grand Rapids Michigan, Zondervan, 2004), 37.

- b. Norm Geisler describes the nature of this information when he writes,
- i. “Staunch Darwinist Richard Dawkins, professor of zoology at Oxford University, admits that the message found in just the cell nucleus of a tiny amoeba is more than all thirty volumes of the Encyclopedia Britannica combined, and the entire amoeba has a much information in its DNA as 1,000 complete sets of the Encyclopedia Britannica! In other words, if you were to spell out all the A, T, C, and G in the ‘unjustly called primitive amoeba’ (as Dawkins describes it), the letters would fill 1,000 complete sets of an encyclopedia.”¹⁵
- c. It is important to note that the 1,000 complete sets of the Encyclopedia Britannica referred to by Dawkins contain highly complex arrangements of letters.
- i. Not one letter is out of order. If constructing the sentence, “Can you do the dishes please?” requires intelligence than how much more intelligence is required to write 1,000 complete sets of the Encyclopedia Britannica?
 - ii. This is the same amount of information required to construct one single celled amoeba. This is staggering.
 - iii. Since we all know that non-living things cannot produce highly complex information (specified complexity), chemical evolution is impossible.
- d. Believing in chemical evolution is like believing that an explosion at a paper and ink factory was responsible for the creation of 1,000 encyclopedia sets. But even if they can explain that, they can’t explain the origin of the factory, the blank paper, the ink, the book binding, or the complex information found on the paper.
- e. Or it is as crazy as believing that after billions of years, some chemicals sloshing around in a pond would eventually turn into a Boeing 747!
- f. In light of this ridiculousness, Anthony Flew writes,
- i. “How do merely physical and mechanical forces—forces without mind, without consciousness—give rise to the world of purposes, thoughts and moral projects? How can a universe of mindless matter produce beings with intrinsic ends [and] self-replication capabilities?” —ANTONY FLEW (Simmons, ROTEOG,171)

¹⁵ Norman Geisler, *I don't have enough faith to be an atheist* (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway, 2004), 116.

- v. **Third one should reject chemical evolution because it is so spectacularly improbable.**
1. The massive amount of information stored in the DNA of the simplest life forms, makes it highly improbable that this information was created by chance. How improbable?
 - a. John Blanchard writes,
 - b. “Dr. James Coppedge, an expert in the study of statistical probability, has calculated that the likelihood of a single protein molecule being arranged by chance is 1 in 10-161st (there are 10-80th atoms in the universe).”¹⁶
 2. Maybe 10-161st means little to you? How about an illustration from the junkyard? Dr. Fred Hoyle
 - a. “Claimed that the probability of life arising on earth (by purely natural means, without special divine aid) is less than the probability that a flight worthy Boeing 747 should be assembled by a hurricane roaring through a junkyard.”¹⁷
 3. “In The Cosmic Blueprint, the physicist Paul Davies says it ‘is possible to perform rough calculations of the probability that the endless breakup and reforming of the soup’s complex molecules would lead to a small virus after a billion years.’ He then tells us what those calculations lead to. He says they work out at one chance in over ten to the two millionth power, a “mind-numbing” number, which put more simply would be harder to achieve than just happening to flip ‘heads on a coin six million times in a row.’ For anyone who has flipped heads on a coin ten times in a row (try it), you get the idea. Davies concludes by saying ‘the spontaneous generation of life by random molecular shuffling is a ludicrously improbable event.’” (Metaxas, IAD, 94-95)
- vi. In summary, the earliest atmospheric conditions, the complexity of life, and the laws of probability rule out chemical evolution as an explanation for the origin of life.
1. Wayne Grudem writes,
 - a. “Random mutation and natural selection (the two processes essential to Darwinian evolution) do not contain the creative power to generate the new genetic information that is necessary for the creation of new proteins and new forms of life.”¹⁸
 2. Leading evolutionary biologist Massimo Pigliucci writes,

¹⁶ Blanchard, 19.

¹⁷ Driscoll, 99.

¹⁸ Grudem, W. (2020). *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Second Edition, p. 354). Zondervan Academic.

- a. “We really don’t have a clue how life originated on earth by natural means.”¹⁹
3. Darwinists Paul Davies wrote,
 - a. “All attempts at formulating a materialistic theory of the origin of life have failed—and not from a lack of trying.”²⁰
 4. The problems with chemical evolution are so great that Richard Dawkins has proposed panspermia (seeds everywhere), which teaches that aliens or crystals brought life to planet earth millions of years ago. This is not science it is science fiction.
 5. James M. Tour, a synthetic organic chemist, is professor of chemistry, professor of computer science, and professor of materials science and nanoengineering at Rice University. He was named among “The 50 Most Influential Scientists in the World Today” by TheBestSchools.org and was named “Scientist of the Year” by *R&D* magazine in 2013.²¹
 - a. “Tour knows as much about the art of creating molecules as anyone. . . He flatly states that what Miller and Urey suggested in 1952 didn’t solve anything. In fact, he says it’s far worse than that. It’s not just that we haven’t moved the ball forward since 1952, but in the seven decades since we have not only not drawn closer to understanding what happened, but have actually moved much further away. The more we have learned about this subject, the more we have actually been able to see that what looked so easy and so tantalizingly close in 1952 is in fact far beyond anything we ever dreamt. It’s as if we were aiming at a target in 1952, assuming we would over time get better at aiming, but as we have been focused on aiming, the target has been moving further and further away. By now it is on the other side of the universe, and the idea of hitting it is simply no longer conceivable, even to the most dedicated marksman. What we have learned in these seven decades is that what we have been trying to do is almost certainly much harder than we originally thought.” (Metaxas, 90 of *Is Atheism dead*)
 6. “What we once thought was a simple membrane surrounding some gooey “protoplasm” was now seen to contain an astonishing universe within itself, a staggering agglomeration of intertwined parts performing stunningly complex functions. Even the membrane was outrageously sophisticated, being perfectly “water-tight” until it somehow “chose” to allow something in or out, and then did so. The more science learned, the more clear it became that a single cell was anything but simple, and the more it became obvious that something so

¹⁹ Center for Science and Culture Frequently Asked Questions, <http://www.discovery.org/id/faqs/#questionsAboutCriticismOfDarwinianEvolution>

²⁰ Paul Davies, *The 5th Miracle: The Search for the Origin and Meaning of life* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1999), 123-33.

²¹ Grudem, W. (2020). *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Second Edition, p. 356). Zondervan Academic.

impossibly sophisticated did not appear to have come into existence by chance. Already in 1978, the evolutionist and Cambridge zoologist W. H. Thorpe said that even the “most elementary type of cell constitutes a ‘mechanism’ unimaginably more complex than any machine yet thought up, let alone constructed, by man.” Exactly how complex is hard to comprehend. The information in the DNA of a single bacterium alone is equivalent to the millions of words in a shelf of twenty books.” (Metaxas, IAD, 93-94)

vii. *Problem one, evolution can't explain the origin of the first life.*

c. Problem two, the fossil record destroys evolution.

i. Science is based on observation.

1. If evolution is true, there should be millions of intermediate species in the fossil record. There are no intermediate species in the fossil record therefore evolution must be false.
2. To prove this, we will look at missing links and the Cambrian explosion.

ii. The missing links.

1. This missing links are the transitional or intermediate species Darwin expected to find in abundance in the fossil record.
2. Here is the problem—the missing links are still missing.
3. Darwin was aware of the absence of missing links in his own day. He wrote,
 - a. “But just in proportion as this process of extermination has acted on an enormous scale, so must the number of intermediate varieties, which have formerly existed on the earth, be truly enormous. Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? 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. The explanation lies, as I believe, in the extreme imperfection of the geological record.”²²
4. Darwin believed that the number of transitional species or missing links found in the fossil record would eventually be “inconceivably great.” He blamed the lack of transitional species in his day to the incomplete fossil record.
5. 150 years later the missing links are still missing, and it is not because of an incomplete fossil record.

²² Charles Darwin, *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of the Favored Races in the Struggle for life, 1st ed.* (London: John Murray, 2003 (1859)), 280.

6. Professor N. Herbert Nilsson of Sweden writes,
 - a. “The fossil material is now so complete that the lack of transitional species cannot be explained by the scarcity of the material. The deficiencies are real; they will never be filled.”²³
7. Darwinists have never given up on the missing links.
 - a. **Archaeopteryx** was hailed as the missing link a few years after Darwin.
 - i. Now everyone agrees that this was an extinct bird.
 - b. **Next Java man** was thought to be the missing link.
 - i. Java man was nothing more than a human skullcap, a thighbone, three teeth, and a lot of imagination.²⁴
 - ii. A few years ago, a 342-page report by 19 evolutionists debunked Java man once and for all.²⁵
 - iii. Ignoring this report Time Magazine hailed Java man as the missing link in a 1994 issue.
 - c. Over the year’s **Neanderthal man** (member of the human family), **Pittdown man** (giant hoax), **Nebraska man** (a single tooth), **Nutcracker man**, and **Lucy** have all been debunked.²⁶
 - i. In 1974 the American anthropologist Donald Johanson found a tiny skeleton east of the Great Rift Valley, Ethiopia. Nicknamed ‘Lucy,’ it was dated at three million years and became a sensation when announced at the Nobel Symposium on Early Man in 1978. Lucy was hailed as the first ape to walk upright and an undoubted link between apes and humans, but in a question-and-answer session at the University of Missouri in 1996, Johanson admitted that the knee joint cited as proof that Lucy walked upright had been found more than two miles away and 200 feet lower in the strata! (Simmons, ROTEQG, 183)
 - d. In 1985, Richard Leakey, the famous evolutionary paleontologist, was a guest on “The Dick Cavett Show.”
 - i. Leakey had with him some impressive-looking human fossils. As they were talking about the fossils, Cavett continues to press Leakey gently about how many of the bones were actually found in the ground. Well, Leakey finally admitted, actually just a small piece of bone was found and then he and his team of experts reconstructed the

²³ Blanchard, 9.

²⁴ Stroebel, 61.

²⁵ Stroebel, 62.

²⁶ Stroebel, chapter 3.

rest with plaster. Cavett was dumbfounded. (Simmons, ROTEOG, 181)

ii. Sadly, this is considered scientific proof!!!

8. Even Darwinian paleontologists admit that the missing links are still missing.

a. **Stephen Jay Gould** was a paleontologist at Harvard University. He is considered by many to be one of the most influential Darwinists of the 20th century. He writes,

i. “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.”²⁷

ii. “. . . the extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology. The evolutionary trees that adorn our textbooks have data only at the tips and nodes of their branches. The rest is inference, however reasonable, not the evidence of fossils. . . Darwin’s argument that the geological record is extremely imperfect, still persists as the favored escape of most paleontologists from the embarrassment of a record that seems to show so little evidence of evolution.” (Simmons, ROTEOG, 176)

b. The late David B. Kitts, School of Geology and Geophysics, Department of the History of Science, University of Oklahoma, offered the following cautionary advice:

i. “Despite the bright promise that paleontology provides a means of “seeing” evolution, it has presented some nasty difficulties for evolutionists, the most notorious of which is the presence of “gaps” in the fossil record. Evolution requires intermediate forms between species, and paleontology does not provide them.”²⁸ (Also found in Simmons, ROTEOG, 177)

c. The late Dr. Colin Patterson, former Senior Paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History, stated:

i. “I will lay it on the line—there is not one such fossil for which one could make a watertight argument.” (Simmons, ROTEOG, 177)

²⁷ Stephen Jay Gould, “*Is a New and General Theory of Evolution Emerging?*” *Paleobiology* 6, no. 1, (1980): 119-130.

²⁸ Blanchard, 9.

- d. Finally, David Raup, curator of geology at the Field Museum of Natural history, writes,
 - i. “The evidence we find in the geologic record is not nearly as compatible with Darwinian natural selection as we would like it to be... There were several problems, but the principal one was that the geologic record did not then and still does not yield a finely graduated chain of slow and progressive evolution.”²⁹
 - ii. “We are now about 150 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.” (Raup quoted by Simmons, ROTEOG, 176)
- e. Niles Eldredge is a very highly regarded biologist and paleontologist and, for many years, has been on the staff of the American Museum of Natural History in New York. He said something quite remarkable about natural selection and the theory of gradual adaptive change:
 - i. “We paleontologists have said that the history of life supports...[the story of adaptive change]...all the while knowing that it does not.” (Simmons, ROTEOG, 178)
- f. Most significantly, the late aerospace engineer Luther D. Sutherland, in his book *Darwin’s Enigma: Fossils and Other Problems*, describes interviews that he conducted with five of the leading paleontologists in the world, all who worked at prestigious natural history museums. Each of these museums had extensive fossil collections. According to Sutherland:
 - i. “None of the five museum officials could offer a single example of a transitional series of fossilized organisms that would document the transformation of one basically different type to another.” (Simmons, ROTEOG, 177-178)
- g. Not only do the missing links wreak havoc on evolution so does the Cambrian Explosion.

iii. The Cambrian explosion.

1. The Cambrian period was roughly 530 million years ago.
 - a. Qualify millions of years...

²⁹ David Raup, “*Conflicts between Darwin and Paleontology*,” *Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin* 50, no. 1 (January 1979): 22-29.

- b. The only fossils found below the Cambrian stratum are single celled organisms.
 - c. In the Cambrian strata complex species appear suddenly (geologically speaking) without evidence of transitional species.³⁰
 - d. This turns Darwin's tree of life upside down.
2. Most science textbooks teach that all life can be traced back to one single celled organism.
- a. This is represented with Darwin's tree of life.
 - b. The bottom of the tree represents a single celled organism. The top of the tree represents all the complex species that evolved from the simple celled organism at the bottom of the tree.
3. The Cambrian explosion paints a very different picture.
- a. Fossils found in the Cambrian period represent nearly every major group of living organisms.
 - b. Interestingly they all show up at once with zero transitional history.
 - c. Which is why evolutionists Richard Dawkins said-
 - i. "It was though they (species) were just planted there (Cambrian period) without any evolutionary history"³¹
 - d. Darwin's tree would be more accurate if it was turned upside down since there were more species in the Cambrian period then there are now since some species have gone extinct since then.
4. The Cambrian explosion is a massive problem for Darwin's theory of descent with modification.
- a. If descent with modification were true, we would find millions of transitional species before the Cambrian period.
 - b. Instead, most of the species we see in the Cambrian period have zero transitional history.
5. To get away from the implications of the Cambrian explosion Darwinists like Stephen Jay Gould argue for punctuated equilibrium.
- a. Punctuated equilibrium denies that creatures gradually evolved over millions of years.
 - b. Instead, creatures remained relatively unchanged (equilibrium) for long periods of time.

³⁰ Stephen Meyer, *Darwin's Doubt: The Explosive origin of Animal life and the case for Intelligent Design* (New York, New York: Harper One, 2013). In this book Stephen Meyer provides a devastating critique of Darwinism from paleontology.

³¹ Blanchard, 10.

- c. Then, suddenly, these creatures rapidly adapted (punctuated).
- d. Punctuated equilibrium rejects Darwin's gradualism, the backbones of Darwin's theory. As a result, it has not gained much support.³² This brings us to the next problem.

d. Problem three, microevolution does not prove macroevolution.

- i. Many scientists assume that microevolution (small adaptations within a species) explains macroevolution (the creation of new species).
- ii. But there are a few problems with this *unobserved* extrapolation.

1. First, there are no examples of microevolution proving macroevolution.

- a. Jonathan Wells refers to these examples as the icons of evolution in his excellent book *The Icons of Evolution*.³³
- b. For instance, Darwin's famous finches merely proved that finch beaks changed size when environmental factors changed.
 - i. Darwin saw this as proof for survival of the fittest since the birds with the bigger beaks survived.
 - ii. Phillip Johnson argues that this is a tautology. A tautology proves nothing since it says the same thing twice. Darwin essentially said that the birds with the bigger beaks survived because the birds with the bigger beaks survived.³⁴
 - iii. Furthermore, Darwinists often ignore the fact that when the environmental conditions changed a few years later the bird beaks went back to normal size.
 - iv. To argue that a temporary change in beak size leads to the creation of a whole new species seems more like a fairy tale than science.
- c. What about the other icons of evolution?
 - i. The famous mutated fruit flies experiment simply proved that flies with two sets of wings could not survive.
 - ii. In addition, the peppered moth experiment and Haeckel's embryo drawings were hoaxes.

³² See *Darwin's Dilemma* by Stephen Meyer.

³³ Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution: Science or Myth* (Washington DC, Regnery Publishing, 2002).

³⁴ Johnson, 20 (*Darwin on Trial*).

- iii. Sadly, these icons of evolution are still used in textbooks to prove that microevolution explains macroevolution.
- d. Since the icons of evolution don't prove that microevolution leads to macroevolution Darwinism moved on to genetics.

2. Second, genetic mutations don't lead to macroevolution!!!

- a. Neo-Darwinists argue that tiny mutations at the genetic level over billions of years (microevolution) creates new species (macroevolution).
- b. But this is highly improbable since the vast majority of mutations are harmful. The Discovery institute writes,
 - i. "Mutations cause harm and do not build complexity. Darwinian evolution relies on random mutations that are selected by a blind, unguided process of natural selection that has no goals. Such a random and undirected process tends to harm organisms and does not improve them or build complexity. As National Academy of Sciences biologist Lynn Margulis has said, 'new mutations don't create new species; they create offspring that are impaired.' Similarly, past president of the French Academy of Sciences, Pierre-Paul Grasse, contended that 'mutations have a very limited 'constructive capacity'' because 'no matter how numerous they may be, mutations do not produce any kind of evolution.'"³⁵
 - ii. Matti Leisola is professor emeritus of bioprocess engineering at Aalto University in Finland. He writes that
 - 1. "actual mutations are very rare and seldom beneficial . . . Negative mutations exceed positive ones by a thousand—to a millionfold, according to various estimations."³⁶
- c. Microevolution at the genetic level and non-genetic level cannot create new species.
 - i. At least this has never been observed in a lab.
 - ii. Therefore, evolutionists Charles Foster says,

³⁵ Center for Science and Culture Frequently Asked Questions, <http://www.discovery.org/id/faqs/#questionsAboutCriticismOfDarwinianEvolution>

³⁶ Grudem, W. (2020). *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Second Edition, p. 356). Zondervan Academic.

1. “The problem of speciation has not yet been solved, and there are limits to variations within species.”³⁷

iii. Furthermore, evolutionist James Shapiro writes,

1. “It is important to note that selection has never led to the formation of a new species, as Darwin postulated. No matter how morphologically and behaviorally different they become, all dogs remain members of the same species, are capable of interbreeding with other dogs, and will revert in a few generations to a common feral dog phenotype if allowed to go wild.”³⁸

3. Finally, no one has successfully described how microevolution leads to macroevolution.

- a. After scouring thousands of articles in peer reviewed journals like the *Journal of Molecular Evolution* biochemist Michael Behe claims that it is incredibly difficult to find a single article that describes the gradual step-by-step process that brings about a new species leading him to write,

- i. “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. Despite comparing sequences and mathematical modeling, molecular evolution has never addressed the question of how complex structures come to be.”³⁹

4. Summary of this point-

- a. The icons of evolution and the Neo-Darwinian synthesis fail to prove that microevolution leads to macroevolution. Furthermore, no one can explain *how* Darwin’s gradualism creates new species. For these three reasons, I reject the idea that microevolution leads to macroevolution.

e. **Problem four, there is overwhelming evidence for intelligent design.**

i. Background

1. Although teleological arguments have been around for centuries (i.e., Aquinas and Paley) the Intelligent Design (ID) movement takes design arguments to a whole new level thanks to recent developments in biology.⁴⁰

³⁷ Keathley and Rooker, 81.

³⁸ James Shapiro, *Evolution: A view from the 21st century* (Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: FT Press, 2011) 90.

³⁹ Michael Behe, *Darwin’s black Box: The Biochemical challenge to Evolution* (New York: Free Press, 1996), 186.

⁴⁰ The Discovery Institute out of Seattle Washington is currently the leading ID think tank.

2. ID teaches that an intelligent agent best explains the existence of specified complexity in nature.
 3. If you walk down a jungle path and see hundreds of bananas lying on the ground arranged to spell, “Stop! Quicksand ahead!” you assume they were arranged by an intelligent being. Why? The arrangement has the marks of design, often referred to as specified complexity.⁴¹
 4. There are many aspects of nature that carry the marks of design. We will look at four.
- ii. **First, the information stored in DNA displays the marks of design.**⁴²
1. Since I discussed DNA above (see the section on the origin of the first life) I will not dwell on it here.
 2. But I will say one thing; chance cannot create complex computer software. Yet DNA is more complex than the most complex computer software ever created.
 3. Bill Gates writes,
 - a. “DNA is like a computer program but far, far more advanced than any software ever created.”⁴³
 4. Another author writes,
 - a. “We know of no structures more complex than living cells. The complexity of major cities and of supercomputers pales in comparison to that of cellular life. The cell’s origin, complexity, and information content cannot be explained by any known process, including natural selection.”⁴⁴
 5. The existence of complex information in DNA is best explained by an intelligent cause.
- iii. **Second, the fine-tuning of the universe displays the marks of design.**
1. For life to exist on planet earth several conditions must be met.
 2. Scientists call this the anthropic principle. Here are a few examples.
 - a. If there is too much oxygen in our atmosphere our atmosphere will burst into flames. If there is not enough oxygen, we will suffocate.⁴⁵

⁴¹ William Dembski, *The Design Inference: Eliminating Chance through Small Probabilities* (Cambridge University Press, 1998).

⁴² Stephen Meyer, *The Signature in the Cell: DNA and the Evidence for Intelligent Design* (New York, New York: Harper One, 2009). This is the definitive book on this exciting topic.

⁴³ Jonathan Wells, *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Darwinism and Intelligent Design* (Washington DC, Regnery Publishing, 2006), 97.

⁴⁴ Keathley and Rooker, 368.

⁴⁵ Geisler, 98.

- b. If the earth's atmosphere were slightly more transparent, we would be bombarded with solar radiation. If the atmosphere were slightly less transparent the solar radiation, we need for life would not reach us.⁴⁶
 - c. Describing the atom's weak force William Lane Craig writes, "A change in the atoms weak force by only one part in 10 to the 100th would have prevented a life permitting universe."⁴⁷
 - d. If the levels of CO₂ (carbon dioxide) were slightly higher the earth would turn into a giant greenhouse and burn up.
 - e. If CO₂ levels were slightly lower plants would not survive and there would be no oxygen. These are just a few of the finely tuned conditions necessary for life to exist on planet earth.
3. Couldn't this all have happened by chance?
- a. Astrophysicist Hugh Ross argues that 122 finely tuned conditions must exist for life to exist on planet earth.
 - b. Eric Metaxas... argues that there are now close approximately 200.
 - c. The chance of these conditions all existing simultaneously by chance is 1 out of 10 to the 138th. The estimated number of atoms in the known universe is 10 to the 70th.⁴⁸
 - d. It takes far more faith to believe that chance, not an intelligent designer, finely tuned these conditions for life on planet earth.

iv. Third, irreducible complexity displays the marks of design.

- 1. Darwin said,
 - a. "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."⁴⁹
- 2. Darwin had a very simple understanding of cells (essentially a blob of Jelly he called protoplasm).
- 3. The invention and subsequent improvement of the electron microscope in the mid-twentieth century, together with other technological advances, allowed scientists for the first time in history to explore the inner workings of a living cell. Since the end of World War II, an explosion of new research into the cell has shown it to be far more complex than anyone had imagined.⁵⁰
- 4. Behe defined Irreducible complexity to mean
 - a. "a single system composed of several well-matched, interacting parts that contribute to the basic function, wherein the removal

⁴⁶ Geisler, 100.

⁴⁷ William Lane Craig, *On Guard: Defending your faith with reason and precision* (Colorado Springs, Co. David C. Cook Publishing, 2010), Chapter 5 contains an excellent discussion of fine tuning.

⁴⁸ Norman Geisler, *I don't have enough faith to be an atheist* (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway, 2004), chapter 4.

⁴⁹ Darwin, *Origin of Species*, 189.

⁵⁰ Grudem, W. (2020). *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Second Edition, p. 359). Zondervan Academic.

of any one of the parts causes the system to effectively cease functioning. An irreducibly complex system cannot be produced directly ... by slight, successive modifications of a precursor system, because any precursor to an irreducibly complex system that is missing a part is by definition nonfunctional.”⁵¹

5. The system is irreducibly complex because the whole system ceases to function if you take away any one part. Behe then argues that evolutionary theory can provide no explanation for this because the individual parts would be useless and would provide no natural advantage to the cell.⁵²
 - a. **The mouse trap** illustration.
6. Michael Behe demonstrated in *Darwin's Black box* that **the bacteria flagella motor** “could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications.”
 - a. Behe proved that it is impossible for this motor to develop gradually over time since the motor is useless unless all 40 parts exist simultaneously.
 - b. If the motor is useless, it should have been placed on the extinction list by natural selection. Since all 40 parts must exist simultaneously Behe argues that it is irreducibly complex. Irreducible complexity is best explained by an intelligent designer.
7. This is currently one of the strongest arguments for design.⁵³

v. Fourth, the human eye contains the marks of design.

1. William Paley lived in the 1700s.
 - a. He believed that God was a master craftsmen and designer.
 - b. To help his friends understand God's design he compared the human eye to a human telescope.
2. Comparison
 - a. The eye was made for vision; the telescope was made for assisting it.
 - b. Each uses a sophisticated lens to achieve its function and purpose.
 - c. Both reflect and manipulate light.
 - d. Both are able to bring an object into proper focus. The muscles surrounding the soft lens of the eye move to bring objects into focus, while a telescope uses dials to move the lens.

⁵¹ Grudem, W. (2020). *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Second Edition, p. 359). Zondervan Academic.

⁵² Grudem, W. (2020). *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Second Edition, p. 359). Zondervan Academic.

⁵³ To read more see *Darwin's Black Box* by Behe already cited above.

- e. **Image of the complexity of the human eye** (side cut).
3. With this in mind, he asked his friends if it would be reasonable to believe that the telescope was created by a craftsman while the eye was not. (Simmons, ROTEOG, 185)
4. One scholar writes,
 - a. The tiny retina of the eye has 130 million receptor cells, 124 million of which are rod shaped and enable us to differentiate between light and darkness. Six million of these receptor cells are cone shaped and can identify up to eight million variations of color. Could this really occur by a random, purposeless process? (Simmons, ROTEOG, 185-186)
5. Author John Blanchard makes a significant point:
 - a. “A partial eye is useless. Five percent of an eye would not give five percent vision—it would give none. What is more, even if all the physical components of an eye were in place, they would achieve nothing unless they were precisely ‘wired’ to an amazing complex of nerve cells in the brain. Small wonder that someone has suggested, ‘Examination of the eye is a cure for atheism.’” (Simmons, 186)
6. The complexity of the eye causes problems for evolutionary theory because a biological system like the eye had to develop over millions of years, and would have never worked until fully developed. (Simmons, ROTEOG, 185-186)
7. Darwin clearly recognized that understanding how the eye was formed posed a problem to his theory, as he wrote bluntly in a letter:
 - a. “The eye to this day gives me a cold shudder.”
8. Dr. Ming Wang is a world-renowned eye surgeon who earned his MD from Harvard and his PhD in laser physics from MIT. He grew up an atheist. He writes this,
 - a. “The more I learned about science, the more—not less—evidence that I saw of God’s creation and design. For example, as I was becoming an ophthalmologist and learning about the inner workings of the eye, the amazing and logical arrangement of photoreceptors, ganglion cells, and neurons, I realized that there is absolutely no way that an intricate structure such as the human eye could ever evolve from a random compilation of cells. The very complexity of a human eye is, in fact, the most powerful evidence of the existence of God.” (quoted by Simmons, 187)

9. He also wrote,

- a. “As a medical doctor and a scientist, I can firmly attest to the fact that it is impossible for natural selection to form the intricacies of the eye.” (quoted by Simmons, 187)

f. *Problem five, evolution cannot account for morality or rational thought.*

- i. If evolution is true, humans are nothing more than chunks of meat.
 1. We have no more value than rocks or bugs.
 2. Most of us are not bothered when six-year-old boys torture crickets.
 3. What makes us different from the crickets if we both evolved from the swamp gas?
- ii. If evolution is true, there is no such thing as free will.
 1. We are simply chemical reactions that respond to stimuli.
 2. Expand...
- iii. If evolution is true, there is no basis for conscience since there is no lawgiver.
 1. Child abuse, rape, and torture should not bother us.
- iv. If survival of the fittest is true, why should we care if the frail, elderly, or mentally handicapped survive? We shouldn't!
 1. William Provine, Darwinian professor of biology from Cornell University, wrote,
 - a. “Let me summarize my views on what modern evolutionary biology tells us loud and clear... There are no gods, no purposes, no goal-directing forces of any kind. There is no life after death... There is no ultimate foundation for ethics, no meaning to life, and no free will for humans, either.”⁵⁴
 2. Thankfully the vast majority of evolutionists don't live out the implications of their worldview.
 - a. If they did society would disintegrate. This implies that the Darwinian worldview is severely broken. It does not work.
 - b. If it does not work, it is not true. The only way that Darwinists can live decent moral lives is by borrowing intellectual and moral capital from the Christian worldview.
 3. Darwinists often respond by arguing that morality has evolved to help us survive. But if evolution is true why should anyone care if anyone survives? All we should care about is survival of the fittest.
- v. If evolution is true, there is no basis for objective truth.

⁵⁴ Blanchard, 30.

1. Although many live like there is objective truth, once again proving their worldview is broken.
 2. For instance, most Darwinists argue that child abuse and rape are always wrong in every situation. But there is no basis for this claim. You can't say that anything is objectively wrong if there is no lawgiver.
 3. All "ought" language must be eliminated from Darwinian vocabulary for the Darwinist to remain consistent.
 4. But he can't remain consistent with the Darwinian worldview because he is made in God's image. This explains why most Darwinists have a conscience even though Darwinism provides no basis for conscience.
- vi. If evolution is true, there is no philosophical basis for rational thought.
1. Summarizing Cornelius Plantinga's one author writes,
 - a. "If beliefs are simply states of the brain, and natural selection chooses such states according to their contribution to survival rather than any relationship to truth, then there is no reason to trust our beliefs as actually adhering to something that is true. Then what does this say about the evolutionist's belief in Darwinism? Confidence in the truthfulness of Darwinism is completely undermined. Dennett's imagery of Darwinism as a universal acid has returned with a vengeance. The acid has consumed itself."⁵⁵
 2. If evolution is true than I can't trust anyone's thoughts because evolution provides no basis for rational thought.
 - a. Everything, including one's thoughts, is meaningless.
 - b. This means that I can't trust the thoughts of a Darwinists trying to convince me of Darwinism.

g. Problem six, similar DNA does not prove common descent.

- i. Since the fossil evidence for evolution is so weak many Darwinists have moved on to DNA.⁵⁶
 1. The argument goes like this, we know that monkeys and humans descended from the same organism since they share 98% of their DNA.⁵⁷
 - a. Paul Davies writes,

⁵⁵ Keathley and Rooker, 355.

⁵⁶ Jonathan Wells argues this in his *Politically Incorrect Guide to Darwinism and Intelligent Design* cited above.

⁵⁷ Charles Foster, *The selfless Gene: Living with God and Darwin* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2009), 70.

- b. “There are several good reasons to believe in a universal ancestor. For a start, every known organism shares a common physical and chemical system. The metabolic pathways of the cell—how it grows, which molecules do what and when, how energy gets stored and liberated, where proteins get made and what they do—are basically the same throughout.”⁵⁸
2. Just because chimps and humans have similar DNA does not prove that they evolved from the same ancestor.
 - a. Shared DNA can just as easily prove a shared designer.
 - i. One scholar writes,
 - ii. Intelligent agents frequently reuse the same parts in different designs to meet functional requirements, such as reusing wheels on cars and airplanes, or reusing key computer codes in different versions of Microsoft Windows.... Thus, common design—the intentional reuse of a common blueprint or components—is a viable explanation for the widespread functional similarities among the biomolecules found in different types of organisms.⁵⁹
 - b. The assumption that shared DNA means a shared ancestor is just that, an assumption.

h. *Problem seven, inefficiently designed traits do not prove evolution.*

- i. Evolutionists argue that inefficiently designed traits rule out ID.
- ii. The primary example of an inefficiently designed trait is the panda’s thumb.
 1. It is practically useless. Therefore, it must not have been designed. It is better explained as a clumsy evolutionary adaption.
 2. Further proofs for inefficient designs are the “left over” parts in whales (leg bones) and humans (tail bones).
- iii. How should ID respond to this critique?
 1. First, the inefficiently designed traits argument does not prove that something was not designed, it proves that it was poorly designed. Therefore, the inefficiently designed traits argument is a theological objection not a scientific objection.
 2. Furthermore, a designer has the right to design things however he or she wants. A poorly designed car with a gas tank in the back (i.e., Yugo) is still designed.

⁵⁸ Paul Davies, *The 5th Miracle: The Search for the Origin and Meaning of Life* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1999), 71.

⁵⁹ Grudem, W. (2020). [*Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*](#) (Second Edition, p. 361). Zondervan Academic.

3. In addition, God sometimes uses suboptimal things to accomplish his purposes including evil and suffering (Romans 8:28-30).
 4. Finally, evolutionist cannot provide many examples of suboptimal design, but scientists are routinely amazed by the vast amounts of optimally designed traits in nature.⁶⁰
- iv. A more recent spin off from the “inefficiently designed traits” critique is the junk DNA critique.
1. Just a few years ago many people believed that human DNA contained large amounts of junk DNA.
 - a. Junk DNA is DNA that serves no purpose.
 2. If junk DNA serves no purpose than there is no point in creating it, therefore it must have evolved.
 3. This is enough proof for some to reject intelligent design.
- v. In *The Myth of Junk DNA* Wells argues that the idea of junk DNA is not just wrong it is ‘spectacularly wrong.’⁶¹
1. Furthermore, the massive ENCODE project undertaken after the human Genome project,
 - a. “Completely reversed that perception (i.e., Junk DNA) when it demonstrated that at least 74 percent to 93 percent of human DNA routinely carried out functions within the cell.”⁶²
 2. The more we learn about the human genome the more we realize that the vast majority of DNA previously believed to serve no purpose, turns out to be very important.

i. *Problem eight, evolutionists are turning on their own theory.*

- i. The evidence for Darwinism is so scant that even Darwinists are rethinking things.
 1. Colin Peterson is the senior paleontologist at the British Natural History Museum and the author of the museum’s general text on evolution.
 2. While giving a lecture at the American Museum of Natural History he said,

⁶⁰ Fodor and Piattelli-Palmarini, *What Darwin Got Wrong* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2010), 81-92.

⁶¹ Jonathan Wells, *The myth of Junk DNA* (Seattle Washington: Discovery Institute Press, 2011), 9.

⁶² Keathley and Rooker, 373.

- a. “Can you tell me anything you know about evolution, any one thing... that is true? I tried that question on the geology stage 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.”⁶³
3. Peterson is not alone in his skepticism. Stephen Jay Gould said this about Neo-Darwinism,
 - a. “I well remember how the synthetic theory beguiled me with its unifying power when I was a graduate student in the mid-1960s. Since then, I have been watching it slowly unravel as a universal description of evolution. The molecular assault came first, followed quickly by renewed attention to unorthodox theories of speciation and by challenges at the level of macroevolution itself. I have been reluctant to admit it—since beguiling is often forever—but if Mayr’s characterization of the synthetic theory is accurate, then that theory, as a general proposition, is effectively dead, despite its persistence as textbook orthodoxy.”⁶⁴
 4. Story of Dr. Meyer and company at a recent global “who’s who” of the evolutionary world...
 - ii. Gould and Peterson admit that the theory of evolution has problems.
 1. If this is the case than why do so many people tenaciously cling to it?
 2. This brings us to the final problem.
- j. ***Problem nine, evolution is religion that masquerades as science.***
 - i. In spite of all the factual evidence against neo-Darwinian evolution mentioned above, it is tragic that the common opinion, perpetuated in many science textbooks today, is that evolution is an established scientific “fact.” Behind this viewpoint is one key assumption, the assumption of what is called “methodological naturalism.”⁶⁵
 1. Methodological naturalism asserts that, to qualify as scientific, a theory must explain all phenomena by reference to purely physical or material—that is, non-intelligent—causes or processes.⁶⁶
 - ii. Moreland’s new book “Science and Scientism.”
 - iii. Science is based on observation evolution is not.

⁶³ Johnson, 10 (Darwin on Trial).

⁶⁴ Stephen Jay Gould, “Is a New and General Theory of Evolution Emerging?” *Paleobiology* 6, no. 1 (January 1980): 120.

⁶⁵ Grudem, W. (2020). *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Second Edition, p. 363). Zondervan Academic.

⁶⁶ Grudem, W. (2020). *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Second Edition, p. 363). Zondervan Academic.

1. Scientists should go wherever the evidence leads many Darwinists don't.
2. Evolution is based on faith not facts.
3. If you don't believe me believe several prominent evolutionists.

iv. Harvard Geneticist Richard Lewontin writes,

1. "We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs... because we have a prior commitment to materialism... Moreover, that materialism is absolute for we cannot allow a Divine foot in the door."⁶⁷

v. Nobel prize winner Harold Urey writes,

1. "All of us who study the origin of life find that the more we look into it, the more we feel it is too complex to have evolved anywhere. We all believe as an article of faith that life evolved from dead matter on this planet."⁶⁸

vi. Finally, Harvard's George Wald writes,

1. "When it comes to the origin of life on this earth, there are only two possibilities: creation or spontaneous generation. There is no third way. Spontaneous generation was disproved 100 years ago, but that leads us to only one other conclusion, that of supernatural creation. We cannot accept that on philosophical grounds; therefore we choose to believe the impossible, that life arose spontaneously by chance."⁶⁹

vii. These Darwinists reject intelligent design because they have a pre-commitment to philosophical naturalism or materialism.

viii. As a result, debates about evolution and ID go nowhere fast.

1. The Darwinist refuses to interact with evidence for design because he or she has already decided that design is not an option.
2. Furthermore, Darwinists conveniently define the rules of science to support materialism.
3. To make any progress in this debate both sides must be willing to honestly state and discuss their presuppositions about science, faith, and naturalism.⁷⁰
4. This is where the real debate lies.

3. In conclusion, after defining evolution I provided nine reasons why it should be rejected.

⁶⁷ Richard Lewontin, *New York Review of Books*, 9 January 1997.

⁶⁸ Harold Urey, *Christian Science Monitor*, 4 January 1962.

⁶⁹ Blanchard, 29.

⁷⁰ For more on this topic see Philip Johnson's book *The Wedge of Truth*.

- a. To believe in evolution you must believe that nothing created everything, non-life produced life, randomness produced fine-tuning, chaos produced highly complex information, unconsciousness produced consciousness, and non- reason produced reason.⁷¹
- b. Wow!!! I don't have enough faith to believe in evolution. It seems for more reasonable to believe that in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth (Genesis 1:1).
- c. Qualifier...
 - i. There are some Christians who believe in Theistic Evolution...
 - ii. Even if evolution is true, it can't answer life's most important questions...

⁷¹ Stroebel, 277.

Works cited

1. Michael Behe, *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution* (New York: Free Press, 1996).
2. John Blanchard, *Evolution Fact or Fiction* (Webster New York: Evangelical Press, 2002).
3. C. John Collins, *Science and Faith Friend or Foes?* (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway books, 2003).
4. Francis Collins, *The Language of God: A Scientist Presents evidence for Belief* (New York New York: Free Press, 2006).
5. William Lane Craig, *On Guard: Defending your faith with reason and precision* (Colorado Springs, Co. David C. Cook Publishing, 2010).
6. Charles Darwin, *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of the Favored Races in the Struggle for life, 1st ed.* (London: John Murray, 2003 (1859)).
7. Paul Davies, *The 5th Miracle: The Search for the Origin and Meaning of life* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1999).
8. William Dembski, *The Design Inference: Eliminating Chance through Small Probabilities* (Cambridge University Press, 1998).
9. Daniel Dennett, *Darwin's dangerous idea: Evolution and the Meanings of life* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995).
10. Mark Driscoll, *Doctrine: What Christians should believe* (Wheaton Illinois: Crossway books, 2010).
11. Fodor and Piattelli-Palmarini, *What Darwin Got Wrong* (New York: Farar, Straus, and Giroux, 2010).
12. Charles Foster, *The selfless Gene: Living with God and Darwin* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2009).
13. Ann Gauger, Douglas Axe, and Casey Luskin, *Science and human Origins* (Seattle: Discovery Institute, 2012).
14. Norman Geisler, I don't have enough faith to be an atheist (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway, 2004).
15. Stephen Jay Gould, "Is a New and General Theory of Evolution Emerging?" *Paleobiology* 6, no. 1 (January 1980).
16. Stephen Jay Gould, *The Panda's Thumb: More Reflections in Natural History* (New York, New York: W.W. Norton and Co. 1980).
17. Phillip Johnson, *Darwin on Trial* (Downers Grove: Illinois, 1993).
18. Kenneth D. Keathley and Mark F. Rooker, *40 Questions about Creation and Evolution* (Grand Rapids Michigan: Kregel Publishing, 2014).
19. Richard Lewontin, *New York Review of Books*, 9 January 1997.
20. Stephen Meyer, *Darwin's Doubt: The Explosive origin of Animal life and the case for Intelligent Design* (New York, New York: Harper One, 2013).
21. Stephen Meyer, *The Signature in the cell: DNA and the evidence for Intelligent Design* (New York, New York: Harper One, 2009).
22. Nancy Pearcey, *Total Truth: Liberating Christianity from its Cultural Captivity* (Wheaton Illinois: Crossway books, 2004).
23. Jay. W Richards, "Squaring the circle," in *God and Evolution*, ed. Jay w. Richards (Seattle: Discovery Institute, 2010).
24. David Raup, "Conflicts between Darwin and Paleontology," *Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin* 50, no. 1 (January 1979).
25. James Shapiro, *Evolution: A view from the 21st century* (Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: FT Press, 2011).
26. Lee Stroebel, *The Case for a Creator* (Grand Rapids Michigan, Zondervan, 2004).
27. Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution: Science or Myth* (Washington DC, Regnery Publishing, 2002).
28. Jonathan Wells, *The myth of Junk DNA* (Seattle Washington: Discovery Institute Press, 2011).
29. Jonathan Wells, *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Darwinism and Intelligent Design* (Washington DC, Regnery Publishing, 2006).
30. Harold Urey, *Christian Science Monitor*, 4 January 1962.