

The Scientific Argument against Evolution

Most modern Americans associate the theory of evolution with the publication of *On the Origin of the Species* by Charles Darwin, in 1859. In reality, many nontheists prior to Darwin believed the universe was eternal or uncaused. Darwin's pivotal contribution was the notion of natural selection, which provided a mechanism to make evolution work beginning with matter alone. According to Darwin, life began as the result of chemical relations in a "warm little pool."¹ Over time, through the process of natural selection, new life forms evolved as organisms adapted new characteristics to meet the challenges of their changing environment. Darwin appealed to the fossil record to prove his theory that species that adapted survived while those who did not passed into extinction.

For Bible believers this naturalistic explanation for the origin of life does not pass the scrutiny of Scripture for a number of reasons. Adam was created as a fully functioning adult male made in the image and likeness of God. Moreover, Genesis one reports that the myriad of life observable in the biosphere was created in fully developed adult form and reproduced after their own kind. Lastly, the Bible is explicitly clear that God alone is responsible for the complex design of the created order:

- Genesis 1:1—"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."
- John 1:1-3—"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. 2) The same was in the beginning with God. 3) All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made."

The observant reader will notice how God's word clearly teaches that the universe is not eternal since it did not exist before God created it. Consequently, at every turn the Bible stands against the unproven theoretical suppositions of evolutionary theory.

Unfortunately, the prevailing thought in modern culture is that something is only true if it can be proven scientifically. In fact, many suppose that science alone is the only source for truth in modern life. This thinking is that if something cannot be subjected to intense scientific experimentation then it is not true. Statements such as, "science is the only source of objective truth" claims to be an objective truth, but it's not a scientific truth.² Believers should never allow themselves to be deceived by this sort of philosophical "tomfoolery." How can science be the only source of truth when statements such as this cannot be scientifically proven? In short, the statement is philosophical in nature—it can't be proven by science—therefore it defeats itself.³

The verses quoted above speak of "the beginning" of which God was the cause. Consequently, it is impossible for the universe to be eternal since everything that has a beginning has a cause. In this case, the eternal God is the originator of time and life. Obviously, these Scriptural realities stand in direct opposition to modern teaching on evolution. While the Bible has sufficient basis to reject evolution simply because it is

repeatedly repudiated by the Scriptures, even those who disbelieve the Bible should reject evolution since there is abundant scientific evidence to disprove it.

This reality can be seen by comparing two different types of science, origin science and operation science. “All science is based on the notion of causality, every event has a cause.”⁴ Since things don’t happen willy-nilly, even if we do not know the specific cause of some event, we can surmise what kind of cause it must have been because of the kinds of effects we see today. “The idea that whatever caused some effect in the past will cause the same effect in the present is called the principle of uniformity. All science is based on finding cause using these two principles: causality and uniformity.”⁵

During the Scientific Revolution when men such as Francis Bacon, Johannes Kepler, Isaac Newton, and William Kelvin were developing the Scientific Method, they made a distinction between primary and secondary causes.⁶ “A primary cause was a first cause that explained singularities—events that only happened once and had no natural explanation.”⁷ In contrast, secondary causes were thought of as being natural causes and laws that govern the way things normally function.⁸ Just as it is wrong for supernaturalists to explain ordinary events such as earthquakes, tornados, and hurricanes using primary causes, it is also wrong for the naturalists to explain all singularities by natural causes.⁹

The result of distinguishing between primary and secondary causes has led to the development of two different types of science: origin science (forensic) and operation science (empirical).¹⁰ Operation science deals with the way things normally operate; it studies things that happen over and over again in a regular and repeated way.¹¹ “Operation science seeks answers that are testable by repeating the experiment over and over, and falsifiable if the cause does not always yield the same effect.”¹² For this reason, operation science seeks out natural (secondary) causes for the events it studies. This repeatability allows the scientist to project the outcome of future experiments.

Despite naturalistic claims to the contrary, origin science is not just another name used by those who teach creationism. Rather it is an entirely different kind of science. Dr. Norman Geisler, author of *When Skeptics Ask*, offers the following definition of origin science:

Origin science studies *past singularities*, rather than *present normalities*. It looks at how things *began*, not how they work. It studies things that only happened once, and by their nature, don’t happen again. It is a different type of study that requires a difference approach. Rather than being an *empirical* science like physical or biology, it is more like a *forensic* science.¹³

The hit television show, CSI, is an example of origin science in action. A person’s death is a singular event, meaning it cannot be reproduced through experimentation in a laboratory. Therefore, the detectives and medical examiners on CSI investigate a past

singularity (a person's death) by examining the effect and then deducing what could have caused that event.

Mechanically, origin science works on different principles than operation science. Since past events cannot be presently repeated, origin science utilizes comparisons between cause and effect relationships observable today with the effect being studied. In this fashion, a medical examiner is able to determine if someone died from natural causes or if some other cause (murder, accident) is responsible for the effect. The bottom line is this: just as operation science recognizes that some events demand intelligent causes, origin science also makes allowances for intelligent causes when the evidence calls for it.¹⁴

Herein lies the basic scientific argument against Evolution, namely it has taken the wrong approach. Evolutionists have applied the principles of operation science to the study of origins. Consequently, they are seeking regular and repeated causes for an event (creation) that occurred only once. Naturalists have endeavored to use the operations that are presently observable to explain how the world got here in the first place. However, in order to properly understand origins, we must use origin science, not operation science.

Intelligent Primary Causes

Origin science is not restricted to secondary causes (the natural causes that operate the universe); therefore, origin science sometimes finds evidence that suggests an intelligent primary cause.¹⁵ Previously we considered the example of the detectives and medical examiners on the television show, CSI. These law enforcement personnel have to determine for each death whether they are looking for a natural cause of death or a murderer—an intelligent cause. More often than not it is concluded that an intelligent being has intervened to bring about the victim's demise.

In the case of the origin of life, what type of evidence is needed to safely suggest the handiwork of an intelligent being? Noted evolutionist, Carl Sagan, has said that a single message from outer space would confirm his belief that there is extraterrestrial life.¹⁶ Unwittingly, Sagan has admitted that some normal events such as communication require an intelligent cause. Do you remember Alphabets Cereal? It's that sugary kid's cereal where the pieces are shaped like the letters of the alphabet. Suppose you awoke one morning to find the following message spelled out on the table in cereal, "Good morning, honey. I hope you have a good day at school today. Love, Mom." Your first inclination is not to assume that the box of cereal tipped over and the characters randomly assembled themselves to deliver you a message. Rather, your first reaction would be to perceive that some intelligent source, in this case your mother, has purposefully arranged the bits of cereal to deliver a message.

The type of order necessary to spell out messages in cereal is known as *specified complexity* and it always points to an intelligent primary cause. Specified complexity is more than simply design or order; it is order of a complex nature that possesses a clear and specific function.¹⁷ Consider the following three types of order.

- Orderly (repetitive) and specified (GIFT GIFT GIFT GIFT). Example: crystal, nylon
- Complex (unrepeating) and unspecified (TGELDHT TBWMHQ PUQHBT). Example: random polymers.
- Complex (unrepeating) and specified (THIS SENTENCE CARRIES A MESSAGE). Example: DNA¹⁸

Only one of these three types of order is the result of intelligent intervention. "It is obvious that wherever we see a clear and distinct message—a complex design with a specified function—it was caused by some form of intelligent intervention imposing limits on the natural matter that it would not take by itself."¹⁹

To bring the point home let us consider two geological formations. As we make this comparison, we need to remember that origin science is a forensic science based upon the principle of uniformity, which maintains that causes in the past are similar to the causes we observe today.²⁰ In order to illustrate the point, consider the following question, "What caused the Grand Canyon?" Even though we were not there to see the formation of the Grand Canyon, we can observe the natural process of water erosion

causing canyons today and see the results produced, which are similar to the Grand Canyon. Therefore, we can surmise that the Grand Canyon was formed through the natural process of water erosion even though we did not directly observe its origin.²¹

In contrast, no reasonable person consistently applying the principle of uniformity would look at Mount Rushmore and conclude that it was the result of the natural process of water erosion. “Since we never observe natural laws chiseling a highly detailed sculpture of a president’s head into stone at the present time, we rightly conclude that natural laws couldn’t have done it in the past either.”²² In the present, we observe that only intelligent beings are capable of carving detailed sculptures out of rock. “As a result, we rightly conclude that, in the past, only an intelligent being (a sculptor) could have created the faces on Mount Rushmore.”²³

The implications of these conclusions are magnified when one considers the extraordinary complexities of human life. Recall that Darwin theorized that all life emerged from a one-celled organism through spontaneous generation alone (natural process). This is the height of absurdity when one considers that a single strand of DNA contains the equivalent of 1,000 encyclopedias worth of complex information. “Natural laws have never been observed to create a simple message like ‘Drink Coke,’ much less a message 1,000 encyclopedias long.”²⁴ Spontaneous generation of life according to the Darwinian model has never been observed. Rather life only arises from similar existing life.²⁵ Ironically, any experiment that seeks to prove the spontaneous generation of life suffers from the intelligent intervention of the scientist conducting the study.

Evidence for Design

We have seen that it is valid science to look for intelligent primary causes to events that show signs of intelligence. Archeology is based on this principle. When archeologists discover pottery or arrowheads they rightly conclude that some intelligent being produced it.²⁶ Likewise, present experience tells us that intelligent causes should be sought anytime we find specified complexity. “This gives us a criteria to show when an intelligent cause is operating and when it is not.”²⁷

Whether one is discussing the origin of the universe, origin of the first life, or new life forms, there are fundamentally only two options. Either everything came to be as the result of natural causes as evolution teaches or an intelligent supernatural cause is responsible for all things. For the sake of brevity, let us consider the origin of new life forms as a means of proving our overall point. Evolution maintains that new life forms developed through natural selection without any intelligent intervention. Conversely, the Bible teaches that all life forms came into existence by special creation through the work of an intelligent designer (God).²⁸

In order to prove his hallmark doctrine of natural selection, Darwin compared the selection that supposedly occurred in nature and which was devoid of intelligent intervention with the artificial selection practiced by breeders.²⁹ Take for example the breeding of dogs. While there can be no doubt that breeders are able to selectively mate dogs to achieved a desired outcome, this by no means proof that one species becomes a totally different species. A breeder’s ability to mate a Golden Retriever with a Poodle to create a Golden Doodle, which does not shed and is hypoallergenic, is an example of artificial selection. As elementary is it may seem, one should note that the result of this type of selective breeding is still a dog. When the discussion is framed in these terms, it is clear that the human action of selective breeding is not analogous to the blind action of natural selection but directly opposite.³⁰

Man has an aim or end in view; natural selection can have none. Man picks out the individual he wishes to cross, choosing them by the characteristics he seeks to perpetuate or enhance. He protects them and their issue by all means is in his power, guarding them thus from operation of natural selection, which would speedily eliminate many freaks; he continues his active and purposeful selection from generation to generation until he reaches, if possible, his goal. Nothing of this kind happens, or can happen, through the blind process of differential elimination and differential survival which we miscall natural selection.³¹

Once again, anywhere design can be observed, as in the case of the breeding of dogs, one should always look for intelligent causes.

Over three centuries ago, Isaac Newton stated, “This most beautiful system of the sun, planets, and comets, could only proceed from the counsel and dominion of an intelligent and powerful being.”³² Christian philosophers and theologians for centuries

have long held to the Teleological Argument for the existence of God. Steaming from the Greek word *telos*, which means design, the Teleological Argument states:

1. Every design had a designer.
2. The universe has highly complex design.
3. Therefore, the universe had a Designer³³

William Paley (1743-1805) popularized the argument through his common sense observation that every watch requires a watchmaker.³⁴ “Imagine you’re walking along in the woods and you find a diamond-studded Rolex on the ground. What do you conclude is the cause of that watch: The wind and the rain? Erosion? Some combination of natural forces?”³⁵ God forbid! There would be no question in your mind that some intelligent being made the watch and some unfortunate person accidentally dropped it on the forest floor.³⁶

There can be no doubt that the universe resembles the design found in our misplaced diamond-studded Rolex, only infinitely more complex. Scores of examples could be provided to document the highly ordered design that is present within creation. For time’s sake, consider just one. If someone took apart a watch and threw all the pieces in their dryer, what are the chances that after one hundred cycles the parts would have reassembled themselves into a fully functioning watch? About the same chance that 1,000 monkeys with typewriters have of writing *Romeo and Juliet*. The greater and more intricate the design, the greater the intelligence of the designer.

Even the noted atheist, Richard Dawkins, author of *The Blind Watchmaker*, acknowledges that life bears evidence of design. Dawkins writes, “Biology is the study of completed things that give the appearance of having been designed for a purpose.”³⁷ Despite acknowledging “the intricate architecture and precision-engineering”³⁸ in each of the trillions of cells in the human body, Dawkins rejects the notion that any form of life is the product of design. All of this highlights the point Norman Geisler and Frank Turek make in *I Don’t Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist*, “the creation-evolution debate is not about religion verses science or the Bible verses science—it’s about good science verses bad science.”³⁹

The Religion of Naturalism

Since evolutionary biologists can offer no support for spontaneous generation, either empirical or forensic, it appears the “scientific” deck has been stacked against creationism by ruling out intelligent primary causes in advance. Phillip Johnson, author of the essay, *The Unraveling of Scientific Materialism*, states “Darwinism is based on an *a priori* (prior) commitment to materialism, not on a philosophically neutral assessment of the evidence. Separate the philosophy from the science, and the proud tower collapses.”⁴⁰ Physicist Hubert Yockey confesses, “The belief that life on earth arose spontaneously from nonliving matter, is simply a matter of faith in strict reductionism and is based entirely on ideology.”⁴¹

Darwinism, like all nontheistic worldviews borrows from the theistic worldview to make its own position intelligible. How so? Darwinists continually emphasize the superiority of reason over faith. Reason requires that the universe is reasonable, which presupposes order, logic, design, and truth. But order, logic, design, and truth can only exist and be known if there is an unchanged objective source and standard of such things.⁴² “To say something is unreasonable, Darwinists must know what reasonable is. To say something is not designed, Darwinists must know design is. To say something is not true, Darwinists must know what truth is, and so forth.”⁴³

As stated earlier, many currently believe that “science is the only source of objective truth.” While a statement such as this claims to be objective, it is certainly not scientific. The statement is philosophical in nature and cannot be proved scientifically. Therefore, it is self-defeating. In fact there are many truths that cannot be proven scientifically that all rational people accept:

1. Mathematics and logic (science can’t prove them because science presupposes them)
2. Ethical judgments (one can’t prove by science that the Nazis were evil because morality is not subject to the scientific method)
3. Aesthetic judgments (the beautiful, like the good, cannot be scientifically proven)
4. Science itself (ironically, the belief that the scientific method discovers truth can’t be proven by the scientific method itself).⁴⁴

This leads us to one of the most important lessons we can learn from considering the scientific arguments against evolution. Science is built on philosophy. In fact, science is a slave to philosophy.⁴⁵

“Bad philosophy results in bad science, and good science requires good philosophy.”⁴⁶ Norman Geisler and Frank Turek, co-authors of *I Don’t Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist*, offer the following to substantiate this point:

1. **Science cannot be done without philosophy.** Philosophical assumptions are utilized in the search for causes, and therefore, cannot be the result of them. For example, assume (by faith) that reason and the scientific method allow us to accurately understand the world around us. That cannot be proven by science itself. One can't prove the tools of science—the laws of logic, the Law of Causality, the Principle of Uniformity, or the reliability of observation—by running some kind of experiment. You have to assume those things are true in order to do the experiment.
2. **Philosophical assumptions can dramatically impact scientific conclusions.** If a scientist assumes beforehand that only natural causes are possible, then probably no amount of evidence will convince him that intelligence created the first one-celled or any other designed entity. When Darwinists presuppose that intelligent causes are impossible, then natural laws are the only game in town. Likewise, if a creationist rules out natural causes beforehand, then he also risks missing the right answer. However, a scientist who is open-minded to both natural and intelligent causes can follow the evidence wherever its leads.
3. **Science doesn't really say anything—scientists do.** Data is always interpreted by scientists. When those scientists let their personal preferences or unproven philosophical assumptions dictate their interpretation of the evidence, they do exactly what they accuse religious people of doing—they let their ideology dictate their conclusions. When that's the case, their conclusions should be questioned because they may be nothing more than philosophical presuppositions passed off as scientific facts.⁴⁷

The evidence simply does not support the Darwinian worldview or Darwinists would not have to borrow from the theistic worldview to make their case. "Intellect, free will, objective morality, and human rights as well as reason, logic, design, and truth exist only if God exists."⁴⁸ Evolution assumes some or all of these realities when articulating their naturalistic view. In short, Naturalists cannot have it both ways.

The work of Hurbert Yockey, eluded cited above, highlights the dirty little secret Naturalists don't want the public to know. Naturalism is a religion. It takes more faith for a reasonable person to believe that life spontaneously arose from nonlife than it does to believe that God, an intelligent cause designed the created order.

In the end, the ordered and complex nature of the world around us leads to only one plausible conclusion, God, an intelligent primary cause, is creator of all things. One need not read even one verse of Scripture to know that it is totally absurd to believe that nothing made something. God is the uncaused cause who created the universe out of nothing by the word of his power. The words of Romans 1:20 rings powerfully true, "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse." Man does not suffer from a lack of evidence. Rather, it is man's

sinful heart that wishes to escape accountability before almighty God. “The fool hath said in his heart there is no God.”⁴⁹

¹ Charles Darwin. *On the Origin of the Species*. (London: John Murray, 1859).

² Norman Geisler and Frank Turek. *I Don't Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist*. (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Book, 2004), 127.

³ *Ibid.*, 127.

⁴ Norman Geisler and Ron Brooks. *When Skeptics Ask: A Handbook of Christian Evidences*. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book, 1990), 213.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 213.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 213.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 214.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 214.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 214.

¹⁰ Norman Geisler. *Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics*. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1999), 567.

¹¹ Geisler. *Why Skeptics Ask*. 214.

¹² Geisler. *Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics*, 568.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 568.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 568.

¹⁵ Norman Geisler and Ron Brooks. *When Skeptics Ask: A Handbook of Christian Evidences*. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1990), 216.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 216-217.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 217.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 217.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 217.

²⁰ Norman Geisler and Frank Turek. *I Don't Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist*. (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2004), 117.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 117-118.

²² *Ibid.*, 118.

²³ *Ibid.*, 118.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 118.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 118.

²⁶ Geisler and Brooks. *When Skeptics Ask: A Handbook of Christian Evidences*. 217.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 218.

²⁸ Norman Geisler and Ron Brooks. *When Skeptics Ask: A Handbook of Christian Evidences*. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1990), 227.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 227.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 227.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 227-228.

³² Isaac Newton. “General Scholium,” in *Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy* (1687) in *Great Books of the Western World*. (Chicago, IL: Encyclopedia Britannica), 369.

³³ Norman Geisler. *The Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics*. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1999), 714-720.

³⁴ Norman Geisler and Frank Turek. *I Don't Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist*. (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2004), 95.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 95.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 96.

³⁷ Richard Dawkins. *The Blind Watchmaker*. (New York: Norton, 1987), 1.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 3.

³⁹ Geisler and Turek. *I Don't Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist*. 120.

⁴⁰ Phillip E. Johnson. “The Unraveling of Scientific Materialism,” *First Things* (November 1997): 22-25.

⁴¹ Hubert Yockey. *Information Theory and Molecular Biology*. (Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 284.

⁴² Norman Geisler. *I Don't Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist*. (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2004), 130.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 130.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 126-127.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 127.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 127.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 127-128.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 132.

⁴⁹ Psalm 14:1