

# Evolution: The Materialist Juggernaut A Christian Challenge

by

Dr. Gregory Edward Reynolds © 1997

Revised © 2001

Revised © 2009

## Introduction

Juggernaut was an incarnation of the Hindu god Vishnu, whose idol was carried through the streets of ancient India on a large cart for public adoration. So blind was the devotion of the common people that many threw themselves in the path of the cart and were crushed to death. Thus “juggernaut” has come to refer to “anything that exacts blind devotion.”

It is my contention that Darwinism or Evolution is a theory rooted in Materialism that exacts blind devotion of its adherents and their students in Western institutions of learning. This devotion explains the almost fanatical rejection not only of the idea of creation and design but also the rejection of a growing body of evidence that does not comport well with the conventional Evolutionary wisdom.

This lecture is an intellectual challenge to those who believe that Evolution is a “fact of science.” A mounting array of evidence from cosmology, molecular biology and biochemistry is challenging Darwinian Evolutionary science at its foundation. My point in this lecture is that Darwinism is a theory based on a number of unproved assumptions that do not account for a number of recent scientific discoveries. The theory itself is rooted in a philosophical commitment to Naturalism. Naturalism or Materialism assumes that all reality is ultimately physical or material. Thus mind or spirit is reducible to material reality, God and religion are banished to the land of irrelevance.

While most people are aware of the “debate” between Evolutionists and Creationists, few are aware that there is a raging debate within the scientific community itself over the theory of Evolution. I believe that establishment Evolutionary science has a vested interest in suppressing this fact.

## 1. My Position: Historic Christianity.

Let me state at the outset that my position is Historic Christianity. I believe that the revelational philosophy of Christian Theism is not only true but that it is the only philosophy adequate to the challenges of life and thought. I believe that the Bible is the infallible Word of God and that the God of the Bible created all things out of nothing (*creatio ex nihilo*). Creeds such as *The Nicene Creed* and *The Westminster Confession of Faith* give a more detailed summary of my position.

## 2. My expertise: Pastor-Theologian not scientist.

I speak to you this evening, however, not as a scientist, but as a pastor and a theologian. The current debate between Creationists and Evolutionists interests me on several levels. First, it of obvious interest as a matter of Christian truth. Consistent Evolutionists are Atheists. Christians are Theists. Second, the debate is important because of the epistemological questions involved. Since I believe that historic Christianity is intellectually both satisfying and defensible I consider the dichotomy, which many make, between faith and science unacceptable. As a Creationist I am enthusiastic about the scientific enterprise and find the debate in the public forum frustrating

because both Creationists and Evolutionists are relatively ignorant of the relationship between knowledge and faith, and the relationship of both faith and knowledge to science.

Thus I intend to deal with this issue at the theoretical level, using sample evidence from various scientific disciplines. My challenge will be for you to apply what I say to your area of expertise. If I can awaken anyone from their dogmatic slumber I will consider this lecture to have been worth giving. I would be a fool to claim to have all the answers in any area of this debate. My main intention is to show that establishment Evolutionary science has not allowed many of the right questions to be asked. As often as it appears to be a juggernaut it looks like an ostrich with its head firmly plunged into the sand.

### 3. The thesis:

Recent evidence discovered in the astronomical and biochemical scientific disciplines suggests fundamental weaknesses in the theory of Evolution that most Evolutionary scientists are unwilling to deal with according to the rules of their own discipline. This further suggests that a theoretical faith commitment to certain presuppositions which lies outside the realm of scientific inquiry is the foundation for Evolutionary science.

### 4. Definitions:

**Evolutionist** - One who believes that “life arose from non-living matter and subsequently developed”<sup>1</sup> “by a naturalistic process in which parent species were gradually transformed into quite different descendent forms by long branches ... of transitional intermediates, without intervention by any Creator or other non-naturalistic mechanism”<sup>2</sup> over long periods of time. I will use Darwinist as synonymous with Evolutionist. Neo-Darwinism is simply a mid-twentieth century academic revitalization of classic Darwinism.

**Creationist** - One who believes that God created all things out of nothing (*creatio ex nihilo*). He designed all things and controls them by His Providence. Man was specially created with dominion over the creation. Note that only some creationists believe in a six day creation and a young earth. That is not what I will be arguing for here. Phillip Johnson refers to this narrower view as “creation-science”.<sup>3</sup> I would prefer not to use that term because many Creationists are not part of the “creation-science” movement (cf. The Institute for Creation Research). The broader definition is that held by the American Scientific Affiliation (ASA), a Creationist alternative to the National Academy of Sciences.

## I. THE PHENOMENOLOGICAL PROBLEM WITH EVOLUTIONARY SCIENCE

Due to my stated purpose, as well as time constraints, the following are meant to be provocative samples, not exhaustive discussions.

### 1. Evolutionary Science does not have adequate hypotheses to account for the extant history of life (fossil record) and other evidence or its absence.

“Darwin’s most formidable opponents were not clergymen but fossil experts.”<sup>4</sup> Even one of Darwin’s most loyal supporters, T. H. Huxley found the absence of transitional intermediates in the fossil record troubling. Darwin himself asked: “Why, if species have descended from other

<sup>1</sup> Michael Behe, *Darwin’s Black Box* (New York: The Free Press, 1996), ix.

<sup>2</sup> Phillip E. Johnson, *Darwin on Trial* (Washington, DC: Regnery Gateway, 1991), 89.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., 4, fn. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., 45.

species by insensibly fine gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms? Why is not all nature in confusion instead of the species being, as we see them, well defined?"<sup>5</sup>

The problem has only become more acute after almost a century and a half of searching. Even Evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould admits that "The history of most fossil species includes two features particularly inconsistent with gradualism: 1. Stasis. Most species exhibit no directional change during their tenure on earth. ... 2. Sudden appearance. In any local area a species does not arise gradually by the steady transformation of its ancestors; it appears all at once and 'fully formed'."<sup>6</sup> Gould considers this failure to find a "vector of progress" in the history of life to be "the most puzzling fact of the fossil record".<sup>7</sup> He even refers to "the extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record" as "the trade secret of paleontology". Evolutionary Paleontologist Niles Eldredge is even more candid: "We paleontologists have said that the history of life supports [the story of gradual adaptive change], all the while really knowing that it does not."<sup>8</sup>

Particularly telling is the reaction of Evolutionists to scientists with a contrary opinion. Nineteenth century Harvard professor and scientist Louis Agassiz responded to *The Origin of Species* by denying that there was any "parental descent" connecting the various species. By his death in 1873 Agassiz had long been isolated and ignored by students and colleagues alike.<sup>9</sup>

Presently there is a rapidly growing movement called Cladism in the area of biological classification. The "cladograms" produced by this school show relationships among living and fossil species in terms of structural and other similarities, but omit hypothetical common ancestors. In other words the diagrams only depict what we have actually observed and discovered. This new method of depiction has raised the ire of not a few committed Darwinists.<sup>10</sup> The missing links are still missing. As a 1980 *Newsweek* article so aptly put it: "The missing link between man and the apes ... is merely the most glamorous of a whole hierarchy of phantom creatures. In the fossil record, missing links are the rule: the story of life is as disjointed as a silent newsreel, in which species succeed one another as abruptly as Balkan prime ministers" (*Newsweek*, Nov. 3, 1980, 95).

## 2. Evolutionary Science does not have adequate hypotheses to account for new micro-scientific evidence.

It was in the arena of micro-science that Darwinians once saw such promise of confirming Evolution. And it is just here that some of the most insurmountable obstacles have recently appeared. It is important to note that the Neo-Darwinian synthesis in the middle of the twentieth century occurred prior to the advent of modern biochemistry.<sup>11</sup> So problematic is the evidence of biochemistry to the theory of Evolution that biochemist Michael Behe maintains that even if the fossil record was continuous (which it decidedly is not), Evolution does not explain the micro molecular world.<sup>12</sup>

Kettleford's now famous observation of "industrial melanism" in the peppered moth has, for years, been put forth as a classic example of the mechanism of natural selection at work. The problem with this observation is that the light and dark moths do not demonstrate development

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., 46.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 50.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 58.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 59.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 166.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 134, fn. 1.

<sup>11</sup> Behe, *Darwin's Black Box*, 24.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 22.

through mutation and natural selection, but rather adaptability within the genetic structure of a given species. For the camouflage to work both light and dark moths must exist simultaneously, rather than evolve one from the other.

The veriest Creationist does not find genetic variation within species boundaries problematic.<sup>13</sup> Creationists of all stripes have always maintained adaptability and change among the “kinds” of animals spoken of in Genesis 1. Micro-Evolution is no proof of Macro-Evolution. Johnson asks: “Why do other people, including experts whose intelligence and intellectual integrity I respect, think that evidence of local population fluctuations confirms the hypothesis that natural selection has the capacity to work engineering marvels, to construct wonders like the eye and the wing?”<sup>14</sup> Johnson later on gives a hint: “The trick is always to prove one of the modest meanings of the term, and treat it as proof of the complete metaphysical system.”<sup>15</sup> This is precisely the nature of “industrial melanism” in the Darwinian scheme. It must be remembered that the claim of Darwinism is not that relationships exist among living things, but that “those relationships were produced by a naturalistic process in which parent species were gradually transformed into quite different descendent forms by long branches ... of transitional intermediates, without intervention by any Creator or other non-naturalistic mechanism.”<sup>16</sup>

Mutational change among fruit flies is in the same category. What is absent in such experiments is a change of species. The changes, however dramatic they may in some cases be, always yield only fruit flies. The invocation of vast time periods, as we shall see, is another all-purpose explanation that explains nothing. The mechanisms for such changes have simply not been discovered. The added fact of the presence of the experimenter in attempting to demonstrate *natural* selection by *random* mutations is no small problem for the Darwinist. The surreptitious inclusion of a “design agent” in the process is telling.

The problem really comes into focus when we compare what we know now about microbiology compared to what was assumed in Darwin’s day. Fellow scientist (biologist) and admirer Ernst Haeckel once declared that a cell is “a simple little lump of albuminous carbon”.<sup>17</sup> This is what biologist Michael Behe refers to as *Darwin’s Black Box*. Haeckel could not have been further from the truth. The complexity of a single cell, not to mention every element in that cell, is nothing short of mind boggling. That very complexity represents a gigantic obstacle to Evolutionists. Evolutionary theory simply cannot explain either the origin of life or its development to its present state of irreducible complexity.

Evolutionary science makes the classic simplistic mistake of assuming that the whole is the sum of its parts (The fallacy of composition). Take, for example, the eye. How could the parts develop by “infinitesimally small inherited variations, *each* profitable to the preserved being?” Evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould posed the question: “What good is 5 per cent of an eye?” He answers that it might be useful for something other than sight or more likely, though not as good as 100 per cent vision it would be better than no sight at all. Phillip Johnson responds as a good lawyer: “The fallacy in that argument is that ‘5 per cent of an eye’ is not the same as ‘5 per cent of normal vision.’ For an animal to have any useful vision at all, many complex parts must be

<sup>13</sup> cf. Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, 68.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 27.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 151.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 89.

<sup>17</sup> Thomas Bethell, “A New Beginning: Darwin revisionism goes mainstream,” *The American Spectator* (September 1996): 17. Cf. Stephen C. Meyer, “The Origin of Life and the Death of Materialism,” *The Intercollegiate Review* (Spring 1996): 25.

working together.”<sup>18</sup> An automobile cannot function at all with partially developed parts or without *all* of the parts.

It is often forgotten that there was articulate scientific dissent to Darwin’s theory in Darwin’s day. In 1871 St. George Mivart opined: “What is to be brought forward (against Darwinism) may be summed up as follows: That ‘Natural Selection’ is incompetent to account for the incipient stages of useful structures. That it does not harmonize with the co-existence of closely similar structures of diverse origin. That there are grounds for thinking that specific differences may be developed suddenly instead of gradually. That the opinion that species have definite though very different limits to their variability is still tenable. That certain fossil transitional forms are absent, which might have been expected to be present ... That there are many remarkable phenomena in organic forms upon which ‘Natural Selection’ throws no light whatever.”<sup>19</sup>

Angus Campbell notes: “In Darwin’s day, the chemistry of sight and how the body fights disease were all black boxes. In the face of ignorance it is forgivable to assume that there might be some simple explanation. Only since the 1950s, when the structure of the first protein molecule was resolved, have we understood the unforgivable exactitude of protein sequencing. Professor Mike Behe has argued that in the case of the cilium and many other structures we are dealing with ‘irreducible complexity.’ Darwin had argued that if a single structure could be shown that in principle could not have been formed by intermediate structures his theory ‘would absolutely break down’ (Darwin, *On the Origin of Species*, 189).”<sup>20</sup> Darwin himself said, “To suppose that the eye ... could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest possible degree.”<sup>21</sup>

Co-discoverer of DNA, Francis Crick has written: “An honest man, armed with all the knowledge available to us now, could only state that in some sense, the origin of life appears at the moment to be almost a miracle, so many are the conditions which would have been satisfied to get it going.”<sup>22</sup> Crick has been reduced to positing the theory of “directed panspermia.” “The basic idea is that an advanced extraterrestrial civilization, possibly facing extinction, sent primitive life forms to earth in a space ship.”<sup>23</sup> Besides the purely speculative nature of this hypothesis, it simply begs the question. Such speculations indicate a faith commitment to the Evolutionary theory. Dr. Hubert P. Yockey in an article titled “A calculation of the probability of spontaneous biogenesis by information theory” in the *Journal of Theoretical Biology* concluded, “One must conclude that, contrary to the established and current wisdom, a scenario describing the genesis of life on earth by chance and natural causes which can be accepted on the basis of fact and not faith has not yet been written.”<sup>24</sup> Since 1977 the facts have proved to be even more elusive.

Stephen Meyer’s article titled “The Origin of Life and the Death of Materialism” (*Intercollegiate Review*, Spring 1996) is a brilliant survey of present origin of life theory and research. The gist of his conclusion is that the only explanation for the origin of the information encoded in DNA is “agent causation.” The order of the chemical makeup of DNA does not explain the presence of the highly complex information encoded therein, which is not

<sup>18</sup> Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, 34.

<sup>19</sup> Behe, *Darwin’s Black Box*, 30.

<sup>20</sup> John Angus Campbell, “John Stuart Mill, Charles Darwin, and the Culture Wars: Resolving a Crisis in Education,” *The Intercollegiate Review* (Spring 1996): 48.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 51, fn. 8. Darwin, *On the Origin of Species. A Facsimile of the first Edition with an Introduction by Ernse Mayer* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964) 186.

<sup>22</sup> Stephen C. Meyer, “The Origin of Life and the Death of Materialism,” *The Intercollegiate Review* (Spring 1996): 28.

<sup>23</sup> Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, 108.

<sup>24</sup> Hubert P. Yockey, “A calculation of the probability of spontaneous biogenesis by information theory,” *Journal of Theoretical Biology* (Vol. 67, 1977): 398.

dependent on the medium in which it is encoded. As chemist Michael Polyani has said: “Whatever may be the origin of a DNA configuration, it can function as a code only if its order is not due to the forces of potential energy. It must be as physically indeterminate as the sequence of words is on a printed page. ... To illustrate the distinction between order and information compare the sequence ‘ABABABAB’ to the sequence ‘Help! Our neighbor’s house is on fire!’ The first sequence is repetitive and ordered, but not complex and informative. The second sequence is not ordered, in the sense of being repetitious, but it is complex and also informative.”<sup>25</sup> In other words “The information in DNA also transcends the properties of its material medium.”<sup>26</sup> “The information carrying capacity of any symbol in a sequence is inversely proportional to the probability of its occurrence.”<sup>27</sup>

“While many outside origin-of-life biology may still invoke ‘chance’ as a causal explanation for the origin of biological information, few serious researchers still do.”<sup>28</sup> Meyer uses probability research to consider the “probabilistic hurdles that must be overcome to construct even one short protein molecule of about one hundred amino acids in length” by chance.<sup>29</sup> Conclusion: 1 chance in  $10^{130}$ . Biochemist Michael Behe has compared these odds to “a blindfolded man finding a single marked grain of sand, hidden in the Sahara Desert, not once, but three times.”<sup>30</sup> Sir Fred Hoyle, Michael Denton and Henry Quastler have come to similar probability conclusions.<sup>31</sup>

Meyer concludes: “During the past forty years, every naturalistic model proposed has failed to explain the origin of information - the great stumbling block for materialistic scenarios. Thus, mind or intelligence or what philosophers call ‘agent causation,’ now stands as the only known cause capable of creating an information-rich system, including the coding regions of DNA, functional proteins, and the cell as a whole. ...Consequently, a growing number of scientists now suggest that the information in DNA justifies making what probability theorist William Dembski and biochemist Michael Behe call ‘design inference.’ ... The materialistic science we have inherited from the late nineteenth century, with its exclusive conceptual reliance on matter and energy, could neither envision nor can it now account for the biology of the information age.”<sup>32</sup>

Even Darwinist Cairns-Smith displays doubts when describing the genetic evidence, “After all what impresses us about a living thing is its in-built ingenuity, its appearance of having been designed, thought out - of having been put together with a purpose ... The singular feature is the [enormous] gap between the simplest conceivable version of organisms as we know them, and components that the Earth might reasonably have been able to generate ... But the real trouble arises because too much of the complexity seems to be necessary to the whole way in which organisms work.”<sup>33</sup>

Notably absent from Ruse’s history of biological Evolution, written in 1996, in his chapter “Contemporary Debates,” is any mention of Behe or his biochemical challenge to Evolution. He

<sup>25</sup> Meyer, “The Origin of Life,” 37.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., 38.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., 43, fn. 76

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., 32.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., 33.

<sup>31</sup> Slick, Matthew J. “The Odds are Against Evolution,” Internet: Christian Apologetics and Research Ministry Root Page: 1.

<sup>32</sup> Meyer, “The Origin of Life,” 39, 40.

<sup>33</sup> Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, 109, 110.

does, however, note that with reference to the idea of “Absolute progress” in “professional evolutionary biology” “no satisfactory epistemic criterion of such progress has yet been given.”<sup>34</sup>

Behe comes to a startlingly comprehensive conclusion: “The impotence of Darwinian theory in accounting for the molecular basis of life is evident not only from the analyses in this book (*Darwin’s Black Box*), but also from the complete absence in the professional scientific literature of any detailed models by which complex biochemical systems could have been produced ... In the face of the enormous complexity that modern biochemistry has uncovered in the cell, the scientific community is paralyzed.”<sup>35</sup> “The result of these cumulative efforts to investigate the cell - to investigate life at the molecular level - is a loud, clear, piercing cry of ‘design!’ The result is so unambiguous and so significant that it must be ranked as one of the greatest achievements in the history of science.”<sup>36</sup>

### 3. Evolutionary Science does not have adequate hypotheses to account for new macro-scientific or astronomical evidence.

Brandon Carter’s *Anthropic Principle* was first publicly articulated in his now-famous lecture to the International Astronomic Union in 1974. In that lecture Carter “pointed to what he called a number of astonishing ‘coincidences’ among the universal constants -- values such as Planck’s constant,  $h$ , or the gravitational constant,  $G$ . It turns out that infinitesimal changes in the values of any of these constants would have resulted in a universe profoundly different from our own, and radically inhospitable to life.”<sup>37</sup> Ever since the emergence of the Big Bang theory a host of technical observations has pointed to a universe that has been intricately *designed* to support human life.

In this new evidential environment several notable physicists have been challenging the Atheistic assumptions of Evolutionary physicists. British-born physicist Paul Davies has enlarged on the “questions raised by the Anthropic Principle in a series of books, without attempting to draw firm conclusions (and who was rewarded with the prestigious Templeton Prize for Progress in Religion in 1995).”<sup>38</sup> Tulane University physicist Frank J. Tipler and astrophysicist and cosmologist John D. Barrow have published a large volume of reflections on the scientific, philosophical and theological implications of the Anthropic Principle. In *The Physics of Immortality* (1994) Tipler attempted a scientific proof of God complete with complex equations. Even several prominent theologians such as Ted Peters, Arthur Peacocke, and John Polkinghorne, the latter two of which are also scientists, have used Carter’s observations to bolster traditional arguments from design for the existence of God.<sup>39</sup>

In light of this sampling of the phenomenological problems challenging Evolution’s explanatory power I quote Jerry Coyne of the Department of Ecology and Evolution at the University of Chicago: “We conclude - unexpectedly - that there is little evidence for the neo-Darwinian view: its theoretical foundations and the experimental evidence supporting it are weak.”<sup>40</sup>

<sup>34</sup> Michael Ruse, *Monad to Man: The Concept of Progress in Evolutionary Biology* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), 534.

<sup>35</sup> Behe, *Darwin’s Black Box*, 187.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 232, 233.

<sup>37</sup> Patrick Glynn, “Beyond the Death of God,” *National Review* (May 6, 1996): 28.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>40</sup> Behe, *Darwin’s Black Box*, 29.

## II. THE EPISTEMOLOGICAL PROBLEM WITH EVOLUTIONARY SCIENCE

### 1. Evolutionary Science contradicts the “scientific method” of true science by assuming certain presuppositions about ultimate reality but claiming that it begins with observable phenomena.

#### The Scientific Method

The problems in the debate between Evolutionists and Creationists stem from a failure to address the more fundamental epistemological issues.

It is critical then to focus on the “scientific method” established and espoused by scientists themselves. In *Darwin on Trial* Phillip Johnson makes a clear statement that nicely sums up the basic attitude of this method: “the evidence must be evaluated independently of any assumption about the truth of the theory being tested.”<sup>41</sup> In overturning a 1981 Arkansas statute requiring “balanced treatment to creation-science and to Evolution-science” Federal District Judge William Overton summed up five essential characteristics of science: [McLean vs. The Arkansas Board of Education]<sup>42</sup>

1. It is guided by natural law;
2. It is explanatory by reference to natural law;
3. It is testable against the empirical world;
4. It's conclusions are tentative - that is not necessarily the final word; and
5. It is falsifiable.

Evolutionary Scientist Stephen Jay Gould praised Overton's opinion: “Judge Overton's definitions of science are so cogent and so clearly expressed that we can use his words as a model for our own proceedings.”<sup>43</sup>

The first two criteria are misleading to the general public. “Natural law” is not something inherent in nature but a human construct based on empirical observation and experimentation. The recurrence of certain *apparent* cause and effect relationships is called a “law.” This is another way of saying that there is observable order in the world. But the phenomena of observation do not come with labels or references to a Law Book of Natural Statutes. In fact, a *natural law* is really a principle of high probability based on repeated observation and prediction. Accordingly *natural laws* are always being revised. “Scientific laws don't generally explain or cause natural phenomena, they describe them.”<sup>44</sup> It is because of this tentativeness that Judge Overton indicated that scientific conclusions cannot be considered the “final word”, the fourth principle. It is also the reason for the third principle that a hypothesis must be testable and the fifth principle that it must be falsifiable.

Karl Popper is well known for championing the principle of falsifiability. He believed that the theory which explains everything explains nothing. “The wrong view of science betrays itself in the craving to be right.”<sup>45</sup> The search for confirming evidence only betrays prejudice for the theory. The dismissal of evidence that challenges the hypothesis undermines the scientific enterprise. References to the “fact of Evolution” betray a denial of the “falsifiability criterion”. Popper once wrote that “Darwinism is not really a scientific theory because natural selection is an

<sup>41</sup> Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, 73.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., 111, 112.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., 184.

<sup>44</sup> Meyer, “The Origin of Life,” 39.

<sup>45</sup> Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, 146, 147.



all-purpose explanation which can account for anything, and which therefore explains nothing.”<sup>46</sup> Johnson observes: “What they [Darwinists] never find is evidence to contradict the common ancestry thesis, because to Darwinists such evidence cannot exist. The ‘fact of Evolution’ is true by definition, so negative information is uninteresting, and generally unpublishable. If Darwinists wanted to adopt Popper’s standards for scientific inquiry, they would have to define the common ancestry thesis as an empirical hypothesis rather than a logical consequence of the fact of relationship. ...Popper was to warn that ‘Confirmations should count only if they are the result of *risky predictions*.’ (Popper uses Einstein’s General Theory of Relativity as an example of risky) If Darwin had made risky predictions about what the fossil record would show after a century of exploration, he would not have predicted that a single ‘ancestral group’ like the therapsids and a mosaic like *Archaeopteryx* would be practically the only evidence for macro Evolution.”<sup>47</sup>

Darwin himself insisted that the problem with the fossil record of his day was the inadequacy of the record and not the inadequacy of his theory: “I do not pretend that I should ever have suspected how poor a record of the mutations of life, the best geological section presented, had not the difficulty of our not discovering innumerable transitional links between the species which appeared at the commencement and close of each formation, pressed so hardly on my theory.”<sup>48</sup> Scientist Stephen Jay Gould lets the epistemological cat out of the bag when he baldly states “human beings evolved from ape-like ancestors whether they did so by Darwin’s proposed mechanism or by some other, yet to be identified.”<sup>49</sup> In light of such unscientific assertions the Piltdown Man scandal should not surprise anyone.

Scientific findings are, by their very nature, always subject to revision, sometimes even to complete reversal. For example, the mechanistic worldview of Newton has been sharply revised in light of the observations of Einstein and Heisenberg. Why then do Darwinists so often speak and write in such an unscientific way?

### The Limits of the Scientific Method

Thomas Kuhn and his epoch making (1970) work *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* may help us to understand. Kuhn maintains that “science employs paradigms as organizing concepts in guiding research.”<sup>50</sup> A *paradigm* is not merely a theory or hypothesis, but a worldview, a culturally prejudiced way of looking at the world. In other words all so-called “facts” are viewed from a perspective made up of certain presuppositions about the ways things are. This worldview is the historical, intellectual context in which science functions. Many, if not most, scientists are not aware of this epistemological given. Thus their lack of epistemological self-awareness leads them to “attempt to force nature into the preformed and relatively inflexible box that the paradigm supplies”. Furthermore, phenomena that do not “fit the box are often not seen at all.”<sup>51</sup>

When enough scientists observe enough evidence that doesn’t fit the conventional wisdom a “crisis” occurs. Michael Denton in *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* claims that the Evolutionary paradigm is in the midst of just such a *crisis*. Since a paradigm is not a single hypothesis or theory it is not falsifiable in the same way.<sup>52</sup> Thus as crisis gives way to a new or revised paradigm it again takes on the characteristics of what Kuhn calls *normal science*. It is, therefore, epistemologically naïve to refer to Evolution as a *fact*, or even to scientific knowledge as *certain*,

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 21.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., 152, 153.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., 47.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., 66, 67.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., 118.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., 119.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., 120.

as in the phrase “the assured results of science”. One would need to be infinite in order to make apodictic statements about present reality, not to mention past reality. The point is that no observer of anything is without bias. As evolutionary historian Michael Ruse observes, “nearly all of us come to evolution through the popular realm - it is not as if we get a disinterested introduction to the subject.”<sup>53</sup>

## 2. Evolutionary Science makes truth claims that are beyond its competence.

By failing to recognize or admit the existence of an assumed paradigm scientists often speak as if science not only discovers truth, but that science is the only source of true knowledge. Thus Creationism is written off as a matter of faith, as if scientists, particularly materialistic scientists, do not assume any ultimate principles, which are not empirically verifiable. So virile is this faith that its suppression and denial of recent cosmological alternatives to Darwinism borders on fanaticism, the very thing they claim to fear so in their opposition.

Darwinism or Scientific Naturalism is rooted in a philosophy of Materialism which asserts that all of reality is physical or material. There is no spiritual or mental reality. What appears to be mind is actually explicable in material terms. This is similar to ancient Monism, which sought to explain all of reality in terms of a single principle, e.g. Thales claimed that “all is water.” Thus Darwinism is an all encompassing worldview or religion. Speaking at the centennial celebration of the publication of *The Origin of Species*, in 1959 Julian Huxley enthusiastically asserted: “This is one of the first public occasions on which it has been frankly faced that all aspects of reality are subject to Evolution. ...In the Evolutionary pattern of thought there is no longer either need or room for the supernatural. The earth was not created, it evolved. So did all the animals and plants that inhabit it, including our human selves, mind and soul as well as brain and body. So did religion ...Finally, the Evolutionary vision is enabling us to discern, however incompletely, the lineaments of the new religion that we can be sure will arise to serve the needs of the coming era.”<sup>54</sup>

Now let us look at the basic tenets of this worldview, Evolutionary Materialism.

### #1 The Exile of God

David Asman, the editor of the editorial page of The Wall Street Journal recently rejected an op-ed piece I submitted because I asserted that Darwinism is inherently Atheistic. In response I pointed out that simply because some people are inconsistent in their reasoning, and therefore posit what is known as Theistic Evolution, is no reason to deny the truth of my assertion. Huxley said it in 1959 as we just heard: “In the Evolutionary pattern of thought there is no longer either need or room for the supernatural.” Despite Darwin’s politic claims to be an agnostic, he wrote to the recalcitrant Charles Lyell: “I would give nothing for the theory of natural selection, if it requires miraculous additions at any one stage of descent.”<sup>55</sup>

In *The Blind Watchmaker* Dawkins comments: “In Darwin’s view, the whole point of the theory of Evolution by natural selection was that it provided a non-miraculous account of the existence of complex adaptations.”<sup>56</sup> Stephen Hawking and Carl Sagan are happy to reassert the Nietzschean conclusion that God is dead. “And so it was that the great idea arose that there might be a way to know the world without the god hypothesis.”<sup>57</sup> Sagan suggests that we revere the Sun

<sup>53</sup> Ruse, *Monad to Man*, 539.

<sup>54</sup> Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, 150.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 162.

and stars. Dawkins sums it up best, “Darwin made it possible to be an intellectually fulfilled atheist.”<sup>58</sup> Such Monism leads naturally to the second unproved assumption of the Materialist.<sup>59</sup>

## **#2 The Primacy of Matter (Cause and Effect in a Closed System)**

Sagan insists that matter is eternal and that this is the ultimate reality. In other words the universe is a closed system of material cause and effect. As David Hume pointed out long ago the idea of cause and effect is unwarranted, and indeed impossible, on the basis of empirical knowledge. Based on the idea that all knowledge comes from empirical experience, the *idea* of cause and effect relationships can only be based on custom. Furthermore since we cannot experience the future, therefore all prediction is based on pure supposition. Empiricism fails because it assumes the existence of a mind and ideas (space and time) prior to experience, and yet claims that there are no ideas without experience. The idea of cause and effect surreptitiously assumes what can only be the product of design. No wonder Hume’s Empiricism lead to skepticism.

## **#3 The Ultimacy of Chance (Random Universe)**

In defining Evolution George Gaylord Simpson said: “Man is the result of a purposeless and natural process that did not have him in mind.”<sup>60</sup> Chance is the Prime Mover of the Evolutionary world.<sup>61</sup> No one can live from day to day on the basis of this assumption. Scientists, especially, cannot do research on the basis of this assumption.

## **#4 The Certainty of Empirical Knowledge**

Carl Sagan nicely sums up the Evolutionist’s faith: “First: there are no sacred truths; all assumptions must be critically examined; arguments from authority are worthless. Second: whatever is inconsistent with the facts must be discarded or revised. We must understand the cosmos as it is and not confuse how it is with how we wish it to be.”<sup>62</sup> The “facts”, of course are the infallible observations of Evolutionists. The problem is that neither of these two propositions is a fact. They are the way Evolutionists wish the cosmos to be.

None of the above dogma can be proved by the scientific method. This is reminiscent of the Logical Positivists’ assertion that nothing is real except the empirically verifiable. This assertion is itself not open to empirical verification.

In *Monad to Man: The Concept of Progress in Evolutionary Biology* (1996) Michael Ruse concludes, “Not only has evolution functioned as an ideology, as a secular religion, but for many professional biologists that has been its primary role. It has not been a mature (or proto-mature) science, governed by epistemic norms, nor has that necessarily been an end ardently sought.”<sup>63</sup> “Evolutionists take their belief in scientific Progress and transfer it into a belief in organic progress.”<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> T. M. Moore, “Beyond Creation vs. Evolution: Taking the Full Measure of the Materialist Challenge,” Internet: Contra Mundum Root Page (1-23-96 tew): 3.

<sup>58</sup> Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, 9.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., 4.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., 114.

<sup>61</sup> Moore, “Beyond Creation vs. Evolution,” 4.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., 6.

<sup>63</sup> Ruse, *Monad to Man*, 530.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., 538.

Patrick Glynn, Resident Scholar of the American Enterprise Institute, in a recent article in the *National Review* (May 6, 1996) registered his astonishment over the fact that the revolutionary work of cosmologist Brandon Carter in positing his “Anthropic Principle” has been largely, and often purposely, ignored by the majority of the scientific community: “... the *a priori* commitment to the atheist notion of the random universe has proved so powerful in our time as to send many scientists scurrying to find logical, and sometimes illogical, arguments to explain away the massive evidence that threatens to refute it.”<sup>65</sup>

This radical challenge to the hegemony of the “chance universe” of Darwinian thought has not come from Christian theologians or “creation scientists” but from the heart of the scientific establishment. The molecular biologist Michael Denton’s *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (1985) and Berkeley law professor Phillip E. Johnson’s *Darwin on Trial* represent a growing number of embarrassing critiques of Darwinism. The double standard exhibited by the Evolutionists’ refusal to seriously consider the challenge belies a narrow-mindedness hitherto thought possible only in fundamentalists preachers who still defend the verdict of the Scopes trial. The fact that many Darwinian scientists have asserted that a “random universe” is an hypothesis *preferable* to that of belief in a supernatural design, elucidates the nature of their commitment.

Glynn laments this state of affairs: “The double standard at work here is breathtaking: a host of scientists, from [Bertrand] Russell to Richard Dawkins to Carl Sagan, are free to use loose surmises based on Darwin’s theory to buttress the public case for atheism; but the moment scientists begin marshaling rather considerable and persuasive evidence for the opposite case, their speculation risks being branded by colleagues as ‘unscientific’.”<sup>66</sup> The point is that all *scientific inquiry* and its conclusions, especially when it comes to cosmology, are debatable.

It must be evident by now that I am not denying the validity of presuppositions *per se*. No one can think, observe or experiment without them. It is ironic to note, as Alfred North Whitehead once implied in *Science and the Modern World* (1925), the dependence of modern science on a Christian worldview. Modern science could not have arisen without the “medieval insistence on the rationality of God, conceived as with the personal energy of Jehovah... The faith in the order of nature which has made possible the growth of science is a particular example of a deeper faith.”<sup>67</sup> Philosopher of Science Stephen Meyer notes: “Despite the now well documented influence of Christian thinking on the rise of modern science from the time of Ockham to Newton, much of science during the nineteenth century did take a decidedly materialistic turn.”<sup>68</sup> Modern science arose in the context of belief in the distinction between the Creator and his creation. It assumed, therefore, that there is a discernible order in the creation that could be explored and exploited for the benefit of mankind. Even the idea of progress is based on a Christian view of history. Evolutionary scientists continue to assume a discernible order in the world while denying the foundation for this assumption. The result is a disturbing set of contradictions. Chance and order cannot co-exist. Man cannot be insignificant and responsible at once. As we shall see it is precisely the intelligence discernible in the order of the cosmos that cannot be explained on the basis of Evolutionary assumptions.

Science, evolutionary or otherwise, cannot by the very nature of its methods and goals explain the origin, sustenance or meaning of life.

It is, therefore, at the epistemological level that the debate between Evolutionists and Creationists must be understood and engaged. Only then can we meaningfully discuss scientific inquiry at the phenomenological level.

<sup>65</sup> Glynn, “Beyond the Death of God,” 31.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 32.

<sup>67</sup> Alfred North Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World* (New York: Macmillan, 1925), 19,24.

<sup>68</sup> Meyer, “The Origin of Life,” 24.

### III. THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE CHALLENGE TO EVOLUTIONARY SCIENCE.

#### 1. Pedagogical: Implications for the Classroom

The second round of the Creationist-Evolutionist debate, like the first round (Scopes Trial) comes to focus in the public school setting. The following are suggestions and observations of what I think the most articulate and well informed creationists are seeking to implement in the schools for which we are all paying.

#### Philosophy of Science and Modesty in the Scientific Enterprise

It is not the atheism of the Evolutionary scientists to which I object (this is not to say that God does not object, or that I agree with this position). It is the disingenuousness of their method of communicating their atheism in the public forum that I find reprehensible. Science, of course, by its very nature cannot prove or disprove the existence of God. The problem is that in the public school debate the nature of the scientific enterprise is never admitted. Evolutionary thought and its Atheistic presuppositions have attained the status of unquestioned authority. This undermines the purposes of both good science and sound pedagogy. Orthodox Darwinist, Michael Ruse has said, "Teaching scientific creationism will stunt abilities in all areas ... Thus I say keep it out of the schools."<sup>69</sup> This seems to be precisely the kind of obscurantism that good pedagogy should oppose. The development of critical thinking can only take place in the context of the free exchange of ideas.

John Angus Campbell makes a cogent case for such freedom in "John Stuart Mill, Charles Darwin, and the Culture Wars: Resolving a Crisis in Education" (*The Intercollegiate Review*, Spring 1996). "Debating Darwinism and comparing it with alternatives is the appropriate liberal education approach to this issue. Furthermore, I hope to persuade you that teaching the technical details of science - the nuts and bolts, the 'science' part of science - will not be sacrificed by an approach to science that stems from a view that teaching science is not that different from teaching social studies."<sup>70</sup> Campbell maintains that *The Origin of Species* employs an *abductive* argument. "The same events may be explained equally well by more than one hypothesis."<sup>71</sup> Rather than undermine the study of science a true debate format would require a careful study of each discipline, the history of that discipline, and various sides of debated issues regarding that discipline. "The precise knowledge required to distinguish real from apparent design, the knowledge of biology required to discuss intelligently whether or not Darwinian stories were more plausible than intelligent design stories would unleash a tremendous - and perhaps even distinctly American - motivator to the study of science."<sup>72</sup> "The enemy of learning in the classroom is not passion but indifference."<sup>73</sup>

To insist that it is "cheating" to invoke the supernatural is itself an unverifiable statement, coming from outside of science. In fact, Evolutionists regularly invoke Materialistic assumptions to explain phenomena, assumptions which are not verifiable themselves. What ought to be recognized is that all scientists and students bring certain assumptions to the observation of the phenomena. Along with discussion of the patterns of phenomena, which is the domain of science proper, the discussion of which assumptions best account for those patterns and phenomena is

<sup>69</sup> Campbell, "Culture Wars," 45.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., 46.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., 47.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., 49.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid., 47.

equally legitimate in the classroom. The absence of the latter level of discussion undermines the entire concept of an education.

Furthermore, Evolutionary thought has a stranglehold on almost every discipline in the modern academy. The scientific method itself has been imposed on disciplines, from sociology to theology, that are not its proper domain. Evolutionary theologian Teilhard de Chardin asserted, "Evolution is a light which illumines all facts, a trajectory which all lines of thought must follow."<sup>74</sup> To insist that only the observable and quantifiable is real spells the death of intellectual and spiritual life. Consequently, much of American intellectual academic life is presently stagnated and is in a radical state of atomistic disarray. True science deals with the observation and manipulation of *the physical world* for the material benefit of mankind. The Bible encourages this enterprise. In fact, the history of science, as we have indicated, shows that modern science is a product of the unified worldview of the Reformation (cf. Alfred North Whitehead). But the province of science is limited. Recent modern science has intruded into other disciplines to such a degree that the general populace now expects "scientific" validation for everything it thinks and does (cf. Jacques Barzun, *Science: The Glorious Entertainment*). Stephen Jay Gould had it right when he said, "Honorable and discerning scientists have always understood that the limits to what science can answer also describe the power of its methods in their proper domain."<sup>75</sup>

My plea is for a little scientific humility in the classroom and in the public forum. The best way to insure this at every level of public education is to teach the philosophy of science. Neil Postman has recently submitted this idea in *The End of Education* (the word "end" here is a McLuhanesque pun). The idea is that every scientist *surmises* a cosmology of his or her preference. This in turn is couched in a worldview which *assumes* certain basic ideas about God, man and the world. These *faith assumptions* help shape hypotheses, rules of evidence, the philosophy of fact and the conclusions of research. All students need to be made aware of the epistemological context of the scientific enterprise. This alone will demystify the sacerdotalism of modern science. And it will rid the classroom of the intellectual bullying that has forced so many young minds to think that the assertion of Genesis 1:1 "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." is intellectually untenable.

In *The Blind Watchmaker*, Oxford zoologist Richard Dawkins says, "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."<sup>76</sup> Theologian Michael Bauman responds, "It seems to me, Dawkin's arrogance aside, that we ought to be far more wary of Darwin and his hide-bound modern disciples than we now are, because even though those followers of Darwin now admit that Darwin was not entirely right, they too often refuse to admit that Darwin's religious critics are not entirely wrong."<sup>77</sup> "Scientists often fail to admit, sometimes even to recognize, that so many of the issues and findings of science are neither purely scientific nor genuinely empirical. Because all empirical endeavors build upon, and proceed according to, various presuppositions, and because those presuppositions and procedures are inescapably philosophical, no scientist and no scientific procedure is truly philosophy-free ... Even in the pursuit of something as fundamental as self-definition, science alone is utterly insufficient."<sup>78</sup> "Too often scientists teach and write as if the only real options

---

<sup>74</sup> Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, 130.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid., 124.

<sup>76</sup> Michael Bauman, "Between Jerusalem and the Laboratory: A Theologian Looks at Science," *Premise* (Vol. III, No. 2, Feb. 29, 1996): 6.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid., 9.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid., 10.

available to us are science or mysticism, empiricism or bias, fact or feeling.”<sup>79</sup> “Science, to be kept serviceable and humane, must be kept humble and teachable.”<sup>80</sup>

### **Fairness to Christian Commitment**

The problem in the public education system is that Christians realize that Evolutionists, under the guise of science, are seeking to impose their own assumptions, or faith, on their students. And when Christians challenge Evolutionary science’s assumptions or conclusions along these lines they are labeled “extreme right wing fundamentalists” and the discussion is supposed to end, as if there were an unassailable consensus among scientists and educators. The hubris one encounters among Evolutionists in their characterization of the Christian position is sometimes astonishing. The vapid *ad hominem* quoted above is only one example. Isaac Asimov’s 884 page *New Guide to Science* has three pages of anti-creationist vituperations.<sup>81</sup> At best the orthodox Darwinist relegates religion to psychologically useful fantasy. Science deals with objective “facts” while religion deals with the subjective realm of faith. This epistemological distinction is a polite way of saying religion is simply irrelevant.

Particularly illuminating along these lines is the response of Evolutionists to an exhibition celebrating the centennial of The British Museum of Natural History in 1981. The exhibition was on Darwin’s Theory. The sign which greeted visitors asked: “Have you ever wondered why there are so many different kinds of living things? One idea is that all the living things we see today have EVOLVED from a distant ancestor by a process of gradual change. How could Evolution have occurred? How could one species change into another? The exhibition in this hall looks at one possible explanation - the explanation of Charles Darwin.” An adjacent poster said: “Another view is that God created all living things perfect and unchanging.”<sup>82</sup> One of the museum’s senior scientists dared tell the public in a lecture: “The idea of Evolution by natural selection is a matter of logic not science ... the inevitable logical consequence of a set of premises.”<sup>83</sup> The responses in the pages of *Nature* reveal a zeal unequaled by theologians. One editorial asked with dismay “is the theory of Evolution still an open question among serious biologists?”<sup>84</sup>

The editors of *Nature* were astonished to discover that this question was more controversial among scientists than they had realized.<sup>85</sup> Needless to say the exhibition was modified along more orthodox Darwinian lines, as heavy weights like Anthony Flew question the integrity of “civil servants” who had a duty to present established truth. The Museum officials were denounced for their “abuse of the resources of a state institution to try to put [their pet theory, cladism] across to all the innocent and predominantly youthful lay persons who throng these public galleries, as if it were already part of the established consensus among all those best qualified to judge.”<sup>86</sup> Here we come face to face with the danger of not distinguishing between what is properly “scientific” and what is truly speculative. As Johnson has well said, “Whenever science is enlisted is some other cause - religious, political, or racialistic - the result is always that the scientists themselves become the fanatics.”<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> Ibid., 13.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., 17.

<sup>81</sup> Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, 69, fn. 2.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid., 133.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., 135.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid., 136.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., 138.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid., 154.

The fact that there is a raging debate among scientists themselves, which is largely unknown to the general public, is itself a scandal that needs to be exposed. Scientists who stick to the rules of their own discipline should be glad for such debate. The unwillingness of many to even admit that there is such a debate, much less affirm its validity, is evidence of the death of creative thought in all but the most technical areas of research. We are being reduced to a culture of technocrats without any reason for existing apart from our own narrowly defined activities in the technopoly. Neil Postman has eloquently analyzed this scenario in *Technopoly*.

Some may think that the concerns expressed above are esoteric and impractical. Ideas, however, have consequences. Sometimes their practical implications are not evident for several generations. It is no accident, for example, that the now-popular belief in the “random universe” of Darwin has spawned random acts of violence. Such violence is an historical novelty. It is no accident that the belief that we live in a “godless universe” has produced an epidemic absence of moral accountability in every institution of our civilization. Cheating and lack of respect for authority is rampant in our schools, as you well know. Can we expect to renew the teaching of “values” when Darwinism and the Materialistic philosophy that it has spawned has robbed us of the concept of spirit and mind? All sorts of criminal and immoral behavior is widely believed to be ultimately chemical in its origin. How can anyone then be held responsible? As C. S. Lewis poignantly observed of English education over half a century ago: “We make men without chests and expect of them virtue and enterprise. We laugh at honour and are shocked to find traitors in our midst. We castrate and bid the geldings be fruitful.”<sup>88</sup>

## 2. Religious

### The Nature of Faith

“Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. ... By faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that the things which are seen were not made of things which are visible” (Heb. 11:1,3). The Materialist’s Bible, if he had one, would read: “Without faith we understand that the worlds were framed by a chance process. The visible is all there is and we are therefore without meaning, so eat drink and be merry for tomorrow we die.”

Both statements are based on *a priori* commitments, and in that sense they are both faith assumptions, because they are not empirically verifiable. Because of this I have argued that both Creationism and Evolution should be equally respected in the public forum and, therefore, in the public schools.

However, I do not think, as I have also argued, that Evolution is adequate to explain the evidence encountered in the various scientific disciplines. That the things observed by Evolutionary scientists with the marks of extreme intelligence written all over them should spring spontaneously from nothing requires an act of faith that defies the imagination and, to this observer, the intelligence as well.

Now let me go one step further and say the I do not believe that Evolution, or for that matter any other theory or religion is adequate to account for anything.

### The Challenge of Created Reality

The Apostle Paul gives us what we might call *A Pauline Point to Ponder*, in Romans 1. “Since the creation of the world [God’s] invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and deity, so that they are without excuse” (1:20).

---

<sup>88</sup> Clives Staples Lewis, *The Abolition of Man* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947), 16.



He also says that people “suppress the truth in unrighteousness” (1:18). The implication of this for scientists is that, whether they acknowledge it or not, they do their science *en coram Deo*, before the face of God. The proof of God’s existence is all around us, and even in our very consciousness, and reasoning power, as well as our consciences. Scientific investigation itself is a revelation of the God of the Bible. In fact, the evidence is not like the signature or style of an artist, or “foot prints in the sands of time.” God is omnipresent and, therefore, impinges on every aspect of reality, every object and every thought, and at every moment. The great unifying mystery underlying the subatomic quest is not matter or energy, as Heisenberg has discovered, but the invisible power of Almighty God. The Eternal Son of God through Whom God made the worlds is also the One by whom God upholds all things, by the word of His power (Heb. 1:2,3). Jesus Christ is the Logos or reason underlying all of created reality (John 1:1). As Job was once asked by God, “Where were you when I laid the foundations of the earth? Tell me, if you have understanding. Who determined its measurements? Surely you know! ...Who then is able to stand against Me? Who has preceded Me that I should pay him? Everything under heaven is mine” (Job 38:4,5; 41:10,11). From a Biblical perspective science can never get “to the bottom” of reality, because God is there.

So, our presuppositions about God determine whether or not we view the evidence as proof or not. That equally intelligent minds can come to such dramatically different conclusions viewing the same phenomena leads us to conclude that one’s presuppositions are determined by something other than the evidence itself. The Bible points to man’s vested interest in maintaining his independence from God. Genesis shows us that is the root of man’s problem. Viewed thus, Darwinism is a sophisticated “suppression” of the truth.

According to the Bible the “suppression” of this evidence is much like the “obstruction of justice,” eventually a day of reckoning comes. The Bible calls this the Day of Judgment. Thankfully by turning to the crucified and resurrected God-man Jesus Christ, suppressors may be forgiven and learn by faith the way of knowledge pursued by the once unbelieving Augustine: “Credo ut Intelligam” - “I believe in order that I might understand.”

## Conclusion

Science is a highly useful, but limited and tentative enterprise. It is not done in a vacuum without the faith assumptions of the scientist. Whether or not Evolution is a theory adequate to account for the extant evidence; and whether or not Scientific Naturalism is a philosophy of life adequate to meet the challenges of life, I leave you to decide.

Stephen Meyer put it eloquently, “If the simplest life owes its origin to an intelligent Creator, then perhaps man is not the ‘cosmic orphan’ that twentieth century scientific materialism has suggested. Perhaps then, during the twenty-first century, the traditional moral and spiritual foundations of the West will find support from the very sciences that seemed to undermine them.”<sup>89</sup>

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography is purposefully weighted in favor of the Challengers of the Conventional Wisdom because it is this view that is, for a variety of reasons, not being heard in the academy.

---

<sup>89</sup> Meyer, “The Origin of Life,” 40, 41.

## Philosophy and History of Science

- Agassiz, Louis. *Essay on Classification*. London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts and Trubner, 1859.
- Clark, Gordon H. *The Philosophy of Science and Belief in God*. Nutley, NJ: The Craig Press, 1974.
- Kuhn, Thomas. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Meyer, Stephen C. *Human Understanding: The Collective Use of Understanding and Concepts*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971.
- Ruse, Michael. *Monad to Man: The Concept of Progress in Evolutionary Biology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- Warfield, Benjamin Breckinridge. "Charles Darwin's Religious Life" (pp. 541-584) in *Studies in Theology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1932.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Darwin's Arguments Against Christianity and Against Religion" (pp. 132-42) in *Selected Shorter Writings of Benjamin B. Warfield*, Vol. II, ed. John Meeter. Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1973.
- Whitehead, Alfred North. *Science and the Modern World*. New York: Macmillan, 1925.

## Challengers of the Conventional Wisdom

- Bauman, Michael. "Between Jerusalem and the Laboratory: A Theologian Looks at Science," *Premise*, Vol. III, No. 2 (Feb. 29, 1996).
- Behe, Michael. *Darwin's Black Box*. New York: The Free Press, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Edge of Evolution: The Search for the Limits of Darwinism*. New York: The Free Press, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Science and Evidence for Design in the Universe*. Fort Collins, CO: Ignatius Press, 2000.
- Berlinski, David. *A Tour of the Calculus*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1996.
- Bethell, Thomas. "A New Beginning: Darwin revisionism goes mainstream," *The American Spectator*, September 1996.
- Campbell, John Angus. "John Stuart Mill, Charles Darwin, and the Culture Wars: Resolving a Crisis in Education," *The Intercollegiate Review*, Spring 1996: 44-51.
- Crick, Francis. *Life Itself*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981.
- Davidheiser, Bolton. *To Be As God: The Goals of Modern Science*. Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1977.
- Denton, Michael. *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*. Warwickshire: Burnett Books Limited, 1985.
- Gange, Robert. *Origins and Destiny: A Scientist Examines God's Handiwork*. Waco, TX: Word Books Publisher, 1986.
- Glynn, Patrick. "Beyond the Death of God," *National Review*, May 6, 1996.
- Hughes, Philip Edgcumbe. *Christianity and the Problem of Origins*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1978.
- Johnson, Phillip E. *Darwin on Trial*. Washington, DC: Regnery Gateway, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Defeating Darwinism by Opening Minds*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Testing Darwinism*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Objections Sustained: Subversive Essays on Evolution, Law & Culture*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1998.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Darwinism Defeated?: The Johnson-Lamoureux Debate on Biological Origins*. Vancouver: Regent College, 1999.
- Meyer, Stephen C. "The Origin of Life and the Death of Materialism," *The Intercollegiate Review*, Spring 1996: 24-43.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Explore Evolution the Arguments for and Against Neo-Darwinism*. Ossining, NY: Hill House, 2007.
- Mivart, St. George. *The Genesis of Species*. London: Macmillan and Company, 1871.
- Moore, T. M. "Beyond Creation vs. Evolution: Taking the Full Measure of the Materialist Challenge," Internet: Contra Mundum Root Page 1-23-96 tew.
- Pera, Marcello, and Shea, Willaim R. *Persuading Science: The Art of Scientific Rhetoric*. Canton, MA: Science History Publications, USA, 1991.
- Polyani, Michael. "Life's Irreducible Structure," *Science* 160, 1986.
- Ramm, Bernard. *The Christian View of Science and Scripture*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954.
- Reymond, Robert. *A Christian View of Modern Science*. Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1977.
- Slick, Matthew J. "The Odds are Against Evolution," Internet: Christian Apologetics and Research Ministry Root Page.
- Sunderland, Luther D. *Darwin's Enigma: Fossils and Other Problems*. Santee, CA: Master Book Publishers, 1988.
- Tipler, Frank J. and Barrow, John D. *The Physics of Immortality*. 1994.
- Yockey, Herbert P. *Information Theory and Molecular Biology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A calculation of the probability of spontaneous biogenesis by information theory," *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, Vol. 67, 1977.
- Zuckerman, Solly (Lord). *Beyond The Ivory Tower*. 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Monkeys, Men and Missiles*. 1988.

## Proponents of the Conventional Wisdom

- Darwin, Charles. *The Origin of Species*. London: John Murray, 1859.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Descent of Man*, 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1871.
- Dawkins, Richard. *The Blind Watchmaker*. London: Longman, 1986.
- Gould, Stephen Jay. *Wonderful Life*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Time's Arrow, Time's Cycle*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Hawking, Stephen W. *A Brief History of Time*. New York: Bantom Books, 1988.
- Sagan, Carl. *The Dragons of Eden*. New York: Random House, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Broca's Brain*. New York: Random House, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Cosmos*. New York: Random House, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Comet*. New York: Random House, 1985.
- Shapiro, Robert. *Origins: A Skeptics Guide to the Origin of Life on Earth*. New York: Summit Books, 1986.

## Propositions re: the Evolutionist-Creationist Debate

1. It should be acknowledged that both Evolutionists and Creationists enter the debate with their own sets of presuppositions about the nature of reality and God.

2. The distinction between religion and science should not be used to deny that all scientists have religious commitments, Theistic, Atheistic or otherwise. Nor should this distinction be used by Evolutionary Materialists to impugn the validity or integrity of the work of scientists who are Theists. Nor should this distinction be used by Evolutionary Materialists to rule out the legitimate questions and opposing views of those who not accept their assessments and views in a given discipline.
3. It should be acknowledged that there are professional scientists in every scientific discipline who are Creationists; and that there are professional scientists in every scientific discipline who are Evolutionists.
4. The existence of the concept of “intelligent design” among those who are not necessarily Creationists (e.g. biochemist Michael Behe) should be acknowledged by scientists and science teachers. Nor should the many questions raised by Evolutionary scientists themselves about their own Evolutionary presuppositions be suppressed.
5. The integrity of scientific work within the narrow confines of a particular discipline need not be compromised by either Evolutionist and Creationist presuppositions. Nor should one’s presuppositions be used as an evasion of the meticulous and detailed work of science.
6. The philosophy, history and methods of science need to be taught at every level of the educational system in order to create a climate that is fair to all presuppositions, and that cultivates an intelligent grasp of the nature of the scientific enterprise. Evolutionary presuppositions should not be taught as scientific fact, but carefully distinguished in the classroom from the actual findings of Evolutionary science.
7. Students should be acquainted with the vast and growing literature of “intelligent design” and Creationist scientists, along with the details of the scientific challenge which astronomical, biochemical, probability theorists, among others, bring to the debate.
8. Unless (as a Christian I cannot say “until”) Materialist scientists can explain the existence of all matter and life on the basis of material origins and present causation, and no one thus far has, they must remain open to the existence of mind/spirit.
9. Unless (again, as a Christian I cannot say “until”) Materialist scientists can explain the gradual development of complex biochemical systems like cilium and the eye, and no one thus far has, they must remain open to rapid or even instantaneous creation.