

# LSI Journal

*a forum for diverse views  
consistent with Scripture*

## Two Creation Apologetics

with Opposing Views of Science are Taught in the WELS

God has blessed the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod (WELS) with something rare: doctrinal unity. We like to say we are united in mind and thought. That said, we do disagree on some things. One of those areas is creation apologetics. This reprint has five articles discussing creation apologetics in the WELS, and two articles demonstrating those two apologetics.

It is the hope of LSI that each of us evaluate our personal thinking on this topic, and carefully consider the words of brothers and sisters in Christ holding alternative positions. LSI invites you to ask questions and participate in a loving brotherly discussion. LSI will attempt to be an impartial discussion facilitator. LSI can provide answers on this topic from multiple viewpoints, since we understand both sides and several intermediate positions. If you do NOT want your comments published, please let us know.

[www.LutheranScience.org](http://www.LutheranScience.org)  
[office@LutheranScience.org](mailto:office@LutheranScience.org)  
[www.facebook.com/LutheranScience](https://www.facebook.com/LutheranScience)

*The Lutheran Science Institute  
13390 West Edgewood Avenue  
New Berlin WI 53151-8088*

**The Lutheran Science Institute, inc. (LSI)**  
**Creation/Evolution Resources from a Confessional Lutheran View**

13390 West Edgewood Avenue, New Berlin WI 53151-8088  
office@LutheranScience.org   LutheranScience.org   LSIblog.BlogSpot.com   facebook.com/LutheranScience

# **LSI Journal**

## **A Forum for Diverse Views Consistent With Scripture**

[article reprint](#)

Views expressed in the Journal are those of the authors and not necessarily of LSI.

*Introductory article:*

### **Two Creation Apologetics with Opposing Views of Science are Taught in the WELS**

(Bergemann; April-June 2014) ..... 5 pages

*Responses to the Introductory Article:*

### **A Comparison of Apologetics –and a Personal View**

(Bergemann; April-June 2014) ..... 7 pages

### **Two Creation Apologetics or Two Sciences?**

(Krug; April-June 2014) ..... 2 pages

### **True Science Debate –A Personal Opinion**

(Holman; April-June 2014) ..... 1 pages

### **Commentary on True Science**

(Winkler; April-June 2014) ..... 2 pages

*Most LSI Journal articles can be interpreted in view of either creation apologetic. The following two articles are an exception. A primary view of one apologetic is the theme of one article, while the other article is written from the opposite view. These articles demonstrate how these two authors present their respective apologetic.*

### **Why Evolution Cannot Even Be Considered Scientific**

(Stueber; July-Sept 2014) ..... 10 pages

### **How Can A Lie Like Evolution Have Scientific Evidence?**

(Bergemann; Jan-March 2015) ..... 8 pages

*Cover photo from NASA Hubble: This photo shows a portion of a nearby dwarf galaxy. That galaxy, the “Small Magellanic Cloud” (SMC), is visible without a telescope. Explorers such as Ferdinand Magellan used the light of this galaxy, and many other heavenly lights, to navigate the seas, so this galaxy was named after Magellan.*



# Two Creation Apologetics

## with Opposing Views of Science are Taught in the WELS

by Mark Bergemann

A teen may hear from her Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod (WELS) pastor at a youth group Bible study, "There is NO evidence for evolution," and the next day be taught at her WELS high school, "There IS evidence for evolution." An article in *Forward In Christ* magazine proclaims that evolution is not science,<sup>1</sup> while several other *Forward In Christ* articles argue the opposite.<sup>2</sup> One Northwestern Publishing House (NPH) book tells us "evolution is not scientific,"<sup>3</sup> while another published that same year, says the opposite.<sup>4</sup> Christlight proclaims that "The Bible and true science never contradict each other,"<sup>5</sup> while students in the Earth Science course at Luther High School are taught the opposite<sup>6</sup>.

This situation can be very confusing for pastors, teachers, students, and laity. What is happening? Two creation apologetics, with opposing views of science, are being taught in the WELS. If pastors, teachers, and authors were aware that two competing creation apologetics are regularly taught in the WELS, they might mention this, as they teach their preferred creation apologetic. If students and laity were aware of this situation, they could better understand why they hear conflicting teaching, and be better able to form their own beliefs around one apologetic or the other.

<sup>1</sup> "Darwinian evolution is a religion, not genuine science." Allen Quist, "Questioning Evolution," *Forward In Christ*, 97:2 (Feb 2010), web version page 2. <http://www.wels.net/news-events/forward-in-christ/february-2010/questioning-evolution> (accessed January 21, 2014)

<sup>2</sup> "Evolution, as an answer to the question of the origin of the universe, is science ... Good science is whatever a majority of scientists say it is at any given time." Vernon Gerlach, "Reflections On Creation Science," *Forward In Christ*, 74:20 (November 1987), web version page 2. <http://www.wels.net/news-events/forward-in-christ/november-1987/reflections-creation-science> (accessed January 21, 2014).

"Biologists already have found it necessary to modify Darwin's theory of evolution. Nothing in human science remains the same for very long." Ronald A. Buelow and Ryan C. MacPherson, "A Lutheran View Of Science" *Forward In Christ*, 91:1 (January 2004), web version page 2. <http://www.wels.net/news-events/forward-in-christ/january-2004/lutheran-view-science?page=0,0> (accessed January 21, 2014).

<sup>3</sup> Jon D. Buchholz, *Basic Bible Certainty: A Study in the Truths of the Christian Faith* (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2010), 8.

<sup>4</sup> "The only way to integrate science and Scripture while also maintaining scientific respectability is to revise one's interpretation of Scripture when a new consensus among scientists emerges –such as the consensus reached during the late 19<sup>th</sup> century in favor of evolution. If one does not want to be stuck in the position of having to revise one's interpretation of Scripture in light of science, then one would be wise not to try and integrate science and Scripture in the first place." Ryan Cameron MacPherson, "The Church and Science Through the Ages: Seven Key Questions From the History of Science," in *Here We Stand –A Confessional Christian Study of Worldviews*, ed. Curtis A. Jahn, (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2010), 208-209.

<sup>5</sup> Gerald Kastens, *Course 5 Teacher's Guide – Reading the Bible: The Focus, Lesson 1* (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2000), 4. <http://online.nph.net/SampleFiles/Print/746091E.PDF> (accessed January 21, 2014). Kastens was the project director of the ChristLight® religion curriculum published by NPH during the 1990s.

<sup>6</sup> "Other dangerous philosophies sneak in such as attempting to find the 'true' science that lines up perfectly with Scriptures. Since even the science of Christians is a human endeavor, it is a mistake to think that a true science exists in a sinful world." Greg Schibbelhut, Earth Science webpage, Luther High School <http://www.lutherhigh.org/academics/course-webpages/earth-science> (accessed January 21, 2014)

---

***Same Theology -- Different Apologetic Methods***

These two creation apologetics hold so much in common. WELS adherents of both apologetic methods hold to the same Biblical doctrines. They both believe that only the Gospel can create and sustain faith, and that their apologetic reflects that belief. They both believe the Bible is inerrant in all it says about every subject, including history and science, and that their apologetic reflects that belief. They both point out that evolution is incompatible with the Christian faith.

There is variation on both sides of this issue. Some even take a middle ground, holding a mixture of views taken from both apologetics. Yet the majority of individuals across this apologetic spectrum hold that science has a legitimate place in our apologetic as we witness to the truth of creation, and against the lie of evolution.<sup>7</sup> Both apologetic methods make significant use of scientific evidence to show logical problems with the evolution story. They both proclaim evidence showing that the world around is often as we would expect based on the Biblical account of creation, and that the world is often NOT as would be expected if evolution were true.

***Two Definitions of Science***

The difference between these two apologetic methods is that they use opposing definitions of science. These two creation apologetics have been taught in the WELS for decades. Dr. Ryan MacPherson, professor at Bethany Lutheran College, mentions a 1978 creation “debate” between David Golisch (then a WELS science teacher at Huron Valley Lutheran High School) and Martin Sponholz (then a WELS science teacher at Luther High School).

Even within a relatively small, theologically conservative church body such as the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod (WELS), scientists and theologians have had significant disagreements regarding how to explain a young-earth thesis among their church members and how to defend that conclusion against old-earth proponents. ... Golisch’s frustration with Sponholz’s paper arose not from a different interpretation of Scripture, but from a different interpretation of science. More exactly, it arose from a different definition of the word “science.” Sponholz defined the laws of science as “intellectual models of artistry. The laws of science are men’s laws. They are not God’s ordinances.” ... Golisch and others were following creation science gurus Henry Morris and Duane Gish, who defined “science” as an endeavor that, if not corrupted by evolutionist practitioners, will discover truths that corroborate revealed truth. ... The Sponholz-Golisch debate illustrates that two young-earth advocates within a synod that tolerates very little theological variance nevertheless differed markedly in their approaches to teaching their beliefs to the next generation of Wisconsin Synod Lutherans and explaining their young-earth worldview to those outside of their fellowship.<sup>8</sup>

One of these two creation apologetic methods defines “science” as temporary “truth,” parts of which are often found to be incorrect and then replaced. Science is seen as mankind’s flawed and incomplete attempt to explain nature.<sup>9</sup> This view of science is similar to that used by the scientific community.<sup>10</sup> This

---

<sup>7</sup> A recent article in the LSI Journal covers in detail the use of reason in defending the Christian faith: Mark Bergemann, “The Place of Reason in Defending the Christian Faith – with Ministry Ideas Regarding Creation/Evolution,” *LSI Journal*, 2012. <http://www.lutheranscience.org/2012reason> (accessed May 22, 2014).

<sup>8</sup> Ryan C. MacPherson, “On the Antiquity of the Earth: Episodes from the History of Science That Have Shaped People’s Perceptions of the Earth’s Age” (paper presented at the tenth annual theological symposium, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, September 22, 1999, with minor corrections and revisions, 2005) <http://www.ryancmacpherson.com/presentation-list/14-conference-papers/36-on-the-antiquity-of-the-earth.html> (accessed January 21, 2014).

<sup>9</sup> For example: “Science is an attempt by mankind to grasp the concepts of God’s creation.” Riley W. Westphal, Chemistry Course Description, Winnebago Lutheran Academy <http://www.wlaving.org/inner.iml/academics/science>

view of science is the one taught by an overwhelming majority of teachers at our WELS high schools and colleges.<sup>11</sup>

### ***“True Science”***

The other creation apologetic method is called “True Science.” The “True Science” apologetic refuses to accept as science any physical laws or theories which violate the teachings of Scripture, rejecting them as “false science,” while accepting scientific laws and theories which are demonstrably true and which do not violate the teachings of Scripture.<sup>12</sup> This view of science was the majority view in the WELS during the 1970s, but has been the minority view for the past 30 years.<sup>13</sup>

For over 50 years the term “True Science,” has been used to describe this second creation apologetic method. It a very descriptive name for the creation apologetic which so often involves the use of that very term. Sometimes those who use this apologetic use similar terms such as “real science,” “genuine science,” “honest science,” or “correct science.” Sometimes those who use this apologetic refer to evolution using the antonym of true: “false science,” or with terms such as “pseudo-science,” “so-called science,” “bad science,” etc. Authors throughout the WELS have used these terms for decades. (*Bold underlines in the quotes below are not in the original.*)

The Bible and **true science** never contradict each other; they cannot, for God created the laws of science too.<sup>14</sup>

**True science** will not contradict what the Bible teaches. We can combat the theory of evolution by proclaiming what the Bible teaches and by encouraging unbiased scientific investigation and honest presentation of scientific facts. **Honest science** will not treat an unproven theory as a fact.<sup>15</sup>

Darwinian evolution is a religion, not **genuine science**.<sup>16</sup>

In the first two chapters of Genesis we have the genesis of the history of God’s reign of saving grace among men. These chapters were not written, to be sure, to satisfy our curiosity about scientific matters, yet they nowhere conflict with **true science**.<sup>17</sup>

---

(accessed January 21, 2014)

<sup>10</sup> For quotes from WELS science teachers and from the National Academy of Science see: Mark Bergemann, “*True Science*”: *A Bad Apologetic Method Rejected in the WELS*, an unpublished research paper prepared for discussion by the Lutheran Science Institute (LSI) Board (March 13, 2013; updated April 22, 2013), 4,5. Copies can be requested from the author at [MarkBergemann@yahoo.com](mailto:MarkBergemann@yahoo.com).

<sup>11</sup> Bergemann, “*True Science*,” 56.

<sup>12</sup> For example, LSI President David Golisch writes in a widely circulated letter to Martin Sponholz, “True science is defined as that which does not disagree with or negate Scripture” (October 1, 1978), point 44. In 1965-1966 *The Northwestern Lutheran* published “Man Distinct from the Animal” by Robert W. Adickes who says, “When the Christian separates the facts of true science from the false theories of modern evolutionary teaching he sees that there is no conflict and he has no difficulty in accepting, through faith, the Scriptural account of man’s creation.” Reprinted in Werner H. Franzmann, ed., *Is Evolutionism The Answer? The Christian Response To Evolutionism* (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1967), 64.

<sup>13</sup> Bergemann, “*True Science*,” 50.

<sup>14</sup> Gerald Kastens, 4.

<sup>15</sup> *WELS Topical Q&A*, in the evolution category. Captured in archive: #30 of 46 (captured September 28, 2009): [http://web.archive.org/web/20090928142048/http://www.wels.net/cgi-bin/site.pl?1518&cuTopic\\_topicID=73&cultem\\_itemID=3119](http://web.archive.org/web/20090928142048/http://www.wels.net/cgi-bin/site.pl?1518&cuTopic_topicID=73&cultem_itemID=3119) (accessed January 21, 2014).

<sup>16</sup> Allen Quist, 2.

**Real science** cannot possibly be a threat to one's faith. ... **Real science** and the Bible are in harmony.<sup>18</sup>

"It makes sense to teach evolutionary theory as well as biblical creationism in Christian schools too. Explain the theory to students and show how it conflicts with the Bible and with **real science** and the well-established laws of nature."<sup>19</sup>

WELS authors who use the other creation apologetic, sometimes use the term "true science" to describe the apologetic they oppose. (*Bold underlines in the quotes below are not in the original.*)

"Other dangerous philosophies sneak in such as attempting to find the **'true' science** that lines up perfectly with Scriptures. Since even the science of Christians is a human endeavor, it is a mistake to think that a **true science** exists in a sinful world."<sup>20</sup>

"We must not attach God's name to our favorite scientific theories. We do not know God's science. If science is only the attempts of humans to understand God's creation there can be no **true science**."<sup>21</sup>

"Within our own circles there exists a Lutheran Science Institute which boasts of 'communicating **true science**.' Several of our synodical schools in their course descriptions boast also of this ability to distinguish between theories and the **true laws of science**. ... The laws of science are man's laws, not God's!"<sup>22</sup>

"We also especially need to guard against Reformed answers to evolution that elevate reason human and try to develop a **true science**."<sup>23</sup>

"That calling [of WELS teachers] is not to save this world from its **false science** by finding a **true science**. Look what must be added to find a hopeful harmony between our Bible and science."<sup>24</sup>

"I have heard that there is no conflict between science and religion. I have heard the laws of science are proved. ... To hide behind the semantics of **true science** which has little or nothing to do with the subject we commonly refer to as science today is to play into the hands of the devil.

---

<sup>17</sup> Wilbert R. Gawrisch, "The Biblical Account of Creation and Modern Theology," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*, 59 (July 1962), web version pages 13, 19. <http://www.wlssays.net/node/588> (accessed January 21, 2014)

<sup>18</sup> Warren Krug, "There's a Role for Science in Biblical Interpretation," *LSI Journal* (January-February, 2005). <http://lutheranscience.org/2005scienceBible> (accessed May 22, 2014).

<sup>19</sup> Warren Krug, "SCOPES TRIAL IN REVERSE. Kentucky 'teacher' gets in trouble for NOT teaching evolution," *LSI Blog* (October 29, 2008). [http://lsiblog.blogspot.com/2008\\_10\\_01\\_archive.html](http://lsiblog.blogspot.com/2008_10_01_archive.html) (accessed January 21, 2014).

<sup>20</sup> Greg Schibbelhut.

<sup>21</sup> Paul L. Willems, "Where Experiments End," *The Lutheran Educator*, 46:4 (May 2005), 102-104.

<sup>22</sup> David A. Kipfmiller, "Fighting The Good Fight," (paper presented at the Capitol Circuit pastors' meeting, St. Paul's Ev. Lutheran Church, Marshall, WI, September 21, 1982).

<sup>23</sup> John Isch, "Remember These Things: The Church's Responsibility to Teach," *Proceedings: Thirty-Ninth Biennial Convention of the Minnesota District, Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod* (June 21-23, 1994), 106-116. As quoted by Paul Boehlke, Reflections on a New Science Building, CHARIS 3:3 (Summer 2004).

<sup>24</sup> Martin P. Sponholz, "Teaching and Unteaching Evolution: The Fossils Say Nothing" (paper presented to a teacher's conference, October 24, 1985, updated and presented as a handout for a workshop at Martin Lutheran College, New Ulm (July 5-10, 1999), 1.

... But what is **true science**? Have we become so enwrapped with the scientific age we live in that we need such a crutch?"<sup>25</sup>

*Mark Bergemann, a retired electrical engineer, serves as president of LSI. He holds a B.S. from UW-Milwaukee and is an evangelism leader at Good Shepherd's Ev. Lutheran Church in West Allis, Wisconsin*

---

<sup>25</sup> Martin Sponholz, "The Changing Laws" (paper presented at the Evening Forum at Dr. Martin Luther College, New Ulm, January 13, 1977), 1, 2.

# ***A Comparison of Apologetics –and a Personal View***

*by Mark Bergemann*

Many of my beloved WELS brothers and sisters in Christ use the “True Science” creation apologetic. I, however, use the creation apologetic with the opposite view of science. We are all concerned with the great temptation of evolution, which claims that there is no Creator God. We all proclaim the same Gospel message, in the hope of bringing lost souls to eternal life. We differ on what science is. We often proclaim the same message to those burdened by the temptation of evolution, but sometimes we proclaim messages from two opposing views. This is because we see science from two opposing positions.

## ***Bypassing the Means of Grace***

I worry that Christians who embrace “True Science” thinking may look to science and reason to support their faith. The Bible teaches that only the Gospel in word and sacrament has the power to create and sustain faith.<sup>1</sup> We must avoid encouraging people to look past these Means of Grace to support their faith.

You might be thinking that my worry about the “True Science” apologetic bypassing the means of grace is an overreaction, but some WELS advocates of “True Science” actually make such a claim. For example, the following WELS quote (published twice by NPH) claims that the “True Science” definition of science removes the difficulty of accepting through faith the biblical teaching of creation. Can this quote be understood in any way other than as Calvinistic rather than Lutheran?

When the Christian separates the facts of true science from the false theories of modern evolutionary teaching he sees that there is no conflict and he has no difficulty in accepting, through faith, the Scriptural account of man’s creation.<sup>2</sup>

Here is another example. A WELS high school science teacher actually states that faith can be strengthened through “True Science”:

When a person with a new faith learns of the contradiction that creation is of evolution, his faith is shaken, but when he learns that science has erred about evolution and that true science agrees with God’s Word about creation, his faith is strengthened. ... There is no confrontation between creation and true science. (True science is defined as that which does not disagree or negate Scripture.) However, there is a big confrontation with this pseudo-science of evolution. The battle is lost with the new believer if he doesn’t learn of the True Science but instead is left with the conflict of pseudo-science and the Bible.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> E.g., “Faith comes from hearing the message, and the message is heard through the word of Christ” (Romans 10:17, NIV’84).

<sup>2</sup> Robert W. Adickes, “Man Distinct from the Animal,” Werner H. Franzmann, ed., *Is Evolutionism The Answer? The Christian Response To Evolutionism* (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1967), 64. Previously published in *The Northwestern Lutheran*, 1965-1966.

<sup>3</sup> David Golisch, in a widely circulated letter to Martin Sponholz, (October 1, 1978), points 41 and 44. The parenthetical statement “True science... negate Scripture” is in the original.



Here a WELS author says that he “thoroughly understood God’s Word” as soon as he heard that there is no scientific proof for evolution.

“My eighth-grade brain came up with a solution. I was pretty sure that each of the days of creation was really a billion years. I wondered why no one had thought of this before. Today I know that the human brain will naturally harmonize two conflicting ideas unless one of them is specifically pointed out as not having any proof. I struggled years with this concept until attending a bible class addressing the subject and then thoroughly understood God’s Word.”<sup>4</sup>

Others in the WELS also warn against bypassing the means of grace. The Rev. Dr. Richard Gurgel, professor at Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary, talks about the creation science danger to faith in a Q&A discussing *This We Believe*, an official doctrinal statement of the WELS:

At the same time some of the conclusions and analysis of creation science may be as flawed as those of evolution. In addition, Christians may begin to base their faith on human research instead of God’s revelation.<sup>5</sup>

Another Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary professor, Rev. Dr. John Brug, talks about the “abuse of science in defense of the faith”:

Although there is solid agreement on the biblical doctrine of creation in our midst, there has been and continues to be considerable discussion and debate in our circles about the validity of certain specific arguments proposed by creation-science. ... There is also an ongoing concern about the use and abuse of science in defense of the faith.<sup>6</sup>

A WELS high school science teacher warns against bypassing the means of grace.

“My condemnation is not against apologetics; it is against bad apologetics. You see, I am convinced evolution is so bad that all Christians readily recognize it as that. But the wolf in sheep’s clothing, the Calvinist drawing a soul away from faith to reason, is to be warned against. ... I speak against using creationist materials without first teaching faith alone. I speak against using creationist materials without first teaching the uncertainty with any and all scientific methods. A faith leaning on science will collapse when the crutches are removed.”<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Stan Bauer, “From the Development Office,” in *Principal’s Notes*, 33:7 (April 2011) 2. Mr. Bauer is the development director at Evergreen Lutheran High School. [http://www.elhs.org/home/140001978/140001978/docs/principal-ap0ss%20notes%20for%20april%202011.pdf?sec\\_id=140001978](http://www.elhs.org/home/140001978/140001978/docs/principal-ap0ss%20notes%20for%20april%202011.pdf?sec_id=140001978) (accessed January 21, 2014).

<sup>5</sup> Richard L. Gurgel, *This We Believe: Questions and Answers* (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2006), 62.

<sup>6</sup> John F. Brug, review of Darrel Kautz, “The Origin of Living Things,” *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*, 86:3 (Summer 1989), 235.

<sup>7</sup> Martin Sponholz, “Idols Of The Market-Place,” October 25, 1978, 32-35. (paper written in response to a critical letter from David Golisch regarding Sponholz’s paper, “Teaching Creation And Science”).

**Logical Fallacy**

A basic premise of the “True Science” apologetic is a logical fallacy.<sup>8</sup> We can claim “Nothing in science contradicts the Bible’s creation account,” because we have defined science as that which does not disagree with or negate Scripture. The “True Science” apologetic commits the “No True Scotsman” fallacy, in which a person uses biased word definitions to protect his argument.

**Two Views of Science**

Tables 1, 2, and 3 compare the definition of science used in these two apologetics. There is variation on both sides, so many will say these tables do not exactly reflect their personal beliefs. These tables list some of the more common claims I have heard from each side, often using the exact words of individuals using these apologetics. Some people take a middle ground by advancing some claims from each column. Others may hold to a variation not covered in either column. I hold to Apologetic B.

**TABLE 1**

<b>Apologetic A ("True Science")</b>	<b>Apologetic B</b>
Science leads to Truth.	Science leads to temporary “truth,” which is often not truth and is replaced.
God created nature. Man discovers the laws of nature and calls them the laws of science. So God created the laws of science. The laws of science are Truth.	God created nature. Man uses his flawed intellect to study nature. Man created the laws of science. The laws of science are flawed and incomplete explanations of nature.
Science and the Bible <u>ARE</u> in harmony, when both are properly understood. What our Creator reveals in nature (what God reveals in science) is always in harmony with what that same God reveals in Scripture. God does not lie.	Science and the Bible sometimes are <u>NOT</u> in harmony. Nature and science are not the same. Science is mankind’s flawed and incomplete attempt to understand and explain nature. Scripture is never in error, science is sometimes in error.

<sup>8</sup> A logical fallacy is an error in reasoning.

## **Who Decides What Science Is?**

The scientific community overwhelmingly supports evolution as science. If scientists decide what is and what is not science, then evolution is science and it has evidence. If scientists do not define science, then who does? If God or Scripture defines science, then can an atheist do science, or can only Christians do science?

Science is mankind's attempt to explain nature. This very basic definition can be tightened and refined in many ways, such as by adding the ability to test and/or falsify, or by adding that a body of knowledge is accumulated, but it is still about people trying to understand and explain the world around them. Science is a human activity, not an activity of God. It is an attempt to explain and not a final certain truth. The truth in science, such as its theories and laws, is often revised or completely replaced as new discoveries are made. Science is a body of knowledge which must be communicated to others. Finally, science is a study of nature, NOT nature itself. This definition conforms with that taught at our WELS high schools and colleges, and with that taught by the National Academy of Science.<sup>9</sup>

**TABLE 2**

<b>Apologetic A ("True Science")</b>	<b>Apologetic B</b>
Science is defined by God and Scripture.	Science is defined by the greater scientific community.
Evolution is <u>NOT</u> science. Evolution is false science, not true science. True science (science correctly understood) is science that is demonstrably true and also does not violate Scripture.	Evolution <u>IS</u> science, because it is accepted as science by the greater scientific community.

## **Evidence for Evolution**

I personally find the evidence for evolution amazingly poor, because I am aware of the many holes and unsupported presuppositions in the evidence for evolution. In my opinion, the scientific evidence for creation is so much stronger. We need to proclaim that message! That said, there is evidence for evolution, and many people, both Christians and non-Christians — including many scientists — find that evidence compelling.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Mark Bergemann, "True Science": A Bad Apologetic Method Rejected in the WELS, an unpublished research paper prepared for discussion by the Lutheran Science Institute (LSI) Board (March 13, 2013; updated April 22, 2013), 4,5. Copies can be requested from the author at [MarkBergemann@yahoo.com](mailto:MarkBergemann@yahoo.com).

<sup>10</sup> Bergemann, see pages 9 and 10 for examples of evidence for evolution.

TABLE 3

Apologetic A ("True Science")	Apologetic B
Evolution has <u>NO</u> evidence. Evidence is certain solid proof. There can only be evidence for something true, like creation. There can be no evidence for something false, like evolution. If something is evidence for both creation and evolution, then that is evidence for neither.	Evolution <u>HAS</u> evidence. False things, like evolution, often do have evidence. While the evidence for evolution often seems very weak to a creationist, that evidence is seen by many as very compelling.
Evolution can be proven false using science alone.	Evolution is overwhelmingly accepted by the scientific community as valid, based on the evidence.

### ***"True Science" Rejected in the WELS***

I searched online databases and my personal library, finding well over 1,000 WELS articles, essays, books, and statements addressing science issues (some as the main theme, some as a side comment). I examined these for "True Science" statements similar to those listed above, and for statements making an opposing claim. Multiple methods (some listed below) were utilized to examine over 110 quotes from over 60 WELS authors. Each approach concluded that the "True Science" apologetic has been overwhelmingly rejected in the WELS for the past 30 years. I presented these findings to the LSI Board at its March 13, 2013 meeting, in the form of a 57 page research paper.<sup>11</sup>

Quotes from WELS high school and college teachers made use of the "True Science" apologetic (supporting that apologetic) prior to 1982 (11 to 3), but since then their quotes have opposed the "True Science" apologetic (24 to 1).<sup>12</sup>

The leaders of workshops at Martin Luther College, Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary, and of other WELS workshops, chose presenters whose message included opposition to "True Science." Over the 62 years covered in this study, 15 workshops were found to have presentations opposing "True Science" and no workshops were found to have presentations supporting "True Science."<sup>13</sup>

The leaders of pastoral conferences and teacher conferences chose presenters whose message included opposition to "True Science." Since 1979, 14 conferences had presentations opposing "True Science" and no conferences had presentations supporting "True Science."<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Bergemann.

<sup>12</sup> Bergemann, 56.

<sup>13</sup> Bergemann, 55.

<sup>14</sup> Bergemann, 55.



Overall, WELS articles supported “True Science” (by making “True Science” claims) from 1950-1979 (19 to 6), and rejected “True Science” (by making opposing claims) from 1980-2013 (78 to 9).<sup>15</sup>

The WELS Conference of Presidents (COP) has at least partially rejected the “True Science” apologetic in an official statement. The “True Science” apologetic claims that science can prove evolution to be false. That claim is rejected by the COP with their words:

Pastors, teachers, and presenters [are] not to present as factual anything that goes beyond what Scripture says on any issue that lies in the realm of scientific observation and theoretical explanation ... there are scientific theories that do, in fact, violate statements of Scripture and must be rejected – not on the basis of science but on the basis of clear statements of Scripture.<sup>16</sup>

## **Science and Miracles**

Modern science does not allow for miracles. This has worked very well in producing our technological world. As an engineer, I utilized science my entire career without once taking miracles into account (and I believe in miracles). All of science is based on natural causes, including medicine, weather forecasting, genetics, and all other branches of science. This also holds true when science is used to understand events from the distant past, such as the eruption of Mt. Vesuvius which destroyed Pompeii, or the conclusion that glacial ice sheets shaped the North American landscape.

When science alone is used to determine the origin of something which was a result of a miracle, science fails, because science does not allow for miracles.<sup>17</sup> Christians who accept what God reveals in Scripture, know that God miraculously created every kind of animal, and that the universe is not billions of years old. Such Christians would never conclude that one kind of animal changed into a new kind, or that sedimentary rock layers were laid down over billions of years, because those conclusions go against Scripture.

Creationists and evolutionists use the same scientific process. They use the same science. The creationist allows his belief in the Creator God to guide his scientific observations and conclusions. The evolutionist allows his belief that there is no creator god to guide his scientific observations and

---

<sup>15</sup> Bergemann, 50.

<sup>16</sup> “The Conference of Presidents (COP) ... discussed how matters relating to creation and the flood are addressed in WELS publications and presentations. While scientific explanations are sometimes offered to explain or understand the biblical teachings regarding creation and the flood, the COP reaffirmed the importance of recognizing that these explanations are to be viewed as scientific theories only. The district presidents will be reminding pastors, teachers, and presenters not to present as factual anything that goes beyond what Scripture says on any issue that lies in the realm of scientific observation and theoretical explanation. The COP recognizes that there are scientific theories that do, in fact, violate statements of Scripture and must be rejected – not on the basis of science but on the basis of clear statements of Scripture. ... Our synod has entrusted the district presidents as the supervisors of doctrine and practice and has called them to serve as the pastors of their respective districts.” Mark Schroeder, “Presidents Discuss Creation, Other Issues,” *Together* (October 18, 2011), <http://www.wels.net/news-events/presidents-discuss-creation-other-issues> (accessed January 21, 2014).

<sup>17</sup> “When science concludes that we have evolved by natural processes from chemical to mankind and were not created, it is wrong. This is a limitation of science; it can discover only natural causes.” Dawn J. Ferch, “Summary: Scientific Methods,” in *Discovering God’s Creation – A Guidebook to Hands-on Science*, ed. Paul Boehlke, Roger Klockziem, and John Paulsen (New Ulm: The Printshop Martin Luther College, 1997), pdf page 45. <http://mlc-wels.edu/divisions/math-science/discovering-gods-creation> (accessed January 21, 2014)

conclusions.<sup>18</sup> Evolutionists use science to develop the best stories they can devise about origins without a creator god.<sup>19</sup>

The “True Science” apologetic attempts to redefine science, by making science conform to Scripture. Science that does not conform to Scripture is considered “false science.” This is a special non-standard view of science. Non-Christians, and even most Christians, use the standard definition of science, and in most cases have never even heard of this special Christianized definition of science.

We are all concerned that the temptation of evolution is pulling so many away from faith in Christ, but proclaiming a special Christian view of science is a bad apologetic.

*Mark Bergemann, a retired electrical engineer, serves as president of LSI. He holds a B.S. from UW-Milwaukee and is an evangelism leader at Good Shepherd's Ev. Lutheran Church in West Allis, Wisconsin.*

---

<sup>18</sup> “The atheistic evolutionist chooses one interpretation because his presuppositions (not the evidence) cannot allow the possibility of a designer. The Christian chooses the other explanation because his presuppositions come from what Scripture says.” *WELS Topical Q&A*, in the evolution category, #3 of 38. Captured in an archive, [http://arkiv.lbk.cc/faq/site.pl@1518cutopic\\_topicid73cuiitem\\_itemid10025.htm](http://arkiv.lbk.cc/faq/site.pl@1518cutopic_topicid73cuiitem_itemid10025.htm) (accessed October 22, 2013)

<sup>19</sup> “We should realize that evolution is internally logical in view of the presuppositions built into the current scientific paradigm. It is man’s best effort at a natural explanation of how we have come to be here.” Paul Boehlke, “Science: Philosophy & Objectives Based on Scripture” (paper presented at the School Visitors Workshop, Dr. Martin Luther College, New Ulm, August 1-3 1978) 4. <http://www.wlssays.net/files/BoehlkeScience.pdf> (accessed October 22, 2013)

# TWO CREATION APOLOGETICS OR TWO SCIENCES?

by Warren Krug

The “Two Apologetics” paper amply demonstrates that some Christians have said or written things concerning science which do not always appear to be in harmony. The paper also has value in wisely warning us not to turn science into a means of grace. All of us would agree that science by itself can't save anyone's soul.

However, as a former teacher and longtime editor of LSI, I am skeptical that there exist two clearly defined and conflicting creation apologetics, one of which is being called True Science. Prior to this idea of two apologetics being raised, I had never heard of it. My search of the WELS website did not find any reference to a True Science apologetic or conflict, either current or in the past. The neat tables describing Apologetic A and Apologetic B which the author has provided are his own creation.

The only major philosophical differences between Genesis-defending Christians with which I have had experience is between those who want little or nothing to do with creationism and those who see in creation science a valuable tool for helping remove stumbling blocks or knock down barriers to receiving the Gospel. For those who already have the Gospel, I believe creation science can also be a valuable aid in helping to deflect the temptations of Satan as he tries to get people to abandon their Christian faith, as I am convinced it did for me in my college days. Of course, creation science must ultimately need to lead people whose faith is under attack to the means of grace for them to receive and retain true saving faith in Jesus.

Perhaps Ken Ham has provided a better way to understand the issues raised in the “Two Apologetics” paper rather than invoking the suggestion of two creation apologetics. In his debate with Bill Nye earlier this year, Ham reminded us that there are two kinds of science. First, there is *operational or observational science*, which an article from Answers in Genesis defines as “a systematic approach to understanding that uses observable, testable, repeatable, and falsifiable experimentation to understand how nature commonly behaves.”<sup>1</sup> Operational science makes use of the acclaimed scientific method. Operational science is responsible for putting men on the moon, for conquering diseases such as polio and smallpox, and for modern technological innovations.

Second, there is *historical or origins science* which investigates alleged events in the past. However, the AiG article says “the past is not directly observable, testable, repeatable, or falsifiable; so interpretations of past events present greater challenges than interpretations involving operational science.”<sup>2</sup> Historical science, which has given us the controversial theories of evolution and the Big Bang, relies heavily on assumptions and is supported by only shallow or superficial evidence. As an example of this shallow evidence I would suggest the fossils. Fossils of alleged human ancestors tend to be seriously fragmented and incomplete. A specific example is the famous Lucy fossil, who is missing about three-quarters of her skeleton. Paleontologists then have considerable liberty to interpret these fossils in such a way that the fossils more closely match the scientists' presuppositions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Roger Patterson, “Chapter 1—What is Science?” (Answers in Genesis, 2007). <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/ee/what-is-science> (accessed May 14, 2014)

<sup>2</sup> Patterson, “Chapter 1—What is Science?” (2007).

When creationist writers and speakers, such as myself, use terms like “true science” or “real science,” we are referring to discoveries made by operational science which certainly appear to be scientific truths or facts. For example, no one doubts that the Earth is a globe, or that a water molecule includes two hydrogen atoms and one oxygen atom, or that scurvy is caused by a deficiency of vitamin C. Engineers could not invent anything and doctors could cure no one if they did not rely upon accepted scientific truths in physics and medicine, respectively. While science is, by definition, always a discipline in search of the truth, no one is standing around waiting for the plethora of accepted facts discovered through observational science to be overturned. However, it is true that, on occasion, new research has debunked or called into question some generally accepted truths. An example is the former belief that trans fats were a healthier option to saturated fat, an idea now being discarded. Yet, these exceptions are relatively rare and only prove science, even operational science, can never be as certain as the Word of God.

I believe the conflicting statements of writers and speakers regarding science which the author has uncovered, at least in general, mean these people are not thinking of the same kind of science, even if they may not personally be acquainted with the terms “operational science” and “historical science.” In other words, when writers say “there is no contradiction between science and the Bible” I believe they have operational science in mind, while those who say “there IS a conflict between science and the Bible” likely are thinking of historical science. Those who say there is “no evidence for evolution” undoubtedly mean the evidence set forth by observational science. Those who say “there IS evidence for evolution” surely must mean the shallow evidence to which evolutionists refer. If there were to be any fact or truth in natural science which contradicts the Bible, that would cause a problem. How is it possible for a holy God to contradict Himself, seeing God is both the Creator of nature and the Author of Scripture? If anyone knows how that is possible, please let me know.

The bottom line is that we who write and speak about scientific matters must be careful to clearly define what we mean when we use terms like “science” and “evidence.” On the one hand, we must be careful not to say or write anything that would suggest creation science is a means of grace. On the other hand, we don't want to cast doubt on the doctrine of inerrancy by suggesting scientists might have discovered something that truly discredits Scripture. With the Lord's help, we may avoid confusion just by always clearly defining our terms.

*Warren Krug, a retired teacher, is the editor of the LSI Journal. He holds a B.S. in Education from Concordia University Chicago and a M.S. in Education from Oklahoma State University. He is a member of Trinity Lutheran, Caledonia, Wisconsin.*



## True Science Debate – A Personal Opinion

*by Bruce Holman, PhD*

Although I see no false doctrine inherent in either apologetic, inviting the reader to choose between opposing positions of adiaphora invites controversy rather than brotherly discussion. Therefore, I will not state a preference for either, but rather I will speak to the unnecessary divisions that such an approach can produce. If anyone is interested in a useful course for my own apologetic, I would refer you to my paper: A Modern Lutheran Apologetic. But putting forward any particular plan designed to further the Gospel does not in itself denigrate any other approach the Spirit may lead individuals to take.

An unnecessary division might occur when those espousing Apologetic A argue that their approach should be used to the exclusion of Apologetic B. This attitude fails to recognize that objective facts have been used in the presentation of the Gospel throughout the history of mankind. This is discussed thoroughly in my paper on Apologetics. To be blunt, such an attitude would look down on Thomas who perhaps insolently cried out for objective verification of Jesus' resurrection. Yet Jesus gave him that evidence. We all wish we had childlike faith which never needs confirmation, but in our fallen state we do not often have such a faith,

Another pitfall would be for those of Apologetic B to turn creation science observations into a purely scientific discussion. This approach taken for example by the intelligent design movement ignores the point of such discussions and blocks the means of grace. LSI has never been involved in that kind of activity. Every LSI blog post for example seems to be chosen by the editor for its relevance to the gospel, and he never fails to use the opportunity to glorify our Savior and his work.

It is my prayer that our church finds the wisdom to be united in the full use of the diversity of gifts that the Holy Spirit has given us.

*Dr. Bruce Holman is the executive director of the Lutheran Science Institute. He is a member of St. Marcus Lutheran in Milwaukee.*

# Commentary on True Science

by Patrick Winkler, P.E.

I appreciate when distinctions are made. They are often instructive or at least offer a touchstone for other learning opportunities and discussions. This is especially true in the areas of theology, science, creation, and evolution. Distinctions assist both author and reader in determining not only what is being discussed but also what is *not* being discussed. Distinctions help us by emphasizing and categorizing concepts that would have otherwise remained obscure.

The current issue of the LSI Journal includes two articles ("Two Creation Apologetics" and "A Comparison of Apologetics – and a Personal View") which offer the reader a number of edifying distinctions as two creationist apologetic approaches are contrasted. In so doing, there are several noteworthy points presented which I highlight for our readers:

1) As confessional Lutherans, we know and believe with absolute certainty that God created the universe some thousands of years ago in six 24-hour periods. From this perspective, we therefore conclude that any scientific assertion which says otherwise is in error and offers a conclusion that is false. For example, from the witness of Scripture, we are absolutely certain that the scientific evolutionary theory of universal common descent is not true.

However, knowing from Scripture that the scientific evolutionary theory of universal common descent is a false theory does not necessarily mean that the theory is scientifically unreasonable and nonlogical. Those who have attended classes in evolutionary biology or stellar astronomy often find that the scientific basis is very reasonable and well thought out.

So how can these two exist side-by-side? How can there be scientific evidence suggesting that something is true, yet we know from Scripture that it is false? Under these circumstances it is most helpful for the Christian to recognize how science understands *final truth*. The National Academy of Sciences points out that truths asserted by science are not to be considered *final truth* but are to be considered incomplete since they are always based *only* on what we know and what we assume, *today*.<sup>1</sup> Such definitions are also reiterated elsewhere by other academic institutions.<sup>2</sup> The implication of this is that while evolution often offers very reasonable, scientific correlations for some observations in the world, this does not mean that such conclusions are finally correct. This is the very reason why *science* can still be scientific yet draw conclusions that are false. Science makes observations, includes scientific and philosophical assumptions, draws conclusions, and makes predictions which correlate with observations (although, such

---

<sup>1</sup> The reader should take note of the definition of "Fact" in "Science and Creationism: A View from the National Academy of Sciences, Second Edition" (National Academy of Sciences, 1999): 2. <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/6024.html> (accessed May 17, 2014). The reader should also note how "final truth" is referred to by the scientific community in "Teaching About Evolution and the Nature of Science" (National Academy of Sciences, 1998): 30. <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/5787.html> (accessed May 17, 2014)

<sup>2</sup> For example, the reader is referred to "Misconceptions about science." Understanding Science. University of California Museum of Paleontology. <http://undsci.berkeley.edu/teaching/misconceptions.php#b2> (accessed May 17, 2014) as well as "Characteristics of Science" Understanding Science. University of California Museum of Paleontology. <http://evolution.berkeley.edu/evosite/nature/llcharacteristics.shtml> (accessed May 17, 2014)

correlations do not imply that the actual cause and effect is understood). Such conclusions might ultimately be shown to be scientifically false and also might not agree with the Bible.

2) Definitions that are adopted for terms influence what one says and what one doesn't say about any particular topic. For example, if one defines *death* as *ceasing to exist*, what is said about death would be completely different than if one defines *death* as a *separation of soul and body*. In the same way, the manner in which *science* and *truth* are defined influences what is said, what is not said, what is assumed, and what is heard when discussing creation and evolution topics. The *True Science* concept described in the two articles ("Two Creation Apologetics" and "A Comparison of Apologetics – and a Personal View") as Apologetic A assumes one set of definitions while Apologetic B assumes another. I think it best to use the term *science* as it is used conventionally in scientific literature (this definition is reflected by Apologetic B in "A Comparison of Apologetics") when discussing creation and evolution topics in order to be as clear and unambiguous as possible.

The reader should also note that just because the specific term *True Science* might rarely be used in print does not mean that the concept is rarely used. In the same way, even though the term *Trinity* is not found in the Bible, the concept of the Trinity is described quite often in Scripture.

3) Finally, it is beneficial for Christian students to be aware of the potential for substituting other objects of faith in place of God's gracious promises to us through Christ in His Word. This change in the object of one's trust from reliance on the absolute certainty of God's promises to reliance on tentative scientific certainty often involves a very subtle shift in the heart of the individual. When, for example, one grows despondent upon hearing that a creation science conclusion has been shown to be scientifically *not* valid -- that shift has already taken place. This is discussed further in the section entitled "Bypassing the Means of Grace" in "A Comparison of Apologetics – and a Personal View".

The well-substantiated presentation in the two articles, "Two Creation Apologetics" and "A Comparison of Apologetics – and a Personal View" are certainly worthwhile for consideration, study, and discussion among our readership.

*Patrick Winkler, P.E., serves as Vice President of LSI. He has worked for fifteen years as a mechanical engineer in the Milwaukee area and earned a M.S. Engineering at the University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee. Prior to that, he served as pastor at Prince of Peace Lutheran Church (Yucaipa, CA) and also at Grace Evangelical Lutheran Church (Casa Grande, AZ). Email: runx10@gmail.com*

# ***Why Evolution Cannot Even Be Considered Scientific***

*By Jeffrey Stueber*

It's all in the marketing. A man comes to your house selling quality low-cost phone service. You take him up on his offer, and then you realize lower cost service is poor service. The phone connection is constantly full of static or dropped in the middle of a call, there are hidden charges on your bill you weren't expecting, and the customer service is non-existent. You are a disappointed customer once you realize you are not getting what you were promised.

Evolutionists market their beliefs according to several mythical claims. First, they claim creationism is complete nonsense that is foisted upon the public in various forms - the Intelligent Design movement one of them. Second, they claim evolution is science and the only possible explanation for the existence of biological life forms. Evolutionists, and perhaps some Christians, accept the claims of this packaging without question.

Before we ascertain the scientific nature of evolution, we must ascertain the nature of science. Science explains using natural laws, natural occurrences, or intelligent or semi-intelligent design. What makes objects of observation capable of being scientifically studied is their ability to be analyzed and quantified in ways that can be understood by different scientists at different times and laymen as well. What makes explanations scientific is their possibility of being verified or falsified. For example, Sociology is a science because one can empirically study the objects of that science: us. A scientific explanation for our behavior can be determined to be true or false by testing it against the behavior of the humans being studied. The claim that water freezes at 32 degrees Fahrenheit is a scientific claim because we can verify it. However, most people will consider the predictions in newspaper horoscopes to be unscientific because they are not precise to the extent we can verify what they claim.

I claim that, using current evolutionists' methodology, many of their claims cannot be validated as true or false. This is because they claim that specific evidence validates the truth of evolution, but when contrary data appears they claim that is evidence as well. Cornelius Hunter explains the problem well: "There is nothing wrong with a theory that is comfortable with different outcomes, but there is something wrong when one of those outcomes is then claimed as supporting evidence. If a theory can predict both A and not-A, then neither A nor not-A can be used as evidence for the theory."<sup>1</sup> Evolution, as it is promoted today, does exactly this as I show below.

## ***The Fossil Record***

Evolutionary theory postulates that life originated as primitive single-cell organisms that evolved into multi-cell organisms and then man through a series of intermediate steps without any divine interference or creation. The existences of many transitional fossils formed the bedrock of Darwin's theory, and their absence plagued Darwin who devoted a lengthy apology for this fact: "[I]t cannot be doubted that the geological record, viewed as a whole, is extremely imperfect; but if we confine our attention to any one formation, it becomes much more difficult to understand why we do not therein find closely graduated varieties between the allied species which lived at its commencement and at its close." Darwin gave us a plausible scientific test for his theory: "If numerous species, belonging to the same genera or families, have

---

<sup>1</sup> Cornelius Hunter, *Darwin's God: Evolution and the Problem of Evil* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2001), 38.



really started into life at once, the fact would be fatal to the theory of evolution, through natural selection.”<sup>2</sup> The test, then, to disprove the evolutionary hypothesis would be to find numerous instances of missing intermediate fossils, and rather than being the exception, the absence of these fossils is the rule.

However, Darwin removed this test by supposing the fossil record is very incomplete and often therefore leads us to the wrong conclusions. “In all cases,” he claimed, “positive paleontological evidence may be implicitly trusted; negative evidence is worthless, as experience has so often shown.”<sup>3</sup> Darwin warned us that if we don’t keep this in mind, we might infer that God brought about these animals.

We continually forget how large the world is, compared with the area over which our geological formations have been carefully examined; we forget that groups of species may elsewhere have long existed, and have slowly multiplied, before they invaded the ancient archipelagoes of Europe and the United States. We do not make due allowances for the intervals of time which have elapsed between our consecutive formations, - longer perhaps in many cases than the time required for the accumulation of each formation. These intervals will have given time for the multiplication of species from some one parent-form: and in the succeeding formation, such groups or species will appear as if suddenly created.<sup>4</sup>

One can only scientifically assert the fossil record is incomplete if one infers there are fossils to be found. Similarly, one can only infer there is a bloody glove to be found if a man used a glove while committing a murder. If the man did not wear the glove while committing the murder, we would not expect to find the bloody glove. If creationism is true, we should not expect to find intermediates. Although Darwin provided us with a plausible scientific test for his evolutionist hypothesis, he provided himself a door through which to escape if the evidence doesn’t fit his theory. What he essentially did is begin a process that has continued today: blaming the evidence rather than the theory.

After years of searching for transitional fossils, scientists have found that the fossil record often is dominated by stasis followed by periods of rapid change with few connecting links. Steven Stanley informs us that the fossil record has forced us to revise the conventional view of evolution because “major evolutionary transitions have been wrought during episodes of rapid change, when new species have quickly budded off from old ones [and] evolution has moved by fits and starts.”<sup>5</sup> This has produced a debate among evolutionists between two camps – the gradualists and the punctuationalists. The former are loyal to Darwin’s original idea of gradual change, and it was Darwin who noted that the evolution of one group from its parent form “must have been an extremely slow process.”<sup>6</sup> The latter, however, imply that species have changed rapidly with few connecting links.

Stanley suggests that, for the remains of humans, horses, and many other animals, “most change has taken place so rapidly and in such confined geographic areas that it is simply not documented by our imperfect fossil record.” For example, the bowfin fish family Amiidae is well represented in the fossil record and yet, according to Stanley, there has not been substantial change to it. During the latter Cretaceous, bowfins became slightly more elongate, but during their entire sixty-five million years of the Cenozoic, they evolved in only trivial ways. Lungfish diversified rapidly, but their number of lineages declined where they remain the same as today. Stanley says we find this pattern of stasis for sturgeon fish, snapping turtles,

---

<sup>2</sup> Charles Darwin, *The Origin of the Species* (New York: New American Library of the World, 1958), 298, 305.

<sup>3</sup> Darwin, 305.

<sup>4</sup> Darwin, 305.

<sup>5</sup> Steven Stanley, *The New Evolutionary Timetable* (New York: BasicBooks, 1981), 3.

<sup>6</sup> Darwin, 305.

alligators, and aardvarks, for instance.<sup>7</sup> Stanley favors the punctuated equilibrium model but does show that species change within only specific limits. This matches what we would expect if genetic homeostasis<sup>8</sup> is true and matches what we would expect from created “kinds” as the Bible says. Stanley, of course, does not accept this conclusion.

Fourteen years after Stanley published his revised evolutionist timetable, J. Madeleine Nash invoked non-Darwinian evolution as the explanation for missing fossils – particularly between the pre-Cambrian and Cambrian layers. Once again, species change little and then new species arise rapidly.

The more scientists struggle to explain the Cambrian explosion, the more singular it seems. And just as the peculiar behavior of light forced physicists to conclude that Newton's laws were incomplete, so the Cambrian explosion has caused experts to wonder if the twin Darwinian imperatives of genetic variation and natural selection provide an adequate framework for understanding evolution. “What Darwin described in the *Origin of Species*,” observes Queen's University paleontologist Narbonne, “was the steady background kind of evolution. But there also seems to be a non-Darwinian kind of evolution that functions over extremely short time periods and that's where all the action is.”<sup>9</sup>

Today these ideas still reign. The pbs.org web site claims “The well-preserved fossil record of bryozoans [a phylum of aquatic invertebrate animals] shows that one species first appeared about 140 million years ago and remained unchanged for its first 40 million years. Then there was an explosion of diversification, followed by another period of stability for vast amounts of time.” The explosion, it suggests, is attributed to punctuated equilibrium.<sup>10</sup> The University of California Museum of Paleontology claims “it is also important to note that we observe examples of gradual, non-punctuated, evolution in the fossil record too” and suggests the question that needs to be answered is “what are the relative frequencies of punctuated and gradual change?”<sup>11</sup> Lastly, an article in the *International Journal of Bio-Science and Bio-Technology* claims “Gradualism and punctuated equilibrium are two ways in which the evolution of a species can occur. . . Scientists think that species with a shorter evolution evolved mostly by punctuated equilibrium, and those with a longer evolution evolved mostly by gradualism.”<sup>12</sup> Apparently it escapes the authors of this article that having it both ways makes evolution unfalsifiable as a theory. Does evolutionist theory predict intermediate fossils or their absence due to punctuated equilibrium? It cannot predict both A and not-A.

Why would evolutionists favor the punctuated equilibrium model? Richard Dawkins is refreshingly honest. Speaking about the gap in fossils between the Cambrian and pre-Cambrian layers, Dawkins remarks that animal fossils in the Cambrian are “already in an advanced state of evolution . . . as though they were just planted there, without any evolutionary history.” Evolutionists of all kinds, he says, do really believe the gap is real, but this gap “is simply due to the fact that, for some reason, very few fossils have lasted from periods before about 600 million years ago.” Here is an opportunity for scientists to either affirm or reject special creation based on the fossil record, except, as Dawkins admits, gradualists and punctuationists both have bias against that belief no matter what the evidence: “Both schools of thought

---

<sup>7</sup> Stanley, 5, 83-84.

<sup>8</sup> Homeostasis is the tendency of a system to change very little. When applied to species, what it means is that animals may change a small amount (as in Darwin's finches changing their beak size), but no further.

<sup>9</sup> J. Madeleine Nash, “When Life Exploded,” *Time*, December 4, 1995, 74.

<sup>10</sup> [http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/evolution/library/03/5/1\\_035\\_01.html](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/evolution/library/03/5/1_035_01.html).

<sup>11</sup> <http://evolution.berkeley.edu/evosite/evo101/VIIA1bPunctuated.shtml>.

<sup>12</sup> [http://www.sersc.org/journals/IJBSBT/vol3\\_no4/3.pdf](http://www.sersc.org/journals/IJBSBT/vol3_no4/3.pdf).

agree that the only alternative explanation of the sudden appearance of so many complex animal types in the Cambrian era is divine creation, and both would reject this alternative.”<sup>13</sup>

The rapid generation of life forms in strata is part of the disproof that Darwin provided us in his *Origin*. There is always a desire to fit intermediates into evolutionist theory, but when intermediates are rare punctuated equilibrium fills the void. Thus, evolutionary theory explains intermediate fossils (“A”) when they exist and when they do not exist (“not-A”). In this case, neither can be used as evidence for evolution.

### **Similarity of Species**

Philip Kitcher says creationists should not argue that because there is disagreement among evolutionists over how evolution happened, that therefore it is false. Evolution, he says, is a certainty because of physical similarities between species – as in the limbs of vertebrates such as bats, horses, and humans.<sup>14</sup> Evolutionists think nothing else could produce such similarities other than evolution.

Homology is the study of bodily structures that are strikingly similar to each other, and homologous structures are those organs: the forelimb of the bat, porpoise, horse, and human for instance. According to Jonathan Wells, Darwin believed homologous organs are inherited from a common ancestor. Darwin’s followers, however, defined homology to be features inherited from a common ancestor. Homologous structures, therefore, cannot be used as evidence for evolution because to do so leaves one mired in circular logic. An evolutionist could tell you homologous organs are evidence of common descent when, in fact, homologous organs are, by definition, organs that came about because of common descent. Wells suggests we can break the cycle by, for instance, recognizing similarities in structure, calling them homologous, but not assuming they derive from a common ancestor.<sup>15</sup>

However, characteristics controlled by identical genes are not necessarily homologous and homologous structures are not necessarily controlled by identical genes. One example is the genes that control segment formation in insects. Fruit flies require a gene called “even-skipped,” but other insects like locusts and wasps do not need it.<sup>16</sup> This discovery a decade before Kitcher wrote his scathing attack on creationism apparently escaped his notice.

If evolutionists argue that similar organs come from a common ancestor, then, if they want to use them as evidence for evolution, they should not exist among animals that do not share a common ancestor. However, Simon Conway Morris provides us with examples of a phenomenon he calls “convergence” in which similar organs evolved independently, not from a common ancestor, because there are strong “inevitabilities” in evolution. Morris says one problem accepting evolution comes from the problem of explaining how we, with feelings of purpose and moral identity, arose by processes that had no purpose. If, however, he says, “we can begin to demonstrate that organic evolution contains deeper structures and

---

<sup>13</sup> Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker: Why the Evidence of Evolution Reveals a Universe Without Design* (New York: Norton, 1987), 229-230.

<sup>14</sup> Philip Kitcher, *Abusing Science: The Case Against Creationism* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1982), 151.

<sup>15</sup> Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution: Science or Myth? Why Much of What We Teach About Evolution is Wrong* (Washington DC: Regnery, 2000), chap. 4.

<sup>16</sup> Wells, 73-74

potentialities, if not inevitabilities, then perhaps we can begin to move away from the dreary materialism of much current thinking with its agenda of a world now open to limitless manipulation.”<sup>17</sup>

Morris offers us an analogy to help us understand how life navigates toward specific forms. Easter Island is one of the remotest places on Earth and it seems unlikely that Polynesian boaters would find the island by accident. However, given the expert navigation techniques of the Polynesians, the island’s discovery was inevitable. So too, he says, there are biological “islands” that are found by life’s search strategies, and it is no wonder, as he says, that “the argument for design and intelligent planning have such a perennial appeal.”<sup>18</sup> The irony is that Morris uses human intelligent planning to show that an unintelligent purposeless process can do intelligent searches.

This idea of convergent evolution is well-represented in scientific literature. For example, an article in Science Daily cites the convergent evolution of the ability to use sound waves to detect objects (echolocation) as in bats and dolphins.<sup>19</sup> An article on the pbs.org web site talks about fish in the waters of Antarctica using a type of antifreeze (molecules called glycoproteins that circulate in the blood of the fish) in their systems that keep them from freezing. Surprisingly, fish on the other end of the globe do this as well, and this article suggests the two fish species diverged long before they evolved this ability.<sup>20</sup>

Yet, evolutionists generally acknowledge that evolution’s outcomes are rare. Stephen Gould has suggested that if you “wind back life’s tape to the dawn of time and let it play again . . . you will never get humans a second time.”<sup>21</sup> If this is true, then it is reasonable to assert that numerous organs or bodily features are unlikely to evolve more than once. What, then, might explain the numerous examples of similar organs existing that do not owe their origin to a common ancestor?

Similarity of organs and limbs are used as evidence for evolution from a common ancestor, but if there are similar structures in species that did not share an ancestor this fact finds a place under the big tent of evolution in the guise of convergence. Perhaps similar structures are evidence of a common biological plan that might perhaps be in the mind of a divine being. Thus, evolution predicts that organs that are similar show descent from a common ancestor (“A”), but then claims similar organs do not necessarily come from a common ancestor (“not-A”). Therefore, neither can be used as evidence for evolution.

### ***Evolution’s Meaninglessness***

Evolution is perceived as a sloppy process that meanders about not knowing where it is going leaving remnants of poorly crafted organs behind. This is Gould’s claim he uses to buttress creationist arguments that biological organs are cleverly designed.

The second argument – that the imperfection of nature reveals evolution - strikes many people as ironic, for they feel that evolution should be most elegantly displayed in the nearly perfect adaptation expressed by some organisms . . . But perfection could be imposed by a wise creator or evolved by natural selection. Perfection covers the tracks of past history. And past history – the evidence of

---

<sup>17</sup> Simon Conway Morris, *Life’s Solution: Inevitable Humans in a Lonely Universe* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 2003), 2.

<sup>18</sup> Morris, 19-20.

<sup>19</sup> [http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2013/09/13090413254\\_8.htm](http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2013/09/13090413254_8.htm).

<sup>20</sup> [http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/evolution/library/01/4/l\\_014\\_01.html](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/evolution/library/01/4/l_014_01.html).

<sup>21</sup> Stephen Gould, *The Meaning of Life*, David Bender, ed., *Constructing a Life Philosophy: Opposing Viewpoints* (San Diego: Greenhaven Press, 1993), 105.



descent – is the mark of evolution. Evolution lies exposed in the *imperfections* that record a history of descent.<sup>22</sup>

However, evolutionists frequently talk about the intelligently designed nature of our universe and life on Earth. Steven Pinker notes that we see signs of engineering everywhere, particularly the eye because “an eye is too well engineered to have arisen by chance [and] no wart or tumor or product of a big mutation could be lucky enough to have a lens, an iris, a retina, tear ducts, and so on, all perfectly arranged to form an image.” The eye does not function without its connections and Pinker admits that “signs of design in human beings do not stop at the heart or the eye. For all its exquisite engineering, an eye is useless without a brain.”<sup>23</sup> Dawkins says “Biology is the study of complicated things that give the appearance of having been designed for a purpose.”<sup>24</sup> Of course both do not accept that creationism is true even though they see evidence of design. They believe that evolution has given us the *illusion* of design.

Many times evolutionists write as if natural selection has a type of intelligence to it. Stephen Gould writes “[N]atural selection is the major *creative* force of evolutionary change. No one denies that natural selection *will play a negative role* in *eliminating* the unfit. Darwinian theories require that it *create* the fit as well. Selection must do this by *building* adaptations in a series of steps, *preserving* at each stage . . . Selection must *superintend* the process of creation, not just *toss out* the misfits.[emphasis mine]”<sup>25</sup> Just as liberals speak of a “wall of separation” between church and state which does not literally indicate a brick wall, evolutionists write as if natural selection does have creative intelligence even though they would deny ever suggesting such a thing. If their science indicates life came about through intelligent planning, why not take the next step and believe divine intelligence was involved?

On the theistic side of the debate, Jonathan Sarfati has authored a book suggesting there is evidence of divine design in nature, and his arguments revolve around the very machinery-like essence of life that evolutionists speak about. Sarfati does detail reasons to not believe in evolution, but his reasons to believe a creation hypothesis mention scientific discoveries and not just arguments against evolution.<sup>26</sup>

What we are told is that evolution is clumsy and wasteful without purpose, but has produced biological machinery that has purpose. How can something with purpose be produced by something that has no goal or purpose? If you think we have stumbled into the realm of metaphysics, you might be right. Evolution is not just science; it is metaphysics largely dressed up as science.

In fact, examples such as these dominate evolutionist writings. Evolution reveals itself in maladapted parts (“A”), but clearly is flexible so as to accommodate what looks like design (“not-A”). Clearly evolution cannot predict the presence of both animals that appear designed and don’t because to do so causes evolution to explain or predict neither.

### **Genetic Evolution**

The organization New Mexicans for Science and Reason suggested when comparing the molecule cytochrome C between bacteria and modern animals, the differences average out to about 65 percent.

---

<sup>22</sup> Stephen Gould, *Hen’s Teeth and Horses Toes* (New York: Norton, 1983), 258.

<sup>23</sup> Steven Pinker, *The Blank Slate: The Modern Denial of Human Nature* (New York: Viking, 2002), 51-52.

<sup>24</sup> Dawkins, 1.

<sup>25</sup> Stephen Gould, *The Panda’s Thumb* (New York: Norton, 1980), 190.

<sup>26</sup> Jonathan Sarfati, *By Design: Evidence for Nature’s Intelligent Designer – the God of the Bible* (Creation Ministries, 2008).

However, horse and pigeon cytochrome C differ by only 11 percent. This fact they suggest is predicted by evolution.<sup>27</sup> They believe the closer animals are physically the closer they are genetically.

Yet, arguing that DNA is evidence for evolution sometimes leads to absurd conclusions that have no evidence for them. An article by Gareth Cook in the *Boston Globe* tells a story of when researchers at Cambridge-based Broad Institute at Harvard and MIT estimated when human ancestors split from chimpanzees – an estimate 1 million years later than paleontologists believe because of fossil evidence. The Broad Institute team put the chimp and human DNA side by side using a computer to calculate how long the DNA would have changed from one into the other. They found that some parts of the DNA seemed to suggest humans and chimps have been apart longer than other sequences suggest by millions of years. They reconciled these differences by suggesting humans split from chimps and then bred with them later so that the more divergent sequences dated before the split while the less divergent ones dated after the split.<sup>28</sup>

Of course another possibility is that humans didn't split from chimps at all. I know that possibility is unacceptable to Darwinists, but they cannot discount that possibility merely because they cannot accept it. If, perhaps, chimps and humans were created separately with no evolution between them, we would expect there to be similar genetic sequences between the two based on what sequences are needed to perform various biologic operations they have in common. However, one would not be able to construct evolutionary sequences between the two – no more than one can construct an evolutionary sequence between a bicycle and a car. If evolutionists have to affirm belief in evolution by suggesting that humans bred with chimps, then they will believe that over special creation.

Evolutionists believe that non-functional parts of the genetic code are evidence of evolution because no creator would make useless DNA. I agree with them. I do not believe that any divine creator would create useless genetic sequences. However, an article on the Evolution News web site claims pseudogenes (useless genes) are no longer nonfunctional.<sup>29</sup> Let us, however, debate with evolutionists on their own terms.

It stands to reason that if we found genetic algorithms or any algorithms in nature they could be attributed to intelligence since algorithms, by definition, suggest creative purpose toward a goal. Yet, when we find these in life forms we still attribute them to evolution. For instance, in *Scientific American*, John Koza and others discuss how computer programmers are creating software versions of bodily processes like mutations in an area of science called "genetic programming." This article doesn't play to Gould's idea of evolution as a sloppy process. In fact, it says "The first practical commercial area for genetic programming will probably be design. In essence, design is what engineers do eight hours a day and is what evolution does."<sup>30</sup> There is, however, no way to reconcile a wasteful process of evolution with one that does design. Evolutionists cannot have it both ways.

In an article on the talkorigins.com web site (which is heavily laden with evolutionists), Adam Marczyk ruminates on genetic algorithms which are computer programming techniques that mimic evolution's problem solving strategies. Amazingly, Marczyk thinks the evidence of these biological algorithms goes beyond what creationists can claim as evidence for their theory. To me, problem-solving strategies would be the type of ingenious solutions a divine creator would employ but something a wasteful inefficient process like evolution would be unable to use. In this blurb, Marczyk hails the genius of evolution:

---

<sup>27</sup> <http://www.nmsr.org/essay3a.htm>.

<sup>28</sup> In-Young Chang and Jennifer Curry, *Evolution*, Vol. 78, Num. 5 (Hackensack, NJ: H. W. Wilson, 2006), 91-93.

<sup>29</sup> [http://www.evolutionnews.org/2012/08/paper\\_rebuffs\\_v063201.html](http://www.evolutionnews.org/2012/08/paper_rebuffs_v063201.html).

<sup>30</sup> John Koza et. al., "Evolving Intentions," *Scientific American*, Feb. 2003, Vol. 288, issue 2.

As astonishing and counterintuitive as it may seem to some, genetic algorithms have proven to be an enormously powerful and successful problem-solving strategy, dramatically demonstrating the power of evolutionary principles. Genetic algorithms have been used in a wide variety of fields to evolve solutions to problems as difficult as or more difficult than those faced by human designers. Moreover, the solutions they come up with are often more efficient, more elegant, or more complex than anything comparable a human engineer would produce. In some cases, genetic algorithms have come up with solutions that baffle the programmers who wrote the algorithms in the first place!<sup>31</sup>

Yet, this is exactly the kind of evidence Sarfati cites in *By Design*. Atheists often complain about the lack of evidence for God's creation, but in my studies I have found that the evidence is so powerful that they can rhapsodize about it and yet not see it.

Evolutionists believe evolution is a sloppy process with no purpose to it ("A"). That is why they can believe in useless genes; no divine creator would employ them. However, they also believe evolution can produce sophisticated genetic programs in our DNA that astound us ("not-A"). Clearly evolution cannot both

### ***The Survival of the Fittest***

Julian Huxley, in his introduction to Darwin's *Origin*, describes one of Darwin's central tenet: "As many more individuals of each species are born than can possibly survive; and as, consequently, there is a frequently recurring struggle for existence, it follows that any being, if it vary however slightly in any manner profitable to itself, under the complex and sometimes varying conditions of life, will have a better chance of surviving, and thus be naturally selected."<sup>32</sup> The principle of the survival of the fittest shows up today in evolutionist thought particularly in Susan Blackmore's ideas of memes (thoughts) where the fittest thoughts survive.

Humans today are not dominated by competition where the fittest survive. Humans, instead, primarily prosper through cooperation, commerce, and charity. There must have, therefore, been some transition from struggle to cohabitation when humans thought it better to cooperate than to fight. According to evolutionists, however, the tendency to compete to survive lies dormant within us and can surface whenever evolutionists need it as evidence for their theory.

Take, for instance, Fred Edwords explanation of why genocide happens. Quoting Peter Singer, Edwords suggests that the practice of ethnic cleansing confers genetic benefits on the victors by eliminating genetic competition. Surprisingly, Singer finds that Moses' act of declaring war on the Midianites would fit in well with evolutionist ideas because Moses was eliminating genetic competition. However, now we have civilization which, Edwords says, is man's "effort to repeal the law of the jungle" and is "a conspiracy of the weak against the strong for the benefit of all." Edwords says genocide and mass murder will normally confer benefits on the victors, but we must resist these impulses.<sup>33</sup> So, if people massacre each other, or cooperate, evolutionists will claim both circumstances are confirmations of evolution.

---

<sup>31</sup> Adam Marczyk, "Genetic Algorithms and Evolutionary Computation," <http://www.talkorigins.org/faqs/genalg/genalg.html>.

<sup>32</sup> Julian Huxley, introduction to Darwin, *The Origin of the Species*, 29.

<sup>33</sup> Fred Edwords, "Why Genocide?" *The Humanist*, January/February, 2009, <http://thehumanist.org/january-february-2009/why-genocide/>.

This is an example of what David Stove calls the “Cave Man” way of squaring evolutionist theory with the data. What Stove is whimsically saying is that evolutionists often argue that we at once behaved as Cave Men, but not now. We at once time struggled to survive and evolved from that struggle, but we don’t struggle to survive now. Stove says if Darwin’s theory were true, then no species can ever escape the process of natural selection.<sup>34</sup> Our lives should still be engaged in a struggle to survive.

There are other ways evolutionists try to have their cake and eat it too. Robert Wright suggests, in an era where condoms are frequently used, men have sexual liaisons that do not create children because according to evolutionary biology men are still saddled with urges that evolved in our precontraceptive hunter-gatherer past. More sex with more females meant more offspring. Philandering is simply a holdover from our evolutionist past.<sup>35</sup>

Frank Zindler uses this approach but in reverse. He argues we are Cave Men now, but at one time we weren’t. Zindler claims that we are social because evolution has equipped us with nervous systems that make us social. However, anti-social behavior still exists. Why? Zindler answers that we live in a culture that is vastly more complex than the world our Paleolithic ancestors lived in.<sup>36</sup> So at one time we weren’t anti-social, but now we are.

Evolutionary theory is so plastic that it can support both chaos and order. It can support competition and anti-social behavior (“A”) and cooperation and social behavior (“not-A”). It can support sexual philandering (“A”) and sexual marital monogamy (“not-A”). However, theories that predict and explain both are not scientific.

## **Conclusion**

Evolutionists often disagree profusely on what evidence confirms evolution. What they do agree on, however, is that life began as simple organisms that changed and developed into multi-celled organism and humans through a meaningless process that often leaves transitional fossil in its wake and often not. For Darwin, the lack of these fossils was a problem, but he suggested our fossil record was very incomplete. Today, more strata have been unearthed and scientists have found missing fossils are the rule and not the exception. Rather than admit, then, that Darwin’s theory of descent with modification is false, they suggest animals changed rapidly via punctuated equilibrium so as to leave few if any fossils. What evolutionist theory has morphed into, then, is a theory that expects to find intermediates and expects, often, to find their absence. Thus, it is a theory that expects one kind of evidence and its exact opposite. However, creationists would expect few if any intermediate fossils because they believe God created kinds of animals with no evolution between them.

Similarly, evolutionists claim similar body organs (homologous structures) imply descent from a common ancestor. Yet, when scientists discover similar organs among animals that did not share a common ancestor, they explain that as convergence. Yet, similarity of organs between different animals could be taken as evidence of God’s creative ability just as similar engines in automobiles are evidence of common car design among several designers.

---

<sup>34</sup> David Stove, *Darwinian Fairytales: Selfish Genes, Errors of Heredity, and Other Fables of Evolution* (New York: Encounter Books, 1995), 4.

<sup>35</sup> Robert Wright, “Politics Made Me Do It,” *Time*, February 2, 1998, <http://www.cnn.com/ALLPOLITICS/1998/01/26/time/wright.html>.

<sup>36</sup> Frank Zindler, “Ethics Without Gods,” *American Atheist*, February, 1985; reprinted in David Bender, ed., *Constructing a Life Philosophy: Opposing Viewpoints* (San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, 1993), 173.

Evolutionists claim evolution occurs as a result of a process that has no goal or end product in mind. When mankind came about, it was a lucky accident. This meaningless in evolution is necessary because to posit meaning or purpose would be to imply design and perhaps a divine designer. Evolutionists point out organs that appear poorly designed - the retina of the human eye, for instance<sup>37</sup> – but when they encounter organs or processes that appear designed they claim they are explained by evolution as well. However, well-crafted organs would be evidence of design, not a sloppy process like evolution.

Evolutionists also believe life has evolved through a struggle of the fittest where only the best adapted organisms with favorable mutations survive. Yet, humans as a whole do not act like this, and hence we are not explained by evolutionary theory. However, evolutionists assert that humans at one time evolved in a struggle for existence, but decided to do otherwise. Yet how can man change his mind if, as evolutionists often assert, there is no soul or self that can usurp biology and change the mind? Humans actually appear to be more like what the Bible describes: sinful creatures who are often warlike but most often obey inborn ethical commands imparted by God.

What explains this tendency of evolutionists to use one set of evidence for their theory but, often, use the exact opposite as well? Clearly evolutionists often bear animosity toward God and, therefore, are in love with a theory of origins different than Biblical creationism. They are either unaware they have sacrificed sound scientific methodology to prop up their beliefs or are unwilling to fix their situation. Fixing the problem would put evolution in a position to be falsified – a situation they would rather avoid. As of now, they have left evolution in a state where it cannot explain any of its facets I have described in this essay and, as such, has no scientific merit.

*Jeff Stueber is a member of the LSI Board of Directors and a free-lance writer living in Watertown, Wisconsin. He is a member of St. John's Ev. Lutheran Church, Watertown, Wisconsin.*

---

<sup>37</sup> Peter Gurney, "Is Our 'Inverted' Retina Really 'Bad Design'?", *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal*, vol 13, no. 1, <http://www.trueorigin.org/retina.asp>.



# How Can A Lie Like Evolution Have Scientific Evidence?

by Mark Bergemann

## Evolution is a Lie

We can be certain that evolution is wrong when it claims the universe is billions of years old. We can be certain that evolution is wrong when it claims one kind of animal changes into a new kind of animal. We can be certain that evolution is wrong when it claims hydrogen gas changed into people all by itself. Why are we certain? Christians who trust God and His Word know with certainty that these claims are wrong, because these things are contrary to Scripture. Evolution is a lie used by Satan to shipwreck the faith of many.

---

**Our sinful nature desires to  
detach God from his creation.**

---

## Evolution is Incompatible With The Christian Faith

The evolution story is contrary to God's revealed truth in Genesis 1-11. Beyond Genesis, creation and Noah's Flood are taught as true history throughout Scripture. The prophets, Jesus, and the Apostles spoke about Adam, Eve, Cain, Abel, Enoch, Noah, the flood, Eden, creation, the fall into sin, and the curse, as real people and true events.<sup>1</sup> Death and suffering are the result of the sin of Adam and Eve, not the means God used to create animals and people.<sup>2</sup>

So, how can a lie like evolution have scientific evidence?

## Parts of the Evolution Story are True

Some parts of the evolution story are true. In this article, we will take for granted that there is evidence for the parts of evolution which are true. Much of modern science has been woven into the evolution story. Let's list some parts of the evolution story with which a creationist might agree. Natural selection (and selection by humans) does produce new species of plants and animals (but not new Biblical kinds<sup>3</sup>). Many animals (such as dinosaurs) and many plants have gone extinct. A waterfall can erode rock, and in doing so, the waterfall moves upstream. Massive ice sheets probably once covered much of the North American continent, sculpting the landscape. Mountains can increase and decrease in height. Continents seem to be

---

<sup>1</sup> Exodus 20:8-11; 1 Chronicles 1:1; 1 Chronicles 1:1-27; Psalm 90:3; Psalm 103:14; Psalm 104; Ecclesiastes 3:20; Isaiah 54:9; Matthew 19:3-6; Matthew 19:28; Matthew 23:34-35; Matthew 24:36-39; Mark 10:6-9; Luke 3:23-38; Luke 11:50-51; Luke 17:26-27; Acts 3:17-21; Romans 5:12-21; 1 Corinthians 11:8; 1 Corinthians 11:12; 1 Corinthians 15:20-22; 1 Corinthians 15:42-49; 2 Corinthians 11:3; 1 Timothy 2:13-14; Hebrews 11:4; Hebrews 11:5; Hebrews 11:7; Hebrews 12:24; 1 Peter 3:20; 2 Peter 2:5; 2 Peter 3:3-6; 1 John 3:12; Jude 11; Jude 14, Revelation 22:3.

<sup>2</sup> Romans 5:12-21; 1 Corinthians 15:20-49.

<sup>3</sup> Biblical "kinds" of animals are the various animal types which God created during the six days of creation (Genesis 1). Most kinds have diversified into multiple species. The cat family has dozens of species, but probably consists of one or maybe two Biblical kinds. Most cats can interbreed, indicating they are of the same kind.

moving on tectonic plates. There may have been only one continent on earth in the past. Our earth and moon seem to have numerous impacts from asteroids. We have watched stars go supernova. It may be that most of the universe is made of dark matter, which we cannot detect. There may be a super massive black hole at the center of every one of a hundred billion galaxies, including our own Milky Way galaxy. Dark energy may exist and be pushing our universe ever larger in size. None of these conflict with Scripture or with a young universe. In fact, the earth and universe are very much as expected from the creation and flood accounts God has revealed in Scripture.

### **Evidence as Absolute Proof**

Evidence as absolute, complete, and certain proof is rather rare. Some of the few places where there can be absolute proof is in mathematics, geometry, and formal logic. In mathematics, we can provide absolute proof that  $y = 5$  in the statement,  $3y + 7 = 22$ . In geometry, we can provide absolute proof that the Pythagorean Theorem is correct (for calculating the length of the hypotenuse of a right triangle). In formal deductive logic, the claim of a formal deductive statement is true, if the premises are true, and if the conclusion actually does follow from the premises (a valid deductive argument). We can provide absolute proof for the argument: 1) All dogs are mammals. 2) Beagles are dogs. 3) Therefore, beagles are mammals.

Evidence is often presented as a claim that something is likely to be true, not as absolute proof. For instance, in science, evidence supports a claim that something is likely to be true, not absolute/final proof that something is true. The National Academy of Science writes:

Scientists never can be sure that a given explanation is complete and final. Some of the hypotheses advanced by scientists turn out to be incorrect when tested by further observations or experiments. Yet many scientific explanations have been so thoroughly tested and confirmed that they are held with great confidence.<sup>4</sup>

### **False Things Can Have Evidence**

In the courtroom, both sides present evidence. One side is wrong (false), but even the false side presents evidence, sometimes very convincing evidence.

False things in science can have evidence too. Scientific theories and laws which are not true can have evidence, sometimes very convincing evidence. A cover story in the Scientific American states:

Copernicus famously said that Earth revolves around the sun. But opposition to this revolutionary idea didn't come just from the religious authorities. Evidence favored a different cosmology. ...Observable evidence supported a competing cosmology –the “geoheliocentrism” of Tycho Brahe. ...This new “geoheliocentric” had two major advantages going for it: it squared with deep institutions of how the world appeared to behave, and it fit the available data better than Copernicus's system did. ...Those opposed to Copernicanism had some quite respectable, coherent, observational based science on their side. They were eventually proved wrong, but that did not make them bad scientists.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> National Academy of Science, *Science and Creationism: A View from the National Academy of Sciences*, (Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1999), 1. <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/6024.html> (accessed September 10, 2014)

<sup>5</sup> Danielson, Dennis and Graney, Christopher M., *The Case Against Copernicus*, Scientific American, January 2014, 72, 75, 77.

For more than a millennium, science understood that the earth was the center of the cosmos. There was evidence for this false understanding. The epicycles of that Ptolemaic system even seemed to explain retrograde travel of the planets. Then there were three competing cosmologies, and each had evidence, but two of them had to be false. The same Scientific American article states:

The Cosmos Three Ways. Seventeenth-century astronomers had three models for the universe. The geocentric model featured an unmoving Earth circled by the sun, moon, planets, and stars. Astronomers accounted for the retrograde motion of the planets with “epicycles,” smaller loops added to the main orbits. Nicolaus Copernicus’s heliocentric universe appeared simpler, but it presented new conceptual problems –stars had to be unthinkably distant, for example. Tycho Brahe’s geoheliocentric model split the difference –the sun, moon and stars orbited the Earth, the planets orbited the sun, and the stars came back close.<sup>6</sup>

The scientific evidence so strongly supported Brahe’s Earth centric system, that the supporters of the correct sun centric Copernican system had to appeal to God. From the Scientific American article:

Rather than give up their theory in the face of seeming incontrovertible physical evidence, Copernicans were forced to appeal to divine omnipotence.<sup>7</sup>

Both Earth centric solar system theories were wrong, in that they misrepresented the way the natural world actually is. The Earth orbits the sun, not the other way around. Even though wrong in their understanding of the physical world, the two Earth centric models had evidence, and explained the motion of the planets rather well.

### **Closer to Complete and Final Truth?**

Brahe’s Earth centric system correctly explained more observational evidence than the previous Ptolemy’s Earth centric system explained. For this reason we can say that Brahe’s theory was an improvement over Ptolemy’s theory. But does the ability of a model to explain more evidence mean that model is closer to correctly representing the natural world, closer to having complete and final truth?

Was Brahe any closer to the complete and final truth than Ptolemy? Both theories were wrong, in that they misrepresented the natural world, having the Earth, instead of the sun, at the center of the cosmos. The sun, planets, and stars moved, while the Earth did not move.

We tend to think that each successive scientific explanation is closer to complete and final truth, sometimes simply because it correctly explains more evidence than previous models. A new scientific explanation may be closer to complete and final truth, but could it be that sometimes the newer explanation is no closer to complete and final truth than the old?

### **Science Is Often Wrong**

Both Earth centric solar system theories were wrong, in that they misrepresented the way the natural world actually is. Many other scientific explanations (theories, laws, models, etc.) have also been found to be wrong, in that they too misrepresented the way the natural world actually is.

---

<sup>6</sup> Danielson, 75.

<sup>7</sup> Danielson, 77.

Phlogiston Theory, Caloric Theory, and Newton's Law Of Gravity correctly explained observational evidence. Each was better at doing this than any previous explanation, but all three were wrong, in that they misrepresented the way the natural world actually is.

Just as Brahe's Earth centric system correctly explained more observational evidence than the previous Ptolemy's Earth centric system explained, Caloric Theory correctly explained more observational evidence than the previous Phlogiston Theory explained. Unfortunately, phlogiston does not exist, and neither does its replacement, caloric.

#### Phlogiston

Phlogiston Theory was proposed in 1667 and soon became the generally accepted explanation for combustion, metabolism, and rust. Matter which is burning releases a substance called phlogiston. Phlogiston Theory explains why air is needed for combustion, why an enclosed area only supports so much combustion, and why we need to breath fresh air (not air filled with phlogiston). The gas we now know as oxygen was considered air that contained no phlogiston. There is experimental evidence for phlogiston. Phlogiston Theory remained the dominant theory until the 1780s, when new evidence was discovered.<sup>8</sup> Phlogiston was solid science, and it was useful in making correct predictions, but is wrong in that it misrepresented the natural world. There is no such thing as phlogiston.

#### Caloric Theory

Phlogiston theory was discarded and replaced by Caloric Theory. Caloric Theory taught that heat is a fluid called caloric which flows from hotter bodies to colder bodies. Caloric Theory explained everything which Phlogiston Theory explained but much more, including why a cup of hot coffee cools while on your kitchen table. Caloric Theory was discarded the 1850s. There is plenty of experimental evidence for caloric.<sup>9</sup> Caloric is solid science, and it was useful in making correct predictions, but is wrong in that it misrepresented the natural world. There is no such thing as caloric fluid.

#### Law Of Gravity

Isaac Newton presented his Law Of Gravity to the Royal Society in 1686. Two bodies attract each other with a force that can be calculated using Newton's famous formula. There is plenty of solid experimental evidence for the Law Of Gravity. Newton's Law Of Gravity was replaced in 1916 by Einstein's General Theory Of Relativity. General Relativity states that gravity is due to curved space-time, not due to a force between two bodies. Newton's Law Of Gravity is solid science, and it is still used today to make correct predictions in many applications, but is wrong in that it misrepresented the natural world. Gravity is not a force between two bodies.<sup>10</sup>

For a list of over 50 obsolete scientific theories see:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Superseded\\_scientific\\_theories](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Superseded_scientific_theories)

In some ways evolution is similar to these abandoned scientific theories and laws. Like these obsolete explanations, evolution has evidence. Like these obsolete explanations, evolution is wrong, in that it

---

<sup>8</sup> American Chemical Society International Historic Chemical Landmarks, *Antoine-Laurent Lavoisier: The Chemical Revolution*. <http://www.acs.org/content/acs/en/education/whatischemistry/landmarks/lavoisier.html> (accessed September 12, 2014)

<sup>9</sup> Robert J. Morris, *Lavoisier And The Caloric*, Paper used as course reference by Associate Professor of Philosophy of Science Jonathan Bain, New York University - Polytechnic School of Engineering <http://www.faculty.poly.edu/~jbain/heat/readings/72Morris.pdf> (accessed September 12, 2014)

<sup>10</sup> O'Connor, J. J. and Robertson, E. F., *History topic: General relativity*, web article of the School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of St Andrews, Scotland. [http://www-history.mcs.st-and.ac.uk/HistTopics/General\\_relativity.html](http://www-history.mcs.st-and.ac.uk/HistTopics/General_relativity.html) (accessed September 15, 2014)

misrepresents the natural world. One kind of animal does not descend from a different kind, the universe is not millions or billions of years old, etc. In another way EVOLUTION IS NOTHING LIKE these abandoned scientific theories and laws. Evolution will never make any progress at reaching any truth, wherever it is attempting to explain the result of a miracle through natural means.<sup>11</sup>

---

**Evolution will never make any progress  
at reaching any truth, wherever it is  
attempting to explain the result of  
a miracle through natural means.**

---

### **Evolution Has Evidence**

As evolutionists write the evolution story, they incorporate much of our scientific understanding about the universe into that story. They utilize math, physics, biology, geology, astronomy, and many other branches of science. The evolution story they write is well thought out, but it is based on countless atheistic assumptions, and it has many unsolved problems. I see the evidence for evolution as unbelievably weak, but it is still evidence. Many see that weak evidence for evolution as compelling. They see evolution as true, even though evolution is false. Even weak evidence can convince. Incredibly, most Christians are also deceived into believing the lie of evolution. Our sinful nature desires to detach God from his creation.

### Natural Selection

Evolutionists claim mechanisms which we observe making small changes, are also able to make large changes. For example, it is reasonable to conclude that natural selection produced several different species of finches from a common ancestor (a finch). Evolutionists then claim that natural selection can do far more. They claim natural selection can enable one kind of animal (like dinosaurs) to evolve into a completely different kind of animal (like birds). However, in the finch example, we started with finches and ended with finches (the famous Darwin finches of Galapagos). All observable examples of natural selection start with one kind of plant or animal, and end with the same kind. We know that new genetic information must be added to the genome to produce offspring of a different kind. There is no known natural (evolutionary) method for this new information to appear, so evolutionists continue to propose possibilities. They have yet to actually demonstrate any proposed method. Natural selection is presented as evidence for evolution, and although extremely weak evidence, it is compelling evidence to many.

### Poor Design

Evolutionists claim that some things in nature are poorly designed, an expectation of natural selection, but not of creation. Creationists point out that many of these so-called poor designs work exceptionally well, so they are not poor designs. In other cases, effects of the curse, or genetic degeneration, may be in play.

---

<sup>11</sup> "When science concludes that we have evolved by natural processes from chemical to mankind and were not created, it is wrong. This is a limitation of science; it can discover only natural causes." Dawn J. Ferch, "Summary: Scientific Methods," in *Discovering God's Creation – A Guidebook to Hands-on Science*, ed. Paul Boehlke, Roger Klockziem, and John Paulsen (New Ulm: The Printshop Martin Luther College, 1997), pdf page 45. <http://mlc-wels.edu/divisions/math-science/discovering-gods-creation> (accessed September 8, 2014)



The poor design argument is evidence for evolution, even though it is weak evidence. Evolutionist Eugenie Scott writes,

Either the direct hand of God or natural selection could explain well-designed structures. ... More difficult for the supporters of the argument from design was explaining those structures that just barely worked or were obviously cobbled together from disparate parts having their functions in related species. ... Nature is full of oddities like antennae modified into fishing lures, or jawbones turned into hearing structures –things that don't so much look engineered as tinkered with. ... For God to have created jerry-rigged, odd, or poorly designed structures is of course possible, but it is theologically unsatisfying and empirically untestable.<sup>12</sup>

#### Evidence For Both Evolution and Creation

Some of the evidence which is presented supporting evolution equally supports creation. For example, humans and many animals have exactly four appendages (such as two arms and two legs, two wings and two legs, or four legs). This is evidence for both evolution and for creation. While this is certainly evidence for evolution, it does not invalidate the alternative to evolution (does not invalidate creation). Evolutionists belittle this type of evidence when it is used to support creation, yet they regularly use that same evidence to support evolution.

Evolution: Many animals having four appendages, instead of two or six, is evidence of common ancestry, which is evidence for evolution. Evolutionists consider similarities between animals, when they claim that one kind of animal descended from a different kind. Birds (which have four appendages) descended from dinosaurs (which also have four appendages). Humans (which have four appendages) descended from ape like creatures (which also have four appendages).

Creation: Many animals having four appendages, instead of two or six, is evidence of common design, which is evidence for creation. God used similar body plans for many of the creatures he created. Humans do the same thing all the time. When we design something, we often use similar plans. Most cars look similar, with four wheels, a windshield, left and right rear view mirrors, and room for at least two people.

#### If the Math Works Out, It Happened That Way

Evolutionists use science to write a story about how they think things might have come into existence without a creator god. Their claim seems to be: if they can construct a story, then it probably happened that way. This is the case even in instances where there is no observational evidence at all. For example, evolutionists claim the solar system is billions of years old, yet it contains comets with a lifespan of maybe 100,000 years. (Comets lose mass through melting every time they pass near the sun.) Evolutionists require a source of new comets to support their claim that the solar system is billions of years old. So evolutionists invent the Oort Cloud as a source of new comets. The Oort Cloud is purposely placed beyond the outermost planet, so far away we cannot see or detect it in any way.

Inventions like the Oort Cloud are completely arbitrary. Such arbitrary conjectures are not the best science. There is no reason at all to have an Oort Cloud, because there is NO evidence for it. Evolutionists accuse creationists of having blind faith, but arbitrary conjectures like the Oort Cloud are examples of blind faith.

Mathematical models of the Big Bang have been calculated with great precision. So have the life cycles of various sized stars, and how they might turn hydrogen into heavier elements such as iron. These are some of the many proposed models incorporated into the evolution story. Parts and pieces of such models can

---

<sup>12</sup> Eugenie C. Scott, *Evolution vs. Creationism –an Introduction second edition*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 89.

be tested, but the whole model cannot be tested, for we cannot make a Big Bang, or even study a star to see that it really does produce iron. Even so, this is science, and it is evidence for evolution.

### **I Am Not Convinced**

At this point some readers may say to themselves, "I am not convinced by this article. I still think there is NO evidence for evolution." My response may surprise you. What you and I believe about evolution and evidence does not affect whether or not evolution has evidence. You and I do not define science, the greater scientific community does, and that community overwhelmingly says that evolution is science and has evidence.

### **Who Defines Science?**

The greater scientific community defines science. That community overwhelmingly says that evolution is science and has evidence.<sup>13</sup>

Question: But aren't these scientific bodies filled with evolutionists?

Answer: Yes. That is precisely the point. The scientific community only accepts natural causes. The scientific community rejects creation as an explanation of origins, because creation is not based on natural causes. They embrace evolution, which is based on natural causes.<sup>14</sup>

Question: Why do scientific bodies speak for science?

Answer: The origin of the word "science" is from words meaning "to know," and "having knowledge."<sup>15</sup> The particular meaning of science discussed in this article is that which scientists practice (physics, chemistry, geology, biology, astronomy, paleontology, etc.). Science is a way of gaining knowledge about nature. It is a human activity. As a human activity, those who practice science work to define and redefine science.

### **Summary**

We have seen that evolution is a lie, because it is contrary to Scripture. We've looked at the nature of evidence, and found that false things like evolution can have evidence. We've considered how science is sometimes wrong, and how evolution is one of the places where science is wrong. Next we surveyed several of the countless pieces of evidence for evolution, and the weaknesses of that evidence.

---

<sup>13</sup> The National Academy of Sciences puts it this way: "Progress in science consists of the development of better explanations for the causes of natural phenomena. Scientists never can be sure that a given explanation is complete and final. Some of the hypotheses advanced by scientists turn out to be incorrect when tested by further observations or experiments. Yet many scientific explanations have been so thoroughly tested and confirmed that they are held with great confidence. The theory of evolution is one of these well-established explanations. An enormous amount of scientific investigation since the mid-19th century has converted early ideas about evolution proposed by Darwin and others into a strong and well supported theory. Today, evolution is an extremely active field of research, with an abundance of new discoveries that are continually increasing our understanding of how evolution occurs. This booklet considers the science that supports the theory of evolution, focusing on three categories of scientific evidence: Evidence for the origins of the universe, Earth, and life. Evidence for biological evolution, including findings from paleontology, comparative anatomy, biogeography, embryology, and molecular biology. Evidence for human evolution." National Academy, 1.

<sup>14</sup> "In science, explanations are limited to those based on observations and experiments that can be substantiated by other scientists. Explanations that cannot be based on empirical evidence are not a part of science." National Academy, 1.

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/science> (accessed September 16, 2014)

Creationists see similar weakness in all evidence for evolution.<sup>16</sup> Finally, we evaluated who defines science, and that the scientific community overwhelmingly accepts evolution as having evidence.

Evolution has evidence: Because evolution is a widely accepted scientific theory, and by definition a scientific theory has evidence, or else it would not be scientific. Evolution is science, because it fits the definition of science. Science is defined by scientists, and the scientific community overwhelmingly defines evolution as science and as having evidence.

Evolution has evidence: Just because evolution is false, does not mean it cannot have evidence. False things like evolution often have evidence.

Evolution has evidence, but this is not absolute proof. Science is sometimes wrong, and it is wrong about evolution.

Evolution has evidence: While creationists see this evidence as very weak, many people find the evidence compelling. Even weak evidence can convince.

Evolution has evidence, but evolution will never make any progress at reaching any truth, wherever it is attempting to explain through natural means, the result of a miracle.

### **Blunting The Temptation Of Evolution**

Evolution truly is a deception of Satan, which he uses to pull God's children (you and me) away from trust in Jesus. It is through faith that we believe in creation. Even so, our human reason can help us to see the logical weaknesses of evolution. The temptation of evolution is blunted when we know how weak the evidence for evolution is. The world around us is often as we would expect, based on the Biblical account of creation. The world around us is often not as would be expected, if evolution were true. Our LSI website has many resources showing logical problems with evolution. Take some time to look through our collection of 200 LSI Journal articles, 900 LSI Blog entries, and dozens of articles by other Confessional Lutherans.

[www.LutheranScience.org](http://www.LutheranScience.org)

*Mark Bergemann serves as president of LSI and as Evangelism Board Chairman at Good Shepherd's Evangelical Lutheran Church. He holds a BS in electrical engineering.*

---

<sup>16</sup> An astrophysicist puts it this way: "The scientific evidence [for creation] is so compelling that many creationists simply cannot understand how anyone could possibly believe in evolution." Jason Lisle, *The Ultimate Proof Of Creation –Resolving The Creation Debate* (Green Forest: Master Books, 2009), 18.