

A photograph of a cave interior, showing a wall covered in various rock formations. In the foreground, two large, ribbed stalagmites rise from the ground. The background wall is covered in numerous stalactites of varying lengths and thicknesses, some hanging in thick curtains. The lighting is warm and focused, highlighting the textures and colors of the rock.

LSI Journal

How Old Is That Cave?

**Did You Watch Me Create the Earth?
The Propaganda of Steven J. Gould
Assumptions of Evolutionists**

fall 2017

Lutheran Science Institute

Creation / Evolution: a Confessional Lutheran view

13390 W. Edgewood Ave.
New Berlin WI 53151-8088

www.LutheranScience.org
office@LutheranScience.org

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR:

Bruce Holman, Ph.D. chemistry.

PRESIDENT:

Mark Bergemann, B.S. engineering.

VICE-PRESIDENT:

Patrick Winkler, M.Div. M.S.Eng., P.E.

SECRETARY:

Jeffrey Stueber

TREASURER PRO-TEM:

Patrick Winkler, M.Div. M.S.Eng., P.E.

PASTORAL ADVISOR:

David Peters, M.Div., S.T.M., A.B.D.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Fritz Horn, B.S. forestry, B.S. education.

Warren Krug, M.Ed.

James A. Schloff, B.S. biology, M.S.

TECHNICAL ADVISORS

Paul Finke, Ph.D. chemistry.

Dwight Johnson, Ph.D. business.

Gary Locklair, B.A. chemistry, B.S. M.S.
Ph.D. computer science.

Charles Raasch, M.Div., S.T.M., A.B.D.

Alan Siggelkow, M.Div., S.T.M., M.S.

Steven Thiesfeldt, M.Ed.

John Werner, Ph.D. Molecular and
Cellular Biology.

LSI Journal

a forum for diverse views
consistent with Scripture

Published four times annually by the Lutheran Science Institute, inc. (winter, spring, summer, and fall). ISSN 2572-2816 (print), ISSN 2572-2824 (online)

Editor: Mark Bergemann

Editorial Committee: Patrick Winkler,
David Peters, Jeffery Stueber.

Views expressed are those of the author or editor and not necessarily those of the Lutheran Science Institute.

Rates: Free in electronic form (pdf). Print subscription including postage (all US \$) 1 year \$13 (\$21 Canada); 3 years \$29 (\$54 Canada). Other countries available. Bulk rates as low as \$0.67 per copy. Order via LSI website or by contacting the editor.

LSI Journal copyright © 2017 Lutheran Science Institute. Requests to reproduce more than brief excerpts should be sent to the editor.

Front Cover Image Credit: 2002 Mark Bergemann, Cave of the Mounds National Natural Landmark, Blue Mounds, Wisconsin. See *Age of Caves* on pages 29-32.

The Lutheran Science Institute, inc. has tax-exempt status under section 501(c)(3) of the IRS Code as a subordinate organization of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod, www.WELS.net.



Vol. 31, no. 4 (fall 2017)

4 Did You Watch Me Create The Earth?

Devotion: God asks 87 questions in Job chapters 38-41. Most of these questions are scientific in nature. Let's paraphrase the first question as, "Did you watch me create the earth so that you know how I did it?"

6 Join the Lutheran Science Institute

7 Assumptions of Evolutionists

Mark Bergemann

Evolutionists start with countless unproven presuppositions. These unproven starting assumptions require that creation be rejected. Creation is rejected NOT on the basis of scientific conclusions, but on the basis of unproven a priori assumptions.

17 The Propaganda of Steven Jay Gould

Jeffrey Stueber

If anyone should know the evidence for evolution, it should be Gould. In an article for Discover magazine, he offered three pieces of evidence for evolution. Despite his obvious scientific acumen, his arguments were not only philosophically illogical but contrary to the available evidence and his own writing.

29 How Old Is That Cave?

Mark Bergemann

Think about the many unprovable assumptions which an evolutionist uses in determining the age of a cave. If any of these unproven assumptions are wrong, then the resulting scientific conclusions made by evolutionists are invalid.

Unless otherwise noted, all Scripture quotations are taken from the Holman Christian Standard Bible, Copyright © 1999, 2000, 2002, 2003, 2009 by Holman Christian Publishers. Used by permission. Holman Christian Standard Bible, Holman CSB, and HSCB are federally registered trademarks of Holman Bible Publishers.

Did You Watch Me Create the Earth?

Where were you when I established the earth? Tell Me, if you have understanding. Who fixed its dimensions? Certainly you know! Who stretched a measuring line across it? What supports its foundations? Or who laid its cornerstone while the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy? Who enclosed the sea behind doors when it burst from the womb, when I made the clouds its garment and thick darkness its blanket, when I determined its boundaries and put its bars and doors in place, when I declared: “You may come this far, but no farther; your proud waves stop here”? Don’t you know? You were already born; you have lived so long! (Job 38:4-10, 21)

It’s been maybe 4,000 years since God asked these questions to Job, but these questions are just as appropriate for us today. Our Creator asks each of us: “Who planned the size of the earth, the seas, and each content? Who implemented that plan?” Of course the answer is the Creator God did these things.



By my count, God asks 87 questions in Job chapters 38-41. Most of these questions are scientific in nature. Let’s paraphrase the first question as, “Did you watch me create the earth so that you know how I did it?” God mocks those who dare to question their Creator, “Tell Me, if you have understanding. ... Certainly you know! ... Don’t you know? You were already born; you have lived so long!” Each of us must answer, “I was not yet born.” Even evolutionists must answer God in that way, but they arrogantly continue, “I was not yet born, but I have determined how

the earth came to be. It did not happen in six days at your command, as you teach in Scripture. Natural processes acted over billions of years to make the earth.”

Evolutionists *assume* there is no creator god, *then* they craft a story (the Theory of Evolution) about how things came to be without a creator god. Evolutionists use many unproven presuppositions to guide their origins story. They *assume* no planet-wide flood on earth. They *assume* deep time (millions and billions of years). They arrogantly say, “Our story of origins shows that there is no creator god, that there was no planetary flood on earth, and that the universe began 13.82 billion years ago.” It is true that their story proposes billions of years, no creator god, and no planetary flood, because they *assumed those things to be true before they began* writing their story.

How arrogant to question God. Evolutionists know that there is a creator god, yet they suppress that truth (Romans 1:18-22) and *assume* that there is no creator god. “Claiming to be wise, they became fools.” (Romans 1:22).

Our response to God’s questions should be to admit God knows far more than we will ever know, that God has far more wisdom and power than we can even comprehend. God is the one and only Creator of everything and the Lord of all. Those of us who trust in that Creator God as our Redeemer can confess with Job, “But I know my living Redeemer, and He will stand on the dust at last. Even after my skin has been destroyed, yet I will see God in my flesh. I will see Him myself; my eyes will look at Him, and not as a stranger. My heart longs within me.” (Job 19:25-27).

We Pray

Lord, grant me a growing trust in you. Impress on me that you know more than I know, and that you use your great power and wisdom for my good, out of your amazing love. Grant me a humble spirit, one which accepts what you say even when my reason cannot comprehend it.

Amen

MSB

Join the Lutheran Science Institute

Associate Membership (subscriber)

Free

Voting Membership

\$29.00 (\$59.00 for 3 years)

www.LutheranScience.org/Join



Those without internet access: Write to
Lutheran Science Institute
13390 W. Edgewood Ave.
New Berlin WI 53151

**Please consider supporting LSI
in every way you are able.**

www.LutheranScience.org/YouCanHelp

While LSI is affiliated with the WELS,
LSI receives no funding or support from the WELS.

Assumptions of Evolutionists

Mark Bergemann

Assumptions Guide Science

Unproven assumptions guide the entire scientific process from start to finish. Assumptions determine what is to be observed and what is not to be observed, which methods, calculations, and models to use, and which to reject. Assumptions determine which conclusions are allowed and which are not allowed. Science is a biased process.

Professor Boehlke and several of his Wisconsin Lutheran College students wrote in the periodical, *Zygon: Journal Of Religion and Science*,
Presuppositions play into every aspect of science. ... Presuppositions can close minds subconsciously. ... Science is a process of investigation and a body of content accepted by a community of its practitioners. Experiment and observation are used to test and retest nature. However, data do not speak for themselves; they must be interpreted. We do not answer our questions simply by experience or by experiment. We sort the data, choose some, value some, and ignore others. Hence, science becomes a framework of thought and empiricism. Scientific presuppositions do play into the entire thought framework. Science cannot claim to be purely objective; it is a human activity.¹

Atheistic evolutionist and Nobel Laureate Francis Crick agrees that assumptions guide the scientific process. He calls these assumptions “preconceived ideas.” This is the world-famous Crick, who along with Watson discovered DNA. Crick writes, “You cannot pursue a difficult program of scientific research without some preconceived ideas to guide you.”²

1 Boehlke, P. R., Knapp, L. M. and Kolander, R. L. (2006), PUTTING PRE-SUPPOSITIONS ON THE TABLE: WHY THE FOUNDATIONS MATTER. *Zygon*®, 41: 422-423. [doi:10.1111/j.1467-9744.2005.00746.x]

2 Crick, Francis. 1994. *The Astonishing Hypothesis: The Scientific Search For The Soul*. New York: Touchstone, 257.

Pointing out the assumptions of evolutionists is a strong and solid argument, one which should remain strong for decades to come.

Assumptions Guide Evolution Theory

Evolutionists start with countless unproven presuppositions. These unproven starting assumptions require that creation be rejected. Creation is rejected NOT on the basis of scientific conclusions, but on the basis of unproven a priori assumptions.

Pointing out the Assumptions of Evolutionists

Pointing out the assumptions of evolutionists is a strong and solid argument, one which should remain strong for decades to come. If an assumption is wrong, then all conclusions based on that assumption are invalid. Pointing out these assumptions is relatively easy. On the other hand, pointing out scientific problems with evolution is often much more difficult and is much more easily countered by the evolutionist. Why not make the easy and solid argument of pointing out assumptions, instead of a more difficult and often weaker argument (one which may be incorrect a few years down the road)?

Simply pointing out the first and primary assumption of evolutionists, their “no creator” assumption, is a powerful and easy to make argument. The “no creator” assumption is imposed on every conclusion which evolutionists make. Pointing out other major assumptions such as the “no flood” and “deep time” assumptions is almost as powerful.

assumption: **No Creator**

The evolution story is written using science alone. The use of other sources of knowledge is forbidden when writing the evolution story. Science is an attempt to explain everything through natural causes. If there is a god, that god could do miracles. Miracles are not natural causes. There-

fore a scientist must reject the possibility of miracles when using science. This works very well in creating our modern technological world. We do not take miracles into account while designing airplanes and cell phones. But the assumption of natural causes is the worst assumption possible when considering origins. The assumption of natural causes means that if something is the result of a miracle, then science will never understand its origin. So if there is a creator god who made the universe, science alone will never be able to discover that fact. Evolutionists start with the assumption that there is no creator god. Evolution is the best story they can construct without a creator god. *If God really did create everything as he reveals in Scripture, then evolution is wrong, since evolution rejects that possibility regardless of the evidence.*³

Boehlke et al. also mention this most basic assumption of science, Presuppositions are always needed, but one can see that our vices often stem from our virtues. The reasonable move to a practical naturalism in the laboratory can, for some, shift to philosophical naturalism that entirely eliminates God. ... One is the presupposition that all natural events must have natural causes. ... Some believe that transcendent qualities do not exist because science has not uncovered them. But at the heart of this is that some assume that matter and energy are all that exist, and if God would appear to them they would question their sanity. ... Presuppositions need to be on the table. Scientists who boldly assert that reality consists exclusively of the interactions of matter and energy need to examine the roots of that claim and recognize it as a basic assumption that is useful only within narrow limits. Presuppositions are not proven, and such extreme use of naturalism without question cannot be justified and becomes scientism. Naturalism rules out the transcendent and the supernatural. This may be a practical and temporary

3 I have made this argument often. These particular words are taken from my video presentation: Mark Bergemann, "Did God Use Evolution To Create?" Presented to the Metro-Milwaukee Pastors' Conference meeting at Nain Lutheran Church in West Allis WI on October 10, 2016. www.LutheranScience.org/Did-GodUseEvolution (accessed Sep 16, 2017)

suspension of thought to make in the laboratory, but it ought to be recognized as such. Tension will remain if some push the application of naturalism to all forms of knowledge and experience.⁴

Evolutionists:

- assume* no global flood on earth,
- propose* global floods on other planets.

***assumption:* No Flood**

Evolutionists *assume* no global flood on earth, yet propose global floods on other planets. This assumption leads evolutionists to so many wrong conclusions. The entire geologic column with its hundreds of millions of years is based on this assumption (and many other assumptions too). Evolution’s “Tree of Life” is based on this assumption (and many other assumptions too). If there really was a global flood on earth, then much of the evolution story would have to be scrapped and a new story written.

***assumption:* Deep Time**

Evolutionists *assume* deep time (millions and billions of years). It is *assumed* that such long times would be needed for slow natural processes to accumulate large changes. Evolutionists *assume* that the very slow natural processes observed today were the means which produced the world we see today. They often reject catastrophes as alternative explanations, even though we have observed catastrophes like the eruption of Mt. St. Helens, which deposited layered sediment and then cut large canyons through that sediment in a few months. The assumption of slow processes over millions and billions of years (and rejection of known fast processes) often leads evolutionists to accept unreasonable explanations which sometimes are contrary to physics, chemistry, and biology as we know them. Evolutionists *assume* that eventually they will figure out how slow natural processes produced what we see today, without violating physics, chemistry, and biology.

4 Boehlke, P. R., et al., (2006), 420, 423, 424.

Greenland Ice Dating

Ice core dating is a good example of how the “no flood” and “deep time” assumptions drastically change scientific conclusions. Evolutionists *assume* that the middle and lower layers in the Greenland ice sheet have been compressed for long ages, with the lowest layers compressed nearly paper-thin. Evolutionists interpret the data to match their assumptions: They force their calculations so that the thickness of each “measured” annual layer does not significantly vary from the *assumed* thickness for that layer. If the ice actually accumulated over the few thousand years since Noah’s Flood, then those layers would NOT be compressed nearly that much and would have to be dated much younger. In addition, they *assume* that past annual snowfalls have been similar to today’s annual accumulations. If there was much heavier snowfall in the past, say for the century or so after the Flood, then the dates evolutionists calculate will be far too old due to that factor too. Meteorologist Michael Oard writes (*italics in original*),

The claimed 110,000 annual layers in the GISP2 ice core to near the bottom of the Greenland ice sheet is not a straightforward deduction. The annual layers, indeed, show up well near the top of the ice sheet. However, the situation becomes much more complicated deeper down in the ice sheet. Essentially, the uniformitarian scientists must make assumptions for the bottom and middle portion of the ice sheet in order to determine the annual layers. ...They *assume* that the Greenland and Antarctica ice sheets have existed for many millions of years. ...They think the amount of snow and ice added each year is approximately balanced by the ice that is lost by melting and calving of icebergs into the ocean. Because of their assumptions, uniformitarian scientists believe that the annual layers thin drastically as they are covered by more snow and ice. ...The upshot of their assumptions is that the amount of annual layer compression believed to have occurred depends upon *how old one believes the ice to be*. For an ice sheet in equilibrium for millions of years, the annual layers would, theoretically, thin rapidly and become almost paper-thin near the bottom

of the ice. On the other hand, if the ice built up rapidly, as in the creationist model during the Ice Age, the annual layers would be very thick at the bottom and thin upward to the present average annual layer thickness.⁵

Rock Layer and Canyon Dating

Assumptions of “no creator,” “no flood,” and “deep time” have led evolutionists to *assume* earth’s sedimentary and volcanic rock layers were deposited over hundreds of millions of years. The evolution story *assumes* canyons are cut through these rock layers over additional long ages. Yet the 1980 eruption of Mt. St. Helens showed thick rock layers can be deposited, and then canyons up to 600 feet deep cut through them, in months. LSI published an article on this in 2009.⁶ Up to date reports are on the Answers In Genesis website.⁷ Dr. Snelling reports that large canyons formed rapidly near Mt. St. Helens in the 1980s,

Side canyons also appeared, resembling the side canyons of the Grand Canyon (technically known as gully-headed and amphitheater-headed side canyons). The breach did not cut straight through the obstruction, but took a meandering path, similar to the meandering path of the Grand Canyon through the high plateaus of northern Arizona. Indeed, this “Little Grand Canyon of the Toutle River” is a one-fortieth scale model of the real Grand Canyon. This amazing feature was cut through soft debris, but another eruption two months later (on May 19, 1982) melted a snow pack that cut through hard basalt bedrock. The resulting Loowit Canyon was more than 100 feet (30 m) deep. Nearby, the

5 Michael Oard, “Do Ice Cores Show Many Tens of Thousands of Years?” Answers In Genesis, October 1, 2004. <https://answersingenesis.org/environmental-science/ice-age/do-ice-cores-show-many-tens-of-thousands-of-years/> (accessed Oct 16, 2017)

6 Warren Krug, “Age of the Earth, Part 1 Mount St. Helens and Surtsey,” *LSI Journal*, 2009 www.LutheranScience.org/2009AgeEarthPart1 (accessed Oct 6, 2017)

7 Andrew A. Snelling, Joe Francis, and Tom Hennigan, *Lasting Lessons from Mount St. Helens*, Answers In Genesis, April 1, 2015. <https://answersingenesis.org/geology/mount-st-helens/lasting-lessons-mount-st-helens/> (accessed Sep 16, 2017)

avalanche cut through lava and ash layers to form a third canyon, Step Canyon, up to 600 feet (180 m) deep. Small creeks now flow through these deep canyons. In other places, geologists assume creeks cut the surrounding canyons very slowly over a very long time period. Yet at Mount St. Helens they know that the canyons formed first and formed extremely rapidly!⁸

Oort Cloud

Assumptions of “no creator” and “deep time” have led evolutionists to invent the Oort Cloud. Evolutionists *assume* the Oort Cloud exists, even though they claim zero evidence for it. Evolutionists know that comets slowly melt as they orbit the sun, and many comets meet their end by crashing into a planet or moon. Since evolutionists *assume* the solar system is billions of years old, they need to find a source for new comets, otherwise there would be no long-period comets left. Evolutionists *assume* there are many icy objects (planetesimals) far past Pluto, and that occasionally they are sent toward the inner solar system. There is zero evidence for this Oort Cloud, which is too far away for us to verify its existence. Evolutionists need this imagined Oort Cloud to exist. The Oort Cloud may exist, but whether it does or doesn’t is in keeping with a young earth.

Similarities between animals are
ASSUMED to be from common de-
scent, not from common design.

assumption: Chemicals Self-Assembled Into Life

Evolutionists *assume* non-living chemical molecules self-assembled into life, yet they have no idea how that could happen. Life spontaneously developing from non-living chemicals goes against what we know about

⁸ Snelling.

physics, chemistry, and biology. World renowned evolutionist Paul Davies writes in *Scientific American* (September 2016),

We do not know the process that transformed a mishmash of chemicals into a living cell, with all its staggering complexity. ... We are almost as much in the dark today about the pathway from nonlife to life as Charles Darwin was when he wrote, “It is mere rubbish thinking at present of the origin of life; one might as well think of the origin of matter.”⁹

assumption: Common Descent

Evolutionists *assume* all animals and plants descended from a common ancestor, a single cell lifeform. Similarities between animals are *assumed* to be due to common descent, or due to that similar feature evolving twice independently. Evolutionists reject the possibility that similarities (in bone structures, DNA, etc.) are due to common design by a creator. This assumption is based on their belief in naturalism, that everything is a result of natural physical causes (the “no creator” assumption). Evolution’s Tree of Life connects the branch of one animal kind to the branch of another based on the assumption of common descent. The only evidence to connect those branches is a very small amount of fossil evidence. Evidence which equally supports creation. There is strong evidence against the assumption of common descent, including the reality that intelligence is needed to create new information in DNA, and that fossils show distinct kinds with at best a handful of debatable transitional forms. See *Evolution’s Tree of Life* (Winter 2016 LSI Journal, pages 28-29).

www.LutheranScience.org/2016winter

assumption: Mutations Lead to New Kinds

Evolutionists *assume* that genetic mutations are able to produce new information in DNA, and with many generations of accumulated new information in its DNA, a new kind of animal is produced. Yet new genetic information has never been observed. An LSI Journal article evaluates

⁹ Paul Davies, “Many Planets Not Much Life – We Still Have No Idea How Easy It Is for Life To Arise-and It May Be Incredibly Difficult,” in *Forum – Commentary on Science in the News From the Experts*, *Scientific American*, September 2016, 8.

claimed instances of new genetic information and explains why those cases would never lead to a new kind of animal. See *Natural Selection* (Fall 2016 LSI Journal, pages 25-31). www.LutheranScience.org/2016fall

assumption: DNA from Natural Causes

The evolution story *assumes* that natural causes can produce the information contained in DNA and the mechanisms needed to read and use that information, even though producing information requires intelligence. See *Code Systems Evidence a Creator and Declare the Glory of God* (Winter 2016 LSI Journal, pages 7-12). www.LutheranScience.org/2016winter

Instead of questioning the *science* of evolution, question the *unproven assumptions* which direct and constrain that science.

assumption: Everlasting Soft Tissue

Evolutionists are being forced to *assume* that biological tissue and cells from dead dinosaurs and other creatures can survive for hundreds of millions of years. Since 2005, evolutionists have repeatedly found tissue (such as collagen, pliable blood vessels, and the proteins actin and myosin) in fossils. The evolution story has dinosaurs going extinct more than 60 million years ago. Tissue has even been found “in bones of a supposed 247-million-year-old reptile,” and “flexible tissue in a supposed 550-million-year-old beard worm and evidence of trace amounts of protein fragments still retained in a 417-million-year-old arthropod.”¹⁰ Evolutionists have put forth suggestions of laboratory contamination and other explanations, but the growing number of impossibly old tissue discoveries by evolutionists is overwhelming such explanations. It seems evolutionists may have to accept the assumption that tissue can survive nearly indefinitely, even though that goes against what we know about biology and chemistry.

10 Anderson, K. (2016 October). Dinosaur Tissue -A Biochemical Challenge to the Evolutionary Timescale. Answers In Genesis. Retrieved from <https://answersingenesis.org/fossils/dinosaur-tissue/> (accessed July 18, 2017)

***assumption:* Gas Molecules Self-Assembled Into Stars**

Evolutionists *assume* hydrogen gas molecules pulled together under their own gravity, forming the first stars, even though this would be contrary to the laws of physics. If gas is compacted, it heats up, and that would push the gas molecules apart due to the gas laws of physics. Evolutionists propose that a shock wave from a nearby supernova could have overcome the outward pressure produced by the gas laws. Now that claim would not work for the very first stars, since there would be no other stars to explode producing the needed shock wave. Evolutionists *hope* to one day figure out how the first stars could overcome the gas laws. Even if a means of overcoming the gas laws is found, it does not mean that the stars formed that way.

Your Creation Apologetic

Pointing out the assumptions of evolutionists is a powerful tool in your creation apologetics toolbox. Make good use of this tool. Start with the “no creator” assumption. If needed, also mention the “no flood,” “deep time,” and other assumptions. Instead of questioning the science of evolution, question the unproven assumptions which direct and constrain that science.

Mark Bergemann is a retired electrical engineer with a B.S. from UW-Milwaukee. He serves as president of the Lutheran Science Institute, and as a Martin Luther College adjunct instructor, teaching the online course Creation Apologetics 101. He is a member of Good Shepherd's Evangelical Lutheran Church in West Allis, Wisconsin.

The Propaganda of Steven Jay Gould

Jeffery Stueber

Stephen Gould is an American paleontologist, evolutionary biologist, and science writer. Gould graduated from Antioch College in 1963 and then went on to get a Ph.D. in paleontology from Columbia University in 1967. That same year he joined the faculty at Harvard University and become a professor there in 1973. In 2000, he become president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.¹ If anyone should know the evidence for evolution, it should be Gould.

In 1981, in an article for *Discover* magazine, Gould offered three pieces of evidence for evolution. Despite his obvious scientific acumen, his arguments were not only philosophically illogical but contrary to the available evidence and his own writing. These show Lutherans, and all creationists, an example of how evolutionists can vigorously argue for their beliefs while using fundamentally flawed logic and evidence.

Gould's 1st Evidence: Microevolution

Gould's first argument rests on evidence for microevolution.²

Our confidence that evolution occurred centers upon three general arguments. First, we have abundant, direct, observational evidence of evolution in action, from both field and laboratory. This evidence ranges from countless experiments on change in nearly everything about fruit flies subjected to artificial selection in the laboratory to the

¹ <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Stephen-Jay-Gould>.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/President_of_the_American_Association_for_the_Advancement_of_Science

² By "microevolution" I refer to changes in the genome that are minor compared to the macroevolution needed to power evolution. Changes in the color of moths or beak size in birds are examples of microevolution.

famous populations of British moths that became black when industrial soot darkened the trees upon which the moths rest.³

In response to this argument, creationists, Gould says, have “tightened their act” and claimed that animals come from different kinds.⁴ However, I have never seen any evidence that creationists have made such claims because of the microevolution Gould cites. Rather, they have done so because the Bible claims that God created distinctive types of animals. For example, Frank Lewis Marsh, in an article published prior to 1971 and at least ten years prior to Gould’s statement says,

It is obvious that from the wording in Genesis that the expression “after his kind” includes both morphological and physiological characteristics. That is to say, when the plants and animals appeared upon the earth the individuals of each basic type were distinctly different in the details of their form, structure, and internal chemistry from the individuals of all other basic types. To express it mildly, in the light of Genesis 1:12 it is difficult to understand how a basic type could transmute into a new basic type or could give rise to a new basic type if its reproductive performance was such as to bring forth additional individuals of the same kind as their parents.⁵

Another author, Henry Morris, also writing before Gould, says much the same thing,

Even though there may be uncertainty as to what is meant by “kind” (Hebrew *min*), it is obvious that the word does have a definite and fixed meaning. One “kind” could not transform itself into another “kind.” There is certainly no thought here of an evolutionary continuity of all forms of life, but rather one of definite and distinct categories. Fur-

3 Stephen Gould, *Hen’s Teeth and Horses Toes* (New York: Norton, 1983), 257.

4 Gould, 257.

5 Frank Lewis Marsh, “The Genesis Kinds in the Modern World,” Walter Lammerts, ed., *Scientific Studies in Special Creation* (Creation Research Society, 1990), 140. The first edition was published in 1971.

thermore, the sense of the passage is that a great many different kinds were created in each of the nine major groups (excluding man) that are specifically listed. There is certainly room for variations within each kind, as is obvious from the fact that all the different races and nations of men, with all their wide variety of physical characteristics, are descended from the first man and are therefore all included within the human “kind.” The same must be true for the other kinds. Many different varieties can emerge within the basic framework of each kind, but at the same time such variations can never extend beyond that framework.⁶

The evolutionist way of fooling us

Cite minor changes in nature, extrapolate,
then proclaim unlimited evolution is true.

The main problem with Gould’s argument, however, is that change is limited. Regarding the moths Gould cites, Jonathan Wells calls these one of many “icons of evolution” that don’t demonstrate the truth of evolution at all. In the early 1950s, British physician and biologist Bernard Kettlewell performed experiments on moths to demonstrate that predatory birds ate light-colored moths which rested on dark-colored polluted tree trunks. Because the dark-colored moths could not be seen as well, they would be less likely to be eaten and, supposedly, this demonstrated the power of natural selection to bring about new species. This was the best evidence available for evolution at that time, but problems with the evidence came later. Population distribution of moths suggested factors other than color and presence of birds were responsible for the survival of dark-colored moths, and evidence has accumulated that peppered moths do not normally rest on tree trunks. Following the passage of anti-pollu-

⁶ Henry Morris, *Scientific Creationism*, 2nd ed., (El Cajon: CA, Master Books, 1985), 217. The first edition was published in 1974.

tion legislation in the 1950s, the percentage of dark-colored moths declined, and the change in the moths never went beyond a change in color.⁷

In 1973, Pete and Rosemary Grant visited Daphne Major, one of the islands in the Galapagos which Darwin visited, to study beak size changes in Darwin's finches. They returned every year for four decades. In 1977 a drought hit the island, and many finches died because they could not crack open large seeds. Within a few years the finch population recovered but the average beak depth had increased from 9.2 mm to 9.7 mm. In 1982, heavy rains came to the island, and the finches with smaller beaks had the advantage because of the increase in availability of smaller seeds. In just a few generations the beak size decreased by 2.5 percent. The depth of beaks changed from 1975 to 2000, fluctuating between larger and smaller beaks, but never showing unlimited change of size.⁸

A college textbook describes the tremendous success of animal breeding, while also pointing out the limits of breeding. Milk production in the Netherlands increased from 1945 to 2000. Selective breeding of broiler hens tripled the hens' body weight. Laying hens, after selective breeding, lay more eggs, lay larger eggs, and lay them sooner. Through selective breeding, racehorses became faster before reaching a limit. A limit in breeding lighter chickens has been reached as well.⁹

However, this textbook also notes that not all breeding is good: "There are also examples where selective breeding has not only improved certain performances, but simultaneously and unintendedly also deteriorated other performances that were not under selection: the so-called negative correlated responses." It's noted that the problems are "structural" — meaning that increasing one part of an animal may cause failure of another part. The authors of this article give examples of this in dog breeding such

7 Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution: Science or Myth?: Why Much of What We Teach About Evolution is Wrong* (Washington DC, Regnery, 2000), Chap. 7.

8 Roberts and Company, *Natural Selection: Empirical Studies in the Wild*, Chapter Eight, <https://ncse.com/files/pub/evolution/excerpt--evolution.pdf>.

9 Kor Oldenbroek and Liesbeth van der Waaij, *Textbook Animal Breeding and Genetics for BSc students*, Centre for Genetic Resources The Netherlands and Animal Breeding and Genomics Centre, 2015, chap. 1.12, 13.4. Groen Kennisnet: <https://wiki.groenkennisnet.nl/display/TAB/> (accessed Oct 11, 2017)

as eyes that pop out of eye sockets because the skull is too small or dogs that can't eat properly because of malformed jaws. Some dogs have been bred for larger ears with an increase in ear infections.¹⁰ This demonstrates a fundamental flaw in any search for further evolution. A change in one part of the animal may have unforeseen negative consequences that do not provide the animal any benefit to survival.

Ernst Mayr was “considered one of the world’s leading evolutionary biologists, he was sometimes referred to as the ‘Darwin of the 20th century.’”¹¹ Author Norman Macbeth quotes Mayr as saying animals have a resistance to change, which Mayr calls “genetic homeostasis.” Mayr provides an example: Researchers were able to decrease the bristles in the fruit fly *Drosophila melanogaster* to 25 bristles, but then the line became sterile and died out. Bristle count was raised to 56 with sterility once again occurring. Macbeth suggests Mayr believes these results are normal and quotes Mayr as saying “Obviously any drastic improvement under selection must seriously deplete the store of genetic variability. ...The most frequent correlated response of one-sided selection is a drop in general fitness. This plagues virtually every breeding experiment.”¹²

Evolutionist Jeremy Rifkin quotes two evolutionists, Loren Eiseley and Douglas Scott Falconer, who also say there are limits to the evolutionary change nature can achieve.¹³

It would appear that careful domestic breeding, whatever it may do to improve the quality of race horses or cabbages, is not actually in itself the road to the endless biological deviation which is evolution. [Eiseley]

The improvements that have been made by selection in these [domesticated breeds] have clearly been accompanied by a reduction of fitness for life under natural conditions, and only the fact that domesticated animals and

¹⁰ Oldenbroek and Waaij, chap. 1.13.

¹¹ <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Ernst-Mayr>

¹² Norman Macbeth, *Darwin Retried: an appeal to reason* (Boston: The Harvard Common Press, 1971), 34-35.

¹³ Jeremy Rifkin, *Algeny* (New York: Viking, 1983), 130, 133.

plants do not live under natural conditions has allowed these improvements to be made. [Falconer]

Many biologists do not share Darwin's confidence that the limited changes observed in plants and animals are actually unlimited. German zoologist Bernhard Rensch has provided a long list of authorities who maintain that macroevolution cannot be explained by microevolution. Author Michael Denton quotes world-famous evolutionist Ernst Mayr as saying that "The proponents of the synthetic theory maintain that all evolution is due to the accumulation of small genetic changes, guided by natural selection, and that transpecific evolution is nothing but an extrapolation and magnification of the events that take place within populations and species." Despite that, Mayr says, there are some evolutionists who have claimed the origin of new "types" could not be explained by known facts.¹⁴

Gould seems to understand these limits. He says that "few systems are more resistant to basic change than the strongly differentiated, highly specified, complex adults of 'higher' animal groups." How could you ever, for instance, convert an adult rhinoceros or a mosquito into something different, he asks. Yet, he says transitions between major groups of animals have happened.¹⁵ To show the vanity of such a search for transitions, Gould quotes classical scholar D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson as saying,

An algebraic curve has its fundamental formula, which defines the family to which it belongs. ... We never think of "transforming" a helicoid into an ellipsoid, or a circle into a frequency curve. So it is with the forms of animals. We cannot transform an invertebrate into a vertebrate, nor a coelenterate into a worm, by any simple and legitimate deformation. ... Nature proceeds from one type to another. ... To seek for steppingstones across the gaps between is to seek in vain, forever.¹⁶

¹⁴ Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (Bethesda, Maryland: Adler&Adler, 1986), 86-87.

¹⁵ Stephen Gould, *The Panda's Thumb* (New York: Norton, 1980), 192-193.

¹⁶ Gould, 193.

If these comments were not enough, three years later James Gleick, writing for the *New York Times*, quotes Gould as saying “We’re not just evolving slowly ...for all practical purposes we’re not evolving. There’s no reason to think we’re going to get bigger brains or smaller toes or whatever —we are what we are.”¹⁷ Gould often departs from his Darwinist allies, because of the strong evidence against evolution. Of course, Gould still remains a staunch defender of evolution.

Given these limits, a skeptic of Darwinism, like me, could and should ask how evolutionists can argue for unlimited naturalistic change. Evolutionist Richard Dawkins shows us. Dawkins also talks about the success of breeding experiments, the creation of new breeds of dogs, for instance, and is impressed by how quickly evolutionary change can progress. “If so much evolutionary change can be achieved in just a few centuries or even decades, just think of what might be achieved in ten or a hundred million years,” he remarks.¹⁸

This is the standard evolutionist way of fooling us. They cite minor changes nature can make, proclaim it as evolution, extrapolate those changes beyond what they show is possible, and then proclaim that unlimited evolution is true.

Gould’s 2nd Evidence: Imperfections of Nature

Gould’s second argument rests on the imperfections of nature.

The second argument —that the imperfections of nature reveal 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 —the camber of a gull’s wing, or the butterflies that cannot be seen in ground litter because they mimic leaves so precisely. But perfection could be imposed by a wise

¹⁷ James Gleick, “Breaking Tradition With Darwin,” *The New York Times* (November 20, 1983), <http://www.nytimes.com/books/97/11/09/home/gould-magazine.html>.

¹⁸ Richard Dawkins, *The Greatest Show on Earth* (New York: Free Press, 2009), 37.

creator or evolved by natural selection. Perfection covers the tracks of past history. And past history—the evidence of descent—is the mark of evolution.¹⁹

There is a philosophical problem with Gould's approach. Although evolutionists at times argue that defects in biological systems are evidence for evolution, they often argue the opposite: That nature appears craftily designed in a way that could support claims of divine design.

Famous evolutionist Richard Dawkins tried to demonstrate that undirected mutations can lead to increased complexity in animals, by suggesting that a computer program simulating monkeys typing on a keyboard can produce the phrase “Methinks it is like a weasel.” What kind of computer program did he use to demonstrate this? Of course, it was a program which knew the target phrase, and then kept each randomly generated phrase that most closely matched the target.²⁰ Dawkins is, in essence, smuggling design and intention into his argument against divine design and intention. Gould himself falls to this temptation when he writes,

The essence of Darwinism lies in a single phrase: natural 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 the advantageous part in a random spectrum of genetic variability. Selection must superintend the process of creation, not just toss out the misfits after some other force suddenly produces a new species, fully formed in pristine perfection.²¹

Assume that I argued that wind, water, and erosion could produce a mud hut and told you that these natural processes *create* the correct ar-

¹⁹ Gould, *Hen's Teeth*, 258.

²⁰ Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker* (New York: Norton, 1987), 46-47.

²¹ Gould, *Panda's Thumb*, 190.

rangements of mud, *build* different stages of hut up from the beginning, *preserve* the best arrangements of each level of hut, *superintend* the process of hut building, and *toss out* the wrong arrangements. Would you be more convinced that wind, water, and erosion could produce that mud hut or would you feel that I had cleverly smuggled in words into my apologetic that insinuated that natural processes had design capabilities? My guess is you would say I smuggled in those words, and you should think the same of Gould.

**All you have to do,
to find out how *frail*
most evolutionists'
arguments are, is to
READ WHAT THEY WRITE.**

However, let's assume that evolutionists were united in claiming that defects in life were evidence that an undirected process produced life. They would have to refute the overwhelming evidence that animals have been assembled by someone or something with an understanding of the sciences. In Jonathan Sarfati's *By Design* book, we learn that the flippers of humpback whales are bumpy, and this design is superior to smooth flippers because these bumps, or tubercles, provide better lift and less drag. This is a design aircraft designers can learn from. Dolphins use echolocation that is the envy of the U.S. Navy. It took an expert in chaos theory to show that the dolphin's "click" pattern is mathematically designed to give the best information. Ants rely on advanced mathematical computations to decide where to go.²² These facts, and many more, are consistent with intelligent design divine creation and not unintelligent evolution.

Gould later argues, rather sloppily, that "The principle of imperfection extends to all historical sciences. When we recognize the etymolo-

²² Jonathan Sarfati, *By Design* (Creation Book Publishers, 2008), 47, 81, 93.

gy of September, October, November, and December . . . we know that the year once started in March, or that two additional months must have been added to an original calendar of ten months.”

Gould’s 3rd Evidence: Continuity of The Fossil Record

This brings Gould to his third argument that “transitions are often found in the fossil record.”²³ *Gould is arguing for the continuity of the fossil record displayed in the same way our calendar months are continuous. However, Gould knows this is not true.*

In 1972, he and Niles Eldredge proposed the theory of punctuated equilibrium that explained away gaps in the fossil record. Gould, in the book *Punctuated Equilibrium*, quotes himself and Eldredge as suggesting that, in 1977, they “wondered why evolutionary paleontologists have continued to seek for over a century and almost always in vain, the ‘insensibly graded series’ that Darwin told us to find” and that it was time for evolutionary theory to “confront the phenomenon of evolutionary non-change.”²⁴ Gould quotes George Gaylord Simpson, whom Gould says is “the greatest and most biologically astute paleontologist of the 20th century,” as saying, at the 1959 Chicago centennial celebration for the *Origin of the Species*, that:

It is a feature of the known fossil record that most taxa appear abruptly. They are not, as a rule, led up to by a sequence of almost imperceptibly changing forerunners such as Darwin believed should be usual in evolution. A great many sequences of two or a few temporally intergrading species are known, but even at this level most species appear without known intermediate ancestors, and really, perfectly complete sequences of numerous species are exceedingly rare. . . . These peculiarities of the record pose one of the most important theoretical prob-

²³ Gould, *Hen’s Teeth*, 258-259.

²⁴ Stephen Gould, *Punctuated Equilibrium* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 22. Material comes from chapters one and nine of Gould’s book *The Structure of Evolutionary Theory*.

lems in the whole history of life: is the sudden appearance ... a phenomenon of evolution or of the record only, due to sampling bias or other inadequacies?²⁵

The situation became so desperate that Gould wrote an article where he backed Richard Goldschmidt, who suggested that macromutations (large scale mutations) are normally harmful, producing what he called “monsters.” However, now and then a macromutation might result in a benefit to the animal, a “hopeful monster.” Gould chose to defend Goldschmidt by arguing not just that macroevolution is microevolution extrapolated, or “(flies in bottles) extended” as he put it, but that “major structural transitions can occur rapidly without a smooth series of intermediate steps.” Gould suggests, instead, that these large changes can happen from small changes in the timing of development in embryos.²⁶ The result of his arguments, then, is to explain away gaps in the fossil record.

Paleontologist and evolutionary biologist Steven Stanley, devoted a book on the extent to which the fossil record displays discontinuity. Stanley immediately, in the introduction to the book, summarizes the peril evolution is in:

Thus, the new message offered by the ancient remains of humans, horses, and many other animals is that evolution has occurred episodically. Most change has taken place so rapidly and in such confined geographic areas that it is simply not documented by our imperfect model. The resulting view of evolution has become known as the punctuational model, while the contrasting traditional view has been labeled the gradualistic model. The punctuational model is not incompatible with what we now know of modern life on Earth. There is good evidence that certain distinctive living species of animals have formed since the dawning of modern civilization in the Middle East.

The punctuational model might appear to represent a

²⁵ Gould, 26

²⁶ Gould, *Panda's Thumb*, 186-193.

minor modification of the traditional scheme of evolution—an esoteric adjustment that should interest only specialized practitioners of biological science. In fact, its consequences reach much farther. The punctuational view implies, among other things, that evolution is often ineffective at perfecting the adaptations of animals and plants; that there is no real ecological balance of nature; that most large-scale evolutionary trends are not produced by the gradual reshaping of established species, but are the net result of many rapid steps of evolution, not all of which have moved in the same direction; and that sexual reproduction does not prevail in the world for the reasons that have traditionally been offered.²⁷

So as we have seen, before Gould suggested that transitions in evolutionary history were as discernible as the months of the year, it was well known this wasn't true. In fact, the situation was so bad that Gould had previously worked to explain away the gaps.

Conclusion

Gould's arguments are masterful works of propaganda that are intended to deceive people into believing in evolution when, in fact, Gould's arguments are frail. All you have to do, to find out how frail most evolutionists' arguments are, is to read what they write—which is what I have done with Gould.

Jeffrey Stueber, a free-lance writer, serves as secretary of the Lutheran Science Institute. He is a member of St. John Evangelical Lutheran Church in Watertown WI.

²⁷ Steven Stanley, *The New Evolutionary Timetable* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 5.

How Old Is That Cave?

Have you ever seen a stalactite growing on a building? One made of minerals, not just ice. They are more common than you may realize. I have seen many. One grew in the basement of my childhood home in Wauwatosa, Wisconsin. That house was built in 1954, and my parents purchased it around 1967. It initially had well water, but the well was capped when city water became available. The pipe which had brought water about 100 feet from the well to the house was not removed. Mineral water slowly dripped out of that pipe's open end into a crawl space in our home's basement. By 1967 these drips had formed a beautiful stalactite, more than 4 inches long. So in less than a decade, that stalactite grew 4 inches.

Evolutionists are well aware that stalactites and stalagmites can grow rapidly, even inches per year under some conditions. Yet because they *assume* deep time (see *Assumptions of Evolutionists*¹ on page 7), they conclude that stalactites in caves form very slowly. To reach this conclusion, they *assume* that conditions for stalactite and stalagmite formation have remained similar to today's conditions for the past tens and even hundreds of thousands of years. For example, they *assume* the dripping water's mineral content and flow rate have always been similar to what is measured today (except for past periods when they *assume* no water flow). They also *assume* that there was no planetary flood on earth, an event which would provide significantly different cave formation conditions for centuries following such a cataclysm. Based on these assumptions and others, they calculate cave stalactites grow less than one inch in 25-100 years. If the flow rate of mineral water was higher in the past, say for the first centuries after Noah's Flood, then cave stalactites may have formed rapidly during those post-flood conditions.

Our LSI Journal cover photo was taken in 2002 in Cave of the Mounds National Natural Landmark, located in Blue Mounds Wisconsin. The web page for that cave states, "It takes approximately 100 years for

¹ Mark Bergemann, Assumptions of Evolutionists, *LSI Journal*, 31. no. 4 (2017): 7. www.LutheranScience.org/2017fall

cave onyx, or calcite, to grow 1 inch.”² This of course assumes that the mineral content and flow rate of the dripping water, and other conditions in the past, were similar to conditions today. That web page continues,

The Cave is made of a natural limestone called galena dolomite. Our limestone formed during the Ordovician Period, between 450-500 million years ago. Our Cave has a 6-foot fossil of a giant cephalopod, a relative of the squid.³ ...The Cave was formed within limestone, a sedimentary rock formed from compacted seashells and other marine sediments. ...During the Ordovician Period, warm shallow seas covered the continent where we find Wisconsin today.⁴

Try to think about some of the many *unprovable assumptions* which an evolutionist uses in making these statements. Evolutionists *assume* that there was no planetary flood on earth. They reject the possibility of a planet-wide flood on earth because such a catastrophe would completely change their scientific conclusions, demolishing the evolutionary geologic column and completely revising the dating of fossils and rocks. Evolutionists *assume* that seashells and other marine sediments slowly accumulated on the sea floor over millions of years, and that happened over 450 million years ago. They reject the possibility that these fossil laden sedimentary rock layers were deposited quickly during a global catastrophe. Evolutionists *assume* that easily eroded limestone has existed for over 450 million years without being completely eroded away.

If any of these unproven assumptions are wrong, then the resulting scientific conclusions made by evolutionists are invalid.

MSB

2 “Fun Facts About Cave of the Mounds -Science,” Cave of The Mounds, <https://www.caveofthemounds.com/about/fun-facts/> (accessed October 5, 2017).

3 “Fun Facts ...,” Cave of the Mounds.

4 “Science of the Cave,” Cave of The Mounds, <https://www.caveofthemounds.com/about/science/> (accessed October 5, 2017).



Water dripping in Rushova peshtera cave, Bulgaria

[credit: Pixabay]



Frasassi Cave in Italy.

[credit: Pixabay]

“Stalactites” are formed when mineral laden water drips from the ceiling, depositing minerals to build an icicle-like formation. The water dripping off of the stalactite may build a “stalagmite” on the floor. Eventually a stalactite and the stalagmite below it may grow large enough to meet, becoming a “column.” There are several memory tricks, pick your favorite:

stalactITES hold TIGHT to the ceiling
stalagMITES MIGHT touch the ceiling

stalactites on the ceiling
stalagmites on the ground