

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.¹ Death and suffering are the result of the sin of Adam and Eve, not the means God used to create animals and people.²

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 kinds³). 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

¹ 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.

² Romans 5:12-21; 1 Corinthians 15:20-49.

³ 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.⁴

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.⁵

⁴ 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)

⁵ 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.⁶

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.⁷

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.

⁶ Danielson, 75.

⁷ 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.⁸ 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.⁹ 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.¹⁰

For a list of over 50 obsolete scientific theories see:

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

⁸ 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)

⁹ 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)

¹⁰ 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 (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.¹¹

**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.

¹¹ "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.¹²

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

¹² 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.¹³

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.¹⁴

Question: Why do scientific bodies speak for science?

Answer: The origin of the word "science" is from words meaning "to know," and "having knowledge."¹⁵ 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.

¹³ 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.

¹⁴ "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.

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

Creationists see similar weakness in all evidence for evolution.¹⁶ 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

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.

¹⁶ 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.