

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."¹ 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

¹ 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.”² 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.”³ 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.⁴

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.”⁵ 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.”⁶ 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,

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

³ Darwin, 305.

⁴ Darwin, 305.

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

⁶ Darwin, 305.

alligators, and aardvarks, for instance.⁷ Stanley favors the punctuated equilibrium model but does show that species change within only specific limits. This matches what we would expect if genetic homeostasis⁸ 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."⁹

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.¹⁰ 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?”¹¹ 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.”¹² 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

⁷ Stanley, 5, 83-84.

⁸ 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.

⁹ J. Madeleine Nash, "When Life Exploded," *Time*, December 4, 1995, 74.

¹⁰ http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/evolution/library/03/5/1_035_01.html.

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

¹² 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."¹³

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.¹⁴ 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.¹⁵

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.¹⁶ 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 "inevitable" 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

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

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

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

¹⁶ 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.”¹⁷

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.”¹⁸ 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.¹⁹ 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.²⁰

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.”²¹ 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

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

¹⁸ Morris, 19-20.

¹⁹ http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2013/09/13090413254_8.htm.

²⁰ http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/evolution/library/01/4/l_014_01.html.

²¹ 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.²²

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.”²³ Dawkins says “Biology is the study of complicated things that give the appearance of having been designed for a purpose.”²⁴ 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]”²⁵ 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.²⁶

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.

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

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

²⁴ Dawkins, 1.

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

²⁶ 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.²⁷ 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.²⁸

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.²⁹ 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."³⁰ 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:

²⁷ <http://www.nmsr.org/essay3a.htm>.

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

²⁹ http://www.evolutionnews.org/2012/08/paper_rebuffs_v063201.html.

³⁰ 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!³¹

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."³² 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.³³ So, if people massacre each other, or cooperate, evolutionists will claim both circumstances are confirmations of evolution.

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

³² Julian Huxley, introduction to Darwin, *The Origin of the Species*, 29.

³³ 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.³⁴ 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.³⁵

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.³⁶ 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.

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

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

³⁶ 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 instance³⁷ – 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.

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