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What do the experts say about science? We will study this book published by Cambridge University and another published by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT).
This issue builds a 3–point creation apologetic:

1) Science is a flawed human endeavor that may not produce final truth about anything.

2) Unprovable presuppositions force evolutionary science to reject the truth about creation and instead accept a lie about millions of years.

3) God reveals final truth and true reality in the Bible.
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What is Science?

Mark Bergemann

Did you know that scientists have long debated the question, “What is science”? You can actually devote your entire career to better defining what science is. “There are whole academic fields (separate from the practice of science itself) that focus precisely on how scientists study nature.”

In 2019, two major universities each published a book on this topic: What Science Is and How It Really Works from Cambridge University; and The Scientific Attitude—Defending Science from Denial, Fraud, and Pseudoscience from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). One of these books reveals,

Despite the weight that the label of science may carry with many people, it is an utter fiction that there is (or ever has been) a uniform consensus among scientists (or anyone else for that matter) as to what precisely defines science.

A goal of these books is to answer the question, “What sets science apart from other ways of knowing?” This leads these authors to center in on the most fundamental aspects of what science is.

My summary of how these books define science is: a consensus among experts about how nature works, limited to natural explanations, a self-correcting process that changes its claims over time, and generating useful explanations (not final truth). That is something with which we

2 Zimring.
4 Zimring, 3.
5 “Science does not generate truth, but rather, useful explanations,” is a quote from a creationist. The secular books we are now discussing describe science in a similar way. The creationist is: Paul R. Boehlke, “Dinosaurs, God’s Creatures,” LSI Journal, 32, no. 4 (fall 2018): 12. www.LutheranScience.org/2018fall
as Christian creationists can agree. The *LSI Journal* has published many
articles that define science in similar ways, such as *The Nature of Science*,
*Dinosaurs, God’s Creatures*, *Dinosaur Retrospect*, *No Experiment Can
Disprove It*, *Amazing Discovery: Seven Planets Orbiting A Red Dwarf*, *How Old Is That Cave?* *Assumptions of Evolutionists*, *Black Holes*, and *Steven Hawking vs God: His Assumptions About The Universe*.

## Cambridge Book Defines Science

James C. Zimring authored the book published by Cambridge. He
is “a professor of pathology at the University of Virginia.” I recommend
this book for those who wish to better understand what science is and what
it is not. What are its strengths and weaknesses? This author attempts to
be a peace maker between science and religion, showing the great simi-
larities in how scientific and religious experts function. As Christians, we
can agree with much of what he says.

Zimring emphasizes the self-correcting nature of science. His fi-
nal chapter is titled, *Putting It All Together to Describe “What Science Is
and How It Really Works.”* That summary chapter begins with the follow-
ing words (all caps in original).

**SCIENCE ENTAILS THE PRACTICE OF COMPENSATING
FOR ERRORS OF NATURAL HUMAN THINKING AND IT
EVOLVES OVER TIME.** Based on the discussions in this book,
the following definition of science is suggested to my fellow sci-
entists and non-scientists alike. First and foremost, science is an

---

15 Zimring, back cover.

---

6 *What is Science?*
outgrowth of normal human observation, reasoning, conclusion, and prediction.\textsuperscript{16}

After detailing how scientists and non-scientists reason in the same way, and with similar flaws and errors, the summary chapter continues,

If science and non-science have so much in common and are so highly rated, what can the distinction possibly be? The proposed distinction is that science makes a particular note of the source of these errors and develops its methodology (over time) to mitigate these errors. …If we define science as a thing that progressively attempts to compensate for errors found in how humans normally navigate the world, it is easy to see why one cannot define what science is by looking for particular common methods found in all scientists (and their work) across the centuries.\textsuperscript{17}

The summary chapter then mentions that “science is nevertheless extremely close to normal human thinking.”\textsuperscript{18} One difference between science and non-science: a “hallmark of science” is that science can be “counterintuitive, and defy common sense in many ways.”\textsuperscript{19} Another difference between science and non-science “is that science is the study of [certain] natural phenomena.”\textsuperscript{20} Regarding natural phenomena Zimring states,

Thus, having an object of study with the correct properties so as to be susceptible to scientific methodologies can be a demarcation criteria. That is, some non-scientists may be acting identically to how a scientist would, but cannot carry out science because of the nature of what they study.\textsuperscript{21}

\begin{itemize}
  \item[$\textsuperscript{16}$] Zimring, 353.
  \item[$\textsuperscript{17}$] Zimring, 354, 355.
  \item[$\textsuperscript{18}$] Zimring, 358.
  \item[$\textsuperscript{19}$] Zimring, 358.
  \item[$\textsuperscript{20}$] Zimring, 359.
  \item[$\textsuperscript{21}$] Zimring, 359.
\end{itemize}
MIT Book Defines Science

The other book we are examining, published by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), emphasizes that science is based on evidence and error correcting. The author is Lee McIntyre, “a Research Fellow at the Center for Philosophy and History of Science at Boston University.” McIntyre states in his summary chapter (italics in original),

What is most special about science is not the alleged “scientific method” that it follows, but rather its respect for the power of empirical evidence to shape and change our theories, and reliance on the practices of critical scrutiny by our peers to catch our mistakes if we do not. …Even if evidence cannot uniquely determine which theory is “true,” deference to empirical evidence is what gives science its special explanatory power.

…Ideological theories like intelligent design…should not be considered scientific. …They champion ideology over evidence. They have no humility over the fact that science pushes us not toward certainty, but more likely toward abandoning some false idea that we desperately wanted to believe.

…Science is a rational process by which we learn how to constantly reevaluate and discard our prejudices, wishes, and hunches about the world and replace them with conclusions that can be squared with the data of human experience. This is the root of scientific warrant. Despite the fact that science can never get us to “truth,” it is still a remarkable and unique way of knowing.

…The scientific attitude requires us to care about evidence and to use it to modify our theory, we had better take seriously the idea not just that science relies on evidence, but also that it requires a theory to be warranted on its basis. This is the backbone of scientific explanation. …If we care about empirical evidence and use it to shape our theories, we are on the road to science. If not, we will remain mired in the ditch of ideology, superstition, and confusion.

22 McIntyre, back cover.
23 McIntyre, 201-203, 205.
Is There a “Scientific Method”?  

Note that none of the preceding definitions of “science” include a “scientific method” (see figure on page 35). Most experts (who study what science is) agree that there is no such thing as a scientific method. Two highly influential philosophers of science long ago rejected the scientific method as being an essential part of science (Popper in 1934, Kuhn in 1962). McIntyre writes,

If there is one thing that most people think is special about science, it is that it follows a distinctive “scientific method.” If there is one thing that the majority of philosophers of science agree on, it is the idea that there is no such thing as “scientific method.”

While McIntyre flatly states that there is no scientific method, Zimring speaks against it a little less forcibly,

However, while one often encounters discussions of “the scientific method” and its application to investigations, there is a lack of agreement about what precisely this method entails, and there are those who argue that the very notion of a scientific model is itself an utter myth. It has further been argued, that different areas of scientific study favor different types of method(s), and thus one cannot precisely define “science” or the “scientific method” per se.  

McIntyre questions science textbooks that still teach the scientific method as being essential to science. I have five college biology textbooks in my library. While all five teach about the scientific method, four of them significantly downplay that method in some way, so it seems that the textbooks are starting to conform with the idea that the scientific

---

25 McIntyre, 9.
26 Zimring, 7.
27 McIntyre, 9.
method is not essential to science.

Here is one quote from each of those four textbooks [bold is in original],

For many years scientists have written about the “scientific method” as though there were a single way of doing science. This oversimplification has contributed to confusion on the part of non-scientists about the nature of science. …A number of complimentary approaches allow understanding of natural phenomena—there is no “right way.”28

There is no formula for successful scientific inquiry, no single scientific method with a rule book that researchers must rigidly follow.29

Science differs from other ways of knowing and learning by its process, which can be quite varied because it can be adjusted to where and how a study is being conducted. Still, the scientific process often involves the use of the scientific method, which begins with observation.30

Not all discoveries are the result of researchers following the scientific method.31

Science Has Changed

Some scientific work in the past would not be accepted as science if done today, including some scientific work that resulted in major discoveries. Zimring writes [bracketed words not in original],

Scholars of science have often rejected any definition [of science] that would render the great historical scientists as “nonscientific.”

---

…What “scientific” means in 2019 may be very different from what is meant in 1919, 1819, or 1719. …But the idea that universal factors must be present in all science over time—that science itself is not evolving—is a difficult position to support.32

Zimring also reports that over much of history, scholars of science claimed that scientific facts were certain final truth, while other ways of knowing only had opinions. Later, many scientific facts were found to be in error, and replaced with new scientific facts. Scientific facts were then “understood to be fallible and thus not so different from opinions.”33

Eventually it was thought that what separated science from other ways of knowing were not the facts of science but the thinking technique used by scientists to produce those facts.34

As we saw in their quotes at the beginning of this article, both Zimring and McIntyre claim that the attribute of error correction is a central part of what differentiates scientific thinking from other ways of thinking.

**Does Evolution Follow the “Scientific Method”?**

Some creationists claim that evolution is not science because it does not utilize the scientific method. That claim falls apart with those who know that the scientific method is not an essential part of science.

While the “hard” sciences of physics and chemistry may more often make use of the scientific method (compared to “soft” sciences like archaeology, psychology, and evolution), even in physics and chemistry, scientific discoveries leading to new theories sometimes have not followed any version of the scientific method. That is why the experts who study what science is, say there is no such thing as a scientific method.

---
32 Zimring, 7-8.
33 Zimring, 6.
34 Zimring, 6.
Is There Truth in Science?

Our earlier quote from the MIT book admits “that science can never get us to ‘truth.’” The Cambridge book also describes this lack of certainty in the conclusions of science. Zimring writes,

It is essential to deflate science to a state more realistic than the common hyperbole of what science is and how confident we are in its claims. …Science must be viewed through a more realistic lens—as an intrinsically flawed process that will not achieve certainty on anything. …Our best scientific theories seldom (if ever) predict all of our observations, and if they do, then just wait until we have a few more observations.35

In contrast to the infallibility of many religious claims, science has long acknowledged that scientific facts that are held as fundamental truths by one generation can be rejected by subsequent generations.36

Two prominent scientists write in their college science textbook (italics in original),

Although philosophers of science rarely agree on many points, they do generally agree that (1) there is no single right way to do science and (2) a scientific approach cannot guarantee truth. …Science offers no ironclad assurance that application of its methods will necessarily result in the absolute final truth about anything.37

35 Zimring, 99, 100, 101.
36 Zimring, 133.
Is Ever-Changing “Truth” Good?

It is amazing when these books claim that the ever-changing, self-correcting nature of science is a primary reason why we should trust science over other ways of knowing, even over revelation from God in Scripture. We can be certain that what God reveals to us in the Bible is FINAL TRUTH and reflects true reality. By its own admission, science does NOT provide final truth. The Bible is final and ultimate truth, and truth does not need correcting.

Yet so many people, even many Christians, reject the truth about how God created the world. They replace the truth revealed by God with human-reason generated scientific conclusions which flow from (as Zimring states) “an intrinsically flawed process that will not achieve certainty on anything.”

Your word is truth.

John 17:17 (EHV)

If you remain in my word, you are really my disciples. You will also know the truth, and the truth will set you free.

John 8:31b-32 (EHV)

Evolution Cannot Explain All Observations

Creationists commonly point out some of the countless places where scientific observations conflict with the evolution story. I do that too, such as in my article, “Fossils in the Geologic Column—Problems for

38 Zimring, 100.
Is There Truth in Science? 39 My purpose in doing so is to help combat the popular but false idea that evolution theory does not have logical problems. We must though, realize that ALL of science has logical problems. Zimring writes,

Scientists are fairly comfortable with a level of incoherence. It is for this reason that you will typically only hear non-scientists reject the theory of evolution because it can’t explain every last specific detail of the fossil record or the lack of some predicted fossils. …Essentially, all theories have anomalies and things they can’t explain. Only nonscientific theories explain everything perfectly and without exception.40

Does your creation apologetic center on questioning evolution because it does not “explain every last specific detail of the fossil record or the lack of some predicted fossils”? If so, you are not making a strong apologetic claim.

As Zimring points out, all scientific theories have “anomalies and things they can’t explain.” Since all science has logical problems, it would be expected that evolution would also, since evolution theory is part of science.

Pointing out places where evolution theory is especially weak—such as the impossibility of non-living chemicals self-assembling into the first life form—can be helpful in getting someone’s attention, and it may be the only apologetic needed in ministering to some. Yet listing evidence which evolution cannot explain is not a very strong apologetic in many cases.

Every creationist could benefit by learning apologetic claims that are often stronger and less easily dismissed. One of the strongest and most easily used creation apologetics is to point out the unprovable presuppositions on which evolution is based. If one or more of those assumptions are false, then evolution theory is invalid and worthless (where it is based on a false assumption). We will look at how to use that apologetic later in this article.

40 Zimring 101, 102.
Web of Belief

Have you ever discussed child baptism with a Baptist? You may have found that discussion soon moved to related questions like: “Are infants sinless?” “Can we do something to help with our own coming to saving faith?” “Must we make a decision to accept Jesus?”

What you find is that baptizing children fits into the theological framework of a Lutheran, but not into that of a Baptist. For a Baptist to accept child baptism, he must also accept many other changes to his beliefs (that is if he wants his beliefs to be self-consistent).

It can be very similar when a creationist and an evolutionist discuss origins. If a creationist discusses dinosaurs with an evolutionist, that discussion may soon expand to related topics like radiometric dating, deep time, ice ages, and even birds.

Just like individual Lutheran beliefs may not fit into a Baptist theological framework, individual creationist beliefs may not fit into an evolutionist’s scientific framework.

The scientific framework includes all scientific theories and laws, and the countless presuppositions (many provable and many unprovable) on which those theories and laws are based.

Zimring spends about 20 pages discussing how new scientific ideas must conform with “countless” existing scientific “background assumptions” and “auxiliary hypotheses.” He includes these assumptions and hypotheses in what he calls a “web of belief.” He introduces this concept as follows,

The existence of the web of belief (e.g., our existing base of understanding built upon centuries of compiled evidence) constrains what hypotheses can even be considered, as any hypothesis that violates the web of belief is not consistent with all the known data.
…Errors in the web of belief can be tremendous barriers to progress, because scientists are hesitant to start modifying any part of the web unless they are compelled to do so by new evidence or by a theoretical impasse that they can’t circumvent without questioning parts of the web previously held to be true.41

Ignoring Our Presuppositions

Zimring introduces “background assumptions” in one’s web of belief using the scenario of your doctor telling you that you have cancer. That diagnosis assumes that your lab test was done correctly. Zimring writes,

What if a clerical mistake was made, and your name was put on someone else’s specimen? You have just challenged the auxiliary hypotheses (or background assumptions that make up your web of belief) required for your diagnosis to be correct.42

While we may question background assumptions when confronted with undesirable conclusions (like a cancer diagnosis), the opposite is also true. We tend to ignore background assumptions behind desirable conclusions. Zimring writes,

It is clear that there are countless background assumptions that must be correct in order for a primary idea to be true, and it is normal human thinking to question them when scrutinizing the main idea. When faced with a conclusion of which we are skeptical, we challenge it by asking: But how do you know (insert background assumption here)? In contrast to our tendency to question auxiliary hypotheses, humans have an amazing capacity to ignore them when the main hypothesis is exciting or desirable.43

41 Zimring, 82-83.
42 Zimring, 83.
43 Zimring, 83-84.
Does God Exist?

Zimring correctly states that science is silent on whether there is a god. He appropriately calls out scientists who argue otherwise. I do though, question parts of his argument. He states [bracketed words not in original],

These ideas [that supernatural explanations are not a part of science] do not speak to whether gods, demons, or Elvis’s spirit exist or have effects on the world; they may or may not. Rather, this simply speaks to the idea that science cannot assess such claims. It is for this reason that supernatural cognitions are not allowed in the scientific realm, not because they are disliked as a concept but because there is simply nothing to be done with them scientifically. On this issue science is not a skeptic; rather, science must simply be silent. …Conversely, those who would deny the existence of God, even those who are professional scientists, are not doing so from a scientific standpoint. …It is of greatest importance that we recognize that this position of science was not chosen; rather, it was forced on science by the very nature of how science works.44

It is true that science does not allow supernatural explanations. It is true that science, by the way it is defined, cannot be used to claim that a god does or does not exist. Yes, God tells us that the natural world shows that God created the world45 and that people know about God from what God created.46 But science is a human-defined way of studying nature, and that way rejects the supernatural (miracles, a creator) by definition. Since science rejects miracles as an unproven presupposition, science cannot be used to show that a god exists or does not exist. In fact, God reveals

---

44 Zimring, 119, 120.
45 Psalm 19:1 (EHV) “The heavens tell about the glory of God. The expanse of the sky proclaims the work of his hands.”
46 Romans 1:19-20 (EHV) “This happens because what can be known about God is evident among them, because God made it evident among them. In fact, his invisible characteristics—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen since the creation of the world, because they are understood from the things he made.”
that by our sinful human nature, we reject what God reveals about himself in nature.  

Note Zimring’s words, “or have effects on the world,” which seem to imply miracles. About the existence of God and miracles, Zimring says “science is not a skeptic; rather, science must simply be silent.” It seems clear to me—based upon Zimring’s statements throughout his book—that Zimring claims science does not reject miracles as impossible, just that science will not take them into account as a possibility. He says this position “was forced on science by the very nature of how science works.”

Zimring may be technically correct in his desire that science be neutral (be “silent” and “not a skeptic”) on the existence of God and miracles. The problem is, scientists do not follow his hoped for “pure” view of what science is. Evolutionists are not simply skeptical about God creating adult fish from water and adult animals from the ground, they LOUDLY OPPOSE such miracles.

[ALL evolutionists, including Christian evolutionists, allow only natural causes—no miracles—when writing the evolution story. Yes, many will allow the existence of a god who never does a miracle. Some even allow a god who starts the Big Bang and then steps back and never does a miracle again.]

Where is the evolutionist who says that science is neutral about the existence of the God of Scripture who created the world thousands of years ago? Evolutionists are not “silent” about that. They seek “Christians who haven’t yet reconciled their faith with evolution.” They work to convince us that millions of years is true.

47 See Romans 1:18-32, especially verse 25 (EHV) “Such people have traded the truth about God for the lie, worshiping and serving the creation rather than the Creator, who is worthy of praise forever. Amen.”
Even very polite evolutionists work to convince us to reject creation and embrace evolution, including evolutionists who are Christian and believe God used evolution and millions of years to create.

The book quoted two paragraphs ago (footnote 48) is an example (a critique of that book is in the fall 2020 *LSI Journal*). A second example: The National Academy of Sciences tells us to stop teaching creation. The Academy claims the origin of the world is the “domain” of science and not the domain of religion (for details see the winter 2017 *LSI Journal*). A third example: The National Science Teaching Association (NSTA) just published a 217-page book explaining how science teachers can convince their students to interpret Scripture so that it conforms to evolution (for details see the spring 2020 *LSI Journal*).

By insisting that Christianity and science are not in conflict, and that we can modify our religious beliefs to conform with evolution, these “polite” evolutionists lead Christians to adapt the false religious doctrines of liberal churches. These unbiblical teachings include:

- Scripture must be interpreted in a way that agrees with science (human reason is above Scripture).
- Jesus knew that creation and the Flood are not true, but he taught them anyway, because that’s what people wanted.
- Writers of Scripture did not understand modern science, so they got some things wrong.
- God used billions of years of death and suffering to create.
- The Bible reveals why God created, not how God created.
- Death and suffering are not the result of sin; they are the means God used to create.

In some ways, I think it may be better for our students to have an outspoken atheist science teacher closer to Richard Dawkins, instead of a more polite Christian science teacher who teaches that science and Christianity are not in conflict. At least Dawkins lets you know to keep your guard up, because you know he intends to destroy your faith in God. The “polite” teachers often hide their intention to destroy your faith in the Creator God of Scripture, and you may not notice how they slowly damage your faith day by day.  

In six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and everything that is in them.

Exodus 20:11a (EHV)  

---  

52 This paragraph and the preceding list are revised from that previously published on pages 12 and 14 of the spring 2020 LSI Journal. More on this topic is at www.LutheranScience.org/2020spring
No Creator Assumption

The *LSI Journal* has many times pointed out that all of science is based on the unprovable “no creator” presupposition. In the following quote, Zimring states that science “strives” to produce “the final word on ‘truth.’” He also says that while doing science, the scientist must reject God and the Bible as having a final word on truth. He makes that point with the words, “not authority, revelation, or statements of a definitive text.” In science, “observations of the natural world,” not God or the Bible, are used to judge “knowledge claims.” Zimring writes,

Humans are persuaded by all manner of things, many of which are emotional or authoritative in nature, and in some ways the actual practice of science is no different. However, in an ideal scientific world—the world that scientific practice strives for—the final word on “truth” is not authority, revelation, or statements of a definitive text; rather, ongoing observation of the natural world around us is the determinant of how we evaluate specific scientific facts and theories. …This requirement of science, to use observations of the natural world as an arbiter of knowledge claims, is fundamental.53

Zimring also states,

Once divine powers are evoked, the discussion is outside the realm of science. …Should a god or gods exist, it would explain a great deal of the workings of the world and even the existence of the world itself. …No outcome of the natural world can ever rule out that God works in mysterious ways. No outcome of the material world can ever rule out that God is testing us. …No occurrence whatsoever can compel a change in the web of belief of God. As such, while both science and religion appear similar in how they explain the world in the context of their premises, they differ in at least this very fundamental way. If no outcome of experience can, under any circumstance, compel a change in the web of belief,

53 Zimring, 130, 134.
then no science can be done.\textsuperscript{54}

The above quote demonstrates that creationists have a very strong apologetic claim in pointing out that science, including evolution, is based on the unprovable presupposition that there is no creator god. If there really is a creator god, then the evolution story falls apart. Zimring’s words unintentionally show why science—why evolution theory—will always and forever be wrong in attempting to explain the origin of an Earth made by a creator god. Note the words Zimring uses in the extended quote above where he writes,

Should a god or gods exist, it would explain a great deal of the workings of the world and even the existence of the world itself.\textsuperscript{55}

In his book, Zimring spends entire chapters explaining in great detail how scientists are human and their thinking has the same flaws that exist in all human thinking. He explains how even scientific observations and therefore scientific data are unreliable and often wrong. One of his primary points is that scientists work to identify and correct these errors. Both Zimring and McIntyre point out this self-correcting nature of science as what separates science from other ways of knowing.

What Zimring does not note: The scientific error-correcting process is based on the exact same unprovable presuppositions that directed and constrained the observations and conclusions it is attempting to correct. The error-correcting process is not allowed to modify the major presuppositions of evolution: 1) no creator, 2) no Flood, and 3) deep time (billions of years). If even one of these presuppositions is wrong, then evolution theory is invalid and worthless. God reveals in Scripture that all three of these presuppositions are false. God created the world thousands of years ago and later flooded the entire Earth at the time of Noah. Since evolution is based on false assumptions, evolution is a worthless concept. For details see the fall 2017 \textit{LSI Journal}.\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{54} Zimring, 115, 116, 118.
\textsuperscript{55} Zimring, 115.
Evolutionist Response

Now, an evolutionist may respond by agreeing that if God created the world thousands of years ago, then evolution would be false. He would then state that the evolutionary assumptions of 1) no creator, 2) no Flood, and 3) deep time have been validated as true by more than a century of scientific observations and conclusions.

That response has a major logical flaw. The “century of scientific observations and conclusions” were all constrained by the three assumptions in question.

Those assumptions directed the entire scientific process used to write the evolution story (evolutionists call evolution a “historical narrative”). Those assumptions determined what was to be observed and what was not to be observed, even changing how to observe (such as changing how to take measurements, forcing them to conform with the assumptions). Those assumptions determined which methods, models, and calculations could be used, and which had to be rejected. Those assumptions determined which conclusions would be allowed and which would not be allowed. Those assumptions forced the evolution story to conform to the assumptions themselves. In light of this, one cannot claim that these assumptions have been validated as true.

This brings up the “web of belief” that we previously discussed. Let’s briefly examine a few individual parts of the evolution story. Notice how the three major assumptions force conformance to those assumptions. Notice how so much of the evidence for evolution is also evidence for creation. One cannot declare one of two competing claims (evolution / creation) to be true, and the other to be false, based on evidence that supports both claims, yet that is what evolutionists so often do when attempting to show evolution to be true.

Greenland Ice Dating

Ice core dating is a good example of how the “no flood” and “deep time” assumptions drastically change scientific procedures and conclusions. Evolutionists assume that the middle and lower layers in the Greenland and polar ice sheets have been compressed for long ages (the deep
time assumption), with the lowest layers compressed nearly paper-thin.\textsuperscript{57} Lines between each “annual” layer in middle and lower depths eventually become impossible to see,\textsuperscript{58} so assumptions must be made to measure the thickness of each layer. Evolutionists force their measurements so that the thickness of each annual layer does not significantly vary from the assumed thickness for that layer (nearly paper thin in some cases). 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 measured differently, resulting in much younger dating.

No Flood

A core assumption of evolutionists is that there was never a global flood on earth. They assume this to be the case, because they cannot think of a natural cause for a global flood, based on their evolutionary model of a 4.54 billion year old earth that solidified from molten rock, and whose water accumulated from comets crashing into the planet. God reveals that He sent the Flood.\textsuperscript{59} We need not find a natural cause for it. If there really was a global flood on earth thousands of years ago, then evolutionists’ interpretation of fossils and of the geologic column is wrong.

Tree of Life

Evolutionists propose that all plants, animals, and people descended from the first living thing. They place each plant and animal on the tip of its own branch on evolution’s tree of life. Common ancestors are placed at the points where branches meet. Common ancestors of biblical kinds are almost always imagined, since there is no known plant or creature to place there. The imagined common ancestor of apes and people is an “ape-like creature.” To see how this compares to creation’s “forest of life”

\textsuperscript{57} “1,400 years per meter” or 0.028 inches thick, the thickness of about 6 pieces of paper. M Casado, AJ Orsi, and A Landais, “On the limits of climate reconstruction from water stable isotopes in polar ice cores,” Past Global Changes Magazine, 25 no. 3 (2017): 146. \url{https://doi.org/10.22498/pages.25.3} (accessed 12-21-20)

\textsuperscript{58} “The ice flow leads to annual layer thinning that together with diffusion ultimately leads to a loss of the annual signal with depth.” Sune O. Rasmussen, A. Svensson, and M. Winstrup, “State of the art of ice core annual layer dating,” Past Global Changes Magazine, 22 no. 1 (April 2014): Figure 1 page 26. \url{https://doi.org/10.22498/pages.22.1} (accessed 12-21-20)

\textsuperscript{59} Genesis 6:17a (EHV): “I myself am about to bring a flood of waters on the earth, in order to destroy all flesh under the sky that has the breath of life.”
read the LSI article, “Evolution’s Tree of Life.”

**Reality and Fabrication**

The evolution story is a mixture of reality and fabrication. True parts of evolution are often used as proof that the false parts of evolution are also true. Evolutionists *correctly* point out that natural selection produces new species within their kind. Then they ask us to *imagine* that natural selection can also produce new kinds. Evolutionists *correctly* point out that the geologic column has a sequence of fossil-containing rock layers. Then they ask us to *imagine* that the plants and animals that left these fossils descended from a bacteria-like common ancestor.

**Change Within Kind Proves New Kinds Develop**

Books written by evolutionists to defend evolution against creationist claims so often describe the science of evolution in ways with which a creationist can agree. So much of what evolutionists see as the proof of evolution are scientific conclusions which do not go against Scripture.

Evolutionists regularly discuss natural selection in ways that conform with a young earth and created kinds. Then evolutionists move to a claim that goes against Scripture: that natural selection can also produce new biblical kinds.

The *LSI Journal* has devoted many articles to evaluating best-selling books by famous evolutionists like Bill Nye and Richard Dawkins, and also books written by the very influential National Academy of Sciences. These books by evolutionists explain evolution theory, defend it against the claims of creationists, and condemn those who teach creation.

I have noticed a common thread woven throughout these books, often presented as the core reason why evolution is true. That common claim is: Since natural selection can produce new species within each biblical kind, that proves that natural selection can also produce new biblical kinds.

---


61 Revised from that previously published on page 7 of the *LSI Lesson Book* 2nd ed. [www.LutheranScience.org/Lessonbook](http://www.LutheranScience.org/Lessonbook)
Now an evolutionist never uses those words. They simply devote entire chapters to example after example of a new finch species descending from other finches, or a cabbage plant being cultivated from a wild mustard plant. Then they literally say something like, “Since artificial selection and natural selection produced all these changes in a relatively short time, imagine how much change would happen in millions of years. Dinosaurs can become birds and ape-like creatures can become humans.”

**Natural Selection**

Here is one example of how evolutionists use change within kind as proof that new kinds can develop naturally. In his famous book, *The Greatest Show on Earth: The Evidence for Evolution*, Richard Dawkins gives 28 reasons why it is true that evolution can “transform a fish into a human.” Most of these 28 reasons are change within kind. That is very weak evidence that fish turned into people.

Seven of the 28 are reasons why new kinds might develop. Six of those seven use words like “imagine” and “think what might” happen. Asking us to imagine that new kinds can develop is an extremely weak claim. One of the 28 reasons is that new kinds develop because most scientists believe it is true. That is also weak evidence, since evolutionists are biased authorities who reject creation before they look at any evidence (the “no creator” assumption). Dawkins’ 28 reasons why evolution can “transform a fish into a human” are all very weak reasons. All Dawkins has done is show that new species can naturally develop within each biblical kind, something with which creationists can agree.

**Defending Evolution**

Evolutionists have written many books and articles to defend evolution against the claims of creationists—to explain why evolution is true and why creation is false. One would expect these books to present evidence showing creation to be false, but that is not the case. The vast ma-

---

62 These two paragraphs are revised from that previously published on pages 17-18 of the spring 2019 *LSI Journal*. [www.LutheranScience.org/2019spring](http://www.LutheranScience.org/2019spring)
The majority of evidence presented is evidence for both evolution and creation. This is the case in books written by the National Academy of Sciences, and also in popular books written by authors like Dawkins, Nye, and Coyne. Most college biology textbooks have a section devoted to explaining why evolution is true—yet even there, the vast majority of evidence presented is evidence for both evolution and creation.

In the last several pages, we saw how evolutionists commonly use the true parts of evolution as proof that the false parts are also true. That is one way that evolutionists present evidence that supports the truth of both evolution and creation, yet claim that evidence somehow shows creation to be false. Another way is shown in the following paragraphs.

**Similar Body Parts**

Cats, dogs, and other animals (and people too) live in a common environment (Earth), breath the same air, and digest the same food (carbohydrates, proteins, and fats). It is not surprising that we find many similarities between them. When two different animals have a similar body part, evolutionists assume it is the result of either: 1) Those body parts evolving independently in two different animals (“convergent evolution” of “analogous structures”), or 2) Those two animals descended from a common ancestor (inheriting “homologous structures”). Evolutionists are forced by their “no creator” assumption to reject a third possibility—that God used a similar body design when creating animals and people.

The similarity of body parts is evidence for evolution (evidence of common descent) and also evidence for creation (evidence of common design). Surprisingly, the similarity of body parts is possibly the most common evidence presented to show evolution true and creation false, even though doing so is an error in reasoning (begging the question, a logical fallacy). Evolutionists usually include a drawing comparing human arm/hand bones to the bones of animals (cat, horse, bat, whale, dog, etc.). An LSI article explains why this is fallacious and shows examples from three National Academy of Sciences books and from five college biology textbooks.64

Punctuated Equilibrium

Here is another example where evolutionists present evidence that supports the truth of both evolution and creation, yet claim that evidence somehow shows creation to be false. Evolutionists expected the fossil record to show gradual changes from one major type of animal to another. Instead, they found what a creationist would predict: distinct kinds of animals. So, in 1972, “punctuated equilibrium” was invented, and it has since been incorporated into the standard model of evolution. Punctuated equilibrium is the claim that biological evolution often happens very rapidly between long periods of stability. One kind of plant or animal evolves so fast that it leaves no fossil evidence. Distinct kinds in the fossil record is solid evidence for creation. It is rather weak evidence for evolution, since no matter what we find (gradual change or distinct; fossils or no fossils), it is claimed as evidence for evolution.65 For details see the spring 2018 *LSI Journal.*66

**Geologic Column**

The geologic column is a third example of evolutionists presenting evidence that supports the truth of both evolution and creation, yet claiming that evidence somehow shows creation to be false. The following two paragraphs are identical except the underlined parts. They show how creationists and evolutionists come to differing conclusions about the same evidence, based on their respective assumptions. These paragraphs are from the winter 2018 *LSI Journal.* See that article for more details.

**Evolutionists:** Based on their belief in *natural causes (no creator), no Flood, and deep time,* they assume each of the 12 geologic systems (or rock layers) were deposited during *12 sequential and very long periods of time.* The oldest and bottom layer, the Cambrian, is thought to have been deposited *between 543 and 490 million years ago.* The most recent and top layer, the Quaternary, is thought to have been deposited *over the last 2 million years.* Fossils in the Cambrian and Jurassic layers are thought to be the remains of creatures who lived in different *time periods.* People, dinosaurs, and trilobites lived in separate *time periods.*

**Creationists:** Based on their belief in *Scripture,* they assume each of the 12 geologic systems (or rock layers) were deposited during *and after the Noachian Flood.* The oldest and bottom layer, the Cambrian, is thought to have been deposited *near the start of the Flood, thousands of years ago.* The most recent and top layer, the Quaternary, is thought to have been deposited *near the end of the Flood and after the Flood, thousands of years ago.* Fossils in the Cambrian and Jurassic layers are thought to be the remains of creatures who lived in *different places at the same time.* People, dinosaurs, and trilobites lived in separate *places at the same time.*

67 The comparison paragraphs are revised from that previously published on pages 28-29 of the winter 2018 *LSI Journal.* [www.LutheranScience.org/2018winter](http://www.LutheranScience.org/2018winter)
Your Creation Apologetic

This article touched on many related topics. What are some ways that we can apply this information in our response to evolution?

1—Final Truth

We have seen that science is a process based on human thinking, one that may never reach final truth about anything. That is according to the experts who study what science is (scholars of science).

How should this knowledge be used in our creation apologetic (in our defense of the faith)? In today’s world, most people view science as “Final Truth.” This includes:

- **Christians who think God used evolution to create**: They see science as the arbiter of all other ways of knowing. They even place science above Scripture.

- **Christians who believe millions of years is false**, but view science as on par with Scripture regarding truth: They reject as being non-scientific, any part of science that goes against Scripture. Therefore, they think evolution is false science. They think that true science always agrees with Scripture.

- **Other Christians who believe millions of years is false**, but unlike those in the previous point, these Christians decide that evolutionists are correctly interpreting geological and fossil evidence—evidence that God placed in the ground to give the Earth appearance of a history that did not take place.68

- **Non-Christian evolutionists**: They see science as the arbiter of all other ways of knowing.

All the Christians listed above, and many of the non-Christians, have too high a view of science, and that affects how they view the origin

---

68 For a discussion of the created fossil apologetic, see pages 24-35 in the winter 2020 LSI Journal at [www.LutheranScience.org/2020winter](http://www.LutheranScience.org/2020winter)
of the world. Your discussions with each of these groups would be different, but it could begin by pointing out that science is not the source of truth they think it is. Science is amazing and has done great things, but it is often wrong.

2—Scientific Method

What science “is” has changed over time. Scholars of science, and also many college science textbooks, now teach that there is no right way to do science, no single “scientific method.”

How should this knowledge be used in our creation apologetic? We should not claim that evolution is unscientific just because evolution does not follow the scientific method.

3—Science is Self-Correcting

These books claim that the ever-changing, self-correcting nature of science is a primary reason why we should trust science over other ways of knowing, even over revelation from God in Scripture. Science needs error correcting because, as Zimring correctly states, it is “an intrinsically flawed process that will not achieve certainty on anything.”

How should this knowledge be used in our creation apologetic? We should compare the truth claims of the Bible to the truth claims of science. Science claims it does not produce final truth, that it is ever changing and self-correcting in pursuit of truth that it never achieves. The Bible claims to be final truth and to reflect true reality. The Bible does not need error-correcting. A central claim of Christianity is that it is true. Jesus really died for our sins and rose from the dead. The Bible is a book of truth, because it is the Word of the one and only true God, who created the universe.

4—Explaining All Observations

We have learned that it is common for scientific theories to be unable to explain all observations. ALL of science has logical problems.

69 Zimring, 100.
Evolution theory is no different, as it cannot explain many things we see in nature.

How should this knowledge be used in our creation apologetic? Does your creation apologetic center on questioning evolution because there is fossil and other evidence it cannot explain? If so, you are not making a strong apologetic claim, since all science has that attribute. Every creationist could benefit by learning apologetic claims that are often stronger and less easily dismissed, such as pointing out the unprovable assumptions on which evolution is based. If one or more of those assumptions are false, then evolution theory is invalid and worthless (where it is based on a false assumption).

5—Christianity and Science Are in Conflict

By insisting that Christianity and science are not in conflict, and that we can modify our religious beliefs to conform with evolution, even “polite” evolutionists can lead Christians to adopt the false religious doctrines of liberal churches.

How should this knowledge be used in our creation apologetic? Understand that such “polite” evolutionists often hide their intention to destroy your faith in the Creator God of Scripture. We should explain to others that we must be cautious when hearing the message of these evolutionists. We should evaluate what they say using Scripture.

6—Unprovable Presuppositions

All science is based on many unprovable presuppositions, or starting assumptions, and evolution is no different.

How should this knowledge be used in our creation apologetic? Instead of centering your creation apologetic on specific evidence that evolution cannot adequately explain, consider what is often a much stronger apologetic: Point out some of the unprovable presuppositions that direct and constrain evolutionary science. Three primary presuppositions of evolution are 1) no creator, 2) no Flood, and 3) deep time (billions of years). If even one of these presuppositions is wrong, then evolution theo-
ry is invalid and worthless. God reveals in Scripture that all three of these presuppositions are false. God created the world thousands of years ago and later flooded the entire Earth at the time of Noah. Since evolution is based on false assumptions, evolution is a worthless concept.

7—Evidence for Both

Evolutionists present lots of evidence that evolution is true. The vast majority of what they present is evidence that also supports the truth of creation.

How should this knowledge be used in our creation apologetic? Learn to recognize evidence that supports both evolution and creation. If a believer is troubled by some specific evidence for evolution, you can often respond by saying that evidence also supports creation. That may quickly blunt that temptation (the temptation to think that God used evolution to create). If an unbeliever brings up such evidence for evolution, you can point out that it is also evidence for creation, and maybe then be able to quickly move to a gospel message about their Savior, Jesus.

8—Similar Body Parts

Possibly the most common evidence evolutionists present for evolution is to compare the arm and hand bones of a human to that of several animals. There is great similarity.

How should this knowledge be used in our creation apologetic? This is one example of “evidence for both” that we just discussed.

9—Reality and Fabrication

The evolution story is a mixture of reality and fabrication. True parts of evolution are often used as proof that the false parts of evolution are also true.

How should this knowledge be used in our creation apologetic? This is a twist on the “evidence for both” that we previously discussed.

We should admit that evolutionists correctly point out that natural
selection produces new species within their kind. Then we should explain how evolutionists follow that truth by asking us to imagine that natural selection can also produce new kinds. Asking for us to imagine something is very weak evidence.

We should admit that evolutionists correctly point out that the geologic column has a sequence of fossil-containing rock layers. Then we should explain how evolutionists follow that truth by asking us to imagine that the plants and animals that left these fossils descended from a bacteria-like common ancestor. Asking us to imagine something is very weak evidence.

**Removing Barriers to the Gospel**

Creation apologetics can be useful in removing barriers to the gospel message—in clearing a path for the news that Jesus is the Savior of everyone. This can be done as needed in ministry to believers as a way to blunt the temptation to think that God used evolution to create. This can be done while witnessing to unbelievers as a way to remove evolutionary obstacles to the gospel message.

A solid creation apologetic is to point out that science is a flawed human endeavor that may not produce final truth about anything. Compare that to the final truth and true reality that God reveals to us in the Bible. Mention the unprovable presuppositions that force evolutionary science to reject the truth about creation and instead accept a lie about millions of years.

Always remember that you are Christ’s ambassador to the world, meaning you are God’s representative to everyone, including evolutionists. Do not belittle those to whom you represent God. Reflect the love of Christ as you minister to both creationists and to evolutionists.

**We are ambassadors for Christ, inasmuch as God is making an appeal through us.**

2 Corinthians 5:20a, EHV
This diagram from a college biology textbook shows one version of the “scientific method.” See page 9 for a discussion of why the scientific method is not considered an essential part of science.
