

Creationism, Theistic Evolution, and Deistic Evolution

Joshua B. Gurtler

Preface:

Any description used of evangelicals as “believers” in this manuscript does not necessarily imply that all believers are currently in a covenantal relationship with Jesus Christ, per John 8:30-32; 12:42-43; Acts 26:27-28, and James 2:18-20. Names of evangelicals, other non-believers, or their materials included in this manuscript is for the purpose of providing specific information pertaining to the influence of teachers and leaders in the creation versus evolution controversy, and does not imply an endorsement of everything they uphold. I have been careful not to use names in a vitriolic manner, as you will plainly see. Names are not mentioned so as to cast aspersions or otherwise libel anyone. My purpose in presenting this material is in the prayerful expectation that it may strengthen the faith of gospel preachers and other christians, as well as glorify our God and savior who released us from our sin.

Editor’s Note: Joshua views the word “christian” as a common noun, like “disciple” or “believer,” not a proper noun; therefore he prefers not to capitalize the word.

Introduction:

- I. I don’t intend to, nor could I begin to answer every question pertaining to the creation versus evolution controversy; however, I hope that this outline will provide you with some tools to help (1) resolve questions you currently may have, or (2) provide you with a source(s) of information when questions may arise in the future.
- II. A popular belief among christians, and otherwise believers today, is that the age of the earth and the universe as well as the means by which God created the universe and complex biological beings is irrelevant to our faith in Christ and Christianity
 - A. While Jeff Smelser will examine Biblical arguments pertaining to the age of the earth, this outline will review current philosophies within the creation-evolution controversy as they pertain to the age of the earth, ending with conclusions I have drawn based on a review of the available science.
- III. Many contend that we can agree to disagree as to whether the universe is 5,700 years old or 13.8 billion years old: the latter date is affirmed by Darwinian supporters and theistic evolutionists, alike.
- IV. No one wants to be pigeon-holed into an arbitrarily-fixed stereotypical category; however, it is generally accepted that believers typically fit into one of the following five categories with respect to creation, evolution and the age of the earth.
 - A. *Young Earth Creationism*
 - B. *Inorganic Old Earth Creationism* - Denies organic biological evolution, but accepts uniformitarian cosmological and geological inorganic evolution.
 - C. *Organic Old Earth Creationism (Or, Progressive Creationism)* - Contends that during eons of time before man was created, God successively created animals and added them in a stepwise fashion to the earth in ever-increasing complexity, to give the appearance of evolution.
 - D. *Theistic Evolution* - Accepts hierarchical evolution of all biological beings (e.g. “particle to people” evolution). Includes Intelligent Design Movement leaders who affirm that evolution may have been driven by the guiding hand of an intelligent designer.

-
- E. *BioLogos* - Accepts naturalistic neo-Darwinian evolution. Teaches that God *may* have allowed naturalistic evolutionary processes to take place for 13.8 billion years without divine intervention before man first appeared. Some describe this as “deistic evolution.”
 - V. Especially since Darwin’s *On the Origins of Species* was published in 1859, believers have been bitterly divided over ideas pertaining to creation and evolution, as well as the age of the earth and the universe.
 - A. Components to this debate include the means by which Jehovah used to create the inorganic cosmos and complex biological life forms, as well as the stance of believers with respect to neo-Darwinism and theistic evolution. This manuscript will provide an overview of the common positions held in this controversy and conclusions I have drawn on the legitimacy of these views based on the evidence.

Body:**I. THE SCIENTIFIC INADEQUACIES OF NEO-DARWINIAN EVOLUTION HAVE BEEN WELL-ESTABLISHED**

- A. While specific weaknesses of neo-Darwinian evolution will be detailed later in this manuscript, my purpose here is not to provide a treatise as to these scientific flaws.
- B. The untenable scientific supports for neo-Darwinian evolution have been thoroughly dealt with by believing as well as non-believing technical experts for over 150 years, although these ideas have been suppressed by the humanistic-leaning media, government and academic institutions
 - 1. (See my article entitled, “Do All Scientists and Surgeons Believe in Darwinian Evolution?” at www.truthmagazine.com/?p=1838)
- C. I would recommend the following books, which are written (for the most part) in layman’s language and draw heavily from original sources to summarize the unscientific nature of neo-Darwinian evolution:
 - 1. *Refuting Evolution*, by Jonathan Sarfati, Ph.D.
 - 2. *Refuting Evolution Part 2*, by Jonathan Sarfati, Ph.D.
 - a. Both of Sarfati’s books are succinct and very readable, even for those at the junior high level.
 - 3. *The New Answers Book: Over 25 Questions on Creation/Evolution and the Bible*, by Ken Ham, General Editor
 - a. This book is a compilation of works by many experts with doctoral degrees in their respective fields.
 - 4. *Creation: Facts of Life*, by Gary Parker, Ph.D.
 - a. The 2006 version is revised and updated.
 - 5. *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, by Michael Denton, Ph.D.
 - a. This book is slightly heavier reading than the others in this list, but is the classic 1980’s work by a renowned biochemist. *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* has influenced many scientists (one of whom was *Darwin’s Black Box* author, Michael Behe) to begin questioning the validity of naturalistic evolution.
 - 6. *Not by Chance!*, by Lee Spetner, Ph.D.

- a. Dr. Spetner is an MIT graduate, Israeli physicist who was employed by John's Hopkins University to study guided-missile systems.
7. *Icons of Evolution*, by Jonathan Wells, Ph.D.
 - a. An excellent overview of the fallacies of some of the more commonly used historical textbook arguments for Darwinian evolution.
8. *The Scientific Case for Creation*, by Bert Thompson, Ph.D.
 - a. This book is available for purchase through Apologetics Press or can be downloaded for free in PDF format from www.ApologeticsPress.com.
9. *The Modern Creation Trilogy, Volume 2: Science and Creation*, by Henry M. Morris, Ph.D. and John D. Morris, Ph.D.
10. *Unraveling Evolution*, by Joshua Gurtler
 - a. I have presented what I consider to be some of the strongest arguments against evolution in a thirteen-lesson workbook entitled *Unraveling Evolution*, suitable for use by teenagers or adults. This workbook can be purchased from me or through most Bible bookstores run by members of "non-institutional" churches of Christ.
 - b. Audio lectures, based on this workbook, expands upon this material and can be accessed at the website of the Southport church of Christ at: <http://www.southportcofc.org/evolution.php>
 - c. My video lectures, which include PowerPoint slides with explanatory diagrams, charts, illustrations, photographs and quotes, may be viewed at www.Youtube.com or accessed at the Southport church of Christ website.
- D. I would recommend bookmarking the following three websites:
 1. Answers in Genesis, www.answersingenesis.org Evangelically-based apologetics organization founded by Ken Ham.
 2. The Institute for Creation Research, www.icr.org Evangelically-based apologetics organization founded by Dr. Henry Morris.
 - a. I would highly recommend signing up to receive hard copies of their free monthly magazine, *Acts and Facts* at: http://www.icr.org/subscriptions/index/?option_old=signup&f_country=US
 3. Apologetics Press, www.ApologeticsPress.com Founded and supported by what may be considered "institutional" churches of Christ. The AP executive director is Dave Miller and AP is under the oversight of the Palm Beach Lakes church of Christ, Palm Beach Garden, FL.

II. FIFTEEN QUESTIONS THAT DIVIDE BELIEVERS, IN SPITE OF THEIR AGREEMENT REGARDING THE NECESSITY OF A FIRST CAUSE

- A. Although many believers are united as to the shaky scientific supports for neo-Darwinian evolution, there are several areas of dissension that have created division. Fifteen of these questions are listed, below.
- B. Although Jeff Smelser's lecture will deal with these types of questions, in order to explain various views within the creation evolution controversy, it is necessary to develop this subject a bit. The fifteen questions are as follows,

1. Is the *Genesis* account of creation to be taken literally, or is it metaphorical or allegorical so as to allow for long ages of time over which Jehovah's creative processes unfolded?
2. If *Genesis* chapter 1 and the days of creation are not to be taken literally, then should the uniformitarian-proposed age of the earth (4.5 billion years) and the universe (13.8 billion years) be accepted (aka, the "old earth position")?
3. If the old earth position is accepted (some call this inorganic evolution), then should the neo-Darwinian-proposed time scale for the first appearance of life (viz. 3.8 billion years ago) be accepted?
4. If it is accepted that life first appeared on earth 3.8 billion years ago, then do we accept the uniformitarian, neo-Darwinian-proposed explanation of the geologic column, which predicts that life became increasingly more complex over the last 3.8 billion years?
5. If we accept the neo-Darwinian-proposed explanation of the geologic column, which predicts that life became increasingly more complex over the last 3.8 billion years, then should we conclude that these organisms evolved (with or without divine intervention) from simpler to greater complexity during this time span?
6. If we accept the neo-Darwinian-proposed explanation of the geologic column, which predicts that life became increasingly more complex over the last 3.8 billion years, then *does it really matter* whether Jehovah allowed complex biological systems to evolve or whether he created them in their fully developed form in incremental stages along the way so as to give the "appearance" of evolution?
7. If we conclude that complex biological systems evolved over the last 3.8 billion years on earth, then should we conclude or does it even matter whether God permitted this evolution to occur naturalistically by neo-Darwinism (aka deistic evolution) or if evolution was influenced by an intelligent designer (i.e., theistic evolution)?
8. If we conclude that evolution was driven by an intelligent designer, then is it really of any significance to oppose the teaching of evolution in schools, colleges, and other public institutions as long as we believe God played a role in the process?
9. If we conclude that the *Genesis* account of creation was allegorical, then do we accept Adam and Eve as the actual first two human beings, or may they be considered only as metaphorical representatives of mankind?
10. If we argue for a metaphorical Adam and Eve, then do we accept the tree of life, the tree of knowledge of good and evil, the fall of man in the garden and the subsequent curses and death as literal or metaphorical?
11. If the tree of life and the fall of man in the garden and the subsequent curses, including death, are metaphorical, then did God create death, which supposedly occurred for 3.8 billion years before man arrived on earth?
12. If the *Genesis* account of Adam and Even are allegorical and we allow for theistic evolution (or either BioLogos), then do we conclude that man also evolved from primates over the last 10 million years?
13. If we conclude that man evolved from primates over the last 10 million years, then at what point during evolution did primates become man and/or at what point did God endow a certain class of primates with an eternal soul?

14. If we don't believe that the *Genesis* creation account is allegorical but argue for other "old earth creationism" ideas (e.g., various gap hypotheses), do we overreach in our exegesis?
15. If we overreach in our interpretation of *Genesis* 1, do we then establish such a damaging precedent to the accurate interpretation of scripture that we compromise many heretofore orthodox or otherwise conservative, rational, and accurate conclusions from God's word?
 - a. Some Biblically-conservative beliefs that have been compromised include miracles, the serpent in the garden, a worldwide flood and two of each kind of unclean animal entering Noah's ark, confusion of man's languages by God at Babel, the miraculous conceptions of Sarah, Elizabeth and the Shunammite woman in 2 Kgs. 4 in their old age, Jacob wrestling with a messenger from God (or God), Joseph's interpretation of dreams, Moses and the burning bush and the staff that turned into a serpent, the 10 plagues, parting of the Red Sea, quail and manna from heaven to sustain the children of Israel, shoes and clothes that did not wear out in the wilderness wanderings, Moses calling forth water from a rock, collapse of the walls of Jericho, the signs given to Gideon, the strength and mighty works of Samson, miracles performed by Elijah and Elisha, Daniel surviving in the Lion's den, the three Hebrews surviving the fiery furnace, the virgin birth of the Christ, the incarnation of deity, the miracles of Jesus, the resurrection, the inspiration of New Testament writers, the canonicity of the epistles, etc.
- C. Controversies surrounding these and other related questions have resulted in at least five generally-accepted camps of thought pertaining to the creation and evolution controversy in light of the Holy Scriptures, as well as many other lesser known sub-divisions.

III. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF UNDERSTANDING DISPARATE CAMPS OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE CREATION VERSUS EVOLUTION CONTROVERSY

- A. Before endorsing a philosophical movement, Christians should be fully aware of the implication surrounding the teaching, lest by their endorsement they lead Christians and/or unbelievers further astray (Gal. 2:9).
- B. Someone recently showed me a picture on the internet of a gospel preacher posing in front of what would unquestionably be classified as blatant immorality. Did this not send the wrong message? Should we not abstain from even the appearance of evil? Should we pose for a picture in front of cannabis plants, bongos, other illicit drug paraphernalia or hard liquor?
- C. Here is the point, most believers would agree that we should be careful about sending the wrong message by our potentially-perceived endorsement of ungodliness or antibiblical philosophies. However, in the creation versus evolution controversy, many ardent young earth creationists give wholesale endorsements to proponents of theistic evolution, which could potentially lead the unsuspecting into these philosophies.
 1. Staunch young earth creationists often laud the works of individuals such as Philip Johnson (author of *Darwin on Trial*, etc.), Michael Behe (author of *Darwin's Black Box* and *The Edge of Evolution*), Jonathan Wells (author of *Icons in Evolution*), William Dembski, Stephen Meyer, etc.
 - a. Indeed, these men have made immeasurably significant and positive contributions to the creation versus evolution controversy.

- b. I hold all of these individuals in high esteem and owe them a debt of gratitude for opening doors, minds, and opportunities for questioning the credibility of neo-Darwinian evolution.
 - c. The intelligent design movement has led individuals such as Anthony Flew (now a Deist) to reclaim their belief in the divine.
 - d. However, when I sometimes ask intelligent design-supporting young earth creationists, “you know that Johnson, Behe, Wells, Dembski, Meyer, etc. allow for evolution, right?” they look at me like I’m from another planet.
2. An adamant young earth creationist told me, some years back, that his family bought a young and very weak christian a copy of Michael Behe’s book, *Darwin’s Black Box*, for a graduation present to help strengthen his faith. When I asked this man if he had read the book before giving it to the teenager, he said no – he had just heard other christians recommend it and he had looked through it. When I told him that Behe allows for evolution, he was shocked. The young man who was given the book has since left the faith. Did the book lead him astray? No, I don’t think so. However, were there other books that might have more accurately represented the Biblical account of creation and promoted faith in Jesus? I believe so.
- a. Spring boarding from this example, would the gospel preacher I mentioned earlier, who posed in front of immorality, negatively influence someone to engage in that sin? I don’t know. Might there be better settings for gospel preachers to pose in photographs so as not to send the wrong message to “little ones?” Certainly.
 - b. At the very least, we should add cautionary disclaimers when endorsing the ideas of individuals who may also be promoting what we understand to be error.
- D. The next few sections of this manuscript will address differences among five of the more commonly-known philosophical camps in the creation versus evolution controversy.

IV. AN INTRODUCTION TO YOUNG EARTH CREATIONISM

- A. Young earth creationism (YEC) is most commonly made up of evangelicals, conservative Jews and Muslims.
- B. YEC accepts the *Genesis* 1 creation account as six, literal, twenty-four hour days in which God made the cosmos, the world, and all organic life, which is reiterated in Exo. 20:11 and 31:17. Creation supposedly occurred just a few thousand years ago (generally, accepted as between 5,700 and 12,500 years ago).
- C. YEC believes that God created animals in fixed phylogentic classifications, which are only able to reproduce “*according to its kind*” (Gen. 1:21-25).
 1. The Biblical descriptions of “kinds” possibly correspond to the Linnaean classification of “family,” although there is currently considerable debate in the scientific community about the reclassification of animals based on genetics rather than morphological similarities.
 2. YEC generally teaches that these “kinds” may vary (evolve or change) within fixed phylogenetic boundaries due to genetic variation based on natural selection, which often occurs due to the selective breeding of a geographically isolated population.
 3. For example, there are various breeds of dogs all over the world; yet, YEC generally affirms that these hundreds of varieties may have originated from a common ancestor (possibly the wolf, *Canidae Canis lupus*). Nevertheless, all dog breeds are still

-
- members of the “dog kind” and are subspecies (*familiaris*) of *Canis lupus*, and have not traversed their fixed phylogentic boundaries.
- D. YEC interprets the geological column not on the basis of billions of years of sedimentary deposition, but rather as the natural result of (1) catastrophic sedimentation during the creation of the world and, (2) the worldwide Noahic flood.
- E. A number of YEC organizations exist. The Creation Research Society lists 143 separate YEC organizations within the U.S. alone, on their home page. A few of the more prominent groups include the following:
1. Institute for Creation Research (ICR), Dallas, TX
 2. Answers in Genesis (AIG), Creation Museum in Petersburg, KY
 3. Creation Research Society (CRS), Research Center in Chino Valley, AZ
 4. Center for Origins Research (CORE), Dayton, TN
 5. Creation Science Evangelism (CSE), Pensacola, FL
 6. Apologetics Press, Montgomery, AL
- F. A 2010 Gallup poll survey revealed that around 40% of Americans are young earth creationists. This number has been declining in the last 50 years, largely due to academic and other secular influences, as well as acceptance of the general theory of evolution by many mainstream denominations, not to mention Roman Catholicism.
- G. YEC accepts that dinosaurs and man co-existed on the earth and that dinosaurs became extinct, giving way to dragon legends in numerous cultures on most continents.
- H. Although not very popular anymore, the *Omphalos hypothesis* was proposed by Philip Gosse in 1857 (two years before Darwin’s debut publication) and has been accepted by some YEC advocates as a means of harmonizing the *apparent* age of the earth with the *actual* age of the earth.
1. Omphalos is the Greek word for “navel.” This teaching affirms that just as God may have put navels on Adam and Eve (although they never had umbilical cords), he also may have created the earth to *appear* billions of years old, complete with the skeletal remains of dinosaurs and other creatures that never actually existed. Jehovah supposedly may have done this simply as a means of further confounding those who were already foolish and stubborn-hearted.
 2. A number of christians in a congregation where I preached some years back held this position and taught their children that dinosaurs never really existed but that God put their fossils in the earth when he created it to further harden the hearts of the stubbornly rebellious.
- I. YEC in relation to Old Earth Creationism (OEC) – Believers who are not YEC supporters, however, often employ various interpretations of the *Genesis* creation account that will accommodate the billions of years necessary for the uniformitarian model.
1. While this position is frequently defended as being based in Bible exegesis, OEC did not *originate* from the Bible as OEC supporters readily admit. OEC advocates argue that they have arrived at these conclusions, not based on the weight of Biblical evidence, but on the acceptance of scientific uniformitarianism, which dates the universe at 13.8 billion years and the earth at 4.5 billion years.
-

- a. Dr. Terry Mortenson fully documents these admissions by OEC theologians in his article, “Why Don’t Many Christian Leaders and Scholars Believe Genesis?” (www.answersingenesis.org/articles/2010/05/31/why-dont-many-christian-leaders-and-scholars).

V. AN INTRODUCTION TO INORGANIC OLD EARTH CREATIONISM

- A. Inorganic old earth creationism (IOEC) is made up of Bible believers of various denominations as well as Jews and some Muslims.
- B. IOEC is generally explained as an attempt to harmonize modern geological uniformitarian science, which posits a 4.5 billion-year-old earth, with the Biblical account of creation.
- C. Many IOE creationists argue for the Gap hypothesis.
 1. The Gap hypothesis says that billions of years (up to 4.5 billion years) transpired in a time gap between Gen. 1:1 and Gen. 1:2, before God made man.
 - a. Some gap advocates argue only for inorganic creation in the interim gap period, while others argue that biological life forms (evidenced by the fossilized remains of extinct animals, dinosaurs, etc.) existed in the 4.5 billion year gap.
 2. The Soft gap hypothesis is another idea, which says that there is a gap in time between Gen. 1:2 and 1:3 when God simply let the inorganic earth sit idle and evolve inorganically without organic life forms for 4.5 billion years. This was supposedly done to provide enough time for starlight to reach the earth before God seeded the earth with biological organisms.
- D. Some refer to IOEC as “pre-organic” or “inorganic evolution,” a term that has been used by secular astronomers (see Lockyer, 1900). That is, IOEC affirms (1) that 13.8 billion years of astronomical and geological evolution actually occurred, while (2) simultaneously denying the evolutionary succession of simple to complex biological organisms.

VI. AN INTRODUCTION TO ORGANIC OLD EARTH CREATIONISM (OR, PROGRESSIVE CREATIONISM)

- A. Organic old earth creationism (OOEC) is made up of Bible believers of various denominations as well as some Jews and Muslims.
- B. OOEC includes those who believe in interpretations of the Bible that allow for a 4.5 billion-year-old earth, arguing that geological layering reveals that organic life has existed for the past 3.8 billion years.
- C. Most progressive creationism advocates argue that we should accept the big bang theory and the uniformitarian 13.8 billion year age for the universe.
 1. Although the big bang hypothesis replaced the steady state theory of the universe since the 1960’s, in recent years, alternatives to the big bang theory have grown in popularity. Some of the alternative ideas are based on brane cosmology, which is principled upon supersymmetric string theory, M-theory (membrane theory) and inflation due to the movement of branes. These ideas are sometimes called “pre-big bang” models. One of these models, the cyclic model, argues that the big bang was preceded by a “big crunch.” Some models predict that the big bang was only an incidental event in a much larger realm called the “multiverse.” Detractors say that these ideas have yet to be scientifically tested; however, many areas of the big bang model have also not been scientifically verified or fully accounted for, (e.g., cosmic inflation, baryogenesis, the particle horizon [this is the inexplicable flatness of the universe, which should digress from the critical density and not be flat {i.e., not have

zero spatial curvature} based on the supposed age of the universe], the absence of magnetic monopoles, the nature of dark energy, failure to observe dark matter, and questions surrounding the age of globular clusters).

- D. OOEC often denies that organic evolution occurred; rather, contending that during eons of time, God successively created animals and added them in a stepwise fashion to the earth in ever increasing complexity. Over time, these simpler animals would become extinct and God would create more complex ones, etc., until finally he created man. OOEC allows for some lateral change (evolution) within an animal “kind” within fixed phylogenetic boundaries, but usually denies the general theory of evolution.
- E. Progressive creationism also teaches that for hundreds of thousands of years, pre-human primates that looked somewhat like men lived on earth and drew on walls in caves, although they weren’t fully human and didn’t have an eternal soul.
1. These primates are sometimes called “spiritless hominids” and include the earliest ancient American Indians and the earliest ancient Australian Aborigines, which OOE creationists claim were not really humans.
- F. A Canadian-born astronomer, Dr. Hugh Ross, and his flagship organization *Reasons to Believe* have, in recent years, been the leading proponents of progressive creationism among evangelicals.
1. Dr. Ross teaches that, amid the spiritless hominids 40,000 years ago, God finally placed modern man on earth and gave him a soul.
- G. OOEC typically advocates some alternate interpretation to the *Genesis* creation account, such as the day-age hypothesis or the gap hypothesis.
- H. The day-age hypothesis was first suggested by an Anglican bishop, George Stanley Faber, in 1823.
1. The day age hypothesis contends that each day in the six days of creation represent long ages of time to account for the supposed uniformitarian 4.5 billion year history of the earth. The argument hinges on the Hebrew word *yom* in Gen. 1, Exo. 20:11, and 31:17, which, it is argued, may be a 24-hour period, or may also be an indefinite length of time (i.e., millions or billions of years).
 2. YEC opponents of the day-age hypothesis argue that the day-age idea is based on a hermeneutical error called an “unwarranted expansion of an expanded semantic field.” This is the practice of assuming that because a word in *some* cases may be used in a non-specific, accommodative and general sense (e.g., the word “day” being used to mean an “age of time” rather than a specific 24-hour period) then *anytime* this word is used it may be interpreted in the general non-specific sense instead of a specific 24-hour period (Chaffey and Lisle, p. 167).
- I. Various gap hypotheses are also argued by some progressive creation advocates. Some of these are included here.
1. Modified gap hypothesis – This is also known as the pre-creation chaos gap hypothesis, which argues that a gap of 4.5 billion years exists between Gen. 1:2 and Gen. 1:3 (proposed by John Neil Clayton). During this modified gap period, all plant and animal life forms (e.g. forests, peat bogs, bacteria, viruses, amoeba, reptiles, dinosaurs, etc.) except for “warm-blooded animals” were on the earth. God allowed these organic forms of life to be buried in the ground because he knew that man would one day need the gas, oil and coal that they would produce (Thompson, 1999).

2. Ruin-reconstruction gap hypothesis – This most popular of the gap hypotheses was introduced by Thomas Chalmers, a Presbyterian evangelist, in 1804 and is based on Gen. 1:1-2 which states, “*In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. The earth was without form, and void; and darkness was on the face of the deep. . .*” This philosophy teaches that the word “was” as in the phrase “*The earth was without form*” should more appropriately be translated, “*became*” as in the phrase “*the earth became without form and void.*” The argument affirms that prior to the earth becoming void, God originally created it with magnificent resplendency. However, after “Lucifer’s rebellion,” or the “Luciferian fall,” the earth became corrupt, so God destroyed the original earth in “Lucifer’s flood” and reconstructed the current world that we know. This gap hypothesis was popularized by the Schofield Reference Bible in 1917 and is currently held by many, especially those of Calvinistic tendencies.
 3. Late gap hypothesis – This is the idea that Adam and Eve existed in the Garden of Eden for long ages of time (millions or billions of years [?]) before the fall. Thus, the gap takes place between *Genesis* chapters 2 and 3.
 4. Literal with gaps hypothesis – This hypothesis argues that each of the six days of creation were literal days; however, Jehovah inserted five eons of time amounting to millions or billions of years into the gaps between each of the six days.
- J. There are other theories as to how the creation account in *Genesis* 1 is to be interpreted, including:
1. The framework hypothesis (FH) – The FH takes a non-literal view of the whole creation account, allowing for an ancient earth. YEC advocates often describe the FH as the most confusing of alternative views to the *Genesis* creation account in which the six days of creation represent neither literal days nor correspond to ages of time (Chaffey and Lisle, p. 168). Rather than inserting eons of time into alleged gaps between verses or days of creation (gap hypotheses), or making each day a long age of time (day-age hypothesis) the FH views the *Genesis* creation account as a non-literal theological literary device used to account for creation. Instead of being an actual chronological sequence, the six days of creation are said to represent topical categories. The major spokesman for this view was the late Meredith Kline from Westminster Theological Seminary. This view has also been supported by British university theologian and Old Testament commentator, Gordon Wenham.
 2. Revelatory day view – This idea contends that the six days of creation are actually a series of six visions, each one lasting one day, that were given to Moses to reveal Jehovah’s creative work.
- K. Some advocates of OoEC allow for some form of creationism/theistic evolution hybrid.
- L. Other progressive creationists contend that we “can’t know” whether evolution is true or not, but that we must simply agree with the majority opinion of the modern scientific community, which argues organic biological organisms have existed on the earth for the past 3.8 billion years.

VII. AN INTRODUCTION TO THEISTIC EVOLUTION

- A. Proponents of theistic evolution include Bible believers of various denominations, as well as Jews, Muslims, eastern religions and various other faiths that affirm some type of divine origin to the universe and biological life forms.
- B. Bible believers who support theistic evolution often contend that the *Genesis* account of creation was simply written to show *that* God created life and not *how* God accomplished it.

-
- C. Most proponents of what is commonly called “theistic evolution” believe that deity(ies) directed the evolutionary process in ways that we may not fully understand (i.e., a “god of the gaps”) and, therefore, although they may believe evolution occurred, they do not fully embrace naturalistic neo-Darwinian evolution.
 - D. Any number of Biblical interpretations of the six day creation account in *Genesis* (e.g., Gap hypotheses, the day-age hypothesis, the framework hypothesis, the revelatory day view, etc.) are used to account for the eons of time theistic evolutionists claim are necessary in order for evolution to have occurred.
 - E. Evangelical teachers such as Timothy Keller, Billy Graham, Chuck Colson, Robert Schuller, and B.B. Warfield have allowed for theistic evolution, as long as it is taught within the construct of God’s creative work in *Genesis* chapter 1.
 - F. The Pew Forum (2008) revealed that the percentage of people within the following religious groups who believe that evolution best accounts for God’s creative work are, Buddhists (81%), Hindus (80%), Jews (77%), Catholic (58%), Orthodox Believers (54%), Mainline Protestants (51%), Muslims (45%), Historically Black Protestant Groups (38%), Evangelical Protestants (24%), Mormons (22%), and “Jehovah’s Witnesses (8%).
 - G. Protestant denominations that allow for theistic evolution include the Presbyterian church, the Nazarene Church, the Anglican Church, the Episcopal Church, the Lutheran Church, the United Church of Christ, the United Methodist Church (UMC, 2008), as well as the Roman Catholic Church by sanction of Pope John Paul II in 1996.
 - H. Other institutions where professors or teachers have allowed for deity-guided macroevolution include *Abilene Christian University* (since at least 1986), *Pepperdine University* (since at least 1984), the *Discovery Institute*, *The Christian Post*, and *Christianity Today*.

VIII. AN INTRODUCTION TO THE INTELLIGENT DESIGN MOVEMENT

- A. The modern intelligent design movement (IDM) began in 1992 by an evangelical Harvard- and University of Chicago-trained law professor, Philip Johnson from the University of California at Berkeley, who rallied other like-minded scientists and philosophers to unite in questioning the ability of naturalistic neo-Darwinian evolution to account for all biological life.
 1. Other notable figures who came to the forefront of the IDM include Michael Behe (Catholic Biochemist, from Lehigh University), William Dembski (evangelical mathematician and philosophy professor at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary), Stephen Meyer (Cambridge-trained physicist, philosopher and director of the *Center for Science and Culture* at the *Discovery Institute*), and Berkeley- and Yale-trained geologist, biochemist and theologian Jonathan Wells (Unification church Member).
 - B. The intelligent design movement is supported by individuals from all walks of faith and belief, including those of the “Judeo-Christian” tradition, Islam, eastern religions, polytheism, paganism, deism, and even some agnostics.
 1. The implications of IDM are that the intelligent designer could have been a personal or an impersonal God, a loving or a cruel deity, a non-divine but created being, or even an extra-terrestrial life form.
 - C. Within the IDM are those who claim to be Christians who subscribe to either young earth creationism, old earth creationism, or theistic evolution.
-

-
- D. Describing the IDM, William Dembski says, “*ID is three things: a scientific research program that investigates the effects of intelligent causes; an intellectual movement that challenges Darwinism and its naturalistic legacy; and a way of understanding divine action*” (1998).
- E. In essence, the IDM argues that there is evidence for the detection of design influenced by some form of intelligence in the inorganic universe as well as in biological organisms.
1. IDM does *not*, however, do the following two things:
 - a. It does not rule out the possibility of *any* form of macroevolution as long as there was input from an intelligent designer.
 - b. It does not demand that all design detected in nature must be **attributed** to an intelligent designer, but that there had to be “*some*” input at various points in the history and/or evolution of the world.
 2. Philip Johnson’s “Wedge” strategy is designed to remove any particular religion from the argument and focus on the single question, “Can design be empirically tested for in the natural world?” If design can be tested for, then ID may be considered science and taught in schools, although the Bible and religion may not be taught.
 - a. The goal is to use the wedge strategy to divide all participants in the debate into one of two camps: Naturalism or Supernaturalism
 3. Two of the more common arguments used by the IDM are:
 - a. The irreducible complexity argument- A hand-crafted, jeweled watch, which would be useless by removing even one of its intricate moving parts, is considered an example of irreducible complexity. Analogously, the biological cell has thousands of essential biochemical components, one of which could not be removed without the cell ceasing to function, thus it is irreducibly complex. If the biological cell is irreducibly complex, then this precludes gradual, step-wise naturalistic evolution of the cell over millions of years by adding one essential biochemical part at a time.
 - 1) Michael Behe’s illustrative analogies for demonstrating this point include the classic hinge- spring mousetrap, and the Rube Goldberg apparatus, which, if one part is removed from either, cease to operate.
 - a) Behe springboards from the mouse trap and the Goldberg apparatus into biochemical machines such as the bacterial flagellum, which have many parts identical to an outboard motor (although functioning with much greater precision than a manmade motor). He concludes that these machines could not have evolved over millions of years in a gradual stepwise fashion without the assistance of an intelligent designer. Two other well-known biochemical systems Behe uses are:
 - 1] The irreducibly complex series of biochemical steps necessary for vision.
 - 2] The irreducibly complex cascade of biochemical reactions required for mammalian blood-clotting.
 - a] Without their completely integrated and fully functional biochemical processes, bacterial flagella, blood, and eyes would have existed for millions of years before bacterial motility, vision or blood clotting were able to occur.

-
- 1} Critics, in my opinion, have not fully considered, addressed or refuted these arguments.
 - 2} For the original presentation of these arguments, see Behe's books, *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution* (1996) and *The Edge of Evolution: The Search for the Limits of Darwinism* (2007).
- b. The programmed information (or coded information) argument- This argument also speaks to the molecular level of organic life and the genetic code that exists in the DNA (or RNA in the case of some viruses) of all living organisms. The genetic information is far too complex, it is argued, and far too intricately-arranged to be accounted for by randomness or natural selection alone.
- 1) Stephen Meyer stated it this way, "*We know from experience that conscious intelligent agents can create informational sequences and systems. . . we know that intelligent agents do produce large amounts of information, and since all known natural processes do not (or cannot), we can infer design as the best explanation of the origin of information in the cell*" (Meyer, 2003).
 - 2) Meyer's latest 611 page book, *Signature in the Cell: DNA and the Evidence for Intelligent Design*, is recognized as the most thorough treatment of this subject thus far (2010).
 - a) An interesting side note is that although Richard Dawkins debated Francis Collins (who, incidentally, allows for theistic or deistic neo-Darwinism), he is unwilling to have an exchange of thoughts concerning evolution or the issue of origins with Stephen Meyer or other IDM leaders.
 - 3) Another side note is that some contend that viruses are not truly living organisms but are parasitic self-replicating cells. Nevertheless, it is undeniable that the virus is an independent and extremely complex organic system which houses detailed and precise genetic information in either RNA or DNA, to allow for replication.
- F. It is important to recognize that there are many arguments for intelligent design that pre-date the modern IDM. Therefore, some creationists who may not support every facet of the current IDM, will still consider many IDM arguments as valid.
1. In fact, the argument for intelligent design (or the teleological argument) has been made for centuries by "christian" apologists such as Marcus Miucius Felix (ca. 280 A.D.), Augustine of Hippo (ca. 400 A.D.), Thomas Aquinas (ca. 1260), the Dutchmen Leonardus Lessius (ca. 1580) and Hugo Grotius (ca. 1620), scientist, philosopher and microscopist Robert Hooke (ca. 1670), George Berkeley and Francois-Marie Voltaire (ca. 1730), and, most notably, by William Paley (ca. 1780) who made the "watchmaker" argument, which has been the object of ridicule by atheists since the 18th century and was the title subject of Richard Dawkins 1986 book, *The Blind Watchmaker*.
 2. Further, non-christian philosophers made the teleological argument centuries before christians did. Non-christian, historical ID advocates such as Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and Ibn Rushd [or, Averroes] all favored an intelligent designer).

3. Twentieth century physicists carried the argument from teleology further in what became known as the *Anthropic Cosmological Principle* (ACP). This principle argues that the universe is far too fine-tuned on the atomic scale to be attributed to random chance alone. Notable physicists who supported the ACP in the 1980's included John D. Barrow, Frank J. Tipler, John Polkinghorne and George Wald.
 4. Finally, the holy scriptures have made the case for an intelligent designer for thousands of years (e.g., Psa. 19; Rom. 1).
- G. The prominent leaders in the modern intelligent design movement (e.g., Johnson, Behe, Dembski, Meyers, Wells, etc.) are avidly opposed to naturalistic evolution; however, they are not young earth creationists and do not absolutely dispense with the possibility of intelligent design-guided evolution from occurring.
1. Note: Although some IDM supporters leave the door open for evolution to have occurred via divine guidance, many (such as Bill Dembski) staunchly deny “theistic evolution,” which he defines as naturalistic Darwinian evolution.
 - a. Technically speaking; however, Dembski leaves the door open for non-naturalistic intelligent design-guided evolution by a God who either pre-programmed the evolutionary process before it began or guided it along the way.
 2. Although the language is sometimes couched, and the possibility of divinely-guided macroevolution is not frequently touted, for obvious reasons, IDM leaders will occasionally broach the subject of the possibility of evolutionary mechanisms, as seen in the following quotes:
 - a. William Dembski and Jonathan Wells: “*ID precludes neither significant variation within species nor the evolution of new species from earlier forms. . . Exactly how that happens remains for now an open question, to be answered on the basis of scientific evidence. The point to note, however, is that intelligence can itself be a source of biological novelties that lead to macroevolutionary changes*” (Dembski and Wells, p. 109).
 - b. Michael Behe: “*I find the idea of common descent (that all organisms share a common ancestor) fairly convincing, and have no particular reason to doubt it*” (Behe, 1996, pp. 5-6).
 - c. Stephen Meyer: “*What natural selection lacks, intelligent selection—purposive or goal-directed design—provides*” (Meyer, 2004).
 - d. Philip Johnson: “*If Darwinian selection does not have the required creative power, then ‘evolution’ in some general sense may still be true, but science does not know how creative evolution has occurred*” (Johnson, 1993).
 3. A deeper analysis of potential theological implications pertaining to the IDM is outlined in J.J.S. Johnson’s paper entitled, “Shades of Enlightenment” (www.icr.org/i/pdf/technical/shades-of-the-enlightenment.pdf).

IX. AN INTRODUCTION TO BIOLOGOS

- A. Biologos is supported by individuals from all walks of faith and belief, including those of the “judeo-christian” tradition, Islam, Eastern religions, polytheism, paganism, deism, and even some agnostics as well as atheists.
- B. The BioLogos Foundation of San Diego, CA was founded by Dr. Francis Collins, is funded by the John Templeton Foundation, and is under the leadership of Darrel Falk (BioLogos, a).

1. Francis Collins, who led the human genome project, was appointed by Barack Obama in 2009 to head the National Institutes of Health (NIH), which controls \$30 billion in research funds. He is also the author of the 2006 bestselling book, *The Language of God: A Scientist Presents Evidence for Belief*.
- C. BioLogos is the philosophy that God created the universe, stood back and let it evolve, thus BioLogos embraces neo-Darwinism (naturalistic Darwinian evolution).
- D. BioLogos denounces, and does not want to be confused or associated with:
 1. Atheistic evolution,
 2. Young and old earth creationism, or
 3. The intelligent design movement.
- E. BioLogos is essentially a theistic (or possibly deistic) interpretation of neo-Darwinian (ND) evolution (although Collins does not like to describe himself as a theistic evolutionist nor as a deist), which accepts the “particle to people” rendition of evolution by unguided naturalistic processes. If God had any part in naturalistic evolution, they argue, it was rare and did not play significantly into unguided ND.
 1. The BioLogos foundation says that, “*BioLogos is the belief that Darwinism is a correct science, and that it properly describes the method by which God chose to create the world*” (BioLogos, b).
- F. Francis Collins and the BioLogos website further describe BioLogos as follows:
 1. “*Theistic Evolution, therefore, is the belief that evolution is how God created life. Because the term evolution is sometimes associated with atheism, a better term for the belief in a God who chose to create the world by way of evolution is BioLogos*” (BioLogos, c).
 2. “*In this light, the Fall was not a historical event but an illustration of the common human condition that virtually everyone agrees is deeply flawed and sinful. In this view, it does not matter if Adam and Eve were historical figures. Their deeds simply represent the actions of all humans and remind us of this troubling part of our natures*” (BioLogos, d).
 3. “*Nearly all scientists agree upon descent from a common ancestor, gradual change over a long period of time, and natural selection operating to produce the diversity of living species. There is no question that those are correct. Evolution is not a theory that is going to be discarded next week or next year or a hundred thousand years from now. It is true*” (Francis as quoted in Giberson, 2009).
 4. “*We also believe that evolution, properly understood, best describes God’s work of creation*” (BioLogos, a).
 - a. The philosophy expressed in these statements differs fundamentally from the intelligent design movement, which contends that although evolution *may have* taken place, an intelligent designer would have been required to direct or intervene significantly in the process (theistic evolution) whereas BioLogos believes God *did not have to* intervene in naturalistic evolution, although he *may* have done so in a limited and insignificant way in the last 13.8 billion years.
- G. Because BioLogos allows for a God who set the universe in motion and then stood back and let it evolve for 13.8 billion years, some describe BioLogos as a form of “deistic evolution.”

1. Marvin Olasky, editor in chief of *World Magazine* said, “[Dr. Francis] Collins recently set up the BioLogos Foundation: Its website defines BioLogos as ‘the belief that Darwinism is a correct science.’ This is confusing: Darwinism means unguided evolution, right? Does Collins mean by ‘theistic evolution’ the concept that God is guiding the evolutionary process? If so, isn’t that a version of ID [intelligent design]? On the other hand, if Collins believes that God passively watches evolution unfold, isn’t that deistic evolution?” (Olasky, 2009).
2. Although Dr. Collins wouldn’t describe BioLogos as a form of deism (or deistic evolution), his description of a God who *could have* allowed unguided, random, naturalistic evolution to create all living beings (including the evolution of man) certainly opens the door to deistic evolution.
3. BioLogos walks the very fine line of embracing a multiplicity of faiths that allow for an “interactive God” while simultaneously claiming that God *may* not have intervened for the entire 13.8 billion year evolution of the universe and biological life.
 - a. Collins affirms that, “*BioLogos requires no miraculous events in its account of God’s creative process, except for the origins of the natural laws guiding the process. Instead, BioLogos states that ‘once life arose, the process of evolution and natural selection permitted the development of biological diversity and complexity,’ and ‘humans are part of this process.’ Moreover, ‘once evolution got under way, no special supernatural intervention was required’*” (BioLogos, e; Collins, 2006, p. 200).
4. BioLogos affirms, however, that God may have intervened non-miraculously in naturalistic Darwinian evolution *within* the laws of nature, “*in subtle ways that are unrecognizable to scientific observation*” (*Ibid*).
 - a. This view is more than a little confusing to many. Here is why:
 - 1) Consider that if God *did* intervene in naturalistic evolution, then evolution would no longer be naturalistic, since it would be (even in some minute way) guided by an intelligent being, which is exactly what the intelligent design movement affirms.
 - 2) IDM advocates, however, affirm that if evolution occurred, it was not naturalistic, as it must have been orchestrated by a higher form of intelligence.
 - a) (On a personal note, I personally appreciate what Dr. Collins is trying to do based on his background and belief system; however, a multi-faith, multi-philosophy, multi-worldview-embracing approach seems so contradictory to the casual observer that it is presently being criticized from every other evolutionary or creationist worldview including young and old-earth creationists, the intelligent design movement, agnostics, and atheists alike).
 - b. Dr. James Johnson at the 2007 *Southwest Regional Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society* presented a lecture entitled, “Shades of the Enlightenment! How the Neo-Deist ‘Intelligent Design Movement’ Recycles the Enlightenment’s Methodology of ‘Reason’ as a Humanistic Substitute for Biblical Creationism’s Revelation-verified Epistemology.” In his written manuscript, he argues that much of the current intelligent design movement resembles a 300 year rebirth of deism (www.icr.org/i/pdf/technical/shades-of-the-enlightenment.pdf).

-
- 1) Johnson's description, although applied to the IDM, would even more accurately describe the BioLogos movement, as BioLogos restricts the creative force of God during creation even more than the IDM philosophy does.
- H. The coalition that Collins has been able to build is quite impressive, including support from Hugh Ross's *Reasons to Believe* organization, as well as one of the most eminent and internationally outspoken atheists, Dr. Michael Ruse. Both of these parties disagree with Collins' conclusions, but see their involvement as a means of bridge-building.
1. Incidentally, Ruse applauds the efforts of believers accommodating naturalistic evolution, and, in turn, makes accommodations for believers. An analogy Ruse uses to justify the atheists' accommodation of christianity is in comparing it to knitting. Elderly women in retirement homes may enjoy knitting. Although their labors don't accomplish anything of great significance, we would not take their knitting away from them, because it makes them content. In the same way, Ruse argues, belief in God is useless and in time, everyone will give up their archaic beliefs and come to accept naturalistic evolution and atheism.
- I. Other notable religious figures who support the BioLogos ideology which allows for theistic neo-Darwinian evolution include the [Chuck Colson Center for Christian Worldview](#) (see Chuck Colson, 2011), evangelical author [Philip Yancey](#) (author of *What's so Amazing about Grace*, etc.), evangelical author [Timothy Keller](#) (*The Reason for God*, etc.), [Robert Schuller](#), [Douglas Swartzendruber](#) (retired professor, Pepperdine University), [Andy Crouch](#) (senior editor of *Christianity Today*), [N.T. Wright](#) (Bishop of Durham, interviewed in the movie *The Case for Christ*), [Bruce Waltke](#) (NASB and NIV translator and former president of the Evangelical Theological Society), a large contingency of professors and pastors from the Nazarene Church, [Alister McGrath](#) (chair of Theology, Ministry, and Education at King's College in London and author of the book, *The Dawkins Delusion?*), [Dinesh D'Souza](#) (Author of *What's So Great About Christianity*), [John Walton](#) (evangelical Bible commentator and professor at Wheaton College), and [Ted Davis](#) (Professor, Messiah College, PA).
- J. Some Areas of Concern with BioLogos
1. Biologos is funded (controlled) by the John Templeton foundation, which also awards prizes to Hindus, Buddhists, Muslims, atheists, and ND evolution-based research.
 2. BioLogos is currently writing a science curriculum to show children they were "*created by evolution*" for homeschooling and private school use.
 - a. Francis Collins, in fact, seems to have a special interest in influencing home-schooled children as he was home-schooled up to the 6th grade.
 3. BioLogos is currently paying "Christian" high school teachers a monetary stipend to attend training sessions in neo-Darwinian evolutionary biology in southern California.
 4. BioLogos is preparing "*Resources for Pastors*" to further influence church leaders to support evolutionary teaching (Morris, H.M., 2010).
- K. Biologos advocates accuse IDM supporters of appealing to the "god of the gaps" to account for any unexplained natural phenomenon that cannot be squared with modern science.
1. What they fail to fully acknowledge is that, as believers, any acceptance of deity or a divine creator presupposes some type of supernatural, superscientific, metaphysical intervention that must axiomatically suspend or supersede the natural scientific processes at some point in time.
-

2. Although it is certainly not good science to appeal to the “god of the gaps” to plug the holes every time we cannot explain some natural event scientifically, a belief in a supernatural first-cause demands that there will be limits to naturalistic reasoning and, at some point, we will reach the edge of scientific explanation and be forced to acknowledge supernatural intervention.

X. DANGERS ASSOCIATED WITH COMPROMISING EVERLASTING BIBLICAL TRUTH TO ACCOMMODATE THE POPULAR, CONTEMPORARY SCIENCE-DRIVEN CULTURE: *THE HYPOTHESIS OF EVOLUTION DESTROYS CHRISTIAN FAITH*

- A. Supporters of macroevolution within religious circles often argue that the teaching poses no threat to belief in God or the Bible.
- B. Reliable testimony and history tells us otherwise. History shows that the teaching of macroevolution may be the single largest driver of atheism and disbelief in the Holy Bible.
 1. For example, in conversations with atheists or unbelievers as to why they do not believe in God and/or in the authenticity of the Bible and the creation account, macroevolution and the Darwinian hypothesis is, almost without exception, always used to prove their case.
- C. People who (1) lost their faith or (2) argue for the faith-dissolving influence of Darwinian evolution include:
 1. Charles Darwin – It is well documented that Charles Darwin’s faith in the scriptures (recall that he originally planned to attend seminary and become a theologian) waned after studying and accepting Lyellian uniformitarianism, an ancient earth, progressive creationism, and, finally, naturalistic evolution.
 2. Douglas Futuyma – (world-renowned author of collegiate biological text books) writes, “*By coupling the undirected, purposeless variations to the blind, uncaring process of natural selection, Darwin made the theological or spiritual explanations of the life processes superfluous*” (*Evolutionary Biology*, 3rd edition).
 3. Andrew Carnegie – said that upon learning of Darwinian evolution he felt a great weight lifted from him now that he knew there was no God.
 4. E.O. Wilson – Two time Pulitzer Prize winner, world renowned atheist and Harvard entomologist who has discovered multiple novel species was originally a southern Baptist from Mobile, AL. He said he lost his faith in God when he first learned of Darwinian evolution at the University of Alabama at the age of 18.
 5. Richard Dawkins, brought up in the Anglican church, said he had doubts about God as a child; nevertheless, he was later convinced in God and creation by the teleological (design) argument. Dawkins became an atheist in his teens after studying Darwinian evolution and concluding that it was a better explanation for creation than intelligent design (Hattenstone).
 6. Other atheists such as Julian Huxley, Stephen J. Gould, Michael Ruse, C.D. Darlington, Lloyd Morain, Oliver Reiser, and A.J. Mattill Jr. have all attested that the philosophy of evolution does away with any need for a divine creator (Note: Quotes from all of these individuals are available upon request).
 7. Mike Riddle, evangelical apologetics lecturer, claims that 70% of children raised in denominational homes today end up losing their faith and “leaving the church.” In surveys he has conducted, he concludes that it is largely because the doctrine of

evolution has weakened their faith by presenting an alternative worldview. When evangelicals criticize him for teaching against evolution and say “it’s not a big deal,” his response is, “it’s not a big deal that we are losing 70% of kids that are raised in the church because of this philosophy?”

- a. On a personal note, I don’t know how accurate Riddle’s numbers are, but it is well established that the teaching of naturalistic evolution leads many away from their faith in Jehovah and Jesus as Lord.
- D. Compromising creation with neo-Darwinism does not win acceptance by the naturalistic evolutionary community.
1. Old earth creationists, progressive creationists, theistic and deistic evolutionists all argue that they are trying to “accommodate” science with creation so that they will be taken seriously. At the same time, they denounce young earth creationists for “marginalizing themselves” with arguments that are laughed at by the scientific community.
 2. The irony here is that the humanistic scientific community still considers theistic evolutionist arguments, such as those of Francis Collins, as pseudo-scientific, even after all the accommodations Dr. Collins has made with Darwinism. Regardless of whether someone is a YEC or a deistic evolutionist (possibly a BioLogos advocate), they will still be rejected by the naturalistic scientific community.
 3. An example of this type of derision displayed by naturalistic evolutionists against theistic evolutionists, in this case Biologos supporters, is documented in the article “Theistic Evolutionists, Too, Face ‘Suspicion, Condescension,’ Mohler Observes,” by Eric Roach (www.scbaptistpress.org/bpnews.asp?id=34515) and follow-up comments by Dr. Terry Mortenson (See **Appendix A**).
 4. My personal opinion and recommendation (if asked), then, is that instead of making such “accommodations” with a philosophy and/or supposed science that we believe to be incorrect, why don’t theologians and believing scientists move away from political maneuvering and focus on what is truly important here – an honest and unbiased assessment of the scientific and theological evidences and arguments for or against creation and evolution.
 - a. Note: See section IV of J.J.S. Johnson’s paper, “Shades of Enlightenment” entitled, “Is It Wise to Sacrifice a Dollar to Gain a Dime?” (www.icr.org/i/pdf/technical/shades-of-the-enlightenment.pdf)

XI. MY ASSESSMENT: WHY I ACCEPT A YOUNG EARTH CREATIONIST VIEW – TEN BIBLICAL ARGUMENTS

- A. The Biblical arguments for a young earth, in my view, are well established.
 1. Jeff Smelser will cover Biblical arguments for the young earth view.
- B. Based on the nature of this lesson, and for posterity, however, I wanted to at least provide ten reasons why I believe inorganic evolution and the old earth view are wrong, from a Biblical perspective.
- C. I do not believe (1) the Bible suggests that the earth inorganically evolved for billions of years prior to the creation of man, and I believe that (2) the word *day* in the *Genesis* creation account refers to a normal 24-hour period and not ages of time. To support this notion, I supply the following ten reasons:
 1. *Genesis* chapters 1 and 2 state that God created the world in **six days**.

2. The word “day” in *Genesis* 1 and 2 is from the Hebrew word *yom*, which is used 1,284 times in the Old Testament. Although the word, in rare instances, can refer to a period of time (e.g., during the “day of Abraham Lincoln”), this fact is clearly borne out in the context of the passage and is not typically preceded by a numerical reference (see Gen. 2:4; Ps. 95:8, 9; and Jer. 46:10). However, whenever *yom* follows a numeral in non-prophetic writings in the Old Testament (such as in *Genesis*) it always has reference to a 24-hour solar day. One biblical scholar noted, “We have failed to find a single example of the use of the word ‘day’ in the entire scripture where it means other than a period of 24 hours when modified by the use of the numerical adjective” (Williams, 1965, p. 10).
3. One survey of Hebrew scholars in nine prominent universities conducted by a Canadian anthropologist corroborated the Biblical 24 hour day position. The professors were asked, “Do you understand the Hebrew *yom*, as used in *Genesis* 1, accompanied by a numeral, to be properly translated as (a) a day as commonly understood, or (b) an age, or (c) an age or a day without preference for either?” Of the seven of nine Hebrew scholars that responded to the survey, all affirmed that *yom* in *Genesis* 1 was referring to a normal 24 hour solar day (as quoted in Surburg, 1959, p. 61).
4. With regard to the word “day” being an age of incalculable length, notice *Genesis* 1:14: “Then God said, ‘Let there be lights in the firmament of the heavens to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs and seasons, and for days and years.’” If the days in *Genesis* 1 are ages, then what are the seasons and years? Longer ages? If *day* in verse 14 means an age, then what does the word *night* mean? In reference to this, Marcus Dods in the *Expositor’s Bible* says, “If the word ‘day’ in this chapter does not mean a period of 24 hours, the interpretation of Scripture is hopeless” (1948, pp. 4, 5).
5. Moses taught that these were 24-hour days in *Exodus* 20:11: “For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day.” and again in *Exodus* 31:17, “for in six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth, and on the seventh day He rested and was refreshed.”
6. The word Moses used for days is the Hebrew word *yamin*. *Yamin* appears over 700 times in the Old Testament and in each instance in non-prophetic literature (such as in *Genesis*) it always carries the meaning of a 24-hour period.
7. The days in *Genesis* 1 and 2 should be understood as normal 24-hour days because they are accompanied by the phrase, “morning and evening” in *Genesis* chapter 1, verses 5, 8, 13, 19, 23, and 31. Apologist Dr. Henry M. Morris stated, “The Hebrew words for ‘evening’ and ‘morning’ occur over 100 times each in the Old Testament and **always** in a literal sense” (Morris, 1970, p. 58, emphasis in the original).
8. How could God have made the fact that there were six 24-hour days of creation any clearer? What else could God have said? “Six days and on the seventh he rested.” “Morning and evening.” “The second day.” “The third day.” “The fourth day,” and so on.
9. If the Holy Spirit, through Moses, had intended to mean ages instead of 24-hour days in *Genesis* 1, He could have employed one of the Hebrew terms for long periods of time: *olam* or *qedem*.
10. Consider this. If this planet was allowed to evolve for 4.5 billion years following God’s creation, after which God created mankind, man would have been created at the **end** of creation, wouldn’t he? Imagine that all 4.5 billion years of the assumed

evolutionary time were represented by one 60-minute hour. In this illustration, animals would only have appeared in the last ten minutes, while humans would have only arrived on the scene in the last 1/100 of a second. Our Lord and Savior Jesus counters this idea in Mark 10:6 by saying, *“But from the **beginning** of the creation, God made them male and female.”* But, if the earth is 4.5 billion years old, then man was created 4.5 billion years too late to be considered present at the beginning of creation. On the other hand, if man was created on the sixth 24-hour day of creation, and the elapsed time from Adam till the present day is, let’s say for sake of argument, 10,000 years, then man has been around for 99.999998% of the world’s existence. This would make the Lord’s statement that man has been on earth since *“the beginning of the creation”* logical. Conversely, had the earth existed for 4.5 billion years, with man present only the last ~10,000 years, that would mean that man existed only during the last 0.000217% of the world’s existence, making Jesus’ statement that man has been here since *“the beginning of the creation”* inaccurate and nonsensical. Further, Paul reiterated Christ’s statement in Romans 1:20-21 in declaring that mankind has been able to witness the power of God since, *“the creation of the world.”*

- D. Could God have taken 4 or 5 **billion** years to create the earth if he had chosen? Certainly he could have. No one denies this. In fact, I believe he could have taken 4.5 **trillion** years or 4.5 **picoseconds**. However, the *Genesis* account of a literal, six, 24-hour-day creation is unchangeable. *“For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, and on the seventh day He rested”* (Exod. 31:17).
- E. One might ask, *“Why is a literal interpretation of Genesis important?”* Here is why. If one does not correctly understand and interpret the first two chapters of the Bible (e.g., a literal 24-hour day creation week, a literal first man and first woman, and a literal serpent that tempted the woman), what is to prevent him from questioning other literally documented historical accounts (e.g., the parting of the Red Sea, that Moses actually wrote the Pentateuch, the virgin birth of our Savior, the resurrection of the Christ, and that the New Testament writers wrote by inspiration of the Holy Spirit).
- F. Dr. John MacArthur stated, *“In other words, if you reject the creation account in Genesis, you have no basis for believing the Bible at all. If you doubt or explain away the Bible’s account of the six days of creation, where do you put the reins on your skepticism? Do you start with Genesis 3, which explains the origin of sin . . . ? Or maybe you don’t sign on until sometime after chapter 6, because the Flood is invariably questioned by scientists, too. Or perhaps you find the Tower of Babel too hard to reconcile with the linguists’ theories about how languages originated and evolved. So maybe you start taking the Bible as literal history beginning with the life of Abraham. But when you get to Moses’ plagues against Egypt, will you deny those, too? What about the miracles of the New Testament? Is there any reason to regard any of the supernatural elements of biblical history as anything other than poetic symbolism? . . . If we’re worried about appearing ‘unscientific’ in the eyes of naturalists, we’re going to have to reject a lot more than Genesis 1-3”* (2001, p. 44, emphasis in the original).
- G. The most thorough and scholarly single-article theological response of YEC to OEC that I’ve read is Dr. Terry Mortenson’s “Systematic Theology Texts and the Age of the Earth: A Response to the Views of Erickson, Grudem, and Lewis and Demarest” (available at: http://www.answersingenesis.org/contents/379/arj/v2/Systematic_theology_Erickson_Grudem_Lewis.pdf).
1. Dr. Mortenson here defends the orthodox view of the creation week in response to popular theological texts used in religious seminaries.

XII. MY ASSESSMENT: WHY I ACCEPT A YOUNG EARTH CREATIONIST VIEW – NINETEEN SCIENTIFIC ARGUMENTS

- A. An honest admission: It would make my professional life a lot easier if I could accept the old earth position.
- B. Although I take no pleasure in arguing my extreme minority position (in the scientific community) on the age of the earth, I believe this issue is an essential element in addressing the subject of evolution and the christian.
- C. Scientists who are believers stand to gain nothing personally by arguing for the young earth position. In fact, we are poised to lose credibility in science, and, at the very least, be objects of derision.
1. For this reason, many scientists are hesitant of embracing the young earth position or are “closet” young-earthers.
- D. Nevertheless, after hearing both sides of the argument for over two decades, and considering the scientific evidence, these are my conclusions:
1. The old earth view is driven by faulty presuppositions based on the now-disproven teaching of geological uniformitarianism (made popular by Charles Lyell and James Hutton in the late 17th century).
 - a. Note: The geological uniformitarianism of Lyell and Hutton (taught in American schools for at least the last 150 years) began to be questioned by geologists by the 1970’s. By the 1980’s, geological uniformitarianism was completely denounced by many of the world’s most reputable geologists. The most notable of these has been Dr. Derek Ager who, incidentally, has been very adversarial towards creationists. I document this more fully in my lecture on uniformitarianism and the age of the earth (available on www.Youtube.com or accessed at the Southport church of Christ website or by audio at the Exton church of Christ website). Some of the admissions of these humanistic geologists with regard to overturning the standard beliefs of geological uniformitarianism are truly amazing.
 2. The scientific community has treated the age of the earth (viz. millions [and now] billions of years) for the past 200 years as *a priori* truth, only later developing experimental research to supposedly validate the preconception.
 - a. That is, even before the “modern science” for the age of the earth was formulated, the old earth position was presupposed as a necessary entity of the modernist movement.
 - b. This stands in stark contrast with true science, which is supposed to be based on inductive reasoning *a posteriori*, following observations of empirical scientific experimentation.
 - c. “But” it is argued, “we have proven the age of the earth by radiometric dating.”
 - 1) I counter that 150 years prior to radiometric dating (since Lyell and Hutton in the late 17th century) modernism has required an ancient earth in order to validate macroevolution and in order to dispense with the need for the divine. All of this is historically well-documented. References can be made available upon request.
 - 2) Radiometric dating is highly variable and has been clearly documented as being based on un-provable presuppositions. Most naturalistic scientists,

however, will not even give the opposing arguments a hearing. In short, the age of the earth, again, is an *a priori* argument based on faith in the modernist presuppositions, bending the observations to fit the hypothesis.

- E. The following are only a few of the scientific arguments for the young earth view, which have not, in my opinion, been fully accounted for or adequately responded to by the naturalistic scientific community.
1. (*Editorial note: I fully grant that empirical evidence *may* either currently exist, or *may* one day be found to invalidate the following arguments. Any scientist who does not leave himself open to peer-review is a practicing propagandist and not a scientist. In fact, I welcome scientific feedback that will repudiate these arguments. No one wants to be known as a builder of straw men. However, at this point in time, I believe that (1) the following arguments have not been fully explained by the scientific community, and (2) unfortunately, modern science refuses to engage creationists in open discussions. The latter point has been repeatedly documented (a) in print and (b) in the experience of numerous young earth creationists in either academia or elsewhere in the scientific arena).
 2. The discovery of DNA, red blood cells and pliable fleshy tissue in fossilized dinosaur remains has been fully documented in peer-reviewed scientific journals. Preserved organic tissue, blood cells, hemoglobin, flexible blood vessels, intestines, colon, liver, muscles, and windpipe have been found in China, Italy, and Montana from dinosaurs that are supposedly 68+ million year old. Mainstream scientists have *not even considered* the fact that the tissue may be younger than previously expected and are currently focusing their efforts on (A) invalidating the findings or, (2) postulating hypotheses to account for the lack of decomposition.
 - a. In the interest of time and based on the nature of this overview, I am not providing corroborating scientific references for these points, but I am happy and willing to do so upon request.
 3. Flatness of the Particle Horizon – The particle horizon of our universe is inexplicably flat (i.e., it has zero spatial curvature) as if looking at a perfectly flat tortilla shell. However, based on a 13.8 billion year old universe, the spatial curvature should digress from the critical density (non-zero spatial curvature). It is axiomatic that this deviation always becomes *greater* (more curvature) with the progression of time. That is, the universe should have refracted from the flatness of the flat tortilla shell analogy to something more similar to a bowl-shaped curvature, in one direction or the other.
 - a. This fact created significant problems for the old universe position in the 1980's, and has not yet been completely accounted for or explained. Predictably, however, supporters of uniformitarianism have explained away the phenomenon by using *computer models* to account for the inexplicable zero spatial curvature. These computer-generated mathematical models have provided them with some theoretical space as well as time to allow them to develop what might be viewed as empirical evidence to explain away the phenomenon.
 - 1) Stated simply, uniformitarianism *cannot* accept a universe that is less than several billion years old, or else supernatural intervention would be necessary.
 - 2) To those who hold the young universe position, the treatment of this issue is questionable, at best, and possibly duplicitous, at worst.

4. The Absence of Billions of Requisite Transitional Fossils – between supposed evolutionary animal groups that comprise the classification level of family and higher.
5. Contemporary Rapid Sedimentation – Mount St. Helens erupted in Washington State in 1980 producing finely layered sediment 25 feet deep in a single afternoon (ca. 6 hours). Extrapolating this to a single year (365 days) is equivalent to 36,500 feet or 6.9 miles of sedimentation that could potentially be produced in one year's time. Mt. Everest is only 29,000 feet or 5.5 miles above sea level. Catastrophic occurrences could fully account for the geological column in a short period of time.
6. Polystrate Fossils – Attesting to rapid sedimentation, polystrate trees 30 feet high have been buried in sediment rapidly, thus requiring a shorter period of time for construction of the geological column.
7. Uniformitarianism claims that the Grand Canyon was created through the erosive force of the Colorado River over millions of years. One of the many problems with this hypothesis is that there is over 1,000 cubic miles of sediment unaccounted for. Where did it go? Catastrophic processes can account for what uniformitarianism cannot.
8. Human Fossils Found in “Ancient” Geologic Layers – These are always explained away by uniformitarians in a number of fanciful ways; most notably, by claiming that humans must have fallen down mine shafts, been buried in layers of rock, become fossilized and discovered later.
9. Radiocarbon (^{14}C) dating, by uniformitarians' own admissions, is only useful for the past 50,000-100,000 years, which is irrelevant in proving that the earth is 4.5 billion years old. However, coal (that is supposedly millions of years old) is frequently carbon dated as less than 50,000 years old. Furthermore, supposed 1 billion-year-old diamonds, the hardest substance known to man which have the lowest chance of being contaminated from outside elements, have also been ^{14}C -dated with ages less than 50,000 years.
10. Radiometric dating is highly variable and inconsistent.
 - a. Radiometric dating is based on at least three un-provable *a priori* assumptions:
 - 1) It must be assumed that when the parent element in the rock was formed, there could *not* have been any of the daughter element present
 - 2) It must be assumed that the decay rates of the unstable parent isotope being tested have *always remained stable* (stable instability).
 - 3) It must be assumed that it is impossible for more of the parent element to have migrated into the rock or more of the daughter elements to have migrated out of the rock being tested at any point in the supposed billions of years of time (who can believe it?).
 - b. During radiometric dating, measurements frequently do not agree with the evolutionary model and are often discarded as “discordant” or “anomalous” readings.
 - c. According to radiometric dating, lava flows from Mt. St. Helens and Mt. Ngauruhoe are 3 million years old, although these rocks were only formed within the last 100 years (Austin, 1996; Snelling, 1998).
 - d. Rock specimens sampled from five locations on the new lava dome of Mount St. Helens in Washington State, created only eleven years earlier, were

- radiometrically dated by the potassium-argon method to five different ages of between 0.3 and 2.7 million years old.
- e. Arguing hypothetically, according to current methods used to date the earth, a rock containing both uranium-238 and lead-206 that was created only 24 hours ago (humor me here) by an intelligent designer, would be radiometrically dated at up to a billion years old.
 - f. Based on these scientific “reaches,” and if past practices tell us anything, radiometric dating will one day be supplanted by a different method of dating the earth to 4.5 billion years old, whenever a “more credible” method can be found.
11. Helium, the byproduct of radioactive decay on earth, is produced and increases in the atmosphere every year. However, accounting for the evolutionary 4.5 billion year age of the earth, there should be at least 2,000 times more helium in our atmosphere than is currently present. Uniformitarianism simply says that it must have “escaped” from the atmosphere, although there is no proof that 2000 times the current concentration of helium has escaped.
 12. Hydrogen is continuously being converted into helium throughout the universe. Nevertheless, hydrogen is readily abundant in quantities much greater than many predict is possible if the universe really is 13.8 billion years old.
 13. The moon is receding from the earth at a rate of 1½ inches per year. However, if the earth and moon are really 4.5 billion years old, then the moon should be at least 3½ times further from the earth than it is presently.
 14. The salinity of the earth’s oceans is gradually increasing over time due to mineral runoffs from rivers and streams.
 - a. Each year, approximately 450 million tons of salt pour into the oceans, while up to 27 percent (a generous estimate) of salts may be removed by salt sprays and ocean floor sequestration and deposition.
 - 1) This would mean that the oceans’ salinity is increasing by at least 330 million tons per year = 330 billion tons in 1,000 years = 330 trillion tons in 10,000 years = 330 quadrillion tons in 100,000 years = 330 quintillion tons every one million years.
 - a) However, if the oceans are as old as uniformitarianism claims (550 million to 4 billion years) then the salinity of the oceans should be, at the very least, 80 times greater than they currently are.
 - b. Because the salinity of the oceans is much lower than predicted by evolutionary hypotheses, dating the earth by the oceans’ salinity (which at one time was a standard practice) has been replaced with radiometric dating.
 15. Trace minerals (e.g. uranium, etc.) are present at much lower concentrations in the oceans than would be expected if the seas were really 550+ million years old, even factoring in sequestration.
 - a. In the 19th century, dating the oceans by mineral influx placed the age around 50 million years with a maximum age of no greater than 100 million years. Because this was not old enough to account for evolution, this method of dating the earth was discarded and replaced with radiometric dating.
 16. Were the earth actually billions of years old, sediment buildup in the oceans would be greater than it currently is. Some estimates, however, predict that only approximately

3,000 feet of sediment has accumulated from these processes, which would give the earth a maximum age of only ca. 10,000 years.

- a. The Mississippi River deposits ca. 300 million cubic yards of sediment into the sea per year = 300 billion cubic yards in 1,000 years = 300 trillion cubic yards in 100,000 years = 300 quadrillion cubic yards in a million years. If the earth were as old as evolutionists' claim, the Gulf of Mexico would have long ago been filled in with debris.

17. Disintegration of the earth's magnetic field.

- a. The earth's magnetic field has been measured since at least 1835. A documented 10% decrease in the earth's magnetic field has occurred in only the last 100 years, creating what appears to be an alternate pole just west of South Africa under the Atlantic Ocean.
- b. Navigational coordinates, based on the earth's "magnetic poles" around the world, are currently being recalibrated to account for the changing poles on global charts (USGS).
- c. One report estimated that the end of the earth's magnetic field could occur as early as the year A.D. 4000.
- d. The earth's magnetic field also shields the planet from the radiation effects of solar winds. When the earth no longer has a magnetic field, life will, arguably, cease to exist on the planet due to exposure to intense radiation.
- e. Calculating backwards to the maximum possible electrical force, Dr. T. G. Barnes of the University of Texas has estimated the maximum age of the earth to be around 7,000 years old.

18. Based on uniformitarian calculations, the annual growth rate of the human population and our supposed evolutionary ancestors (viz., *Homo neaeanderthalensis*, *Homo heidelbergensis*, and *Homo erectus*) on earth in the past 1 million years has only been 0.00015% per year, or an annual increase of only 15 people per 1 million in population per year.

- a. This would amount to a doubling time of once every 30,000 years. However, in recent history the population growth has been ca. 2% per year with a doubling time of only 35 years.
- b. Young earth advocates have estimated that if the first man and woman were placed on earth 4,000 years ago, and assuming a conservative 0.5% population increase (Note: this lower percentages is used to account for attrition due to disease, war, famine, etc.), the number of humans on earth would be equivalent to the current world population.

19. Dating the oceans by coral reefs is an imprecise science since coral has been recorded growing between 0.8 and 414 mm per year, based on atmospheric conditions.

- a. One estimate is that large coral reefs could be produced in under 3,500 years.
- b. Coral reefs have displayed the ability to produce more than 365 as well as less than 365 bands in one years' time, thus, dating by coral reefs is highly variable, at best.

20. Trees in especially moderate climates (cooler summers and warmer winters) frequently produce more than one annual ring per annum (multiannual, annual rings) such as could have occurred during more moderate climates of the past.

a. Based on this information, the oldest trees on earth, which have a maximum of ca. 4,800 annual rings, are consistent with the YEC-predicted age for the earth.

F. For further reading on this subject, along with the testimony of 50 scientists who believe the earth is young, I would recommend the book, *In Six Days: Why Fifty Scientists Choose to Believe in Creation*, ed. John Ashton, 2000.

XIII. THIRTY-ONE SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL ARGUMENTS AGAINST NEO-DARWINIAN EVOLUTION

A. Although naturalistic evolutionists would disagree with some (many) of the following conclusions, this does not diminish the fact that internationally-credentialed doctoral scholars in biology, immunology, biochemistry, geology, physics, medicine, philosophy, etc. have raised these objections to ND.

B. In the interest of time and based on the nature of this overview, I am not providing corroborating scientific references for these points, but I am happy and willing to do so upon request.

1. Nevertheless, these points are all fully documented in available literature, including the ten books listed in section I, C on pages 2-3 of this outline.
2. Macroevolutionary natural selection (survival of the fittest) is based on a tautology (circular reasoning) and is a philosophical argument rather than a scientific one.
 - a. Douglas Futuyma, among others, has argued that natural selection has even been considered tautological by the scientific community.
 - b. For example, "Which animals survive to spread their genes? The 'most fit' ones, of course. Which ones are 'most fit?' The ones that pass their genes along, of course." Thus, natural selection says nothing regarding the definition of what comprises "the fit."
 - 1) They believe it occurred because it had to occur and it had to occur because they believe it occurred.
 - c. Is natural selection based on intelligence, size, speed, skill, hearing, vision, sense of smell, strength, disease resistance, societal cooperation, etc.? No one can say, except that the "most fit" organisms survive to spread their genes, and the ones that spread their genes must be the ones that are the most fit.
 - d. Macroevolutionary natural selection is an *a priori* assumption that is assumed such that all data collected must be forced into the macroevolutionary model.
 - e. Although many, even creationists, have questioned whether natural selection is a valid objection to ND, I believe it remains a valid point, based on available quotes from the non-creationist community.
3. It has since been proven that "small changes" in animal do not accumulate over generations leading to macroevolution. Lynn Margulis from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst has made this case, among many others.
4. Billions of transitional fossils are missing (aka, "missing links").

-
- a. In order to skirt the issue, the hypothesis of “punctuated equilibrium” has been taught – via recycled novel nomenclature by Gould and Eldridge in the 1970’s.
 - 1) The reasoning goes like this, “If we find ANY transitional fossils in the geological record, then it must prove ND to be true. However, if we don’t find the transitional fossils between two animal groups, then this proves that one life form must have evolved into another group so rapidly that they didn’t leave evidence of it in the fossil record.”
 - a) This is a non-scientific “jury-rigged” argument, premised upon the lack of evidence rather than conclusions based on evidence derived from empirical scientific experimentation and inductive reasoning. Ever heard of a “stacked deck?”
 5. For any fossil that is put forward as a supposed transitional form between two biological groups (aka, a “missing link”) there are macroevolutionists that are willing to deny that it is truly a transitional fossil.
 - a. ND supporters will counter, “Well, even among believers there isn’t absolute agreement on creation, evolution or the age of the earth.”
 - 1) My response is, “No one ever claimed there was or needs to be a consensus of opinion among believers. In fact, just the opposite is true. It is the macroevolutionary ND supporters who continually spread the inaccurate idea that there is a scientific consensus regarding ND evolution among the scientific community.”
 6. In the “Cambrian explosion,” all Baupläne or anatomical body types (phyla) of animals appear inexplicably and all of a sudden in the Cambrian layer of the geological column. There are no transitional fossils for the Cambrian and Pre-Cambrian groups, as Gould well pointed out.
 7. The very complex and highly-functional eyes of the ancient arthropod, the trilobite, appear the same in the fossil record (a) when it appeared as (b) when it disappeared, over a supposed span of 200 million years. No evolution took place.
 8. Evidence for supposed ape to man evolution has been stretched and altered for the past 150 years. Recent claims for the evolution of man based on the primate fossils “Ida” and “Ardi” have been refuted by many macroevolutionists
 - a. For more detailed information on “Ida” and “Ardi”, see the articles I wrote entitled, “Lemur-Like Fossil, ‘Ida,’ Says Nothing About Alleged Human Evolution” and “‘Ardi’ – An Archaeological Conundrum for Evolutionists” (**Appendix B** and **Appendix C**).
 9. The supposed proof for the evolution of man, based on the relationship between human and chimpanzee DNA, has proven to be a philosophical rather than a scientific argument. Commonality could just as easily indicate a common designer as a common ancestor.
 10. Textbook teaching of peppered moth evolution has been refuted by macroevolutionists.
 11. Textbook teaching of horse evolution has been refuted by macroevolutionists for at least 40 years.
 12. Textbook teaching that lethal or neutral fruit fly mutations prove Darwinism has been refuted by macroevolutionists.
-

-
- a. Note: For ND to be demonstrated *a posteriori* by laboratory mutations would require:
 - 1) *Additional* genetic material added to the genome of the organism (not inversions or deletions).
 - 2) The mutations would have to give the organism a competitive advantage to survive in the wild, thus it would be a mutant that would persist in natural settings and *outcompete* wild-type species.
 - 3) The mutation would have to produce a phenotypic variant; that is to say, there would have to be some noticeable *structural* difference in the organism, which is what ND requires
 - a) All of these facts make horizontal variation in antibiotic, pesticide, chemical, radiation, or allergen resistance in progeny irrelevant.
 13. Textbook teaching regarding ND embryology and Haeckel's embryos has been refuted by macroevolutionists including S.J. Gould.
 14. Textbook teaching regarding the presence and significance of vestigial organs in macroevolution has been refuted for at least 30 years in the scientific community.
 15. Textbook teaching regarding animal homology is not empirical proof that macroevolution occurred UNLESS naturalistic processes are presumed *a priori* to the exclusion of supernatural creation.
 16. Textbook teaching regarding macroevolution being proved by variations within Galapagos Island finches (horizontal variation) has been refuted since at least the late 1970's.
 17. The fact that large reptiles once roamed the earth (some people in Florida, Australia, Africa and India still think they do) proves nothing regarding macroevolution, as some ND supporters even point out. However, they also admit that dinosaurs are the "best recruiting tool" for teaching the public about evolution.
 18. Macroevolution teaches that the array of biological organisms on earth should evolve from simple to more complex and diverse.
 - a. The geological record, on the other hand, shows that there was a much greater diversity of life and more species in the past, which is being honed down to less diversity and fewer species, presently.
 - b. Stephen J. Gould showed that instead of a tree of life, the fossil record looks more similar to an inverted tree of life (or bush) with the greatest diversity in the past (aka, "decimation and diversification").
 19. Macroevolution has not been able to account for the naturalistic origin of life. Spontaneous generation was refuted by Louis Pasteur 140 years ago.
 20. Michael Behe's idea of irreducibly complex biological systems has yet to be fully addressed by the ND community.
 - a. Especially at the biochemical level, it takes more faith to believe that intricately-functioning molecular mechanisms could have evolved one piece at a time until perfect, than it does to believe in creation.
-

-
21. The theory of relativity, quantum mechanics and string theory are revealing a highly-ordered infinitesimally fine-tuned universe that operates within such precise sub-atomic laws that it takes more faith to believe in naturalism than creation.
 22. Very few evolutionists will debate creationists anymore.
 - a. The majority (although not all) of debates between creationists and macroevolutionists end with the creationists making a stronger polemic case, while macroevolutionists frequently become angry, frustrated and sometimes vitriolic because of the inadequacies of their arguments.
 - b. Regarding the failure to win debates with creationists, the foremost defender of ND-evolution in the United States, Dr. Eugenie Scott, warned her evolutionist friends, “*Avoid debates. . . you probably will get beaten*” (Eugenie C. Scott, “Monkey Business,” *The Sciences* [January/February 1996], pp. 20-25.)
 - 1) Scott is Executive Director of the National Center for Science Education, Berkeley, California, and received her Ph.D. in Anthropology from Missouri University in 1974. Her past previous position was Assistant Professor, University of Colorado at Boulder, 1984-86.
 23. Adolph Hitler devised his genocidal pogroms based on Darwin’s teaching of the “survival of the fittest” in the attempt to make a superhuman race of people, even as Darwin predicted that one day the “savage races of the world” would be abolished.
 - a. Atheists and macroevolutionists have done everything they can to deny or divert public attention from this fact, while whole texts have been written documenting the facts presented here.
 24. In the trillions of experimental generation cycles of bacteria tested by scientists in laboratory settings, these microorganisms have never been induced into evolving into anything other than bacteria (i.e. no macroevolution).
 - a. Antibiotic resistance is a mutation that occurs based on genetic material already in the genome, while ND evolution requires macromutations by means of NEW genetic material (i.e. different, novel and superiorly-evolved beneficial genes.).
 25. Naturalistic philosophers have been proposing evolution (without any scientific proof) at least since Thales in 588 B.C. Western Europe’s 18th century Biblical criticism, modernism and atheism had been looking for a “scientific explanation for evolution” in order to explain away God for 100 years before Darwin’s publication. For this reason, Darwin’s arguments, as weak as they were, were touted as truth.
 26. Neo-Darwinism isn’t founded on the four-tiered scientific method.
 27. Macroevolutionists do not want the general public to see that there is a disagreement even among macroevolutionists (e.g., Lynn Margulis, Univ. MA Amherst) regarding the mechanism to drive the process. ND is currently being challenged by those who believe evolution occurred; they just believe it could not have happened by the, “*zoological, capitalistic, competitive, cost-benefit interpretation of Darwin*” (Margulis, “Science’s Unruly Earth Mother,” 1991, *Science*, pp. 252:378-381).
 28. Historical scientists, all the way back to 1859 as well as thousands of doctoral scientists, physicians, surgeons and philosophers around the world have voiced their opposition to ND as a viable explanation for the complexity of life (www.truthmagazine.com/?p=1838).
-

29. The convergent evolution (i.e., simultaneous identically-evolved anatomical structures in different animals) of organs such as human and octopus eyes requires more faith to believe than does creation.
30. Blood alpha-hemoglobin of the crocodile is more similar to the chicken than it is to a supposedly more closely-related animal, the viper.
31. Many out of place (“topsy-turvy”) fossils appear in rock much older than can be accounted for by macroevolution.
32. Frequently in discussions with evolutionists, an “appeal to the majority” opinion is made.
 - a. Majority opinion has never established truth on any scientific subject, including the rotundity of the earth, geocentrism versus heliocentrism, early 19th-century forced sterilization of the mentally-ill in the United States, majority support for the scientific arguments in favor of the Holocaust by scientists and philosophers Nazi Germany, bleeding to treat the ill, lobotomies to treat the mentally ill, the steady state theory of the universe, etc.

Conclusion:

- I. This outline has examined various positions that Bible believers hold, and have been divided over at least since 1859 in the creation versus evolution controversy.
 - A. Fifteen questions, which have divided believers, on the subject were listed.
 - B. Five of the most common overall positions that believers hold, which were provided include,
 1. Young Earth Creationism
 2. Inorganic Old Earth Creationism
 3. Organic Old Earth Creationism (Or, Progressive Creationism)
 4. Theistic Evolution
 5. BioLogos (includes those who allow for Deistic Evolution)
- II. A warning was issued for teachers to be careful when endorsing and recommending a movement before knowing all the ramifications of the philosophy and the potential influence it may have on Christians or unbelievers.
 - A. Notable examples of current movements, which allow for evolution include (1) the modern intelligent design movement, which allows for intelligent design-guided evolution, as well as (2) Dr. Francis Collins’ BioLogos movement, which is currently sponsoring workshops and short courses to train teachers and “pastors” in accommodating the Bible and naturalistic macroevolution.
- III. Examples of individuals who gave up their faith in Jesus due to Darwinian evolution were provided.
- IV. Tools were provided for further study and to answer some of the more common questions in the creation versus evolution controversy. These tools included,
 - A. Ten recommended books for further study.
 - B. Ten Biblical reasons in favor of the young earth position.
 - C. Nineteen scientific arguments in favor of the young earth position.
 - D. Thirty-one scientific and philosophical arguments against neo-Darwinian evolution.

- V. My final opinion and recommendation (if asked), then, is that instead of making “accommodations” with a philosophy and/or supposed science that believers feel is inaccurate, we should move away from political maneuvering and focus on what is truly important – an honest and unbiased assessment of the scientific and theological evidences and arguments for or against creation, evolution, and the age of the earth.
- A. As always, I am open to rebuttal.

Joshua B. Gurtler
1029 Square Dr.
Phoenixville, PA 19460

REFERENCES

- Ashton, John, ed. *In Six Days: Why Fifty Scientists Choose to Believe in Creation*. 2000. Green Forest, AR: Master Books. 384 pp.
- Austin SA. 1996. “Excess Argon within Mineral Concentrates from the New Dacite Lava Dome at Mount St. Helens Volcano.” *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal*. 10(3).
- BioLogos Website, a. “About Us.” Accessed on 12 Jan. 2011 at: <http://biologos.org/about>
- BioLogos Website, b. “How is BioLogos different from Darwinism or Social Darwinism?” Accessed on 12 Jan. 2011 at: <http://biologos.org/questions/biologos-darwinism-social-darwinism/>
- BioLogos Website, c. “How is BioLogos different from Theistic Evolution, Intelligent Design and Creationism?” Accessed on 15 Feb. 2011 at: <http://www.biologos.org/questions/biologos-id-creationism/>
- BioLogos Website, d. “How does the Fall fit into evolutionary history? Were Adam and Eve historical figures?” Accessed on 15 Feb. 2011 at: <http://biologos.org/questions/evolution-and-the-fall/>
- BioLogos Website, e. “What role could God have in evolution?” Accessed on 12 Jan. 2011 at: <http://biologos.org/questions/evolution-and-divine-action/>
- Collins, Francis S. *The Language of God: A Scientist Presents Evidence for Belief*. 2006. New York: Free Press.
- Chaffey, Tim, and Jason Lisle. *Old Earth Creationism on Trial*. 2008. Green Forest, AR: Master Books.
- Chuck Colson Center for Christian Worldview. “Creation/Evolution.” Accessed on 26 January, 2011 at: http://www.colsoncenter.org/search-library/search?n=1&view=searchresults&cb_spheres_creenv=on
- Dembski, William A. 1998. “Science and Design.” *First Things*. 86:21-27.
- Dembski, William A., and Jonathan Wells. *The Design of Life: Discovering Signs of Intelligence in Biological Systems*. 2008. Dallas: Foundation for Thought and Ethics. 339 pages.
- Dods, Marcus. “Genesis,” in *The Expositor’s Bible*, Vol. 1, ed. W.R. Nicoll. 1948. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Giberson, K. W. [Evolution, the Bible, and the Book of Nature: A conversation with Francis Collins](#). *Christianity Today*. Posted on christianitytoday.com July 10, 2009.
- Hattenstone, Simon. “Darwin’s child”. London: The Guardian, 10 Feb. 2003. Accessed on 12 Jan. 2011 at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2003/feb/10/religion.scienceandnature>.
- Johnson, J. J. S. “Shades of the Enlightenment!” Presented to the Evangelical Theological Society Southwest Regional Meeting, Fort Worth, Texas. March 24, 2007. Manuscript accessed on 12 Jan. 2011 at: <http://www.icr.org/i/pdf/technical/shades-of-the-enlightenment.pdf>
- Johnson, Phillip. 1993. “God and Evolution: An Exchange, Howard J. Van Till/Phillip E. Johnson. *First Things*. Accessed on 26 January, 2011 at: <http://www.firstthings.com/article/2008/09/004-god-and-evolution-an-exchange-37>

-
- Lockyer, Norman. Inorganic evolution as studied by spectrum analysis. 1900. London:Macmillan and Co., Ltd. 198 pp. Accessed on 22 Jan. 2011 at:
<http://books.google.com/books?id=RN7PAAAAMAAJ&dq=%22inorganic%20evolution%22%20lockyer&pg=PP1#v=onepage&q=%22inorganic%20evolution%22&f=false>
- MacArthur, John. *The Battle for the Beginning: The Bible on the Creation and the Fall of Adam*. 2000. Nashville, TN: W. Publishing Group, a division of Thomas Nelson Inc.
- Meyer, Stephen C. "DNA and the Origin of Life: Information, Specification, and Explanation" in J. A. Campbell and S. C. Meyer, (eds.), *Darwinism, Design, and Public Education*. 2003. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press. pages 223-285.
- Meyer, Stephen C. 2004. "The origin of biological information and the higher taxonomic categories." *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington*. 117:213-239.
- Meyer, Stephen C. *Signature in the Cell: DNA and the Evidence for Intelligent Design*. 2010. New York:Harper One. 611 pages.
- Morris, Henry. *Biblical Cosmology and Modern Science*. 1970. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.
- Morris, H.M. 2010. "Creation by Evolution: Understanding the Theological Hazards of Bruce Waltke, BioLogos and the New Darwinian Evangelicals." *Acts and Facts*. 39(6):4-5.
- Olasky, M. An hour, sir, please? Francis Collins could help the church by clarifying his views. *World*. 24 (15): 76. As quoted by Lawrence Ford, "Christianity on the Public Stage: Dr. Francis Collins and the dangerous doctrines of BioLogos." 2009. Christianity on the Public Stage. *Acts & Facts*. 38 (9): 4-5. Accessed on 15 Feb. 2011 at: <http://www.icr.org/article/christianity-public-stage-dr-francis>
- Pew Forum. 2008. "Religious Groups: Opinions of Evolution." Conducted in 2007. Accessed on 23 January 2011 at: <http://pewforum.org/Science-and-Bioethics/Religious-Differences-on-the-Question-of-Evolution.aspx>
- Snelling A.A. "Andesite Flows at Mt. Ngauruhoe, New Zealand, and the Implications for Potassium Argon 'Dating'." Presented at the Fourth International Conference on Creationism. Beaver Falls, PA, August 3-8, 1998.
- Spetner, Lee. *Not By Chance!* 1997. Brooklyn, NY: Judaica Press, Inc. 272 pp.
- Surburg, R.R. "In the Beginning God Created," in *Darwin, Evolution, and Creation*, ed. P.A. Zimmerman. 1959. St. Louis, MO: Concordia.
- Thompson, Bert. 1999. "The Bible and the Age of the Earth [Part II]" *Reason and Revelation*. September, 19[9]:65-70.
- United Methodist Church. "Science and Technology." The Book of Discipline of The United Methodist Church . 2008. The United Methodist Publishing House. Accessed online on 23 January, 2011 at:
<http://www.umc.org/site/apps/nlnet/content3.aspx?c=1wL4KnN1LtH&b=3082929&ct=6715227>
- United States Geological Survey. "Frequently Asked Questions." Accessed on 2 February, 2011 at:
<http://geomag.usgs.gov/faqs.php>
- Williams, Arthur F. In: *Creation Research Annual*. 1965. Ann Arbor, MI: Creation Research Society.
-

Appendix A

FOLLOW UP COMMENTS BY Dr. TERRY MORTENSON

From: Terry Mortenson [mailto:TMortenson@AnswersinGenesis.org]

Sent: Thursday, January 27, 2011 12:03 PM

To: TMortenson@AnswersinGenesis.org

Subject: Dr. Mohler, Biologos, and respect from evolutionists

Friends,

Here's an enlightening article on the problem of trying to be acceptable to and respected by the scientific establishment (which is controlled by atheist evolutionists): <http://www.bpnews.net/BPnews.asp?ID=34515>.

Dr. Mohler (president of Southern Baptist Theological Seminary) is absolutely right. Compromise with evolution and millions of years never makes a person respectable in the eyes of the secularists.

And it certainly doesn't make non-believers be more open to the gospel and more trusting of the Bible. Proof of that is the last 200 years of history, when most of the church has compromised with millions of years and increasingly in recent times has compromised with Neo-Darwinian evolution. During this time the church in Europe, the United Kingdom and North America has increasingly drifted away from the truth and authority of the Word of God and the culture in those countries has become increasingly godless, immoral and hostile to Christianity. Whereas increasingly over the last 50 years, those Christians who have returned to faith in God's Word in Genesis 1-11 have been revived in their faith and obedience to the Word and their boldness and confidence in evangelism that has led many evolutionized unbelievers to faith in Christ.

Also, I would add to Dr. Mohler's critique, that Karl Giberson's comments in the web article reveal that as a biologist he is absolutely clueless about how astronomers and geologists measure the age of the earth or universe. "The measurements that scientists make to determine the age of the earth and the universe" are hardly simple. But more importantly, when they observe things such as tree-rings, red-shift of starlight, thickness or position of rock layers or the fossils in them or radioactive isotopes used in dating methods, they are using anti-biblical, atheistic, uniformitarian *presuppositions* (assumptions) to *interpret* those observations to mean that millions of years of history have elapsed. Without those anti-biblical, atheistic, uniformitarian assumptions, there would be no evidence of millions of years. Rather, creation scientists using biblical assumptions based on the history recorded in Genesis (i.e., as they are wearing "biblical glasses") are increasingly seeing the abundant evidence of Noah's Flood and a young earth and young universe, just as the Bible clear [*sic*] teaches. This is no surprise, for creation must confirm the truth of God's Word, because God's Word (as an eye-witness testimony of God) tells us what truly happened in the past to produce what we see in the present.

Dr. Derek Ager was a prominent evolutionary geologist in the United Kingdom before his death in 1993. He was an ardent anti-creationist, even warning creationist readers of his last book (published posthumously) that they better not try to use anything in his book to support their view. But he's dead now, so I do it anyway, because what he said is so true. As a result of studying geological formations in over 50 countries, he had come to largely reject the uniformitarian assumptions dominating geology (and so became a "neo-catastrophist"). In his book, which discusses numerous examples (with pictures) of geological formations that could not possibly have formed over millions of years (as conventional geologists have been brainwashed to believe), but rather show evidence that they were formed catastrophically in hours, days, weeks, months or a few years, he states,

"I should, perhaps, say something about the title of this book. Just as politicians rewrite human history, so geologists rewrite earth history. For a century and a half the geological world has been dominated, one might even say brain-washed, by the gradualistic uniformitarianism of Charles Lyell. Any suggestion of 'catastrophic' events has been rejected as old-fashioned, unscientific and even laughable. ..." Derek Ager, *The New Catastrophism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. xi.

Later in the book he adds,

"Perhaps I am becoming a cynic in my old age, but I cannot help thinking that people find things that they expect to find. As Sir Edward Bailey (1953) said, 'to find a thing you have to believe it to be possible'." Derek Ager, *The New Catastrophism* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993), pp. 190-91.

The majority of scientists (including the majority of Christian scientists, such as Dr. Giberson and Dr. Francis Collins) have been brainwashed with “smoke and mirrors” evolutionary arguments during their education from grade school all the way through their PhD programs (as well as by science programs on TV, the natural history museums and the state and national parks) so that they can’t see the overwhelming evidence in the creation that confirms the literal truth of Genesis.

The Christian compromise with evolution started with the church’s acceptance of subtly atheistic and deistic interpretations of the rocks and fossils and its simultaneous rejection of the biblical teaching about the Flood and the age of the creation, which took place way back in the early 19th century (50 years before Darwin published *On the Origin of the Species*), as I explain and document in [The Great Turning Point](#). Compromise with error always leads to more compromise with error.

We can expect to see more theological and moral corruption of the church as Christians become deceived by the false arguments coming out of BioLogos, Reasons to Believe (headed by Hugh Ross), Discovery Institute (leading the Intelligent Design movement) and other old-earth (progressive creationist) or theistic evolutionist organizations that claim to be “evangelical” or at least believing in God. And we can also expect that wherever individual Christians, churches, schools, universities and seminaries return to faith in the literal truth of Genesis 1-11 and get equipped with solid apologetic answers (from groups such as AiG) to defend their faith, we will find believers on fire for the Lord and His Word, growing in godliness and motivated to lovingly and graciously share the gospel of Jesus Christ with a lost, evolutionized world.

Terry

Terry Mortenson, M.Div., Ph.D.
speaker, writer, researcher, event outreach
ext: 480



Terry Mortenson, M.Div., Ph.D.
speaker, writer, researcher
TMortenson@AnswersinGenesis.org
phone: (859) 727-2222 ext. 480
fax: (859) 727-6578
answersingenesis.org

Appendix B

Lemur-Like Fossil, “Ida,” Says Nothing About Alleged Human Evolution

By Joshua Gurtler

The popular press has been raving about the fossilized primate skeleton nick-named “Ida.” She has been hailed as the “eighth wonder of the world” and is supposedly evolution’s “missing link” between humans and what are considered “early” primates. A quick review of the literature and scientific commentary surrounding this controversy, however, reveals that Ida is nothing for creationists to lose sleep over. By all appearances, the uproar is only another smoke and mirrors publicity campaign orchestrated by Darwinian paleontologists, publishers, and museum curators vying for the spotlight and a return on their investment. The pro-evolution, left leaning, online encyclopedia Wikipedia has done a thorough job describing the exaggerations and sensationalism surrounding Ida, leaving the impression that there is little here to fuss over.

What We Know

The fossilized remains of a supposedly 47 million-year-old lemur-like creature were, according to reports, uncovered in 1983 in the Messel pit outside Darmstadt Germany. Half of the skeleton was sold to a museum in Wyoming. The other half was held in secrecy until 2007 when it was sold for \$750,000 to a University of Oslo professor, Dr. Jorn Hurum, and a scientific team he assembled. Hurum and team reportedly bought the specimen after two other museums turned down offers to buy the piece as too expensive. The fossil was purchased to be put on display in the University of Oslo Museum of Natural History. The significance of the finding is that it is 95% complete, and represents a new genus and/or species of animal. The new genus was named *Darwinus*, in honor of Charles Darwin, and its unveiling was arranged to coincide with the 200th anniversary of the naturalist.

When you filter through all the media hype, here are the less-than-convincing facts. (1) Darwinists classify apes, monkeys and humans into a group of “higher” primates known as anthropoids. However, for 150 years there has been no consensus as from what line of “early” primates the anthropoids descended. (2) A splinter group of evolutionists (including Jorn Hurum and his team) believe the evolutionary line of anthropoids should be traced back to a group of “lower” primates called adapids. (3) Adapids are currently classified in the superfamily Strepsirrhines, a group that includes living lemurs. (4) The Hurum team argues that adapids (including Ida) should be reclassified out of the lemur line and into the Superfamily Haplorhini along with anthropoids. Thus, Hurum argues, Ida is the link between the most primitive primates and modern anthropoids.

Darwinists Answer Darwinists

Many renowned pro-Darwin scientists have dissented from Hurum’s conclusions. Here are eight examples.

1. Standard analysis of a primate specimen involves comparing 200 – 400 traits with the latest *Eosimias* fossils from Asia as well as anthropoids from Egypt. Hurum’s team did not include these fossils in their analyses and examined only **30** characteristics from Ida. In this regard, Dr. Richard Kay of Duke University stated “*There is no phylogenetic analysis to support the claims, and the data is cherry-picked*” (as quoted in Gibbons, 2009).
2. University of Chicago paleontologist, Callum Ross also disagrees with Hurum’s conclusions, stating, “*Their claim that this specimen should be classified as haplorhine is unsupported in light of the modern methods of classification*” (Ibid.).
3. Christopher Beard, curator of paleontology at the Carnegie Museum of Natural History, commenting on the failure of Hurum’s team to consider the latest research stated, “*It’s like going back to 1994. . . They’ve ignored 15 years of literature*” (Ibid.). Beard also disagrees that Ida should be reclassified with

anthropoids. In an article in *New Scientist* he stated, “*In order to establish that connection, Ida would have to have anthropoid-like features that evolved after anthropoids split away from lemurs and other early primates. Here, alas, Ida fails miserably. So, Ida is not a ‘missing link’ – at least not between anthropoids and more primitive primates*” (Beard 2009a). In another interview, Dr. Beard stated, “*This fossil is not as close to monkeys, apes, and humans as we are being led to believe*” (Beard 2009b). Beard was further quoted as saying, “*I actually don’t think it’s terribly close to the common ancestral line of monkeys, apes and people. I would say it’s about as far away as you can get from that line and still be a primate*” (Ritter, 2009). Beard said that he “*would be absolutely dumbfounded if it [Ida] turns out to be a potential ancestor to humans*” (McGourty, 2009).

4. University of New England paleoanthropologist Peter Brown states that Hurum’s team did not offer sufficient proof that Ida was ancestral to humans. “*It’s nice it has fingernails, something we have, as do most primates. . . but they’ve cherry-picked particular characters and they’ve been criticized (by other scientists) for doing that.*” (Dayton, 2009).

5. John Fleagle of the State University of New York at Stony Brook called Ida a “*pretty weak link*” and stated, “*It doesn’t really tell us much about anthropoid origins, quite frankly*” (Ritter, 2009).

6. Matt Cartmill, an anthropologist from Duke University said “*The P.R. campaign on this fossil is I think more of a story than the fossil itself*” (Moskowitz, 2009).

7. Dr. Henry Gee, a senior editor for the most esteemed scientific journal in the world, *Nature*, has repeatedly stated that it is misleading to claim that Ida is a “*missing link.*”

8. To be accepted for publication in a scientific peer-reviewed journal, the editors required that Hurum’s team remove wording from their manuscript suggesting that the fossil was in the evolutionary line to humans

Questionable Motivation

Darwinists and intelligent design advocates, alike, have suggested that the manner in which Ida was unveiled to the world bears the marks of profiteering rather than an investment in the advancement of science. “*You need an icon or two in a museum to drag people in,*” said Hurum, “*this is our Mona Lisa and it will be our Mona Lisa for the next 100 years.*” (Randerson, 2009).

Dr. Hurum, already well known for profiting from pro-evolution TV documentaries, arranged for the production and broadcast of documentaries on Ida to be aired on BBC Television and the History Channel (owned by A&E Television Networks). This was all done before the scientific community was permitted to review his claims. Hurum also worked with Little, Brown publishers and Colin Tudge on the book “*The Link – Uncovering Our Earliest Ancestor*” prior to official peer review by fellow paleontologists.

One article described the media controversy as follows: “*Ida’s debut to the world was comprised of an astonishingly slick, multi-component media package. . . ‘The way these things used to work is that a finding was released in the scientific journals and then it finds its way into the more popular media, and then production companies find out about it and do a TV show.’ In the case of Ida, a production company got in on the ground floor, filming the entire research process as it happened*” (Cline, 2009). In other words, Ida’s missing link status was predetermined before the claims could be corroborated or refuted by the scientific establishment.

One individual on Hurum’s team, Dr. Philip Gingerich, said they would like to have published their findings in a more credentialed scientific journal such as *Nature* or *Science* but told the Wall Street Journal, “*There was a TV company involved and time pressure. We’ve been pushed to finish the study. It’s not how I like to do science.*” In response, Dr. Peter Brown says, “*That sounds all sorts of warning bells*” (Dayton, 2009).

Questionable Scientific Scrutiny

To be accepted for publication in *PloS One*, the authors were required to remove wording that suggested the fossil was in the evolutionary line to humans. *PloS One*, published by the Public Library of Science, is an open access “inclusive” online journal. It is currently known as a newer venue with a less rigorous review process and a higher acceptance rate than other more prestigious journals. Whereas most journals typically require two or more reviewers to critique and approve a manuscript for publication, publishing in *PloS One* often includes only one peer reviewer and a \$1,250 fee. If the discovery of Ida really is the “missing link” Darwinists have been searching for since the 1859 publication of *The Origin of Species*, you can be assured it would have been published in a journal of notoriety such as *Paleobiology*, *Nature*, or *Science*.

Ida Appears to be a Mosaic, not a Transition

Creationists and ID advocates should take comfort that for the past 150 years, Darwinists continue to grasp at straws in attempts to prove that humans evolved from primates. To date, there is no scientific consensus as to the uncontested validity of a series of missing links in line to humans. The fact that Ida has fingernails, typical of most primates, is less significant than has been suggested. The presence of nails only proves that Ida represents a mosaic (a term also used to describe other animals such as the Duck-Billed Platypus, Red Panda, Hoatzin, Archaeopteryx, Spiny Anteater, and the Pronghorn Antelope). There is no continuum of finely graduated transitional fossils that predate any of these animals. Where did they come from? Mosaics are creatures that look as if they have been piecemealed together by someone with an imagination. Were gradualistic Darwinian evolution true, there would be countless millions of transitional fossils exhibiting all the intermediary animal forms between the amoeba and man. What is really found are animals appearing suddenly and, apart from special creation, inexplicably. The late Harvard paleontologist Stephen J. Gould said, “*The absence of fossil evidence for intermediary stages between major transitions in organic design, indeed our inability, even in our imagination, to construct functional intermediates in many cases, has been a persistent and nagging problem for gradualistic accounts of evolution*” (1980).

Concluding Thoughts

The good that can come from this controversy is another opportunity for the wheat to be separated from the chaff by testing individual honesty and scientific integrity. Like-minded truth-seekers (Darwinists and creationists alike) can unite and find common ground in opposing what is falsely called knowledge, potentially opening doors for meaningful and productive dialogue as Paul had with the Athenians. “*And they took him and brought him to the Areopagus, saying, ‘May we know what this new doctrine is of which you speak? For you are bringing some strange things to our ears. Therefore we want to know what these things mean’*” (Acts 17:19, 20).

Truth Magazine. August, 2009. LIII(8):8-10

References

- Beard, Christopher. 2009a. Why Ida Fossil is not the Missing Link. *New Scientist*. Accessed on 15 June, 2009 at: www.newscientist.com/article/dn17173-why-ida-fossil-is-not-the-missing-link.html?full=true&print=true
- Beard, Christopher. 2009b. The Missing Link? (An Interview) Nightline, ABC News television, May 20, 2009.
- Cline, Elizabeth. Ida-lized! The Branding of a Fossil. *Seed Magazine*. May 22, 2009. Accessed on June 7, 2009 at http://seedmagazine.com/content/article/idalized_the_brand_of_a_fossil
- Dayton, Leigh. Scientists divided on Ida as the missing link. 21 May, 2009. *The Australian Newspaper*. Accessed on 14 June, 2009 at: www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,25515021-2702,00.html

Gibbons, Ann. "Revolutionary" Fossil Fails to Dazzle Paleontologists. *ScienceNOW Daily News* published by *Science Magazine*. May 19, 2009. Accessed on June 14, 2009 at:
<http://sciencenow.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/2009/519/1?rss=1>

Gould, Stephen, J. 1980. Is a New and General Theory of Evolution Emerging? *Paleobiology* 6:119-130.

Moskowitz, Clara. Amid Media Circus, Scientists Doubt that Ida is Your Ancestor. 20 May, 2009. *Live Science*. Accessed on 16 June, 2009 at:

www.livescience.com/animals/090520-fossil-reactions.html

McGourty, Christine. Scientists Hail Stunning Fossil. BBC News. May 19, 2009.

Naik, Gautam. 2009. Fossil Discovery is Heralded. *The Wall Street Journal*. Accessed on 14 June, 2009 at: <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB124235632936122739.html>

Randerson, James. Fossil Ida: Extraordinary find is 'missing link' in human evolution. *The Guardian*. 19 May, 2009. Accessed on June 14, 2009 at:

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/2009/may/19/ida-fossil-missing-link>

Ritter, Malcolm. Early Skeleton Sheds Light on Primate Evolution. Associated Press Article. May 20, 2009. Accessed on 14 June, 2009 at: http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20090520/ap_on_sc/ancient_primate

Appendix C

“Ardi” – An Archaeological Conundrum for Evolutionists

By Joshua Gurtler

Ardipithecus ramidus or “Ardi,” for short, is the latest in a series of extinct primate fossils that have been passed off as missing links in the ape-to-man evolution controversy. Regarding Ardi, National Geographic Magazine stated, “*Scientists today announced the discovery of the oldest fossil skeleton of a human ancestor. The find reveals that our forebears underwent a previously unknown stage of evolution more than a million years before Lucy, the iconic early human ancestor specimen that walked the Earth 3.2 million years ago*” (Shreeve, 2009).

Far from illuminating the supposed “descent of man,” Ardi actually generates far more questions than answers for Darwinists, and in reality should be viewed as a boon for creationists. Words and phrases that come to mind after reading the evolutionist explanations of Ardi are: *hypothesis, conjecture, grasping at straws, stab in the dark, “we’ve got nothin’.*” Am I being too harsh? In the eleven articles that detailed the discovery and reconstruction of Ardi in the journal *Science*, the authors used the words “probably” at least 77 times, and the words “suggest,” “suggesting,” “suggestive,” or “suggests” at least 117 times (*Science*, 2009). Does that sound like scientific precision? Hardly – and it only gets worse.

What Do We Know?

Ardi is not a new discovery. A team of researchers led by Dr. Timothy White (U.C. Berkley) first uncovered Ardi’s species 18 years ago (1992) at Aramis in the Afar depression of Ethiopia. This was reported in 1994; however, after nearly two decades of work and millions of dollars siphoned from American and Japanese taxpayers [Leakey Foundation, 2009] 125 crumbling bone fragments from 36 scattered skeletons were pieced together (Gibbons, 2002). Some of these bones were so chalky that their margins reportedly turned to dust while being cleaned. Darwinists’ best guesses describe Ardi as a 110 lb., 4 foot tall female primate that lived ca. 4.4 million years ago and either walked on all fours all the time, or upright on two feet on the ground (bipedally) as well as quadrupedally in trees.

Here is where things get sticky. If Ardi was, in fact, bipedal, Darwinists admit that decades of evolutionary teaching will now be overturned and that man could not have descended from the great ape line (e.g., chimpanzees, bonobos, and gorillas) but (according to their scenario) must have evolved simultaneously with these animals, although along different evolutionary lines (Gibbons, 2009a). They call this process “convergent evolution.” Put more simply, convergent evolution occurs when two lines of animals coincidentally evolve matching body parts concurrently. The classic example is the unrelated human eye and the octopus eye, with essentially indistinguishable physiological mechanics that just so happened to have evolved independently. More than one scientist has concluded that the chances of two different evolutionary lines of animals (read gorillas and humans) coincidentally evolving identical anatomical features is a statistical improbability. Harvard evolutionist and paleoanthropologist David Pilbeam stated, “I find it hard to believe that the numerous similarities of chimps and gorillas evolved convergently” (Gibbons, 2009a).

At the very best, Ardi nullifies years of Darwinian teaching about human ancestry and presents a distinct narrative for the evolution of man. At worst, Ardi represents the next in a 100+ year series of extinct primate skeletons that have been pawned off to the unassuming and non-scientific public as proof of evolution, until the next discovery comes along overturning everything we’ve been taught heretofore. Creationists should never be ashamed to challenge humanist ideology – and our work becomes much easier when the evolutionists themselves disagree with their own arguments. What follows is a sampling of admitted Darwinist difficulties with Ardi.

Darwinists Refute Darwinists

(Note: According to Darwinists, in order for Ardi to have significance in the evolution of modern man, she had to have walked upright on two legs, known as bipedalism. If she didn't walk upright, evolutionists admit that she is nothing more than just another extinct primate.)

1. Pro-evolution Ann Gibbons published an article in *Science*, "A New Kind of Ancestor: Ardipithecus Unveiled," which casts doubt on Ardi's bipedalism (Gibbons 2009b).
2. Dr. Carol Ward is not confident that Ardi was bipedal based on the following report: "However, several researchers aren't so sure about these inferences. Some are skeptical that the crushed pelvis really shows the anatomical details needed to demonstrate bipedality. The pelvis is 'suggestive' of bipedality but not conclusive, says paleoanthropologist Carol Ward of the University of Missouri, Columbia" (Gibbons 2009b).
3. Anatomist William Jungers of Stony Brook University is unsure that Ardi was bipedal (Gibbons, 2009b). He stated, "This is a fascinating skeleton, but based on what they present, the evidence for bipedality is limited at best" (Shreeve, 2009).
4. Gibbons (2009b) stated that paleoanthropologist Bernard Wood of George Washington University in Washington, D.C. casts doubt on the ancestral significance of Ardi in stating, "I think the head is consistent with it being a hominin (humans and their ancestors, J.G) ... but the rest of the body is much more questionable."
5. Even Ardi discoverer Dr. Timothy White downplayed the idea that Ardi is a missing link in stating, "Instead of thinking of something between a chimp and a human – don't think of it as a series of links in a chain as much as branches in a tree" (Wright, 2009).
6. Evolution-supporting *Time Magazine*, commenting on the lack of scientific confidence in Ardi's bipedality as well as her lineage to humans, stated, "Indeed, looking at the evidence, different paleoanthropologists may have different interpretations of how Ardi moved or what she reveals about the last common ancestor of humans and chimps" (Lemonick and Dorfman, 2009).
7. The left-leaning British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), not confident that Ardi is a missing link of human evolution, reported, "Even if it is not on the direct line to us, it offers new insights into how we evolved from the common ancestor we share with chimps, the team says" (Amos, 2009).

One more glaring problem is Ardi's supposed 4.4 million year age, which was determined by radiometric dating of nearby volcanic strata (Wikipedia, 2010). The difficulty here is that radiometric dating is notoriously inaccurate. For example, according to radiometric dating, lava flows from Mt. St. Helens and Mt. Ngauruhoe are 3 million years old, although these rocks were only formed within the last 100 years (Austin, 1996; Snelling, 1998).

In summary, Darwinists believe Ardi *may* have been an extinct primate that *may* have walked on two limbs or *may* have walked on four limbs, that *may* have been in line to apes, or *may* have been in line to humans, or to both, that *may* have significance in the evolutionary lineage of man, or *may* not. Translation: "We've got nothin'."

"The grass withers and the flower falls off, but the word of the Lord endures forever (I Pet. 1:24, 25, NASB).

Truth Magazine. May, 2010. LIV(5):8-10.

References

Amos, Jonathan. 2009. Fossil Finds Extend Human Story. BBC News, October 1. Accessed on 7 February, 2010 at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/8285180.stm>

Austin SA. 1996. Excess Argon within Mineral Concentrates from the New Dacite Lava Dome at Mount St. Helens Volcano. *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal*. 10(3).

-
- Gibbons, Ann. 2002. In Search of the First Hominids. *Science*. 295:1214-1219.
- Gibbons, Ann. 2009a. Ancient Skeleton May Rewrite Earliest Chapter of Human Evolution.” *ScienceNOW Daily News*. October 1. Accessed on Feb. 12, 2010 at: <http://sciencenow.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/2009/1001/1>
- Gibbons, Ann. 2009b. “A New Kind of Ancestor: Ardipithecus Unveiled,” *Science*, 326:36-40.
- The Leakey Foundation. “Meet Ardi.” 23 October, 2009. Accessed on 7 February, 2010 at: http://www.leakeyfoundation.org/?option=com_content&view=article&id=11312
- Lemonick, Michael D. and Andrea Dorfman. 2009. “Ardi is a New Piece for the Puzzle of Human Evolution,” *Time Magazine* October 1. Accessed on 15 February, 2010 at: <http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,1927200,00.html>
- Science Magazine*. 2009. Special Issue: *Ardipithecus ramidus*. 2 October. Vol. 326.
- Shreeve, Jamie. 2009. “Oldest Skeleton of Human Ancestor Found.” *National Geographic Magazine*. October 1. Accessed on 7 February 2010 at: <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/pf/85209423.html>
- Snelling A.A. “Andesite Flows at Mt. Ngauruhoe, New Zealand, and the Implications for Potassium Argon ‘Dating’.” Presented at the Fourth International Conference on Creationism. Beaver Falls, PA, August 3-8, 1998.
- Wikipedia. 2009. Ardipithecus. Accessed on 2 February, 2010 at: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ardipithecus>
- Wright, Ted. 2009. “An Archeologist on Ardi.” 9 October. Accessed on 7 February 2010 at: <http://blog.soundrezn.com/2009/10/09/an-archeologist-on-ardi/print/>