

An Introduction to Evolution for Students: A Flawed Theory

Joseph M. Holden, PhD and Norman L. Geisler, PhD

See *Living Loud: An Introduction to Apologetics for Students*, 3rd edition (2024)

Copyright Joseph M. Holden and Norman L. Geisler, 2025. All Rights Reserved.

Darwinian evolution is often taught as *fact*, while creation is ignored and considered a matter of religious *faith*, setting up a *perceived* conflict between the Bible and science. Today, evolution has been incorporated into most science classes, which has made evolution a formidable barrier that hinders many from receiving the biblical account of creation and the development of life.

A Christian student often endures a college course for an entire semester as the professor speaks eloquently about how life began by purely natural causes and never asks a critical question that challenges the basic assumptions of evolutionary theory. However, after reading this essay, you will be able to discuss and question evolution with your teachers and fellow students without causing a “holy war” in the classroom. Your insights may prove to be both refreshing and challenging.

Our goal will first be to understand evolution and then to demonstrate that it presents a flawed view of the origin of life. Second, we will answer common objections by evolutionists to the Christian doctrine of creation. In responding to evolutionists, abundant scientific evidence and compelling reasons exist, apart from relying on the Bible. These will help demonstrate that the universe and life were supernaturally created. By avoiding Scripture and using a scientific approach to answer evolution, we will avoid being accused of religious favoritism.¹

What is Evolution?

When talking about evolution, many of us think of Charles Darwin (1809-82) as its founder. Although Darwin may be the most well-known person associated with evolution, its roots go back to certain ancient Greek philosophers. Of greater importance is the evolutionists’ unbending central belief that all living things have evolved or developed by purely natural and undirected processes from simple forms of life to more sophisticated forms. Various views of evolution have developed; however, the views we will discuss involve the origins of first life and the evolution of new life-forms.

Evolutionists Believe Life Began by Chance From the Right Combination of Nonliving Materials

The first belief concerns the *origins* of first life (known as chemical evolution). According to many evolutionists, a swirl of gases along with water touched by an electrical charge ignited a chemical reaction that generated the building blocks of life.² No supernatural element was required; that is, life emerged purely by natural causes. This view directly confronts the biblical model of origins in Genesis 1, where there is an

intelligent God that supernaturally created life. Several reasons support why life did not emerge purely by natural causes and from nonliving material.

First, it has been scientifically demonstrated that life never comes from nonlife. We could ask an evolutionist to furnish an example of life emerging from nonliving things, whether observed in nature or in the laboratory without intelligent intervention, but even the pasteurization process has confirmed that life cannot come into existence where there is no life. When Louis Pasteur (1822-95) killed all bacterial life by sterilizing his test tube and placing a seal around the lid, he showed the scientific community that life could not emerge from a nonliving environment.

On the other hand, Christians can adequately account for the cause of life. God qualifies as the first cause of life because it takes life to give life, and God is life (Jn. 14:6; Col. 1:15-17). Furthermore, what is more reasonable to believe: that life begets life or that nonlife begets life? Have you ever seen a rock bear fruit, or nothing give rise to something? No!

Second, intelligent life needs an intelligent cause. It is unreasonable to believe that intelligent life arose from a nonliving, unintelligent cause. Did the information in *Webster's Dictionary* come together by a gust of wind in a paper mill? I don't think even the atheist could believe that! Were Shakespeare's plays composed by an explosion in a printing shop? No. Did the presidential faces on Mount Rushmore emerge as the result of wind and rain erosion? Of course not! All of these examples were created by an intelligent cause. In other words, it is unreasonable to believe that intelligent life was caused by nonintelligent natural forces.

Third, as discussed previously, the idea that life arose purely by chance is unscientific. Science prides itself on observation and experimentation, not on reasoning based on chance. Besides, the odds of life beginning by chance are very low—and for all practical purposes, zero. Some have calculated the chance to be 1 in 1,040,000. That's more atoms than there are in the universe! It takes more faith to believe in evolution than it does to believe in a supernatural creator. Most Christians don't have enough faith to be an atheist!

Fourth, some experts in the field of biology have shown the evolutionary model of the origins of first life (chemical evolution) to be false. Even Darwin himself admitted that "if it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down."³

Taking up that challenge, Michael Behe (pronounced Bee-hee), biochemistry professor at Lehigh University, has demonstrated that a living cell shows marks of intelligent design.⁴ In his book *Darwin's Black Box*, Behe provides strong evidence that a living cell could not have originated by evolutionary processes because the cell needs all of its parts functioning together at the same time for its survival. This means that the

cell could not have come together in stages over long periods of time because it could not have survived with only part of its necessary components intact. With a cell, it's either all or nothing.

Dr. Behe illustrates this point by using a mousetrap.⁵ If any one part of the mousetrap is missing or not functioning, it will not work as a whole. It is the same with a living cell. It must have all its parts functioning and in place at one time or it dies. This new discovery challenges evolution by demonstrating that life must have been created fully formed as the Book of Genesis indicates.

Evolutionists Believe Simple Life has Changed over Millions of Years into a More Complex State by a Process Called “Natural Selection”

The second main characteristic of evolution departs from the origins of life (chemical evolution) and addresses the development of *new* life-forms (biological evolution). According to evolutionists, life arose naturally into a one-celled animal, then mutated and changed, or evolved, over millions of years into the various kinds of life we see today—humans being the highest of the chain. This process is said to be guided by what Darwin called “natural selection.”⁶

Natural selection is the process by which the weaker species become extinct because they are unable to adapt to changes in their environment. Have you heard the term “survival of the fittest”? According to evolutionists, this process enables the various kinds to gain biological purity while at the same time weeding out the less fit. The overall effect is said to be an ever more sophisticated and stronger kind.

These different kinds of life, including humans, supposedly share in a common genetic ancestry. This means that in the distant past one kind, such as reptiles, grew into another kind, such as birds. This process continued through the millions of years and finally produced humans. This transition from one kind or type of life into another is called “macroevolution.” Changes that occur within the same kind are called “microevolution”; for instance, the various kinds of dogs reflect the reality of microevolution. The following chart will help you distinguish the two types of evolution.⁷

<i>Microevolution</i>	<i>Macroevolution</i>
Change <i>in</i> kinds	Change <i>of</i> kinds
Change <i>within</i> one <i>kind</i> of bird	Change <i>from</i> reptile to bird
<i>Possible</i> to occur	<i>Impossible</i> to occur
<i>Many</i> fossils to support	<i>No</i> fossil support
<i>Does</i> occur today	<i>Does not</i> occur today
<i>Can</i> be observed	<i>Cannot</i> be observed
Scientific	Unscientific

Christians accept *micro*evolution, which is defined as “micro” meaning *small*, as a scientific fact. However, when turning to the Book of Genesis, we find a radically different picture of life’s development, and that picture is opposed to macroevolution. Moses wrote that God made each individual form of life to reproduce after its own “kind” (Gen. 1:21-26). That is to say, cows give birth to cows, dog to dogs, fish to fish, and humans to humans. No cross-kinds of reproduction or macroevolution occurs.

It is a universal scientific fact that one basic type of life does not give rise to, or transform into, *other* types. There is adaptation within a specific kind (for example, some dogs are big and some small, some long hair and some have short hair, etc.) but not a transformation of one kind into another (for example, from dog to horse). Now that you know what evolution is, let’s take a deeper look at some of the problems with it.

Problems with Evolution

Before we look at the various shortcomings of evolution, remember that it’s not necessary to simply quote Bible verses to reveal evolution’s fatal flaws. Abundant evidence from a scientific and philosophical standpoint shows that evolution should be rejected and creation believed.⁸

First, for evolutionists to establish that over long periods of time one kind of life evolves or changes into a different kind (apes changing to humans, or reptiles to birds), they must look initially at the fossil evidence. This is the best way to discover how the various types of life developed throughout time.

If the evolutionists are right, thousands of fossils should have been preserved, showing a transition from one kind into another. For example, we should see reptiles becoming birds and apes changing into humans. This, however, is not what we find. The fossil record is an embarrassment to evolutionists.

The fact of the matter is clear: the fossil record supports creation.⁹ Discoveries show that animals appear fully formed and not in “transition,” as evolutionists claim. These preserved fossils appear suddenly within the geological column and not spread over long periods of time. This agrees with what Genesis says about the creation in the beginning; namely, that God created all of the animals fully mature and reproducing after their own kind. As one biology textbook correctly notes the problem for evolution, reads:

Many species remain virtually unchanged for millions of years, then suddenly disappear to be replaced by a quite different, but related, form. Moreover, most major groups of animals appear abruptly in the fossil record, fully formed, and with no fossils yet discovered that form a transition from their parent group.¹⁰

A zoology textbook reveals that data from the early fossil record is of no help in supporting evolution.

Most of the animal groups that are represented in the fossil record first appear, 'fully formed' and identifiable as to their phylum, in the Cambrian, some 550 million years ago....The fossil record is therefore of no help with respect to the origin and early diversification of the various animal phyla...¹¹

Let's look at what some scientific experts in the field are saying about evolution.

- Darwin found it hard to believe that the eye could be formed by natural selection when he asserted, "To suppose the eye with all its inimitable contrivances for adjusting the focus to different distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree."¹²
- Stephen Jay Gould, professor of geology and paleontology at Harvard University, says, "All paleontologists know that the fossil record contains precious little in the way of intermediate forms; transitions between major groups are characteristically abrupt."¹³ Gould goes on to assert, "The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology."¹⁴
- David Raup of the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago asserts, "We now have a quarter of a million fossil species but the situation hasn't changed much. The record of evolution is still surprisingly jerky and, ironically, we have fewer examples of evolutionary transition than we had in Darwin's time."¹⁵
- Michael Denton, molecular biologist and medical doctor, says, "As evidence for the existence of natural links between the great divisions of nature, they are only convincing to someone already convinced of the reality of organic evolution."¹⁶
- Michael Behe, professor of biochemistry at Lehigh University, writes in his book *Darwin's Black Box*, "No one at Harvard University, no one at the National Institutes of Health, no member of the National Academy of Sciences, no Nobel prize winner—no one at all can give a detailed account of how the cilium, or vision, or blood clotting, or any complex biochemical process might have developed in a Darwinian fashion. But we are here. Plants and animals are here. The complex systems are here. All these things got here somehow: if not in a Darwinian fashion, then how?"¹⁷

Second, systemic changes (e.g. circulatory, respiratory, or reproductive systems) that occur between different kinds of animals—such as from fish to amphibian or ape to human—must be completed all at once not gradually. The internal system of an animal is such that changes from one kind to another must be immediate or else the animal will die. For example, a person can make minor changes in a car gradually, over time, without altering its basic type. Gradual changes can be made in the shape of the fenders, the car's color, and its trim. But if a change is made in the size of the pistons, this involves *simultaneous* changes in the cam shaft, block, cooling system, engine compartment, and other systems. Otherwise, the new system will not

function. This is the reason why no fossils support a *gradual* change from one kind of life to another (macroevolution). Although minor changes within kinds are possible, gradual changes *of* kinds are not.¹⁸

Third, different animal types may have similar bodily appearances (such as apes and humans), but this does not automatically make them ancestors, any more than a bird and an airplane have genetic linkage because of similar body design. Body shape has no necessary connection with common ancestry. Rather, similar body types point to a common Creator who suited animals and humans for a similar living environment.

Fourth, unfortunately, evolutionists have adopted a way of thinking about “cause and effect” that has evolutionists “boxed in” to a naturalistic worldview that can only lead to naturalistic conclusions. This way of thinking is known as *uniformitarianism*, which rightly believes that “the present is the key to understanding the past.” However, they assume that all natural laws and processes operating today in the universe were always operating in the past in the same (uniform) unchangeable manner. But if this is the case, then only naturalistic conclusions can be made, since we only observe natural causes today. Thus, nothing *supernatural* can be known to have occurred in the past, including the singular event of the origin of life.

A more appropriate approach to understanding the past is by employing the principle of *uniformity* which also states that “the present is the key to the past.” However, this approach doesn’t limit our thinking to only natural causes since it holds that “the kinds of causes that produced certain kinds of effects in the present are the kinds of causes that produce similar events in the past.” That is to say, by observing over and over what kinds of effects are produced by causes in the present, we can discover which kind of cause is needed to produce life. In other words, the kind of causes known to produce certain kinds of effects in the present can be assumed to produce similar kinds of effects in the past. For example, when an archaeologist discovers ornate pottery, we know from repeated experience in the present that only an intelligent cause could have produced the ornate design found in the pottery. Likewise, we know from uniform experience that information (e.g. DNA) is only caused by an intelligent cause. In addition, the design we see on Mount Rushmore of the presidential faces is better explained by drawing on our present repeated experience, which recognizes that an intelligent cause is needed to produce that kind of effect. Another way to put it is that, based on our uniform experience with artists and sculptures, it would be absurd to posit a natural, non-intelligent cause to account for the design we see at Rushmore. To make it clearer, our regular experience in the present informs us that non-intelligent causes, such as wind and rain, cannot produce the information contained in poetry. Without this principle of uniformity, we, as well as archaeologists and forensic scientists who analyze singular events like the origin of life, could know nothing about the past and the kind of causes that are necessary to explain the effects we see today. To put it another way, the effect must be *similar* (not identical or totally different) to its cause, like produces like, and being causes being. This approach allows room for a supernatural creation and to make the appropriate causal connections to life in the universe which requires an intelligent cause.

What About the Ape-Men Discoveries?

Most of us at one time or another have seen science textbooks that feature the pictures of an ape transforming over millions of years into modern man. Occasionally, newspapers print headlines that read, “Ape-Man Discovered!” Why do some scientists seem so eager to believe in ape-men discoveries? Because they are motivated to conclusively show the world that there is a genetic connection between the animal kingdom and human beings. According to evolutionists, such a find would be the crowning proof that would win the war over creationists.

How does the Christian explain these discoveries that seem so authentic? Although it may seem like solid evidence, they usually are nothing more than cases of mistaken identity, evolutionary bias by the media, pure fantasy, or outright manufactured fakes. Let’s look at some of these “ape-man discoveries” and their shortcomings.

- *Pitldown Man*. This discovery by Charles Dawson in 1912 was said to be evidence of a half-million-year-old ape-man. However, in 1953 it was found out that Pitldown Man was a fake. When the evidence was examined more carefully, scientists discovered that it had been altered to give the appearance of age when actually the jawbone was that of an orangutan.
- *Nebraska Man*. In 1922 a tooth was found on a farm in Nebraska. Initially it was said to be a tooth of a one-million-year-old ape-man. Later, geologist Harold Cook found another tooth, similar to the first one, attached to a skull, which was found to belong to a rare pig.
- *Peking Man*. The evidence for Peking Man has disappeared since 1941. There are serious problems with believing that Peking Man was an ape-man because he died by a blow from a sharp object, which is a highly unlikely cause of death for a pre-human.
- *Java Man*. This alleged missing link was discovered by Eugene Dubois’s expedition in 1891 along the Solo River in Java (now Indonesia). The fossil evidence for Java Man indicated to some scientists that it lived 500,000 years ago. However, a closer look at the initial dating process and skull cap and femur bones suggest that it is either a human or ape but not both.
- *Lucy*. In 1974 while in Ethiopia, Donald Johanson discovered the remains of an animal that allegedly lived more than 3 million years ago. However, an overemphasis on the few bones (of the 207 bones that make up Lucy’s skeleton, 160 are missing!) that seemed to resemble humans is a shallow argument. The pelvis does not support Lucy walking upright, and the dissimilarity of the remains rule out Lucy as being any sort of human ancestor. Lucy is an extinct ape.
- *Ramapithecus*. In 1932 several teeth and jawbones were found in India. These were thought to belong to an early ape-man dating from about 14 million years ago. However, anthropologists have since discovered that they belong to an ape.

- *Neanderthal Man*. Neanderthals and *Homo erectus* are not transitional links leading to humans; rather, many paleoanthropologists classify them as human beings. Scientist, Casey Luskin, clarifies the current state of our relationship to Neanderthals:

Darwin skeptics continue to debate whether we are related to Neanderthals and *Homo erectus*, and evidence can be mounted both ways. The present point, however, is this: Even if we do share common ancestry with Neanderthals or *erectus*, this does not show we share ancestry with any nonhuman-like hominins. According to Sigrid Hartwig-Scherer, the differences between human-like members of *Homo* such as *erectus*, Neanderthals, and us reflect mere microevolutionary effects of ‘size variation, climatic stress, genetic drift, and differential expression of [common] genes.’ Whether we are related to them or not, these small-scale differences do not show the evolution of humans from nonhuman-like or ape-like creatures.¹⁹

10 Major Flaws with Human Evolutionary Theory²⁰

1. Evolutionary theory lacks a first cause that adequately explains the emergence of the first life.
2. Evolutionary theory lacks an adequate cause to explain the presence of information-rich biological systems such as the human cell.
3. Evolutionary theory lacks any transitional fossil (missing links) in the Hominin Phylogeny to demonstrate human origins.
4. Human evolution is inferred without clear fossil evidence. The fossil record is extremely fragmentary.
5. The evolutionary sequence for the majority of hominin lineages is unknown and cannot be reliably reconstructed.
6. Natural selection has never been shown to bring about the existence of new species/kinds. It has only shown to weed out inferior kinds.
7. Though many paleoanthropologists believe australopithecines walked upright and were the ancestral hominins to our human genus <i>Homo</i> , there is little agreement and clarity, if any, regarding which species of <i>Australopithecus</i> it is. Even the origin of genus <i>Australopithecus</i> is uncertain.
8. There are no good ape-like hominin creatures to be considered as viable candidates for transitional species to human-like members of the <i>Homo</i> genus.
9. Evolutionists offer no viable solution to the abrupt non-Darwinian appearance of genus <i>Homo</i> in the fossil record, and cannot provide any clear evolutionary precursors. In addition, the sudden emergence of human culture and creativity in recent times is unparalleled in the animal world, especially in the areas of human communication and linguistics.
10. The subtle differences present in our human-like <i>Homo</i> genus can be accounted for by small-scale microevolutionary change (i.e. changes within genus or species).

Is Creation a Science?

According to evolutionists, creation—the belief that God supernaturally created the world apart from any evolutionary processes—should not be taught as “science.” We are told that creation is a matter of *faith* and evolution is a matter of scientific *fact*, and that creation should be taught in church but never in the science classroom. Critics say that the idea of a “Creator” is religious and not scientific and, therefore, should be excluded from the public classroom. For Christians, however, this couldn’t be farther from the truth. The evolutionists’ understanding of creation is both misdirected and mistaken for many reasons.

First, creation is scientific. Evolutionists fail to see the difference between “operation science” and “origin science.” How things *originate* can be wholly different from how things *operate*. Both macroevolution and creation are theories of the origin and development of life that are classified under origin science, the study of past events that only occurred once. *Operation* science, on the other hand, observes the *present* workings and operations occurring over and over again in our universe. Since evolution and creation are not occurring today, neither can be studied directly using operation science.

To put it simply, origin science seeks to understand what happened in the past; whereas, operation science attempts to understand the present observable workings of things. Origin science addresses past *singularities*, and operation science observes present *regularities*. Origin science looks at how things began, and operation science focuses on how things presently *operate*.

Origin scientists accomplish their investigation by piecing together clues that were left behind. In contrast, operation scientists conduct firsthand observations and repeated testing. Origin science approaches evolution and creation by viewing and reconstructing the evidence that remains (because creation and evolution can’t be repeated in the laboratory today). This occurs when scientists discover bones, animal, or plant remains (fossils). These remains can tell scientists about what happened in the beginning, when life first emerged. This way of studying theories of origins is done much the same way police scientists (forensic experts) gather evidence after a homicide occurs. Because police didn’t observe the actual crime, these experts must gather clues to piece together what probably happened in the past. The study of evolution and creation is approached the same way. Just because creation isn’t approached using *operation science* doesn’t mean that it can’t be studied using the methods of *forensic* or *origin science*.

The following chart will help clarify the differences between origin and operation sciences.²¹

<i>Origin Science</i>	<i>Operation Science</i>
Studies the past	Studies the present
Studies <i>singular</i> events	Studies <i>regular</i> events
Studies unrepeatable events	Studies repeatable events
Studies how things began	Studies how things operate
Creation/Evolution	Astronomy
Discovers <i>what</i> happened in the <i>past</i>	Discovers <i>how</i> things happen in the <i>present</i>

Evolutionists often make the mistake of confusing the role and limitations of the two sciences. To do so would be equivalent to measuring air temperature with a wind velocity instrument; it’s a category mistake.

Second, just because creation is found in a religious book (the Bible) doesn't mean that it's not scientific. Other well-known sciences study objects that are found in the Bible. For example, geologists study rocks, archaeologists dig for artifacts, paleontologists examine the remains of living things, and biologists investigate the origins and operations of living creatures. Does this mean that geology, archaeology, paleontology, and biology are not scientific? Of course not! If evolutionists reject creation as science because it is found in a religious source, we must also reject the other major sciences.

Third, it is obviously wrong to reject something simply because of its source. To reject something because of its source is called a “genetic fallacy” in logic. This fallacy is seen in Nathaniel’s statement concerning Jesus, when he asked, “Can anything good come out of Nazareth?” (Jn. 1:46). Source does not determine truth!

If the same people who reject evidence because of its source applied the same restrictions consistently, they would have to restrict the teachings and influence of the popular philosopher Socrates. This is because his call to philosophy was given by a Greek prophetess, a *religious* source. Further, most government institutions would have to forbid the use of overhead projectors because the idea for an alternating-current motor came in a vision Nikolai Tesla had while reading a pantheistic poet.²² Society would come to a grinding stop if this logic were applied consistently to everyone.

Fourth, if the facts that support creation are not taught because they are associated with religion, facts that support evolution also should be excluded because they favor the religious position of secular humanism. Yes, atheism is a religious position! Several atheistic religions exist, such as Taoism, some forms of Buddhism, and secular humanism. For example, the father of modern education, John Dewey, was a “religious humanist.” Dewey and others felt so strongly about religious humanism that they agreed to formulate their own doctrinal statement in 1933 called the *Humanist Manifesto*. Their most obvious claim is that they consider humanism to be a religion even though they deny the existence of God. In the statement they make their beliefs evident:

To establish such a religion is a major necessity of the present. It is a responsibility which rests upon this generation. We therefore affirm the following:

First: Religious humanists regard the universe as self-existing and not created.

Second: Humanism believes that man is a part of nature and that he has emerged as the result of a continuous process.

Third: Holding an organic view of life, humanists find that the traditional dualism of mind and body must be rejected

Sixth: We are convinced that the time has passed for theism, deism, modernism, and the several varieties of “new thought.”²³

Forty years later (1973) the humanists drafted a second manifesto that made even clearer their disbelief in the existence of God and their support of the theory of evolution. It reads: “As in 1933, humanists still believe that traditional theism, especially faith in a prayer-hearing God . . . is an unproved and outmoded faith. . . . Science affirms that the human species is an emergence from natural evolutionary forces.”²⁴

As seen above, evolutionary curriculum agrees perfectly with the secular humanist religion that denies the existence of God. If evolutionists are consistent with their view of limiting the teachings of creation because of its association with Christianity and the Bible, they should also limit their own teaching since evolution is a central belief of the secular humanist religion.²⁵

Fifth, the facts that support creation can be studied without it being “religious.” Creation can be examined in a public setting without worshiping God or believing the Bible is true. We can approach the facts of creation from a *detached, objective, and academic* point of view much the same way a geologist studies rocks without being religious. Even though rocks are religious objects of worship to some people, this doesn’t make the geology professor “religious.” The choice to worship the Creator, or a rock for that matter, is entirely up to the individual.

Further, all schools have rules of behavior that prohibit cheating, rape, or even theft. Even though these rules of conduct are totally compatible with the Bible, it would be incorrect to say that the school is “religious” and, therefore, must eliminate these moral rules.

To take the evolutionists’ way of thinking to the extreme, we would have to call our leaders in government “religious leaders” because they often give us laws that are compatible with religious beliefs. Several of the Ten Commandments found in Exodus 20 have been adopted as law in our country. For instance, our law prohibits murder, false witness under oath, and stealing. Just because something is compatible with a religion doesn’t make it religious.

If creation curriculum is excluded from the classroom simply because of its association with Christianity, then so should the rest of the sciences because of their association with religion. After all, science examines objects that are worshiped or used in religious rituals, such as rocks, trees, animals, stars, bones, the sun, and the forces of nature.²⁶

Sixth, many overlook the fact that modern natural science was largely influenced by early European scientists who believed in a supernatural creation of the universe. They did have a desire to study nature as God’s creation because of what they might learn about God and His established order in the world. Among those who laid the foundational principles for which modern science is indebted are:²⁷

- Johannes Kepler (1571-1630): celestial mechanics, physical astronomy
- Blaise Pascal (1623-62): hydrostatics
- Robert Boyle (1627-91): chemistry and gas dynamics
- Nicolaus Steno (1638-87): stratigraphy

- Isaac Newton (1642-1727): calculus and dynamics
- Michael Faraday (1791-1867): magnetic theory
- Louis Agassiz (1807-73): glacial geology and ichthyology
- James Young Simpson (1811-70): gynecology
- Gregor Mendel (1822-84): genetics
- Louis Pasteur (1822-95): bacteriology
- William Thomson (Lord Kelvin) (1824-1907): energetics and thermodynamics
- Joseph Lister (1827-1912): antiseptic surgery
- James Clerk Maxwell (1831-79): electrodynamics and statistical thermodynamics
- William Ramsay (1852-1916): isotopic chemistry

Why do Many Scientists Accept Evolution as Fact?

If evolution is untrue, why do so many teachers and students believe it's a fact? Many textbooks and magazine articles portray evolution as an undisputed champion of the origins and development of life. They show countless pictures of the latest "new" bone discoveries and emphatically declare that our great ancestors were apelike creatures. Some professors, who have vigorously supported evolution, make those who doubt or question evolution's credibility feel like ignorant outcasts. Scientists who question the veracity of evolution are often purged from the faculties of university science departments and/or banned from research projects and publishing, thus ensuring a lock on ideas supporting evolution. There are at least three reasons why many secular academicians accept it as fact.

1. Some scientists overestimate the evidence for evolution. In an evolutionist's zeal to discover clues that prove evolution's credibility, he tends to overlook problems with the evidence itself. The ape-man discoveries discussed earlier serve as ample evidence of initial excitement that only evaporates months later after the truth is discovered. Unfortunately, by the time the truth about the evidence is known to the public—if they hear it at all—the media has already published the findings as fact.
2. Some teachers present evolution as fact and the students blindly accept it. Most students go through school never questioning the evidence. The story of life is usually one-sided and rarely appeals to any significant representation of creation. Consequently, this lopsided view is then carried into life without ever being sufficiently investigated or critically examined. As a result, when conversation about evolution or creation arise, it is easier for the student to favor the position that's most familiar—evolution.
3. Some people believe evolution is fact because they have absorbed it by "osmosis." Television and radio shows incorporate different components of evolution into scripts. This is accomplished most subtly in many cases. After watching television or listening to radio for several years, these evolutionary components become more familiar and are quickly accepted as true. Why? Because the script presents evolution as an indisputable fact that every "reasonable" person should believe. To

question evolution would be equal to questioning your own existence! Before you know it, you are well indoctrinated in evolutionary philosophy without enrolling in a single college class.

Not all scientists accept Darwinian mythology. In 2016, the Royal Society in London hosted a three-day conference on “New Trends in Evolutionary Biology” where some pro-evolution scientists admitted that Neo-Darwinian theory can’t explain the generation of life nor novel anatomical traits.²⁸ And over a thousand scientists and engineers have signed their names to a little-known petition, *A Scientific Dissent From Darwinism* between 2001 and 2023. In doing so, they all affirm:

We are skeptical of claims for the ability of random mutation and natural selection to account for the complexity of life. Careful examination of the evidence for Darwinian theory should be encouraged. There is scientific dissent from Darwinism. It deserves to be heard.²⁹

Conclusion

In the end, evolutionists must answer three crucial questions:

1. How does something come from nothing?
2. How does life come from nonlife?
3. How does intelligence come from nonintelligence?

Ironically, 20th-century evolutionist and Nobel Prize-winning biochemist, George Wald, correctly sums up the painful dilemma that confronts modern evolutionists today who reject divine creation. Wald writes,

When it comes to the origin of life there are only two possibilities: creation or spontaneous generation. There is no third way. Spontaneous generation was disproved one hundred years ago [by Louis Pasteur], but that leads us to only one other conclusion, that of supernatural creation. We cannot accept that on philosophical grounds; therefore, we choose to believe the impossible: that life arose spontaneously by chance!³⁰

There is little doubt as to the impact of the theory of evolution upon the world. It has been broadly accepted by secular colleges and universities. We know, however, that truth is established by evidence not majority vote. The evidence for creation far outweighs the scant evidence for evolution. Fortunately, scientists now have access to more information and technology than Charles Darwin ever dreamed. Ironically, scientist Robert Jastrow accurately assesses the scientific pursuit: “For the scientist who has lived by his faith in the power of reason, the story ends like a bad dream. He has scaled the mountains of ignorance; he is about to conquer the highest peak; as he pulls himself over the final rock, he is greeted by a band of theologians who have been sitting there for centuries.”³¹

Notes

¹ For an easy-to-understand book that exposes the errors of evolution, see Phillip E. Johnson, *Defeating Darwinism by Opening Minds* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1997). For more advanced reading from a non-Christian point of view, see Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (Bethesda: Adler & Adler, 1985).

² For more information on chemical evolution, also called “prebiological evolution,” see Phillip E. Johnson, *Darwin on Trial* (Downers Grove: IVP, 1991), 102–112, 199–200.

³ Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, Great Books Series (New York: Random House, 1993), 232.

⁴ Michael J. Behe, *Darwin’s Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution* (New York: The Free Press, 1996).

⁵ *Ibid.*, 39–48.

⁶ Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1987), 21.

⁷ Geisler, “Evolution, Biological,” *Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics*, 224–28.

⁸ See Jonathan Wells’s excellent book *Icons of Evolution* (N. Y.: Regnery Publishing, 2000).

⁹ See Duane T. Gish, *Evolution: The Fossils Say No* (San Diego: Creation Life Publishing, 1981).

¹⁰ C.P. Hickman, L.S. Roberts, and F.M. Hickman, *Integrated Principles of Zoology*. 8th ed. (St. Louis, MO: Times Mirror/Moseby College Publishing, 1988, 8th ed), 866.

¹¹ R.S.K. Barnes, P. Calow and P.J.W. Olive, *The Invertebrates: A New Synthesis*. 3rd ed. (Malden, MA: Blackwell Sci. Publications, 2001), 9-10.

¹² Charles Darwin, *On the Origin of Species* (New York: Random House, Inc., 1993), 227.

¹³ Stephen J. Gould, “The Return of Hopeful Monsters,” *Natural History* 86, no. 6 (June 1977): 24.

¹⁴ Stephen J. Gould, “Evolution’s Erratic Pace,” *Natural History* 86, no. 5 (May 1977): 14–15.

¹⁵ David M. Raup, “Conflicts between Darwin and Paleontology,” *Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin* 50, no. 1 (January 1979): 15.

¹⁶ Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (Bethesda: Adler & Adler, 1985), 195.

¹⁷ Behe, *Darwin’s Black Box*, 187.

¹⁸ Geisler, “Evolution, Biological,” in *Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics*, 227–28.

¹⁹ Casey Luskin, “Do Fossils Demonstrate Human Evolution?” in William A. Dembski, Casey Luskin, and Joseph M. Holden, gen. eds, *The Comprehensive Guide to Science and Faith: Exploring the Ultimate Questions About Life and the Cosmos* (Eugene, OR: Harvest House Publishers, 2021), 370; Sigrid Hartwig-Scherer, “Apes or Ancestors?” in William A. Dembski, ed., *Mere Creation: Science, Faith and Intelligent Design* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1998), 220.

²⁰ See William A. Dembski, Casey Luskin, and Joseph M. Holden, gen. eds., *The Comprehensive Guide to Science and Faith* (Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 2021), 545-553.

²¹ Chart adapted from Geisler & Brooks, *When Skeptics Ask*, 215.

²² Norman L. Geisler and J. Kerby Anderson, *Origin Science: A Proposal for the Creation-Evolution Controversy* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987), 35.

²³ *Humanist Manifestos I and II*, Paul Kurtz, ed. (Amherst, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 1973), 8. Interestingly, these humanistic beliefs are opposite of the beliefs in the American Declaration of Independence.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 13–17.

²⁵ In 1961 the Supreme Court asserted that secular humanism is a religion protected by the first amendment in the case *Torcaso v. Watkins*. Humanist John Dewey concludes his book *A Common Faith* (Yale University Press, 1934), 87, with an explicit and militant call to establish humanism as the “common faith” of humankind. The book ends: “Here are all the elements for a religious faith that shall not be confined to sect, class, or race. Such a faith has always been implicitly the common faith of mankind. It remains to make it explicit and militant.”

²⁶ Geisler & Anderson, *Origin Science* (Baker, 1987).

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 39–40.

²⁸ “Why the Royal Society Meeting Mattered, in a Nutshell,” *Evolution News*, December 5, 2016, https://evolutionnews.org/2016/12/why_the_royal_s/

²⁹ The entry point for A Scientific Dissent from Darwinism is <https://dissentfromdarwin.org/>. The 2023 list of signatories may be downloaded from there and redirects, as of April 2024, to <https://www.discovery.org/m/securepdfs/2023/05/Scientific-Dissent-List-05012023-2.pdf>. Dissent from Darwin is in part a play on words from Darwin’s 1871 book *The Descent of Man*.

³⁰ George Wald, “The origin of Life”, *Scientific American*, May 1954, 191:48

³¹ Robert Jastrow, *God and the Astronomers*, 2nd ed. (New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1992), 107.