

Evolution: A Theory in Crisis

Norman R. Gulley

Introduction

Evolution is possibly the most influential worldview ever to affect the human race. It has become all-pervasive in nearly every modern discipline. Darwin believed that “his theories would necessitate a complete redrafting of the problems and scope of several sciences, including psychology, paleontology, and comparative anatomy.”(1) Evolution radically altered biology and later became married to Mendelian genetics, producing what historians of science call the neo-Darwinian, or modern synthesis, phase of evolution.

The Origin of Species, published in 1859, “has had a massive influence not only on the sciences, which increasingly are built on evolutionary assumptions, but on the humanities, theology, and government.”(2) As Ernst Mayr noted, Darwin’s theory, “It was one of the most novel and most daring new conceptualizations in the history of ideas.”(4) No wonder many widely consider him the Newton of biology.

Alfred R. Wallace(5) and Charles Darwin independently thought of natural selection as the mechanism for evolution. Both took theology before going on to make contributions to evolutionary studies, and Darwin drifted into agnosticism and atheism through his study into evolutionary theory. He lost his faith during the years 1836-1839, some 20 years before publishing *The Origin of Species*.(6) His loss of faith was one major factor in Darwin’s turn to natural selection as the mechanism for his theory.(7) It is also a fact that his evolutionary theory has caused many others to lose their faith. Martin Lings contends that “more cases of loss of religious faith are to be traced to the theory of evolution...than to anything else.”(8)

Evolution has influenced social theory, with the “survival of the fittest” applied to the extermination of 6 million Jews in the Holocaust under Hitler’s Third Reich. It continues to influence society. Robert Wright wrote a major article (*Time*, Aug. 15, 1994) entitled “Infidelity: It May Be in Our Genes.” Viewing male promiscuity as a product of evolution, he says, “According to evolutionary psychology, it is ‘natural’ for both men and women—at some times, under some circumstances—to commit adultery.” Wright claims that nearly 1,000 of the 1,154 past or present societies studied have permitted a man to have more than one wife. Furthermore, the article contends that “it is to a man’s evolutionary advantage to sow his seeds far and wide.” In America the divorce rate is 50 percent. Wright concludes that “lifelong monogamous devotion just isn’t natural, and the modern environment makes it harder than ever.”(9) With such widespread belief that humans are mere animals, no wonder we see so much moral disarray that regards life as well as marriage as disposable.

As Henry Morris rightly observes, “untold damage has been wrought, especially during the past century, by this dismal doctrine that man is merely an evolved animal. Racism, economic imperialism, Communism, Nazism, sexual promiscuity and perversions, aggressive militarism, infanticide, genocide, and all sorts of evils have been vigorously promoted by one group or another on the grounds that, since they were based on evolution, they were ‘scientific’ and, therefore, bound to prove beneficial in the long run. Even cannibalism, of all things, is beginning to receive favorable attention by certain evolutionists.”(10) What a tragedy that Darwin was blind to such possibilities, even saying that evolutionary theory ennobles!(11)

Influence on Evangelical Theology

Evolution has even made remarkable inroads into evangelical theology by calling into question the historicity of the Genesis account of creation. Paul K. Jewett notes that “few

who confess the Christian doctrine of creation would suppose that the world was fashioned in a week of time some six thousand to ten thousand years ago. Drafts of time of a vastly different magnitude are indicated by the findings of the natural sciences.”(12) Theology accommodates science by interpreting the Genesis record in the light of the current scientific worldview.(13) Some evangelical theologians believe that death existed in the human race prior to the fall,(14) which raises questions whether death is sin’s wages, and hence undermines the atonement. According to evolutionary theory, death is something natural and not a result of human sin. Karl Barth claims that death is a part of being finite. God has no beginning or end, but in contrast, humans have a beginning and an end. Therefore, death is a part of being human.(15)

Theistic evolution attempts to accept evolutionary theory while holding on to the fact that God as Creator launched the process and perhaps even superintended it. Some contemporary theologians “deny any original act of creation, and equate creation with that universal, continuing activity which traditional theology called ‘reservation’ or ‘providence.’”(16) Called “continuing creation,” process theologians influenced by Alfred Whitehead especially espouse it,(17) and it appears in the theology of John Macquarrie.(18) Theistic evolutionists look at the Genesis account of creation as either myth, saga, or poetry, in which the only factual information is that God created through natural processes. Many hold that the other creation stories in Mesopotamia, such as the Enumah Elish account, form the basis for the biblical account. All of these ideas question the authority of the biblical record and shove it aside to make room for evolutionary theory.

The root problem of theistic evolution is that it overlooks the worldview of evolution. Darwin did not believe in miracles or in the intervention of God either at the beginning or anywhere else along the evolutionary process. His worldview was a closed system that removed God from the natural laws of cause and effect. It believed that natural selection without God accomplished evolutionary development. Clearly, anyone accepting biblical

creationism believes in the supernatural act of God in creating. Theistic evolution is logically a misnomer. It is like saying that God began the process and yet had no part in it. Behind the term *theistic evolution* lie two opposing philosophical views, and hence opposing paradigms: supernaturalism and naturalism. A marrying of the two doesn't explain anything, for one cancels the other.

Although theistic evolution cannot explain the origin of humanity, the Jesuit paleontologist Pierre Teilhard de Chardin espoused it.(19) Augustine of Hippo(20) and Thomas Aquinas(21) believed in progressive creation.(22)

The Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) addressed the relationship between Scripture and science. It speaks of "the rightful independence of science"(23) and of "the legitimate autonomy of human culture and especially of the sciences."(24) This is in keeping with the Catholic division between Scripture and tradition. The "Document on Revelation" places "sacred tradition" before "sacred revelation."(25) In the same way it expects science to take precedence over Scripture in the area of evolution. The current *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (1994) says, "The question about the origins of the world and of man has been the object of many scientific studies which have splendidly enriched our knowledge of the age and dimensions of the cosmos, the development of life-forms and the appearance of man." The document gives thanks to God "for the understanding and wisdom he gives to scholars and researchers."(26)

Evolution of Evolution

Darwin became an evolutionist during March 1837, or certainly by July 1837.(27) Although Darwinian evolution began with *The Origin of Species*, various forms of evolution reach back through Hume to the classical philosophers such as Democritus, Epicurus, Aristotle, and the Ionian nature philosophers such as Empedocles.(28) As Isaac Asimov

points out in his *New Guide to Science*, “from Aristotle on, many men speculated on the possibility that organisms had evolved from one another.”(29) Evolution as the transmutation of species, though, goes back only to the eighteenth-century Enlightenment,(30) as indicated by Peter J. Bowler,(31) Loren Eiseley,(32) and John C. Greene.(33)

We should keep in mind that evolutionary theory has had its own evolution. We could divide into a number of stages, including classical Darwinism (1858-1890s); the modern synthesis,(34) also called neo-Darwinism (1915-1930s);(35) post-Darwinianism,(36) later questioned by DNA and molecular biology (1950s); and the punctuated equilibria views and cladistic taxonomy (1980-onward).(37) The classical period focused on natural selection as the sole mechanism for evolution until Mendellian genetics forced a synthesis with natural selection to form neo-Darwinism. In the 1950s the discovery of DNA by Watson and Crick in molecular biology caused a reanalysis of evolutionary theory.(38)

Throughout the first two periods of the theory’s history scientists considered gradualism, or a series of microevolutionary changes over sufficient time, as the way evolution occurred. Not so today. Punctuated equilibrium (Stephen Jay Gould, Niles Eldredge) suggests that new species appeared abruptly, just as we see demonstrated in the fossil records. Philosophers of science have rightly called this new focus a new paradigm change in evolutionary theory,(39) because, in part, it rejects natural selection as the sole mechanism for change and gradualism as its time frame. The modern form of taxonomy called cladistics (Simpson, Cox, Halstead, Hennig, Greenwood, Forey, Gardiner, Patterson, and Nelson)(40) finds distinct gaps between species, with no ancestral linkage. Paleontologists, geneticists, immunologists, embryologists, and taxonomists are among those whose research supports the post-Darwinian view.

Although evolution has had its own evolution, it is still evolution. Therefore, in the literature, when later evolutionary views criticize former views, it does not mean to say that the exponents of the new concepts have given up evolutionary theory. It simply indicates that

both Darwinian evolution as well as neo-Darwinian evolution have been radically called into question by scientists whom I consider as belong to post-Darwinian evolution. In this chapter we will consider some evidence that questions the theory of evolution in its various stages. The reader should keep in mind that evolutionists still actively defend the concept. As Peter J. Bowler, historian of science, Queen's University, Belfast, states, "biologists have begun a more active campaign to defend the theory (Eldredge, 1982; Godfrey, 1983; Halstead, 1983; Kitcher, 1982; Montagu, 1982; Newell, 1982; Ruse, 1982; Futuyma, 1982)." (41)

Recent Publications Questioning Evolutionary Theory

We will mention a few of the recent major publications that raise issues about evolutionary theory. Some representative titles include: *The Collapse of Evolution*, by Scott Huse;(42) *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, by Michael Denton; (43) *Darwin on Trial*, by Philip Johnson;(44) *The Creation Hypothesis: Scientific Evidence for an Intelligent Designer*, edited by J.P. Moreland;(45) *Of Pandas and People: The Central Question of Biological Origins*, by Percival Davis and Dean H. Kenyon;(46) *The Descent of Darwin: A Handbook of Doubts About Darwinism*, by Brian Leith;(47) and Alvin Plantinga's seminal articles, "When Faith and Reason Clash: Evolution and the Bible," in *Christian Scholar's Review*.(48) From an earlier time comes Michael Polanyi's insightful article, "Life's Irreducible Structure," in *Science*;(49) and a book by W. R. Bird, *The Origin of Species Revisited: The Theories of Evolution and of Abrupt Appearance*.(50) Together they make a formidable attack on evolutionary theory.

The Parameters of Science

Evolution claims to be a science and therefore able to demonstrate its theory through empirical evidence. By contrast, adherents to evolutionary theory claim that creationism is

nonempirical and hence nonscientific. The comparison does have problems, though. It is true that we can demonstrate change in nature, but the evidence limits itself to minor differences (microevolution). Evolution, however, requires macroevolution, or transformation from one species to an entirely different species. Empirical evidence is insufficient to prove the claims made. Extrapolating macroevolutionary change from microevolution is merely an unproven and untestable theory. We cannot, on the basis of known evidence, demonstrate it. Scientists can accept it only by faith. This is no different from accepting faith that God created the world and all within it. While we do have a few examples of what appear to be major changes, such exceptions still seem to prove the rule of no macroevolutionary change.(51)

Faith in either macroevolution or in creation by God is still only faith. It is not empirical evidence. Because it is faith and not empirical evidence, that is, not something that science can demonstrate in the lab today, the origin of humanity by evolution or God's creation lies beyond the proper domain of science. That which stands beyond the demonstrable is in the realm of philosophy or metaphysics and not that of science. Colin Patterson, senior paleontologist at the British Natural History Museum, characterized evolution and creationism "as scientifically vacuous concepts which are held primarily on the basis of faith."(52)

Is evolution a science? Most people automatically consider that it is. But true science is testable, being either verified or falsified through experimentation. Can evolutionary theory qualify as science on those terms? It has elicited a number of different answers. At one time Karl Popper, a leader in the philosophy of science, questioned whether evolution is scientific because it is not falsifiable. In 1974 he wrote: "I have come to the conclusion that Darwinism is not a testable scientific theory, but a metaphysical research programme."(53) Later he conceded that parts of evolution are testable, and to that extent it is scientific.(54) But even then much of evolutionary theory remains beyond the objectivity of science, such as the origin of life in the beginning and the assumed process of gradualism in which small transitional

stages transformed molecules into human beings. The claim that random genetic mutation and natural selection produced increasingly complex forms of life without any evidence of transitionals in the fossil record question the theory as being scientific. To these matters we will return later.

What about biblical creationism—is it scientific? Gunther S. Stent considers that “the very term ‘scientific creationism’ is and oxymoron.”(55) Judge William Overton, considering the Arkansas law that mandated the teaching of creationism, ruled that creation science does not constitute a genuine science.(56) J. P. Moreland rightly shows that the statements “By its very nature, Natural Science must adopt Methodological Naturalism” (in support of evolution) and “Theistic science is religion and not science” (in opposition to biblical creationism) are not first-order claims of science about some scientific phenomenon. “Rather, they are second-order philosophical claims *about* science. They are metaclaims that take a vantage point outside science and have science itself as their subject of reference. Thus the field of philosophy, especially philosophy of science, will be the proper domain from which to assess these claims, not science. Scientists are not experts in these second-order questions, and when they comment on them, they do so qua philosophers, not qua scientists.”(57) The leading philosopher of science Alvin Plantinga, says, “We need theistic science.”(58)

Theistic science takes the position that we need not restrict scientific methodology to methodological naturalism, as in evolutionary theory. Philosopher and historian of science Michael Ruse confines the scope of science to “unbroken, natural regularity.”(59) Why should science be confined to the natural realm? Although it is true that empirical evidence lies at the core of scientific enquiry, Paul K. Feyerabend speaks about the various problems in empiricism. Different thinkers have “proceeded in different ways and thereby given rise to different kinds of scientific knowledge do exist. Why cannot divine action, or the supernatural, be seen as one kind of scientific thinking, as when God is the cause of creation

in theistic science? After all, as Charles B. Thaxton notes, “science includes many elements; it includes asking what causes things.”(61)

The Origin of Life

The origin of life is unknown to empirical science. Evolutionists have suggested many ideas. One popular thesis assumes that life arose out of a prebiotic soup when molecules crossed the divide from organic chemistry to biology. While at the University of Chicago in 1953, graduate student Stanley Miller, in Harold Urey’s lab, experimented with amino acids in a mixture of water, methane, ammonia, and hydrogen—substances assumed present in the primitive earth. He subjected the chemicals to an electrical spark.(68) “Because amino acids are used in building proteins, they are sometimes called the ‘building blocks of life.’ Subsequent experiments based on the Miller-Urey model produced a variety of amino acids and other complex compounds employed in the genetic process, with the result that the more optimistic researchers concluded that the chemicals needed to construct life could have been present in sufficient abundance on the early earth.”(69)

During the 1980s a major skepticism developed toward the Miller-Urey experiments. Atmospheric physicists doubt that the early earth’s atmosphere contained significant amounts of ammonia, methane, or hydrogen. Molecular biologists discovered that RNA—a bridge from the chemicals to DNA—is “exceedingly difficult to synthesize under the conditions that likely prevailed when life originated.” Moreover, RNA is no longer thought to replicate itself easily as biochemists once believed.(70) “Perhaps the most discouraging criticism has come from chemists, who have spoiled the prebiotic soup by showing that organic compounds produced on the early earth would be subject to chemical reactions making them unsuitable for constructing life. In all probability, the prebiotic soup could never have existed, and without it there is no reason to believe that the production of small amounts of some amino

acids by electrical charge in a reducing atmosphere had anything to do with the origin of life.”(71)

Thus because we have no empirical evidence for how life began, science has not been able to deny the biblical record of divine creation. Cambridge University astrophysicist Sir Frederick Hoyle, in his book *Evolution From Space* (1981), said: “The likelihood of the spontaneous formation of life from inanimate matter is one to a number of 40,000 naughts after it!” He concludes: “It is big enough to bury Darwin and the whole theory of evolution.”(72)

It is incredible that some scholars believe life began many times in the universe (Dawkins, Asimov, Billingham).(73) They teach it even though we have no evidence of life anywhere in the universe outside of the earth. The winner of the Nobel Prize for Physiology or Medicine in 1962 for his work on DNA, Francis Crick, postulates that life began on some other planet some 9 billion years ago.(74) In his view of “Directed Panspermia,” Crick believes that bacteria such as *Escherichia coli*, organisms about one micron wide and two microns long, were packaged and put aboard a spaceship and sent to earth. The advantage of such bacteria is they could be frozen alive and most of them will survive. “At a very low temperature, such as that of space, many of them might well survive for well over ten thousand years. They would be almost immune to impact shock and other similar hazards.”(75)

However, such scholars do not explain how life began on those other planets. Transporting bacteria on a spaceship from outer space will not solve the failure to give an explanation of how life started on our planet. The question simply shifts to that planet—how did life begin there? Furthermore, we have no empirical evidence that bacteria evolve into more complex organisms. As far as our planet is concerned, science finds no evidence of a prebiotic soup in the earliest rocks.(76) And even if we did have such evidence, Klaus Dose, from the Institute of Biochemistry, Johannes Gutenberg University, Germany, concludes, “It

is extremely unlikely that the first forms of life could have evolved spontaneously in a primordial soup.”(77)

The Function of DNA

In 1953 Francis Crick and James Watson unraveled the architecture of the double helix DNA molecule.(84) The discovery of DNA has added enormously to our understanding of how living organisms develop. Research has now shown that the idea of natural selection and random genetic mutation, with its emphasis on descent, is too limited a view. DNA is a unique information storage device that speaks far more of design by an intelligent Creator.

Michael Denton, in his seminal book *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, describes DNA’s amazing ability to contain information. “The capacity of DNA to store information vastly exceeds that of any other known system; it is so efficient that all the information needed to specify an organism as complex as man weighs less than a few thousand millionths of a gram. The information necessary to specify the design of all the species of organisms which have ever existed on the planet, a number according to G. G. Simpson of approximately one thousand million, could be held in a teaspoon and there would still be room left for all the information in every book ever written.”(85)

John W. Oller, Jr. And John L. Omdahl compared human language with that of DNA. They noted that “the origin of the human language capacity is not unlike the problem of the origin of life itself.”(86) They conclude that “the intricate and articulate structures of language are mirrored in the delicate arrangements of biological representations in correspondence to information coded in DNA. We have shown logically that the language capacity cannot have originated in a purely materialistic manner. The logical gulf that separates mind from matter really is an uncrossable barrier to any materialistic origin. If the definitions of Peirce and Einstein are accepted, the gulf they describe cannot be crossed

without the intervention of a truly transcendent Intelligence—a conclusion both of them accepted.”(87)

It is not good enough to say, with Oxford University zoologist Richard Dawkins, that God cannot be the origin of DNA. “To explain the origin of the DNA/protein machine by invoking a supernatural Designer is to explain precisely nothing, for it leaves unexplained the origin of the Designer,” he wrote. “you have to say something like ‘God was always there,’ and if you allow yourself that kind of lazy way out, you might as well just say ‘DNA was always there,’ or ‘Life was always there,’ and be done with it.” What Dawkins completely overlooked was the two-leveled reality at work in the living organism, that is, the DNA at the higher level suggesting design and the physical-chemical development at the lower level that some claim to be illustrative of descent. What Dawkins needs to do is to take seriously the seminal work done by another Oxford University professor, Michael Polanyi.

In an influential article, “Life’s Irreducible Structure,” Michael Polanyi, former Fellow of Merton College, Oxford University, compared machines with evolutionary theory. Human beings make machines even though such devices operate according to laws of inanimate nature. “So the machine as a whole works under the control of two distinct principles. The higher one is the principle of the machine’s design, and this harnesses the lower one, which consists in the physical-chemical processes on which the machine relies.”(88)

Polanyi considers living mechanisms and information in DNA as boundary conditions, with a sequence of boundaries above them. He reasons that “a boundary condition is always extraneous to the process which it delimits.” For example, when Galileo conducted his experiment of balls running down a slope, the choice of the slope had nothing to do with the laws of mechanics. Furthermore, the shape and manufacture of test tubes have nothing to do with the laws of chemistry. Nor can we define the structure of machines by the laws they harness. He concludes: “Thus the morphology of living things transcends the laws of physics and chemistry.”(89)

Because of DNA, Polanyi questions evolutionary theory. “In the light of the current theory of evolution, the codelike structure of DNA must be assumed to have come about by a sequence of chance variations established by natural selection. But this evolutionary aspect is irrelevant here; whatever may be the origin of a DNA configuration, it can function as a code only if its order is not due to the forces of potential energy. It must be as physically indeterminate as the sequence of words is on a printed page. As the arrangement of a printed page is extraneous to the chemistry of the printed page, so is the base sequence in a DNA molecule extraneous to the chemical forces at work in the DNA molecule.”(90)

Polanyi asks, “Can the control of morphogenesis by DNA be likened to the designing and shaping of a machine by an engineer?”(91) He answers in the positive. The codelike structure of DNA, with all its information regulating the growth of the organism, acts on the organism like an engineer acts on a machine. The fact that the organism harnesses the physical-chemical substances within it in no way fully defines the organism itself, for it is under dual control—from DNA and the physical-chemical substances, with DNA being the primary level of influence. IT would seem to me that this model places design (not descent) from the DNA as the primary influence in morphogenesis.

Scott M. Huse observes that “computer scientists have demonstrated conclusively that information does not and cannot arise spontaneously. Information results only from the expenditure of energy (to arrange the letter and words) and under the all-important direction of intelligence. Therefore, since DNA is information, the only logical and reasonable conclusion that can be drawn is that DNA was formed by Intelligence.”(92)

On the basis of the work done on DNA, it seems more reasonable to say that it demonstrates an intelligent Creator, and thus speaks eloquently on behalf of design rather than for descent.

The Eye

In 1861, two years after the publication of his *Origin of Species*, Darwin wrote a letter to biologist Asa Gray, saying that “the eye to this day gives me a cold shudder.”(102) “To suppose that 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 possible degree...The belief that an organ as perfect as the eye could have formed by natural selection is more than enough to stagger anyone.”(103)

If what Darwin knew then about the eye made him shudder, imagine how he would react when we have discovered so much more about the eye! “electrophysiological studies have recently revealed very intricate connections among the nerve cells of the retina, which enable the eye to carry out many types of preliminary data processing of visual information before transmitting it in binary form to the brain. The cleverness of these mechanisms has again been underlined by their close analogy to the sorts of image intensification and clarification processes carried out today by computers, such as those used by NASA, on images transmitted from space. Today it would be more accurate to think of a television camera if we are looking for an analogy to the eye.”(104)

A look at the human eye had every reason to make Darwin tremble, for how could natural selection produce such ordered and precise design and complexity? Furthermore, how could natural selection, a slow process, have a workable eye at every stage of its development? Richard Dawkins admits that the human eye “could not possibly come into existence through single-step selection.”(105) He believes the human eye could have taken several hundred million years to evolve.(106) Yet Dawkins can argue, “The eye is, par excellence, a case where a fraction of an organ is better than no organ at all; an eye without a lens or even a pupil, for instance, can still detect the looming shadow of a predator.”(107)

But how can a fraction of an eye really be an eye? How can the alleged slow process to produce the eye really be possible when the eye is only a part of a wider complex network of interdependent parts forming the visual network? “Here is the problem,” Alvin Plantinga says. “How does the lens, for example, get developed by the proposed means—random genetic variation and natural selection—when at the same time there has to be development of the optic nerve, the relevant muscles, the retina, the rods and cones, and many other delicate and complicated structures, all of which have to be adjusted to each other in such a way that they can work together? Indeed, what is involved isn’t, of course, just the eye; it is the whole visual system, including the relevant parts of the brain. Many different organs and suborgans have to be developed together, and it is hard to envisage a series of mutations which is such that each member of the series has adaptive value, is also a step on the way to the eye, and is such that the last member is an animal with such an eye.”(108)

The eye is too complex both in itself and in its visual network to just evolve gradually. That is why Dawkins’ idea that an eye is an eye even during its hypothetical early stages does not make sense. Harvard scholar Stephen Jay Gould asked what good 5 percent of an eye might be. Realizing that it could not see, he thought it might have some other function than sight. Dawkins disagreed with Gould and argued that the organism used the 5 percent eye “for 5 percent vision.” But how can 5 percent of an eye have 5 percent of vision when no vision is possible until the eye is 100 percent an eye, with all its parts in place and fully functioning as noted above by Plantinga? Lawyer Phillip E. Johnson saw the illogic of Dawkins’ conclusion, stating that “the fallacy in that argument is that ‘5 percent of an eye’ is not the same thing as ‘5 percent of normal vision.’”(109)

Dan E. Nilsson and Susanne Nilsson of Lund University suggested that the human eye could have developed in “a few hundred thousand generations” or “1,829 steps,”(110) yet they start with a flat, light-sensitive patch of cells. Saying nothing about where those light-sensitive cells came from, they just assume their presence, thus ignoring a fundamental part of

what they should be proving. True science will start the process at the beginning, not way down the line.

What we have said about the eye applies to other organs, or body parts, such as the avian lung(111) and bird wings, just to name two. Each of these organs comprises a complex network, so that no one part can evolve without all parts developing at the same time. The problem is, how can an emerging lung be a lung, or an incomplete wing be a wing? How can an avian lung, through which air passes in only one direction, have developed from the two-way passage found in all other vertebrates? Beyond all this is the complexity of the human brain. Caltech neurobiologist Roger Sperry, winner of the 1981 Nobel Prize for study on the two hemispheres of the human brain, argues “that the brain system as a whole somehow controls its parts in ways that supersede the mechanistic physical states of the brain’s 10 billion neurons.”(112) Although he dismisses the supernatural, Sperry at least apparently realizes that more exists to the brain than the “mechanistic physical” dimensions. The intricacies of the human brain are equivalent to the most complex computer network known to mankind, and speak eloquently for a Creator rather than random chance for its existence.

Michael Denton observes: “If complex computer programs cannot be changed by random mechanisms, then surely the same must apply to the genetic programmes of living organisms.”(113) It is not correct to compare the “evolution” of planes from Bleriot’s monoplane to Boeing’s 747, for that development did not depend upon chance.(114) The sheer perfection throughout the universe, at every level, cannot be explained on the basis of chance and random processes.(115)

Random chance introduces the theory of probability into evolutionary thinking. Enormous amounts of time have been a safe haven for the evolutionary hypothesis. Such theorists believe that, given sufficient time, any evolutionary development is possible. If we considered evolution a steady linear development, then sufficient time made the theory seem possible. Thus in the probability game, as on a roulette wheel, the number 26, for example,

could come up exactly when needed along the evolutionary line. But such an approach to probability is no longer possible today, because we better understand the complexities of evolution. Huston Smith says: “We now see that significant organic changes require that innumerable component developments occur *simultaneously* and *independently* in bones, nerves, muscles, arteries, and the like. These requirements escalate the demand on probability theory astronomically. It would be like having 26 come up simultaneously on ten or 15 tables in the same casino, followed by all the tables reporting 27, 28, and 29 in lockstep progression; more time than the earth has existed would be needed to account for the sequences that have occurred.”(116)

The Cell

Darwinian evolution believes that we can explain through gradual microevolutionary steps the entire development of life from the prebiotic soup all the way to human beings. (It even posits that life may continue to evolve beyond human beings.)(117) This suggests that evolution is change from the simple to the complex. We have already noted the complexity of human beings. Much could be said about the general complexity of the animal kingdom too. Our point here is that complexity is not the end of some evolutionary process, but appears even in the smallest building blocks of life, as in DNA and in the single cell.

Molecular biology has opened up a whole new world of complexity that staggers the imagination and exposes how incredulous is the theory of evolution. W. R. Bird, in his book *The Origin of Species Revisited*, speaks of the enormous complexity of a single cell. Quoting Sagan, he concludes that the simple cell has “information...comparable to about a hundred million pages of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*.”(118) Richard Dawkins compares it to 30 volumes of the encyclopedia.(119) Whichever analogy one takes, it is a staggering amount of storage in just one tiny cell! *Of Pandas and People* goes so far as to say that “if the amount of

information contained in one cell of your body were written out on a typewriter, it would fill as many books as are contained in a large library.”(120) The tiny bacterial cells are incredibly small, and “each is in effect a veritable micro miniaturized factory containing thousands of exquisitely designed pieces of intricate molecular machinery, made up together of one hundred thousand million atoms, far more complicated than any machine built by man and absolutely without parallel in the nonliving world.”(121)

Who can explain how the simplest, tiniest cell became complex? We have no known evolutionary development of such so-called primitive cells. In fact, as Jacques Monad rightly states, “the simplest cells available to us for study have nothing ‘primitive’ about them.”(122)

The Fossil Record Doesn't Support Darwin

A. Hallam, of the department of geological sciences, University of Birmingham, Great Britain, observes that fossils “are the only direct evidence we have of the history of life on our planet, and in particular of the course of evolution.”(142) If that is so, then evolutionary theory rests on an extremely flimsy foundation, as we will see in this section. In fact, a tautological relationship exists between evolution and fossils. “The only justification for assigning fossils to specific time periods in that chronology is the assumed evolutionary progression of life. In turn, the only basis for biological evolution is the fossil record so constructed. In other words, the assumption of evolution is used to arrange the sequence of the fossils, then the resultant sequence is advanced as proof of evolution.”(143)

Paleontologists have recorded nearly 100,000 fossil species, and yet “where sequence does exist it is exceptional or relatively trivial.”(144) Moreover, 99 percent of the biology of any organism resides in the soft anatomy that doesn't get preserved, so the fossil record is only 1 percent of the organism.(145) At best, researchers estimate that only 87.8 percent of

the 329 living families of terrestrial vertebrates were fossilized. Birds especially have left a poor record.(146)

Evolution necessitates a change from one species to another up the increasingly complex progression from the first cell to human beings. If that in fact happened, we would expect to find remains of transitional forms between the evolving species. But we can search the fossil record at every level and find no such evidence. In the first edition of *The Origin of Species* Darwin admits that the fossil record is “the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory.”(147) Instead of giving up his theory, though, he seems to blame the fossil record for the absence of the transitional forms. “I do not pretend that I should ever have suspected how poor a record of the mutations of life, the best preserved geological section presented, had not the difficulty of our not discovering innumerable transitional links between the species which appeared at the commencement and close of each formation, pressed so hardly on my theory.”(148)

Darwin clearly blames the fossil record in a chapter on the imperfection of the geological record. Elsewhere he argues that the reason we do not find innumerable transitions is due to “the record being incomparably less perfect than is generally supposed. The crust of the earth is a vast museum; but the natural collections have been imperfectly made, and only at long intervals of time.”(149) As a result “the geological record is far more imperfect than most geologists believe.”(150) Darwin concludes that “the noble science of geology loses glory from the extreme imperfection of the record,” for fossils are “a poor collection made at hazard and at rare intervals.”(151)

Apparently Darwin came to the fossil record with his own preconceived assumption about evolution, then forced that upon the fossil record rather than allowing the absence of transitional forms to call his theory into question. And he did it in the name of science. Such a procedure runs counter to scientific methodology that allows the objective data or experimentation to verify or falsify a theory.

Martin J. S. Rudwick, lecturer in history and philosophy of science, Cambridge University, in his book *The Meaning of Fossils* notes the subjectivity of fossil study. “The ‘meaning’ of fossils has been seen in many different ways in different periods. Indeed, the same fossil specimens (for example, sharks’ teeth) have been reinterpreted several times within different frames of reference—they have, as it were, been seen with different eyes.”(152) Moreover, study has shown that “there was no fossil evidence of one species changing gradually into another when traced through successive strata; and—much more seriously—there was no fossil evidence that any of the major groups, with their distinct types of anatomical organization, had had any common ancestors.”(153) L. Beverly Halstead in *Nature* agrees, stating “no fossil species can be considered the direct ancestor of any other.”(154)

Evolutionary paleontologists attempt to find evidence for evolution in the fossils. “The Darwinist approach has consistently been to find some supporting evidence, claim it as proof for ‘evolution,’ and then ignore all the difficulties.”(155) On the other hand, what is perhaps surprising to many people is the fact that the fossil experts, rather than clergy, have been “Darwin’s most formidable opponents.”(156)

Evolution as a Religion

When we remove God or the supernatural from the realm of causality, something has to fill the vacuum. Not only has naturalism taken the place of God, but evolution has become a religion in place of the biblical religion that worships the Creator. Physicist H. S. Lipson observed that “evolution became in a sense a scientific religion: almost all scientists have accepted it and many are prepared to ‘bend’ their observations to fit in with it.”(182) Alvin Plantinga noted that “evolution has deep religious connections; deep connections with how

we understand ourselves at the most fundamental level.”(183) that evolution “is by no means religiously or theologically neutral.”(184)

A conflict rages between Scripture and science when it comes to the doctrine of creation. We should remember that it is not just the historicity of Genesis that scientists question, for the doctrine of creation appears in 60 places throughout the New Testament.(185) The doctrine of God as Creator, and not nature, is fundamental to the biblical worldview. Scientists rejecting the Genesis account of creation are really denying the biblical worldview. Thomas Kuhn has persuasively shown that some current teachings of science may not be correct, and that scientific paradigms have changed. Although Kuhn never mentioned the naturalistic evolutionary worldview, his thesis applies to it also.(186)

Plantinga opposed the surrender of science to Scripture or Scripture to science, for how do we know if the position to which we surrender is the right one? “The belief that when there is a conflict, the problem must inevitably lie with our interpretation of Scripture, so that the correct course is always to modify that understanding in such a way as to accommodate current science—is every bit as deplorable as the opposite error. No doubt science can correct our grasp of Scripture; but Scripture can also correct current science.”(187) He believes that a battle rages between perennial naturalism, Enlightenment humanism, and Christian theism, all “three basically religious ways of viewing ourselves and the world.” He observes that “according to a popular contemporary myth, science is a cool, reasoned, wholly dispassionate attempt to figure out the truth about ourselves and our world, entirely independent of religion, or ideology, or moral convictions, or theological commitments. I believe this is deeply mistaken. Following Augustine (and Abraham Kuyper, Herman Dooyeweerd, Harry Jellema, Henry Stob and other Reformed thinkers), I believe that there is conflict, a battle between the *Civitas Dei*, the City of God, and the City of the World.”(188)