

Bible Special 06-09-19b

Let's continue our study now, and we're taking a look at evolution proper. This is the primary alternate system of belief in our world today, and it is a philosophy. And the difficulty is that if you start with the presupposition that evolution must have happened, then objective scientific evidence is going to get interpreted in that light, and that's how it's going to be presented.

And if you parse articles closely in journals like Nature and so on, you're going to find people saying probably, and seems to have, and it appears that, and these are not scientific facts. These are conclusions and hypotheses that are drawn from objective scientific evidence that says here's this bone, here's this fossil, here's this fact of radio astronomy, or here's this observation that the Hubble telescope has made, or that astrophysics has calculated, or whatever. And then these are woven together into conclusions, and the fabric and the context and the background of that is the presuppositions of secular humanism, materialism, and empiricism.

So what we as intelligent, scientifically oriented Christians have to do is look at those articles, look at those programs, look at these presentations, and filter fact from hypothesis. There are in fact fossils, but guess what? If you look at the fossil record, 95% of the fossil record, all of the fossils that have ever been found are sea-dwelling invertebrates. Seashells, anemones, squids, little microorganisms that float around in the sea, little tiny bug-like critters that swim around.

95% of the fossil record is not vertebrate. So now you're only dealing with 5%. And I'll give you some additional facts on that here shortly.

But the other resource that I mentioned in the first session tonight, in addition to the Answers in Genesis website, which has links to a lot of other creation or creationist oriented websites. There are a lot of good articles there. There's also a list on that website.

Have you ever heard people argue, as I have, that there aren't hardly any credentialed, educated scientists who believe the Bible, who believe in creation, and so on? There is a list on Answers in Genesis of scientists who are current, who have their doctorate, who are practicing scientists in all different fields of physics, paleontology, biology, and so on, who are creationists. And there's hundreds of them. Hundreds.

And there's links. You can click them and read their articles. Don't let people tell you that you're alone, that you're a horribly minute fraction of backward, benighted, mystical people.

Many, many, many. In fact, on here it says there are thousands of scientists who do not think evolution can explain the evidence, who do not think evolution, with its foundation in mutation and natural selection, can account for the fossil record, who do not have confidence in the dating. And another great source of information, in addition to that website, is this book, Darwin on Trial.

Now, you will find vociferous opposition to both the Answers in Genesis website and Darwin on Trial as a book. People will say, oh, that's been repudiated, that's been discounted, that's been snuffed out. Oh, no, it hasn't.

If you want an interesting read, this is a great book to read. It's written from a scientific perspective. It's written in a balanced and objective way.

And I want to read you just a little bit from this book. Chapter 3 is called Mutations, Great and Small. And it talks about Darwin.

Darwin, it says here, his unique contribution was to describe a plausible mechanism by which the necessary transformations could occur. We're talking about animals coming into all of the diversity that we see around us. Darwin, as I mentioned earlier, he provided a scientific mechanism.

And people said, see, we don't need any sort of a creationist god. We don't need any mysterious forces or any other causes not presently operating in the world. Darwin, now listen, Darwin was particularly anxious to avoid the need for any, what he called, saltations, salting the process.

Sudden leaps by which a new type of organism appeared in a single generation. You're going along and you've got clams and squids and mollusks, and then, blop, in one generation you suddenly have a platypus or a salamander or a lobe-finned fish that just jumps out of the invertebrates and goes up on land and becomes something. Darwin said, that can't be.

It's got to be gradual. It's got to be tiny little evolutionary steps. So much so, in fact, it says here, saltations or systematic macromutations, a big change all at once, are considered impossible by most scientists for good reason.

Living creatures are extremely intricate assemblies of interrelated parts. It's just like the space shuttle. The space shuttle is simple compared to virtually all forms of biological life.

An airliner, a 747 with all of its intricate systems is simple compared to biological life. And if you make any kind of a big change in a biological organism, you will kill it every time. They just can't survive big changes.

They never do. It is impossible to imagine how the parts could change in unison, all of these parts change at once, like going from a running lizard to a winged creature of some sort. It just pops out wings.

Daddy didn't have wings. Mommy didn't have wings. But I've got wings.

Watch me fly. It just doesn't happen, right? It just doesn't happen. So in a word, in Darwin's word, saltation is the equivalent of a miracle.

For that to take place, that would be miraculous. At the extreme, it's virtually indistinguishable

from special creation. If a snake's egg hatched and a mouse emerged, we could classify this event as an instance of either this saltation type of mutation or a miracle.

You just don't breed snakes and have a mouse pop out. So Darwin emphatically rejected any evolutionary theory of this sort. He wrote in a letter to a colleague, he said, If I were convinced that I required such additions to the theory of natural selection, these miraculous changes within one generation, I would reject it as rubbish.

I would reject my whole theory as rubbish if we had to have these big leaps. I would give nothing for the theory of natural selection if it required miraculous additions at any one stage of descent. Do you understand what he's saying? There should be a smooth, exceedingly gradual change from generation to generation with no big leaps.

Or he says, if it takes a big leap, my whole theory is rubbish. So Darwin had to explain every complex characteristic, and the classic examples are eyes and wings. How do you evolve an eye? I mean, look at our eye.

You've got eyelids, eyelashes, you've got the iris and the lens and the pupil and the cornea and the muscles for pointing it this way and that. You've got the socket that houses it. You've got the optic nerve that connects it to the brain and all of the brain cells that are connected there to interpret.

You've got light patterns hitting a layer of cells in the back of your eye. Well, how does that turn into three-dimensional, full-color vision, right side up when the image is hitting your eyeball upside down? How does that all happen? Well, according to Darwinian evolution, it had to gradually occur. So you've got a blob of cells floating around in the muck somewhere, and it says, well, time to start working on the eye.

So how does this happen? Well, Stephen Jay Gould, a very famous evolutionary guy, asked himself this same question. Because the first step toward a new function such as vision or the ability to fly would not necessarily provide an advantage. If you just develop a little bit of a light-sensitive spot or a little forearm that has some webbing in its armpit or something, how does that make you more survivable? So Stephen Jay Gould asked himself the excellent question, what good is 5% of an eye? And he speculated that the first eye parts might have been useful for something other than sight.

This is the famous rejoinder that they come out with. Well, maybe it didn't start out to be an eye. Maybe it started out to be something else, and it just kind of turned into an eye later on.

Well, Richard Dawkins is a real famous evolutionist author. He wrote a book called *The Blind Watchmaker*. People say if you find a watch in the sand, it had to be made by somebody.

Richard Dawkins says, oh no, evolution is the blind watchmaker. It makes a watch, and it's dumb and unintelligent, unpowerful. It just happened.

And so he called his book *The Blind Watchmaker*. Well, this is what Richard Dawkins says. An ancient animal with 5% of an eye might indeed have used it for something other than sight, but it seems to me just as likely that it used it for 5% vision.

And actually, I don't think it is an excellent question. Vision that is 5% as good as yours or mine is very much worth having in comparison to no vision at all. So 1% vision is better than total blindness.

6% is better than 5. 7% better than 6, and so on up the gradual continual series. So Richard Dawkins says, well, your little blob of cells floating around there got a little light-sensitive spot, and that gave it a very slight advantage. And then the next one had a little bit more of a light-sensitive spot, and it just gradually developed, and each time it was better than its predecessors, and so that's the version that survived.

Well, here's what Philip Johnson, who wrote this book *Darwin on Trial*, by the way, the author is Philip E. Johnson. My copy is published by InterVarsity Press. The fallacy in the argument, Johnson says, is that 5% of an eye is not the same thing as 5% of normal vision.

For an animal to have any useful vision at all, many complex parts must be working together. Even a complete eye is useless unless it belongs to a creature with the mental and neural, nerve-like capacity to make use of the information by doing something that furthers survival or furthers reproduction. You could take your eye, pluck it out, stick it on a squid or stick it on a sea urchin or stick it on a starfish, and what good would it do? Or take somebody else's, take somebody else's eye and stick it on a starfish.

Does this suddenly confer an evolutionary advantage on this sea creature? Because it's not just the eye, it's everything that goes with it. You've got to have it connected to a brain who can do something with it, which can do something with it. What we have to imagine, Johnson says, is a chance mutation that provides this complex capacity all at once.

Because if you develop a light-sensitive spot, but that light-sensitive spot doesn't hook into the cell in such a way or into the organism in such a way that the organism says, oh, I see an enemy approaching, run away, run away. Well, he's going to be sitting there with his light-sensitive spot and get gobbled up just like the next guy. Right? So as soon as it evolves, it has to confer an advantage.

Any small change has to confer an advantage or it won't survive. Survival of the fittest, right? Genetic mutation, survival of the fittest. Each microscopic gradual change that Darwin said had to be part of this process, every time a very tiny change happens, it has to make the organism more survivable or it's not going to proliferate, it's not going to dominate, it's not going to replace the earlier version.

You could have some kind of a little organism, a little multicellular organism. It could get light spots all over it. It could be covered in eyes.

But if it doesn't survive any better than the non-eye guy, or if it slows him down because all the eyelashes are dragging through the seawater or whatever, then he's winking and blinking and he says, here it comes, here it comes, and then he gets eaten. There's no advantage. There's no advantage.

So do you see the fallacy in this argument? You think of the millions and millions and millions of mutations that had to occur just to move up one species to the next, to go from a lizard to something bigger and better than a lizard. Millions of mutations to change the skin. It has to confer an immediate advantage.

So think about wings. We're going to fly now. So the wing, this is another part of Johnson's article, which exists in quite distinct form in insects.

Think about an insect's wings like a dragonfly or a bumblebee or a bird with its muscle, skin tissue and feathers and so on, or a bat. With the first infinitesimally small inherited modification, those are Darwin's words, infinitesimally small inherited modification. So they say, well, the dinosaurs had feathers and some of them evolved into birds.

So the dinosaurs that they dig up have these little bitty front feet and big back feet. So he's running away and they say this is how wings on birds evolved. As he was running, some of them mutated and had little flaps of skin or wider arms.

So when he was running away, he could run a little faster because he was scooping the air. So this flap or web might help a small creature jump further or save it from breaking its neck in a fall or something like that. Eventually, such a proto-wing might develop to a point where the creature would begin gliding and by further gradual improvements, it would become capable of genuine flight.

Johnson says what this imaginative scenario neglects is that forelimbs evolved into wings would probably become very awkward for climbing or grasping, which are essential functions to stay alive and get your food and get away from predators. They would become awkward and cumbersome for those purposes long before they became useful for flying. So what are you going to do in the time in between your highly useful arm? I mean, imagine yourself.

You're going to evolve into a flying human being. So you're going to start getting flaps of skin on your arms and you're going to start getting webbing and as you run away from criminals or whatever, you're going to be able to run faster with this flapping skin and maybe you're starting to grow some feathers out your arms. But in the meantime, how are you going to function as a human being? It's going to interfere with a lot of things until they become fully functional wings.

How did these animals get along? What sustained them in that awkward phase between the goofy arms and the moderately functional wings? Well, there's no explanation for this. Not only that, now listen to me. There is no fossil evidence for this.

They find no fossilized animals with intermediate wing arms. Either they have little arms or they have wings. They don't have something in between.

Never found any fossils of these transitional types. Same thing with eyes. If the eye evolved at all, it had to evolve many times in the different parts of the evolutionary tree.

The eye had to get started in a lot of different lines because there are many different kinds of eye. Ernest Mayer writes that the eye must have evolved independently at least 40 times. A circumstance would suggest to him that a highly complicated organ can evolve repeatedly and convergently when it's an advantage, if that evolution can happen at all.

But, if that's true, why did the many primitive eye forms that are still with us never evolve into more advanced forms? We have many animals that have very primitive eyes and they've never evolved any further. We've got little organisms that are light sensitive, and evidently they've been light sensitive for millions and millions of years. Why didn't they evolve any further? They're still light sensitive.

There's single-celled animals with a light sensitive spot that have a little pigment screen behind it. There's some many-celled animals that have a similar arrangement that's set into a cup, and that cup gives it some direction finding because whichever way the cup is facing, that must be where the light's coming from. The ancient Nautilus, you know the Nautilus that's down in the sea, has a pinhole system, kind of like a pinhole camera, and it's just this light that comes through a pinhole.

There's no lens or anything like that. And the Nautilus is unchanged. You can find fossilized Nautili that go back to the quote-unquote dawn of time, and they're still the same today.

Why didn't their eye evolve and get any better? Well, they can't explain this. And so we don't have transitional, we don't see ancient Nautiluses with their little pinhole eye changing shape and becoming more and more complex. We don't find fossils with half an eye or with a 40% eye.

They either have some sort of functional, visual, light-sensing system, or they don't. We don't see these intermediate transitional elements whatsoever. Well, we had a question on the break which I wanted to address because it's addressed in this chapter.

Now, all of this is just in one chapter of this book, and I'm just giving you this as a sample because there are valid, scientific, reasonable arguments against evolution. There's plenty in the Bible as well, and we're going to close with some scriptures that demonstrate why the secular materialist empirical model of evolution is anti-Bible and anti-Christian. But you can be a thinking, intelligent, scientifically inquiring mind and still believe the word of God, and you can still find the holes in evolution using their own methodology.

For example, these scenarios are speculation. There's another book by a guy named Denton called *Evolution, a Theory in Crisis*. That's written at a little bit more technical level.

But he describes the avian feather, feathers on birds. Have you ever been out on a walk and you found a bird feather laying on the ground? You pick it up and you look at it, and if you look at it closely, if you look at it in a magnifying glass, you see how infinitely complex it is with the little fibers coming off of each larger fiber. Did you know that bird feathers have a very sophisticated system of hooks and places for those hooks to engage? It's kind of like Velcro, and when a bird spreads its wings to fly, the wings interlock, otherwise the air would just go flopping through the feathers and the bird would just flap helplessly and fall to the ground.

What holds the spread feathers of a bird's wing together? They've got a very sophisticated system of hooks, like Velcro, that hook each adjacent feather and provide this sort of parachute-like surface. It's very sophisticated. Now, why would that evolve in an arm turning into a feather-flapping thing? It confers no advantage until you actually start to fly.

Did that just happen to occur along with the mutation that happened to create feathers, that happened to make the arms bigger, that happened to give the animal the flapping motion? Along with that, it's not just that birds have wings with feathers, birds have hollow bones. How did that come along? It just happened to also evolve hollow bones? They also have a very sophisticated breathing system. The avian lung is quite different in structure than that of any conceivable evolutionary ancestor.

Birds breathe differently than any kind of a lizard, any kind of putative ancestor breathes, and they have to because of the nature of their metabolism. To replenish the oxygen in their wing-flapping muscles requires a very special, delicately balanced system of supply. This is why birds have dark meat and white meat, because it's a whole different kind of muscle to do those rapid flapping motions.

Here's a quote from Denman. Just how such a different respiratory system could have evolved gradually from the standard vertebrate design is fantastically difficult to envisage, especially bearing in mind that the maintenance of respiratory function is absolutely vital to the life of an organism to the extent that the slightest malfunction leads to death within minutes. Just as the feather cannot function as an organ of flight until the hooks and barbules are co-adapted to fit together perfectly, so the avian lung cannot function as an organ of respiration until the parabronchi system, which permeates it, and the air sac system, which guarantees the parabronchi their air supply, are both highly developed and able to function together in a perfectly integrated manner.

One part doesn't work without the other. The hooks don't work without the barbules, the air sacs don't work without the parabronchi, and vice versa. They all have to be there together, or it doesn't function.

This idea has been called irreducible complexity, and a lot of people make a bunch of fun of Michael Behe and saying that it's all been debunked and so on. It has not. There are so many examples, you can't even count them.

Well, if you want a fascinating read into the scientific reasons to question evolution, even if I was an unbeliever and didn't think there was a God and didn't think Genesis happened, I still couldn't swallow evolution just based on the scientific evidence alone. And this is a great book, Darwin on Trial, Philip E. Johnson. It's worth a read.

This one cost me \$15. But you could get it anyway. Pass it around.

But I want to conclude with some things from our major book that I recommended to you at the beginning, So What's the Difference by Fritz Reidenauer. This is what he says at the close of the chapter on evolution. In summary, and this is a great summary, Isaac Asimov said that simple forms of life came into being more than 3 billion years ago and have formed spontaneously from non-living matter.

That's what he believed, and that's kind of a statement of the standard view. But Asimov's statement, this is what Fritz Reidenauer says, it reminds him of a story he heard one time. It seems that one scientist was picked by his peers to tell God that because they had figured out how to clone people, that all the other scientific miracles had become an everyday occurrence, they didn't need God anymore.

It's kind of the God of the gaps idea. We figured everything out so we don't need God anymore. So they said, you're the scientist to go tell God that science has everything figured out and we don't need you anymore.

So the scientist went up to God and told him it was time for him to retire or get lost. You know, you're all done. We've explained everything now.

So after listening patiently, God said, very well, how about this? Let's have a man-making contest. The scientist said, okay, great, because we just learned how to clone humans, so I'm all set. So God said, but we're going to do this the same way I did it back in the old days with Adam.

Sure, no problem, said the scientist as he bent down and grabbed a handful of dirt. God smiled and said, no, no, no, you go get your own dirt. This is the problem with a lot of scientific investigation today, isn't it? Is that they're starting with parts that God already made.

They're starting with a genome and saying, look how this can be made to change if we play with it. Let's see the scientists go make their own DNA. Start with their own organic molecules and so on.

But in summary, Reidenhauer says that although evolutionists and naturalism believers think that life came about in an unsupervised fashion, the Bible teaches that there is a mighty and personal God who lovingly and caringly created the universe, the earth, and all the living creatures in it. This is Genesis chapter 1. This is Psalm 24, 1. The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein. He created it.

He has founded it. Romans chapter 1, verses 18 through 20, we've reviewed that many times. Evolution teaches that there is no purpose and no meaning in life.

It's just a random accident. But the Bible teaches that creation clearly demonstrates God's glory. There is a purpose in the universe.

There is a purpose on this earth. There is a purpose in life. Once again, Psalm 19, Romans 1, 18 through 20.

Jesus Christ was there at the beginning. John chapter 1, we've just seen this on Sunday mornings. God offers eternal life to transcend this physical universe in the same way that we've recognized in recent days that 95% of the universe is unobservable because there are kinds of matter and kinds of energy that are not part of this visible universe.

We understand that there is a greater environment where God and the angels dwell. And God is going to take us to that place. Jesus has gone there to prepare a place for us.

John 14, I go to prepare a place for you. Evolutionism claims there is nothing special or sacred about humanity. We're no better than animals.

Why should you care any more about a person than you do any other animal life? Evolution therefore says that basically you're a victim of your environment. It's like a giant pachinko machine. Forces were set in motion in the past and that's what drives your decisions now.

You can't really help it because you're just a product of your environment and a product of these accidents. You don't really have free will. And natural selection does away with moral values.

Survival of the fittest is the only guiding principle. Well, we'll resume our study next time. But just be thankful that God is in his heaven and he's revealed himself in his word.

Father, thank you for the truth of your word. Thank you for the Lord Jesus Christ who rescues us from this lost and corrupted world. We pray that God the Holy Spirit will remind us of who we are and why we're here in the days ahead.

We ask it in Jesus' name. Amen.