

Bible Special 06-09-26b

Let's resume now our investigation of the manifestation of secular humanism in science, which shows its face to us as evolution. It is the alternative, indeed the only alternative explanation, with even a pretense of viability, to the religious explanation, as we would call it, or they would call it, the biblical explanation, the true explanation, of where life came from, where the universe came from, that there is intelligence and there is purpose, and there is directed power behind what we see around us. And our intuition really tells us this.

If you sit and watch any reasonably developed form of life for very long, I suppose you could stare at a piece of grass or something and not get this effect, but if I sit and watch a goldfish swimming or watch an ant, when I was a little boy living out in Barstow, we had these great giant red ants. Of course, they probably weren't that big. I was much smaller at the time, but they seemed big.

But, you know, they're fascinating to watch, and you can watch one come up out of the earth and go about his business in his little antenna. Later on, when I was junior high age, I sent off to the Edmund Scientific Company, and I got a thing called a Penscope. It looked like a pen, went in your pocket, but you could open it up, and it had a 30-power microscope, which is a wonderful magnification, because it's not so big that you start having trouble, you know, what's what, and many of us have messed with a microscope, and you can hardly find what you're looking at, and it's dim and hard to see, and unless you spend a lot of money, you can't get really good lenses.

But at 30 power, it's amazing the detail that you can see. I remember one day vividly, it was the summertime in Oklahoma, and I was out in the front yard of our home, and I slapped my arm, and there was a sweat bee there, and I basically just kind of stunned him. I didn't crush him or kill him, it just kind of kept him from flying away, and he was crawling on my arm, and I thought, oh, I had my Penscope in the pocket of my jeans there, and I pulled it out, and I looked at him through the Penscope, and I was stunned.

It was like watching a science fiction movie. I could see the facets of his eyes, and he had all of these bristly hairs sticking out, and he had these articulated legs, and this little proboscis in the front of his head, and his wings and the glistening surfaces of these clear veins, and there were hairs and little pads and things on his... I was just stunned. I had just been swatting sweat bees all my life, and I had never stopped and looked at one to see the incredible complexity.

It's got its own guidance and flight system. It's got its own senses for altitude and direction and controlling of wings and landing and taking off and feeding and reproducing and all of this. If you gave these specifications to an engineering company, a scientific company, and said, look, I'd like you to design me a robot that's about an eighth of an inch long, and I want it to be able to navigate all kinds of surfaces, upside down, right side up.

I want it to be able to fly at such and such a speed and land at the drop of a hat, and I want it to be able to do all the things that an ant or a fruit fly can do, the company would throw up its hands in hopeless disbelief that you'd ask such a thing, and yet God does it every day. There is intelligence, and our intuition, our innate common sense tells us this is not the kind of thing that happens accidentally. Well, if you choose to reject God, you don't want to believe that there even is a God.

You are now pretty much required to come up with an explanation for how things got here. How can all of this be accounted for if there is no God? And this is what evolution has done. Indeed, Richard Dawkins, who is a very famous, he's a zoologist.

He did a lot of his work at Oxford in England, and he's very famous because back in the mid-1980s, he wrote a book called *The Blind Watchmaker*, where he very succinctly offers the arguments for evolution, and he said, Darwin made it possible to be an intellectually fulfilled atheist. I now have an explanation for things that doesn't require God, is what he's saying when he says, science made it possible for me to be an atheist and have a rationale for it, have an explanation. That's what he's saying.

Darwin made it possible to be an intellectually fulfilled atheist. Here's something else, by the way, that Richard Dawkins said. He just came out with a new book.

It's called *The God Delusion*, where he makes an all-out attack and assault on all religions, and Christianity in particular. But this is a quote from him from earlier days. This is what Richard Dawkins said.

Now listen, because he's talking about you. It is absolutely safe to say that if you meet somebody who claims not to believe in evolution, that person is ignorant, stupid, or insane. If you meet somebody who claims not to believe in evolution, that person is ignorant, stupid, or insane.

Or wicked, but I'd rather not consider that. He goes on in that same book to say that the thing that he dislikes the most about creationists is that they're intolerant. How tolerant is it to say anybody that doesn't believe my way of thinking is ignorant, stupid, or insane? Or maybe wicked.

Well, that's Richard Dawkins. We talked in the first session about one half of this two-legged stance on which evolution rests. Evolution is defined as the process of life developing into higher and higher forms by means of natural selection and mutation.

Mutation makes a change. Natural selection causes that change to become dominant. And I made the major point.

There's a plethora of points. You can pursue reading in all of this ad nauseum. I just want to give you a few fundamental principles.

If you get into a discussion, you don't want to be an ignorant Christian. Don't fulfill the prophecy that says if you don't believe in evolution, that person is ignorant. We want to be people who don't believe in evolution, and we're not ignorant.

In fact, we know the science better than they do. So, here's the thing to remember. And I'm only giving you a few things.

There are many more. But here's one thing to remember about natural selection. Do you remember what I talked about in the first session on natural selection? What's the problem with it? The whole description of evolution is that these tiny, tiny incremental changes happen.

But each change, the only reason it persists and becomes a part of the ongoing upward evolution of the organism is that it confers an advantage. A change cannot last if it doesn't confer an advantage. Only those organisms that are most successful at reproduction are going to perpetuate changes.

Now, these changes come about by the other leg of evolution, which is mutation. These are changes at the molecular or DNA level. The difficulty that they have discovered is that oftentimes, a change in DNA or a change in the genes, and we're not even talking about where did life come from, we're assuming that life is already here and that it is somehow moving up the chain of complexity to greater and greater things.

But assuming all of that for the moment, many of these changes that we observe, scientists can induce mutations, they can go in and goof with the genes and make things change. But many times, if you change a gene to create one benefit, it carries a side effect somewhere else. I was reading an article where it talked about the genes that control how long we live.

Dr. Gobble gave me a great article out of the paper on scientific studies. They've identified a gene that helps determine how long we live. And so they said, well, let's see if we can make people live longer.

We'll test this in mice. We'll develop a breed of mouse, and we'll eliminate this gene that says you're going to age and get older and die at a certain point. We'll just take that gene out so that maybe we'll just have immortal mice and they'll never die.

So they did this, and what they discovered is that when they turn that gene off, that makes the organism age. The reason it ages is because of a change in the balance of proteins and things that control how your cells divide. And what happens is the aging gene makes your cells slow down in division as you get older.

And as you have a cell that's the product of a division of a division of a division of a division, it says, let's slow this dividing down. Well, that's basically aging. So we turn that off, and your cells can just divide, divide, divide, divide, divide, divide, divide.

Well, do you know what we call rampant cell division? Cancer. And by turning off aging, the

organism started developing cancer right off the bat, because there was no control over their cell division. So this gene, and of course the scientists said, well, it has evolved to ensure that the organism is going to age progressively and not be cancer-ridden.

What I find interesting about that argument is how can that possibly be selected for? Because if you think about natural selection, what is natural selection again? What is the definition of it? It is that organism which is most successful at what? Reproduction. Once you reproduce, it doesn't matter how great you are. You can be the oldest lived thing in the world.

It doesn't matter. Your transfer of helpful attributes stops at the point that you reproduce. Reproduction typically takes place in the earlier part of an organism's life.

So what if you live a long time? That doesn't confer a selective advantage. If anything, it's a selective disadvantage to your species because there's a bunch more old ones hanging on. This is a problem in our society, isn't it? Oh, look, how are we going to pay all the social security for these old people? It's dragging down the young ones.

We need to get rid of the old people so the young ones can move up into jobs. These old people who are hanging on to their jobs and living longer and being smarter and healthier and all that. Why now the young ones can't move up and take more senior jobs.

These old people are all in the way. They've already reproduced. So think about it.

What's the logic? There's no selective pressure. There's no selective advantage to living a long time. Because once you reproduce, your contribution to the gene pool is over with.

And there's no advantage to living a long time. It's a disadvantage. You're getting in the way of the young ones.

So the most successful species would be those that are robust and healthy and can do all kinds of things, get away from predators, feed well, find mates, reproduce, and then keel over and die. Because if you hang around, you're just getting in the way, eating the food and breathing the air and drinking the water of all the ones that need to come up behind you and do a good job of reproducing. So anything, I mean, how do you explain menopause? How do you explain a lot of things that take place after reproduction? How did those things evolve when there's absolutely no possible way for selection to improve them? Well, this is a question, of course, evolution can't answer.

There is no selective advantage to tiny mutations. If they are significant enough to actually affect the survivability of the organism, they are typically so radical that they break the organism. You know, if you get mutations that are very radical, they almost always end up being lethal.

And this has been proven in experimentation. So they're arguing two conflicting ideas, that very gradual mutations will nevertheless confer an advantage, and that advantage is going to be

significant enough, that that genetic mutation is going to perpetuate itself all the way through the species and replace the earlier version of the species with a new and better and improved version, and yet it's so minute and gradual that it doesn't harm it in any way. Well, this requires a series of miracles, hundreds and thousands and millions of successive miracles to get from single-celled organisms all the way up to elephants and giraffes and lions and tigers and so on.

Now, there are so many things we could cover, but I want to talk about the fossil record. People say, well, you know, the fossils, that just puts creationism out of its misery. The fossils totally refute biblical creationism.

No, they don't. In fact, the fossils are a great embarrassment for Darwinian evolution, because evolution requires this gradual change, right? You don't have things just magically appearing. Evolution can't account for that.

You can't have a big mutation where one day a reptile egg hatches and out pops a bird. Evolution can't explain and can't account and can't offer any sort of rationale for that happening. You have to have a slightly different reptile and a slightly different reptile and a slightly, slightly different over millions of years.

Listen, there are fossil beds that are continuous. We have one right here in the United States up in Wyoming. It covers, in an unbroken record, five million years of evolution.

All scientists acknowledge that this fossil bed is an unbroken record of evolution. And guess what? There are no transitional forms. There is no evidence of gradual change from one species to another in that record.

The fossils instead show, and the other thing is, when a new version of the species comes out with that improved genetic attribute, it's got a better wing or a better leg or a better beak or a better eye, it has to supplant and replace the earlier version of that organism. If it doesn't, the same thing is going to happen as taking your poodles and your Dobermans and your collies and all your other kinds of dogs and putting thousands of them together and leaving them for years and years. Everything is going to migrate back to the middle.

The genetic mutation, the improvement is going to be absorbed and lost and diluted in the gene pool. When you get an advantage, it has to replace the earlier versions and become the dominant feature. And then the next little incremental change, that has to dominate and totally replace all the others and so on.

Each little incremental change has to replace and supplant earlier versions. If it doesn't, if those two versions can interbreed, that feature won't be selected for. I mean, natural selection is not happening, right? The earlier version is just as good as the later version, so it's not being naturally selected and it's going to be absorbed back into the gene pool.

So it has to be an advantage, and such an advantage that all earlier forms disappear. Well, the problem is, many of the animals that they say are precursors of modern animals, never died

out. They're still here.

How can you explain this? Well, it mutated and then a giant ocean current washed it over someplace where it was no longer competing with the earlier version. This is the kind of argument they try to make. But there are continuous fossil beds.

There are still, to this day, no actual transitional fossils for some of the major vertebrates. For example, and this again is acknowledging a debt here to Philip Johnson in his book, in the middle of the book here, fish, according to evolution, turned into amphibious creatures, both sea and land, right? Crawled out like a salamander or something. So fish species developed the ability to climb out of the water and move onto the land, except no specific fossil fish species has been identified as an amphibian ancestor.

There's no fossilized fish, and they say, look, here's the ancestor of all the amphibians. There are some extinct fish called ripidistians. That starts with R-H and the rest of it sounds like it's pronounced.

Ripidistians, Darwin described them as an ancestral group. The ripidistians have skeletal features resembling early amphibians, including bones that look like they could have evolved into legs. But when you look at scientific textbooks, there's one called vertebrate history, none of the known fishes is thought to be directly ancestral to the earliest land vertebrates.

Most of them lived after the first amphibians appeared. When you look in the fossil record, these fish that they say, oh, look, this has a thing that looks like it might turn into a leg. They live after fossils that are amphibians.

Now that can't be evolution. They can't be an ancestor if they live after. Your grandpa is not going to be born 20 years from now, right? So where is the ancestor of the amphibians? There is no ancestor for the amphibians in the fossil record.

None. Zero. Zilch.

Science won't tell you this. Your evolution science textbook won't tell you this. Where did the amphibians come from? There is not the first shred of fossil evidence.

Then evolution says amphibians turned into reptiles. Now what's a reptile? These are your lizards, right? Your dinosaurs are thought to have been reptiles. No satisfactory candidate exists to document this transition.

There are fossil amphibians called Cimoria that have some reptile-like skeletal characteristics, but they are too late in the fossil record. Recent evidence indicates they were true amphibians. They are not a transition into reptiles.

The transition is hard to document in any case because there are important differences that are in the soft tissues, and those don't fossilize. You can't see the reproductive organs. You can't

see whether it laid eggs or not.

But listen to this. Amphibians supposedly turned into reptiles, right? This is what evolution says. Amphibians lay their eggs in the water.

This is like your frogs. Have you ever seen frog eggs? They are little blobs in long tubes and things. They sit in the shallow parts of a pond.

Well, those eggs turn into little larvae. Have you ever seen tadpoles swimming around? They develop in the water. They pop out of their eggs and then they develop while they are swimming around.

Tadpoles gradually turn into frogs. That's how amphibians, all amphibians, that's how they reproduce. How do reptiles reproduce? Think about little alligators and turtles and things.

What happens when an egg hatches? Reptiles lay a hard shell cased egg and the young are perfect little replicas of their parents at birth. Little baby alligators come right out and bite your finger. They are all ready to go.

They are not little tadpoles. No explanation exists for how an amphibian could have developed a reptilian mode of reproduction by Darwinian means. It's a big huge vacuum.

There is no explanation. So now, think about this. Maybe next week you are going to be talking to somebody who believes in evolution.

They are going to say, oh, you are just some kind of a Christian nutcase. And you say, okay, well explain this to me then. How did fish become amphibians? What ancestral species of fish became amphibians? They won't know.

Say, okay, well tell me this. Which amphibians turned into reptiles? They won't know. There is no scientist on earth that knows.

Because they have no fossil evidence at all. Okay, how about reptiles to mammals? The evolutionists say reptiles turned into mammals. Cold-blooded became warm-blooded.

Things that lay eggs that hatch out as perfect replicas of their parents became these little blind things that have to nurse and be nurtured in order to grow up. So, they typically go to things technically like jaw structure and so on to define the difference between a reptile and a mammal. A mammal typically has a solid jaw bone.

A reptile has multiple bones in its jaw, the lower jaw especially. Well, there is no line. They can't trace a line.

Here is a fossilized species. This is the reptile that was the proto-mammal. They have lots of species that have mammal-like characteristics, especially when they look at, again, they can't see the soft tissues, but they can look at the jaw bones.

They say, look, this jaw bone is almost like a mammal. Some of these fossilized species, they say, you know, this is so intermediate between a reptile and a mammal that we can't tell really which it is. We don't know how to classify it.

It might be a reptile, it might be a mammal. We just don't know. Well, in fact, here is what Douglas Futuyama says.

He is a scientist, and he says, the gradual transition from therapsid reptiles to mammals is so abundantly documented by scores of species in every stage of transition that it is impossible to tell which therapsid species were the actual ancestors of modern mammals. And that sounds like, well, gee, there is just so much abundant fossil evidence. There are so many of these reptiles that look like mammals, so many mammals that look like reptiles.

It is just hard to tell which one turned into what. And this seems to be an argument for evolution. But Johnson says, look, large numbers of eligible candidates are a plus only to the extent that they can be placed in a single line of descent that can conceivably lead from a particular reptile species to a particular early mammal descendant.

The presence of similarities in many different species that are outside of any possible ancestral line only draws attention to the fact that these similarities don't imply ancestry. If there are all of these candidates, but only one of them was the ancestral line, then why are there so many others that look so similar? Looking similar doesn't mean it's an ancestor, by their own account. Look at all these that look similar, and they're not the ancestor, is what he's saying.

So just because they look the same doesn't mean that one evolved into the other. And what it means is there's just a lot of animals that look real similar. It doesn't mean any one of them evolved into another.

The notion that mammals in general evolved from reptiles in general through a broad jump of diverse therapsid lines is not Darwinism. Darwinian transformation requires a single line of ancestral descent. You can't have a bunch of reptiles all turning into a bunch of mammals.

But, that's what the fossil evidence would seem to suggest. A few people have actually tried to do this. This is what they call making mammals a polyphyletic group.

That's a fancy way of saying, instead of one phylum of mammals, and one mammal that was the granddaddy atom of all subsequent mammals, maybe there were a bunch of reptiles that all turned into mammals around the same time. And there are multiple lines. But the problem here is, if you don't have a single ancestor, then how do you explain the common characteristics of all of the mammals that are explained by having a common ancestor? They all nurse, they all have blind and helpless babies, and this evolved several times all separately, and the odds of the same thing occurring separately and then developing similar bone structures, and similar coping mechanisms, and similar lactation, and all the rest of it, is just astronomically beyond belief.

So, there is no satisfactory solution for figuring out, from the fossil record, how reptiles could have turned into mammals. So, what are the problems now? I mean, just the ones that we've looked at, and I could give you many more, but we can't show, in evolution, how fish turned into amphibians from the fossil record. We can't show from the fossil record how amphibians turned into reptiles.

We can't show in the fossil record how reptiles turned into mammals. They also say that reptiles turned into birds, and they have one little example, where they say, oh, look, here's a feathered lizard, and we think it turned into a bird, and that's the Archaeopteryx. You may have heard of it.

So, it's a possible bird ancestor. You can score one point for the evolutionists and say, well, if you think reptiles turned into birds, you've got Archaeopteryx. You've got one possible, there's no proof, but it's possible that Archaeopteryx is an intermediate form, that the evidence could be interpreted either way.

This is what Johnson says. Persons who come to the fossil evidence as convinced Darwinists will see a stunning confirmation of the theory when they look at Archaeopteryx. Skeptics will see only a lonely exception to a consistent pattern of fossil disconfirmation.

The fossil record seems to refute Darwinism on every other score, and here's one exception where, well, okay, here's a fossil that might make your point. If we are testing Darwinism rather than merely looking for a confirming example, a single good candidate is not enough to save a theory that pauses a worldwide history of continued evolutionary transformation. Then you have from apes to humans.

That's probably a subject all on its own, but the point here is, what happened with Darwinism? Scientists didn't go to the fossil record and go to the molecules and go to the facts that exist in the world around us and say, what's the best explanation for these facts? They start with the theory of evolution, and then they make their observations and they fit those observations into the theory. Now, this is the same kind of thing that can happen in Bible interpretation. If you come to the Bible as a Calvinist, believing that God is sovereign and man doesn't really have free will, and then you impose that thinking on all of the passages of Scripture, and you shoehorn Scripture into your preconceived notion, we call that bad theology.

That's bad interpretation. That's eisegesis. You've already made up your mind and you're just trying to find proof for it in Scripture.

Well, this is exactly true in the same way in science. If you've already made up your mind that evolution happened, then you're going to try to shoehorn every new fossil find and every new experimental observation and every new piece of scientific evidence into your preconceived notion. And it isn't any better as a means of science than it is as a means of theology.

We want to be good students. We want to learn by objectively looking at the evidence and

finding the best possible explanation. That's good science.

And you can be a good scientist and be a Christian. You can be a good Bible interpreter as a Christian by developing consistently the objectivity that says, here is the evidence. What is the best conclusion to draw? And so we find that our worldview as we develop it studying Scripture is consistent when we turn those same skills to looking at the scientific evidence.

What is the best explanation? And the explanation offered by materialism and evolution is sorely, sorely lacking. But for the Darwinist, for the secular humanist, there is no alternative. He refuses the Creator and he's stuck with Darwinism.

He has to make it work because there's no other explanation available. So they'll make a lot of compromises. Well, we'll pick up in our study of this subject next time.

Father, thank you for the truth of your word. Thank you for revealing reality to us. We pray that God, the Holy Spirit, will remind us of who we are and why we're here, shining his lights in a dark place.

We ask it in Jesus' name. Amen.