

# Contents

*Introduction* 7

## UNIT 1 **Claim: Evolution is Science**

Chapter 1 **Argument: Creationism is Religion, Not Science** 17

Chapter 2 **Argument: Evolution is Compatible with Christian Religion** 33

Chapter 3 **Evolution is True Science, Not “Just a Theory”** 49

## UNIT 2 **Claim: Evolution is Well Supported by the Evidence**

Chapter 4 **Argument: Natural Selection Leads to Speciation** 71

Chapter 5 **Argument: Some Mutations are Beneficial** 99

Chapter 6 **Argument: Common Design Points to Common Ancestry** 107

Chapter 7 **Argument: “Bad Design” is Evidence of Leftovers from Evolution** 113

Chapter 8 **Argument: The Fossil Record Supports Evolution** 128

**UNIT 3 Claim: “Problems” with Evolution are Illusory**

Chapter 9	<b>Probability of Evolution</b>	157
Chapter 10	<b>Irreducible Complexity</b>	167
Chapter 11	<b>Evolution of Sex</b>	181
Chapter 12	<b>Evolution of Mankind</b>	193
Appendix 1	<b>Common Arguments for Evolution That Have Been Rejected</b>	207
Appendix 2	<b>Common Arguments for Creation That Should Not Be Used</b>	219

# Introduction

**B**elief in creation is ‘nonsense.’ Creation is “a religious view that has nothing to do with science.” Daily, the airwaves and newspaper racks are filled with such inflammatory claims.

The barrage of new arguments and scientific ‘evidence’ that ‘prove’ evolution can seem overwhelming to believers in the Word of God, who are ridiculed as irrational religious zealots who still live in the dark ages because they believe the Bible’s fables about creation. It is more crucial than ever that believers are ‘ready’ to defend their faith (1 Peter 3:15).

This book pulls together the most powerful arguments that Christians are likely to hear from today’s leading evolutionary scientists. These arguments come from two powerhouses in the media—PBS-TV and the journal *Scientific American*—which have taken up the mantle of the pro-evolution crusade, preaching their message to a broad market around the world. PBS summarized the modern arguments for evolution in its lavish eight-hour series on *Evolution*, which still re-airs and is shown in schools across America. It has also aired in Australia. *Scientific American* pulled together its own best arguments in a combative cover story, “15 Answers to Creationist Nonsense.”

## **PBS-TV’s Evolution series—multimillion-dollar propaganda**

The Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) first aired its ambitious TV series *Evolution* in September 2001. Co-produced by Clear Blue Sky Productions (founded and chaired by Microsoft billionaire Paul Allen), *Evolution* had almost unlimited funding. In addition to the TV series, the producers launched an aggressive campaign to fully equip teachers to indoctrinate young people in molecules-to-man evolution. This propaganda effort included

## Refuting Evolution 2

“an unprecedented array of resources for further learning at home and in school” (their own words), including a free teacher’s guide, an interactive Web site, a multimedia Web library, teacher videos, monthly newsletters, student lessons and teacher training workshops.

To avoid the impression that *Evolution* was one-sided propaganda, the producers claimed that they invited the Discovery Institute, part of the ‘intelligent design’ movement,<sup>1</sup> for ‘balance’. But the Discovery Institute declined because they would have been slotted in the ‘religious’ objections segments, whereas their objections to evolution are purely scientific. By failing to provide space to the scientific criticism of evolution, the PBS/Nova series gave the impression that the only criticisms of evolution are ‘religious’. They also ignored the self-declared atheistic faith of many of evolution’s proponents, including several of those involved in the series, e.g. Richard Dawkins, Daniel Dennett, the late Stephen Jay Gould, Edward O. Wilson and Eugenie Scott.

The PBS overview of this program leaves no doubts about the producers’ worshipful attitude toward evolution:

Evolution plays a critical role in our daily lives, yet it is one of the most overlooked principles of life. It is the mechanism that determines who lives, who dies, and who gets the opportunity to pass traits on to the next generation, and the next, and the next. ... Evolution [is] the underpinning of all of biology, affecting our health, our food supply and the vast web of life. ... It’s such a simple theory, yet we see millions of examples of it at work in our everyday lives....

The goal of *Evolution* is to heighten public awareness about what evolution is and how it works, and to dispel common misunderstandings. The project seeks to illuminate why evolution is relevant, to improve its teaching, and to encourage a national dialogue on the issues currently surrounding this science.<sup>2</sup>

- 
1. See Wieland, C., “CMI’s views on the Intelligent Design Movement,” [creation.com/idm](http://creation.com/idm), 30 August 2002.
  2. PBS Web site, “Evolution project overview,” [www.pbs.org/wgbh/evolution/about/overview\\_project.html](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/evolution/about/overview_project.html).

Such in-your-face propaganda demands an answer from Christians who believe the biblical account of origins.

### **Scientific American's '15 Answers to Creationist Nonsense'**

*Scientific American* is a semi-popular journal which publishes attractively illustrated and fairly detailed, but not overly technical, articles, mostly on science. It is not a peer-reviewed journal like *Nature* or the in-depth *Journal of Creation*,<sup>3</sup> but many of its articles are very useful.

Yet behind the surface is a deeper agenda. The most recent editors, as will be explained in this book, have been working to push an atheistic worldview. Further, they have been pushing a number of corollaries in the guise of 'science', such as a radical pro-abortion, human cloning and population control agenda.

Evidence of *Scientific American's* agenda was its refusal to hire a science writer named Forrest Mims III after he admitted he was a creationist and pro-life. The editor who rejected Mims admitted that his work was 'fabulous', 'great' and 'first rate', and 'should be published somewhere'.<sup>4</sup> *Scientific American* subsequently published an article about his revolutionary atmospheric haze detector, although it did not mention the incident of blatant discrimination.<sup>5</sup>

John Rennie (b. 1959), editor in chief from 1994 to 2009, has fervently promoted the anti-God evolution agenda. Like many anti-creationist propagandists, he often launches into attacks against creationists with a poor understanding of their position. Additionally, he has only a bachelor's degree in science, so is far less qualified than the leading creationist scientists, who have

---

3. Published by *Creation Ministries International*.

4. "Science's Litmus Test" (telephone transcript of conversation between Forrest Mims and Jonathan Piel, then editor of *Scientific American*), *Harper's Magazine*, March 1991. The transcript makes it clear that an outstanding writer was not hired for disbelieving in the sacred cow of evolution (and a 'woman's right to choose' [to kill her unborn]).

5. Carlson, S., "The amateur scientist," *Scientific American* 276(5):80–81, May 1997.

Ph.D.s from leading secular universities.<sup>6</sup>

Yet this did not stop his activism at the height of the controversy in Kansas over changes to de-emphasize evolution in the state education standards. Rennie personally urged scientists on university admissions committees to adopt ‘big stick’ tactics in bullying the Kansas governor and the state board of education. He urged them to proclaim that ‘in light of the newly lowered education standards in Kansas, the qualifications of any students applying from that state in the future will have to be considered very carefully.’<sup>7</sup> In logic, this is known as the fallacy of *Argumentum ad baculum*, i.e. ‘Agree with me or else unpleasant consequences will follow!’ Rennie is far from the only evolutionist to resort to this.

Rennie became more actively involved in the fray, taking on the role of the valiant B.Sc. scientist trying to stem the creationist tide. His diatribe “15 Answers to Creationist Nonsense” is subtitled “Opponents of evolution want to make a place for creationism by tearing down real science, but their arguments don’t hold up.” Even the magazine’s cover had splashed on the top, “15 ways to expose creationist nonsense.”

But as will be shown, Rennie—and the anti-creationist leaders that he represents—have only the vaguest ideas about real creationist arguments. Many of the ‘creationist arguments’ that they attack are straw men which serious creationists have also rejected. (These bad arguments are listed in Appendix 2 of this book, page 219.) Rennie’s other arguments in defense of evolution are also nothing new, and have been mostly answered on the *Creation Ministries International* website [creation.com](http://creation.com). One purpose of this book is to help Christians recognize and answer the logical fallacies common among evolutionists, including inconsistent definitions of the word ‘evolution’—*equivocation*, and failure to differentiate between ‘origins science’ and ‘operational science’ (explained in detail on page 22). It will also point out that evolutionary belief is largely a deduction from materialistic axioms, which Rennie actually acknowledges, and lamely tries to defend.

---

6 See for example [creation.com/creation-scientists](http://creation.com/creation-scientists).

7. Cited in: Johnson, P., *The Wedge of Truth: Splitting the Foundations of Naturalism*, p. 80, InterVarsity Press, Illinois, 2000.

Rennie argues that creation has no place in science and has done nothing for the advancement of science. Yet he completely misses the irony that *Scientific American* was founded by a staunch believer in creation—the artist and inventor Rufus Porter (1792–1884), who thought that science glorified the creator God. In the very first issue, his editorial stated:

We shall advocate the pure Christian religion, without favouring any particular sect ... <sup>8</sup>

The founder of *Scientific American* also wrote an astonishing article in that issue, ‘Rational Religion,’ which bluntly declares that we all depend on the Creator God, who revealed Himself in Holy Scripture. Porter’s godly admonition is worth rereading:

First, then, let us, as rational creatures, be ever ready to acknowledge God as our Creator and daily Preserver; and that we are each of us individually dependant on his special care and good will towards us, in supporting the wonderful action of nature which constitutes our existence; and in preserving us from the casualties, to which our complicated and delicate structure is liable. Let us also, knowing our entire dependence on Divine Benevolence, as rational creatures, do ourselves the honor to express personally and frequently, our thanks to him for his goodness; and to present our petitions to Him for the favours which we constantly require. This course is rational, even without the aid of revelation: but being specially invited to this course, by the divine word, and assured of the readiness of our Creator to answer our prayers and recognize our thanks, it is truly surprising that any rational being, who has ever read the inspired writings should willingly forego this privilege, or should be ashamed to be seen engaged in this rational employment, or to have it known that he practices it.<sup>9</sup>

Christianity *is rational*. The purpose behind this book is to encourage believers in the absolute authority of God’s revealed

---

8. Porter, R., To the American public, *Scientific American* 1(1), 1845.

9. Porter, R., Rational religion, *Scientific American* 1(1), 1845.

## Refuting Evolution 2

Word. Further, it's to give them ammunition to *disseminate* this truth. This includes defending the foundational truths found in Genesis (1 Peter 3:15, Jude 3), and refute the arguments of unbelieving scientists (2 Corinthians 10:4–5).

My previous book, *Refuting Evolution* (1999, updated 2007), gave teachers, students and parents answers to the influential publication *Teaching About Evolution and the Nature of Science* (1998), a standard reference for science teachers produced by the US National Academy of Sciences. This new book was inspired by two more recent statements of evolutionary beliefs: the PBS-TV series *Evolution* and a *Scientific American* broadside titled '15 Answers to Creationist Nonsense.' If Christians can digest these arguments, along with the straightforward rebuttals, they will be fully equipped to answer even the best arguments thrown at them by their peers, teachers, neighbors and nonbelievers with whom they share the Gospel.

The material for this book was taken from my series on the PBS/Nova series [creation.com/pbs](http://creation.com/pbs), and my response to *Scientific American's* article [creation.com/sciam](http://creation.com/sciam). The appendices are taken from the *Creation Answers Book*, which I co-authored (under the editorship of Dr Don Batten), and CMI's most popular web article "Arguments we think creationists should not use", which was mainly my anonymous authorship. None other than Richard Dawkins commended the existence of such an article.

**Note about citations:** Quotations from the *Scientific American* article by John Rennie will be labeled SA, followed by the page number. Quotations from and other mentions of the PBS-TV *Evolution* series will be labeled PBS, followed by the episode number, e.g. PBS 6 refers to Episode 6. The seven PBS episodes have these titles:

- Episode 1: Darwin's dangerous idea
- Episode 2: Great transformations
- Episode 3: Extinction!
- Episode 4: The evolutionary arms race!
- Episode 5: Why sex?



Episode 6: The mind's big bang

Episode 7: What about God?

*Creation*, formerly *Creation Ex Nihilo* (before that *Ex Nihilo*), is the *Creation Ministries International* international quarterly magazine. *Journal of Creation* (*JoC*), formerly *TJ* (before that *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal*), is the *Creation Ministries International* international peer-reviewed journal for advanced topics in creation. In this book, it will always be cited as *JoC* even before this new name was adopted.



# UNIT 1

CLAIM:

## **Evolution is Science**

*Evolutionists insist that evolutionary theory is science, but creationism is religion.*



# Chapter 1

## **Argument: Creationism is Religion, Not Science**

*Evolutionists say, 'Creationism is a belief system that has nothing to do with science.'*

**T**he two-hour premier episode of the PBS/Nova series *Evolution* sets the tone for this propaganda effort—ridiculing biblical religion as the enemy of true science, which had long shackled scientific study. Much of the first episode is a dramatization of the life of Charles Darwin (1809–1882). It opens with Darwin's famous voyage on HMS *Beagle*. Darwin introduces himself and Captain Robert FitzRoy (1805–1865) in broken Spanish to villagers in South America. The villagers then lead Darwin and FitzRoy to the skull of an extinct ground sloth, and this conversation ensues:

**Darwin:** I wonder why these creatures no longer exist.

**FitzRoy:** Perhaps the Ark was too small to allow them entry and they perished in the Flood.

**D:** [laughs]

**F:** What is there to laugh at?

**D:** Nothing, nothing.

**F:** Do you mock me or the Bible?

**D:** Neither.

## Refuting Evolution 2

**F: What sort of clergyman will you be, Mr Darwin?**

**D: Dreadful, dreadful.**

Then the drama moves to a scene on the *Beagle*, where Captain FitzRoy is reading from Genesis 1, and Darwin is below deck rolling his eyes.

There we have it—the alleged struggle between science and ‘fundamentalist’ religion. Of course, the representative of ‘fundamentalism,’ Captain FitzRoy, is made to spout a silly straw man argument. Nowhere is there any hint that there could be any scientific objections to evolution.

But FitzRoy’s argument is unbiblical—the Bible clearly states that two of *every* kind of land vertebrate animal was on the Ark, and the Ark had plenty of room for all the required animals.<sup>1,2</sup>

But then—not that we should be surprised—the PBS dramatization goes well beyond artistic license and actually falsifies history. Darwin’s anti-Christianity hadn’t fully developed by the time of the *Beagle* voyage, and he even attended church services, while FitzRoy likely didn’t believe in a global Flood during that voyage. After all, FitzRoy himself had given Darwin a welcoming gift of the long-age–advocating book *Principles of Geology* by Charles Lyell (1797–1875), which was a great inspiration for Darwin’s evolutionary ideas, as will be shown later in this book.

- 
1. Sarfati, J., “How did all the animals fit on Noah’s Ark?” *Creation* 19(2):16–19, 1997, [creation.com/arkanimals](http://creation.com/arkanimals); Woodmorappe, J., *Noah’s Ark: A Feasibility Study*, Institute for Creation Research, El Cajon, CA, 1996.
  2. This includes dinosaurs. Skeptics overlook a number of things, and recent scientific research since the first edition of this book makes the creationist case even easier: the Ark was huge; many dinosaurs were small; even the big ones started life off in eggs no larger than footballs; growth rings on their bones show that they went through a growth spurt so they could have been on the Ark before this; dinosaur names have been multiplied so that they were represented by comparatively few ‘kinds,’ baby or ‘teen’ dinosaurs have sometimes been given different names to the adult specimens. Recent summaries of the new evidence are “Shrinking dino numbers,” *Creation* 33(1):8, 2011 and “Dino puberty blues,” [creation.com/dino-puberty-blues](http://creation.com/dino-puberty-blues).

## **Philosophical assumption behind 'modern science'—naturalism**

The media is not subtle about its ridicule of 'creation science.' John Rennie gets right to the point in '15 Answers to Creationist Nonsense.' He asserts:

'Creation science' is a contradiction in terms. A central tenet of modern science is methodological naturalism—it seeks to explain the universe purely in terms of observed or testable natural mechanisms. [SA 84]

Now we get to the key issue. It's not about scientific facts at all, but self-serving materialistic 'rules of the game' by which the evolutionary establishment interprets the facts.<sup>3</sup> So it should be instructive for people to understand what's really driving Rennie and his ilk—a materialist or naturalist agenda that excludes God. This is not a tenet deducible by the experimental method, but a philosophical assumption from *outside* science.

Rennie illustrates his view of 'modern science' with an example from physics:

Physics describes the atomic nucleus with specific concepts governing matter and energy, and it tests those descriptions experimentally. Physicists introduce new particles, such as quarks, to flesh out their theories only when data show that the previous descriptions cannot adequately explain observed phenomena. The new particles do not have arbitrary properties, moreover—their definitions are tightly constrained, because the new particles must fit within the existing framework of physics. [SA 84–85]

What has this to do with evolution? Creationists agree that the particles would not behave arbitrarily, because they were created by a God of order. But an atheist has no philosophical justification from his underlying religious premise, i.e. 'God does

---

3. See Wieland, C., "The rules of the game," *Creation* 11(1):47–50, 1988, [creation.com/rules](http://creation.com/rules).

not exist', for a belief in an orderly universe.<sup>4</sup>

### **Deceptive attacks on creation 'science'**

Evolutionists tend to lump all opponents of materialistic 'science' under the same category, whether they call it 'creation science' or 'intelligent design', ignoring the profound differences among the various camps. As a result, they make some outlandish claims that simply do not apply to Bible-believing Christians. For instance, *Scientific American* attacks 'creation science' because it promotes some shadowy intelligence that is beyond scientific inquiry and that offers few answers to scientific questions:

Intelligent-design theorists invoke shadowy entities that conveniently have whatever unconstrained abilities are needed to solve the mystery at hand. Rather than expanding scientific inquiry, such answers shut it down. (How does one disprove the existence of omnipotent intelligences?)

Intelligent design offers few answers. For instance, when and how did a designing intelligence intervene in life's history? By creating the first DNA? The first cell? The first human? Was every species designed, or just a few early ones? Proponents of intelligent-design theory frequently decline to be pinned down on these points. They do not even make real attempts to reconcile their disparate ideas about intelligent design. [SA 85]

In reality, the founders and leaders of modern 'creation science' base their views on the Bible, believing it is God's inspired account of history given to mankind. It is wrong to confuse this group with other, more recent advocates of 'intelligent design' who wish to avoid all appeals to biblical authority. Christians don't advocate just any 'designer' who may or may not be capricious. Rather, they identify the Designer with the faithful Triune God of the Bible.<sup>5</sup>

---

4. See also Sarfati, J., "Why does science work at all?" *Creation* 31(3):12–14, 2009; and "The biblical roots of modern science," *Creation* 32(4), 2010; [creation.com/roots](http://creation.com/roots).

5. See Sarfati, J., *By Design*, Creation Book Publishers, Atlanta, 2008.