

THE WEAKNESSES OF EVOLUTION

Dowlen Road, January 18, 2009 AM

INTRODUCTION:

- A. I don't subscribe to the local newspaper, but I do get online in the morning and scan the headlines.
 - 1. This headline caught my attention last November: *Educators debate the merits of changing how evolution is taught.*
 - 2. As the time approaches for Texas schools to update their science curriculum, a debate has erupted over some of the proposed language to be used. For example, some object to language that says:
 - a. Students are to "analyze and evaluate strengths and limitations of scientific explanations."
 - b. Students should use "critical thinking and scientific problem solving to make informed decisions."
 - c. "The student is expected to analyze, review, and critique scientific explanations, including hypotheses and theories, as to their strengths and weaknesses using scientific evidence and information."
 - 3. I'm confused. This sounds like things students should do in science class.
- B. There is an agenda at work in this controversy.
 - 1. These objections are raised by defenders of Darwin's theory of evolution. They don't want this language in the guidelines because they want evolution taught as a scientific fact. They don't want students to study and critique its weaknesses; they just want them to accept it!
 - 2. Some will even claim that evolution has no weaknesses or flaws to be studied. However, nothing could be farther from the truth. Consider these five weaknesses with the theory of evolution.

They begin with poor logic.

- A. Many evolutionists begin explaining the existence of our world with a basic assumption.
 - 1. This assumption is that God cannot be the answer. He is just a myth, a fairy tale, and cannot be the source of our world. No matter what the evidence says, the answer cannot be God!
 - 2. They build a wall between science and religion. They would say that we can dabble in religion if we choose, just don't make it part of science. This is how they justified teaching only evolution in science classes. You cannot say anything about an intelligent designer because that's a religious myth and not part of science.
- B. There is a fundamental flaw in this logic.
 - 1. What are we to do when the science cannot adequately explain the evidence? What are we to do when science drives us toward God?
 - 2. This is not a hypothetical question. The more we learn about the complex world in which we live, the more we recognize that nature could not pull this off on its own. There had to be an intelligent designer behind it.
 - 3. Atheists recognize this problem and have been scrambling for an explanation. Richard Dawkins, a well known atheist, offered this solution. He suggested that aliens may have visited our planet billions of years ago and planted the simple life forms that began evolution. He was quick to point out that these aliens must also have been the product of evolution and could not have been created by God. This doesn't solve the problem; it only moves it to a galaxy far, far away. But it is a revealing comment. Evolutionists will accept anything – even aliens – before they will believe in God.
- C. There is no conflict between science and religion. In fact, they actually compliment one another beautiful.
 - 1. Science helps us appreciate the grandeur of God's creation. The more we understand our world, the more we see His hand at work (**Psalm 19:1-2**). One scientist observed, ***This most beautiful system of the sun, planets, and comets, could only proceed from the counsel and dominion of an intelligent and powerful Being.***
 - 2. Our atheist friends will wonder what fundamentalist said that. It was Sir Isaac Newton (1687, *Principia*). Clearly he did not see a conflict.
 - 3. Arbitrarily eliminating God from this discussion limits our quest to find truth and ensures we will not find the right answer.

They have no starting point.

- A. Any reasonable attempt to explain how our world came to exist must have a starting point. It must adequately account for how everything started.
 - 1. Christians have a starting point (**Genesis 1:1**). We begin with an all powerful God who spoke the world into existence.
 - 2. People may choose to accept or reject that idea, but it is a reasonable way to account for the beginning.
- B. One of the fundamental problems with evolution is that it has no adequate way to explain the beginning.
 - 1. Kids are taught about a big bang, but this answer is lacking. Where did the matter, energy and ignition come from that caused the explosion? Matter and energy are not eternal. If we began with nothing, where did the "something" come from to create the big explosion?
 - 2. It's not just an issue of the theories being flawed; they are fundamentally inadequate. If you take God out of the picture and accept that matter and energy are not eternal, then you can't explain the beginning! This is a weaknesses of evolution.

They cannot account for life.

- A. Moving beyond the issue of a starting point, evolution encounters a second insurmountable hurdle.
 - 1. Even if we give them the material to work with, they still have a problem. How did this lifeless material come to life?

2. As you think about that question, remember that life is amazingly complicated. We talk about a simple cell, but there is nothing simple about it. Even this basic component of life is a wonder of intricate design – far more complicated than Darwin ever knew. How could it be that, out in some swamp billions of years ago, all of the materials necessary for life came to be in the same puddle? How is it that these materials were able to come together in just the right configuration to form the hundreds of systems necessary for life? How is it that all these systems started working at the same time?
 3. Evolution says that nature did it – all by itself. This is not just laughable, it's unscientific. Life coming from non-life has never been observed. In fact, evolutionists cannot even come up with an adequate theory on how it might have happened.
 4. Science teaches that only living things give rise to other living things.
- B. Believers can adequately account for the beginning of life.
1. Life was created by God (**Genesis 1:20-21, 24-27**). One can choose to accept or reject this, but at least it makes sense.
 2. It is also consistent with all known scientific principles.
 3. Having no adequate way to explain the beginning of life is surely to be counted as a weakness with the theory of evolution.

The fossils don't fit.

- A. Darwin believed that the evidence for evolution would be found in the fossils.
1. First, the fossil record would show this gradual development of life for which his theory called. As scientists dug into the earth, they would find simple life forms in lower strata which become more complex as you move higher. This would prove that life started out simple and evolved into more complex forms over time.
 2. Second, the fossil record would produce the transitional forms necessary to prove his theory. The basic claim of evolution is that one form of life gradually evolved into another (fish to reptiles). If this was true, then you would expect to find hundreds of creatures that are part fish and part reptile, and show this gradual change from one to the other. If evolution is true, we would expect to find millions of these transitional forms as we dig into the earth.
- B. If Darwin were alive today, he would be disappointed. Rather than supporting his theory, the fossil record stands in conflict with it.
1. For example, it does not show the gradual development of life as he anticipated. Rather, the fossil record shows life suddenly bursting on the scene in very complicated forms.
 2. There is also a complete absence of transitional forms. Remember: there should be millions of these "in between creatures." How odd that we have not found even one indisputable example. This is clearly a weakness with the theory.
- C. Let me also add that the fossil record does agree with one explanation of how life came to exist.
1. Think about it: life suddenly bursting on the scene; no transitions from one kind of life to another.
 2. This evidence fits well with the Bible account of creation.

They cannot account for man's morality.

- A. If it is true that men ultimately came from things that weren't even alive, how do you explain our sense of morality?
1. We are plagued with the sense that we ought to behave a certain way.
 2. We have these ideas about certain things being right and wrong.
 3. We feel badly and suffer guilt when we violate these moral codes.
 4. Everyone is this way, everyone in every culture.
 5. We expect other people to know about these codes and follow them. If a local stole your wallet at a market in Tibet, you would expect him to know that it was wrong. And he would!
- B. How do you explain this innate sense of morality we all possess?
1. Some atheists would be quick to explain that we learned it from our parents. But all this does is move the problem back one generation. Where did the earliest men learn this morality?
 2. Some say we learn from our experiences with pleasure and pain. The caveman got mad at his friend, clubbed him over the head and killed him. After his friend was gone, he felt bad because he missed him. This is how murder came to be viewed as wrong. But this does not explain why our moral impulses sometimes lead us to do things that are painful. When a man sees a child drowning in a river, part of him says, "save the child." Another part says, "You better not, you might drown too." But his moral sense says, "I ought to save the child. It's the right thing to do!" The atheist has no way to explain how man came to be this way. It is a weakness of evolution.
 3. But we have a reasonable way to explain it (**Genesis 1:26-27**). We are made in the image of a moral God who put within us this moral sensibility. It is more evidence of God's hand at work. A person may choose to accept this or reject it, but it is a reasonable way to explain man's morality.

CONCLUSION:

Not only has God given a sense of morality, but He has always given us a standard by which we are to live. This is why men are atheist. It's not because of the evidence, but the implications. If they accept the notion of God, then suddenly they become accountable to Him. There is a day coming when we will give account before God for the lives we have lived. Are we ready to face Him? Are we ready to answer?