

12 Arguments Evolutionists Should Avoid

For years, we have maintained a list of arguments creationists should avoid. There are enough good arguments for biblical accuracy and a young earth that dubious claims can safely be discarded. Now we want to address a similar topic: arguments evolutionists should avoid. These arguments have not only passed their expiration date, but they never should have been made in the first place.

Argument 1: Evolution is a fact

When our core beliefs are attacked, it is often easy for humans to retreat to statements such as, "My belief is a fact, and yours is wrong." That is exactly why we cannot trust mere human understanding to explain the unobservable past -- emotion and pride get in the way. Evolution is not a fact, no matter how many times evolutionists say it is. It is a framework built on assumptions about the past -- assumptions that will never have direct, first-hand, observational proof.

Argument 2: Only the uneducated reject evolution

Besides the arrogance of such statements, this argument has no validity. Mainly, those who make this claim usually define "educated people" as those who accept evolution. Anyone who disagrees fails the test, no matter what their background (e.g., if we follow this ideology, Isaac Newton must have been uneducated). There are many lists of well-educated scholars who look to the Bible for answers -- and we could point out Darwin's own deficit of formal education (he earned a bachelor's in theology). But the bigger issue is that education -- or lack thereof-- does not guarantee the validity of a person's position.

Argument 3: Overwhelming evidence in all fields of science supports evolution

The irony, of course, is that for centuries prior to Darwin's publication of *On the Origin of Species*, the majority of scientists found the opposite to be true: the "evidence" supported creation. What changed? Not the evidence. Rather, the starting point changed (i.e., moving from the Bible, God's word, to humanism, man's word). Creationists continue to see everything in light of God's word and all evidence as supporting the biblical account. In reality, there is no "neutral" starting point; everyone -- whether they acknowledge it or not -- interprets the "facts" according to a particular way of thinking (i.e., worldview).

Argument 4: Doubting evolution is like doubting gravity

Why does this argument fail? We will show you. Take a pencil or pen. Hold it in the air. Then drop it to the floor. That is gravity. Next, make a single-celled organism -- like an amoeba -- turn into a goat. Go ahead. We will wait ... No? As you can see, there is a fundamental difference between operational science, which can be tested through repeatable experimentation, and historical science, which cannot.

Argument 5: Doubting evolution is like believing the earth is flat

Ironically, the Bible describes the earth as round and hanging in space -- long before this could have been directly observed (Job 26:10; Isaiah 40:22). The appeal of this claim is that it stereotypes creationists as stuck in the past, since the common assumption is that people once universally believed the earth was flat before science "proved" otherwise (which was not the case -- only a few bought into the idea that the earth was flat). But even if this were true (it is not), direct, repeatable observation shows us the earth is round and orbiting the sun. Evolutionary stories about fossils are not direct observations; they are assumption-based beliefs.

Argument 6: It is here, so it must have evolved

A conclusion does not prove the premises are true. That is, if the answer is "four," we could arrive at that any number of ways: $2 + 2$, $5 - 1$, etc. In the same way, evolutionists often assume that since certain species or traits exist, this is proof of evolution because that is how it must have happened. This argument, however, is self-reflexive and useless. The Bible offers another (and more sound) framework for how those traits and species came to be.

Argument 7: Natural selection is evolution

This is likely the most abused argument on the list -- and most in need of being scrapped. Often evolutionists bait people into showing them a change that is merely natural selection and then switch to say this proves molecules-to-man evolution. However, this is quite misleading. Natural selection, even according to evolutionists, does not have the power to generate anything "new." The observable process can only act upon existing characteristics so that some members of a species are more likely to survive. In fact, it is an important component of the biblical worldview.

Argument 8: Common design means common ancestry

Historical common descent is not and cannot be confirmed through observation. Rather, certain observations are explained by assumptions about the past. These observations, we might add, have alternative explanations. Common body plans (homology), for example, do not prove common descent -- that is an assumption. A common Designer fits the evidence just as well, if not better.

Argument 9: Sedimentary layers show millions of years of geological activity

Sedimentary layers reveal one fact: sedimentary layers. In other words, we can -- and should -- study the rocks, but the claim that rocks prove the earth must be billions of years old ignores an important point: such an interpretation is built upon many assumptions. When we start from the Bible and examine the rocks within the framework of a global Flood, the need for long ages vanishes.

Argument 10: Mutations drive evolution

Perhaps because of movies and fiction, the popular idea is that mutations make evolution go. Given enough time, shifts in the genetic code will produce all the variety of plants and animals on earth -- and beyond. The problem? Mutations cannot produce the types of changes evolution requires -- not even close. Some may benefit an organism (e.g., beetles on a windy island losing wings), but virtually every time mutations come with a cost.

Argument 11: The Scopes trial

Misconceptions about the Scopes trial run rampant. Often, accounts sound something like this: Fundamentalist Christian bigots arrested an innocent biology teacher fighting for scientific freedom, and while they won the court case, they ultimately lost the public perception battle to the well-reasoned presentation of the defense. Thanks to the play *Inherit the Wind*, this common -- though completely flawed -- perception of the event continues to be used against creationists. It is blatantly obvious that the intention of the play is to mock Christians who take their religion seriously and to openly promulgate a secular, naturalistic, nontheistic worldview.

Argument 12: Science vs. religion

News stories thrive on conflict and intrigue, and one common theme presents science and religion as opposing forces -- reason struggling to overcome draconian divine revelation. It grabs attention, but it is false.

Many atheists and humanists oppose biblical the gospel, but science does not. After all, the truth of a risen Savior and an inerrant Bible puts quite the damper on the belief that God cannot exist. However, science, as a tool for research, works quite well within (and, in fact, requires) a God-created universe. Otherwise, there would be no reason to do science in the first place.

Why does all this matter? The evolutionary teachings that pervade society do have a great bearing on why many will not listen to the gospel, and thus why social problems abound today. If they do not believe the history in the Bible, why would anyone trust its moral aspects and message of salvation? If we accept evolutionary teachings, then we must accept that the Bible's account of history is false. If the Bible is wrong in this area, then it is not the word of God and we can ignore everything else it says that we find inconvenient. If everything made itself through natural processes without God, then God does not own us and has no right to tell us how to live. In fact, God does not really exist in this way of thinking, so there is no absolute basis for morality. Furthermore, the fossil record documents death, disease, suffering, cruelty, and brutality. Allowing for millions of years in the fossil layers means accepting all this before Adam's sin. But the Bible makes it clear that death, bloodshed, disease, and suffering are a consequence of sin (Genesis 3:19).

We need to show the world that the gospel and the book that contains it are trustworthy from the first word to the last. Most of the attacks against the Bible and those who trust in it are based on flawed premises and faulty logic, which is why we investigate these arguments. Beliefs about the past -- and arguments against what God says -- have real consequences. If we do demolish such strongholds, it is because we want as many as possible to experience the fullness of God in Christ.

Adapted From Answers In Genesis