

Scripture, Science & Tim Keller's Theistic Evolution

Abstract

This position paper regarding theistic evolution is offered in response to Tim Keller and others in the PCA who claim Darwinian and Neo-Darwinian macroevolution are consistent with both God's special revelation in Scripture and the findings of science. The opposite position is held and defended in this paper. Genesis 1 is not mythological; rather, it is the factual account of God's supernatural work of creation. Additionally, both the history of evolutionary theory and modern discoveries in molecular biology expose the fact that evolution is a presupposition with no roots in scientific discovery.

According to Tim Keller, Genesis 1 and Genesis 2 are incompatible if both are read literally. Dr. Keller says Genesis 2:5 seems to indicate God's work of creation followed a natural order. In other words, according to Dr. Keller we should not expect to have light without a natural or created source of light, and we should not expect to have plants without the same natural processes that we presently observe operating in nature. Thus, Dr. Keller's method of interpreting Genesis 1 is based on nature and science as his interpretive grid, rather than Scripture.

We contend that Scripture is God's supernatural special revelation and Scripture teaches that God created various kinds of life individually and supernaturally rather than through a naturalistic evolutionary process by which one kind evolved into another. Genesis 1 recounts God's supernatural creation of the universe and earth's biosphere. Subsequently, Genesis 2 starts by saying, "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them." Consequently, Dr. Keller's interpretation contains a glaring contradiction. He says Genesis 2 should be read literally; however, a literal reading of Genesis 2 means that Genesis 1 is an account of the creation of the heavens and the earth and all the hosts of them. Thus, a literal reading of Genesis 2, as suggested by Dr. Keller, dictates that God followed a supernatural order in His work of creation because Genesis 2 immediately points to Genesis 1 as the historical record of the creation of the heaven and the earth.

Thus, the wisdom of the Westminster Confession of Faith, which says that Scripture is its own interpreter, should be followed to interpret the events recorded in Genesis 1. Using the wisdom given in Scripture, we can interpret nature accurately and see that Scripture and sound science agree. Life comes only from life and each kind reproduces another like itself.

Romans 1:19-20 and Psalm 19:1-6 reveal that God and His glory are displayed in the things He has made. By way of contrast, evolutionary philosophy posits that accidental, random, and unguided natural processes created the beauty, design, form, functionality, and productivity of God's creatures and the habitations that He created for them. This paper shows that prominent scientists reject the speculative notion that the diversity of life on earth could be the result of randomness. They simply say it is impossible. In fact, you don't have to be a scientist to know that design is not an illusion and that life comes only from life. (WCF 1.1)

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to examine theistic evolution in the light of both Scripture and science and render a judgement regarding its truthfulness. We begin with self-attesting Scripture, the lens through which Scripture, creation, and science should be viewed and interpreted.

We will show that Scripture and science agree on the question of evolution while exposing the common essence of Darwinian evolution, Neo-Darwinian evolution, and theistic evolution. All three presuppose naturalistic evolution and superimpose it over God's supernatural work of creation.

Consequently, the term theistic evolution is inherently contradictory and misleading. The word theistic infers supernatural involvement by God in the creation of the biosphere; however, inference is as far it goes. In fact, theistic Neo-Darwinians postulate that evolution is a law of nature that randomly created the immense diversity of life we observe every day. For example, Francis Collins speculates that the human eye would be perfect if God had actually created it by divine fiat. He concludes that the eye is imperfect because it is the result of the natural random process of evolution.

Specifically, they speculate and postulate that the nucleotide sequences within DNA molecules that comprise the genes, that supply the information for assembly of proteins, and that produce specialized creatures ranging from hummingbirds to whales are all the result of a natural random process. This notion is impossible and absurd both biochemically and mathematically. By way of contrast, Scripture reveals the distinct creation of various categories of plants and animals with enough detail to communicate specific creative fiat rather than creation by evolution of one from the other. The God of Scripture is an infinite Genius with infinite power, and it is obvious He is the designer, creator, and sustainer of all He has made. We conclude theistic evolution is simply another version of truth suppression (Romans 1:19-20).

Scripture is clear on the issue of origins, and Scripture and sound science have always been in agreement. Before modern day advances in molecular biology, it was clear in a general or qualitative sense that Scripture and science were in accord. For example, life comes only from life is clearly revealed in Scripture and science agrees. Furthermore, each kind of life reproduces another like itself with only minor variations called microevolution. The phrase "after his kind" is repeated in Genesis 1 to the point of being emphatic. The science of heredity that we call genetics agrees. Today, we know that DNA is highly determinative and stable so that a species continues to reproduce the same species. This agrees with Scripture. Mutations do not produce new body plans and when mutations occur, they are not helpful. So, Scripture and science agree, life comes only from life, and each kind produces another like itself.

The history of science chronicles the advances that led to the discovery of DNA, and it is not difficult to see that Darwin knew nothing about DNA, RNA, and the complex

enzymes involved in mitosis, meiosis, transcription of DNA and more, including new discoveries in epigenetics that continue to baffle modern day Neo-Darwinians. Darwin held false presuppositions, and the fact that Neo-Darwinians, including theistic Neo-Darwinians, continue to stand on this false foundation that are explained by Romans 1:19-22: "For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them. For his invisible attributes, namely, his eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly perceived, ever since the creation of the world, in the things that have been made. So they are without excuse. For although they knew God, they did not honor him as God or give thanks to him, but they became futile in their thinking, and their foolish hearts were darkened. Claiming to be wise, they became fools..."

Evolutionists presently attempt to use genetics to patch Darwin's hole-riddled ship. But it's to no avail because the more we learn about genetics the greater the holes in Darwin's ship. DNA, and the molecular mechanisms associated with its functions, is too complex to support accidental randomness. Even some scientists who do not believe in divine special revelation see this. Consequently, the scientific reality is that evolution is not considered a scientific given by many highly qualified experts in multiple scientific disciplines. Scholars and experts in molecular biology, genetics, mathematics, and information technology are jumping ship so why did scientifically unqualified theologians in the PCA ever get on this ship? And, why not abandon ship immediately?

The history of molecular biology shows that Darwin had no scientific basis for his grand theory when he first published *On the Origin of Species* on November 24, 1859 and neither is theistic evolution grounded in science because it is simply Neo-Darwinian evolution with the adjective theistic attached. Compared to a tree, evolutionary theory is rooted in Darwin's speculations with all modern versions constituting the branches. Theistic evolution is just a branch of Darwin's tree but this tree never had any roots in true scientific discovery.

We pray that this paper will provide scriptural and scientific clarity and with God's help open the eyes of those who are deceived by the false religion of evolution.

Definitions

Scripture is God's special supernatural word revelation to man. As such, it clearly addresses the origin of the cosmos and life on earth. The self-attesting nature of Scripture is defined in the Westminster Confession of Faith, Chapter 1.4 which says: "The authority of Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man, or church; but wholly upon God (who is truth itself) the author thereof: and therefore it is to be received because it is the word of God."

Thus, Scripture is its own witness and interpreter. It is not to be interpreted through the lens of nature or presupposed and unfounded scientific assertions that are contradictory to its divinely inspired revelation because Scripture is God breathed (2 Timothy 3:16) and comes to us by the will of God not the will of man. (2 Peter 1:21)

Definition of Revelation

Dr James Bannerman provides a concise definition of God's special word revelation: "Revelation, as a divine act, is the presentation of objective truth to man in a supernatural manner by God. Revelation, as the effect of that act, is the objective truth so presented."

Definition of the Issue

Biblical authority is the issue. More precisely, is Genesis 1, factual, historical, objective truth? Proponents of theistic evolution assert that Genesis 1 should not be interpreted as factual. Consequently, the issue boils down to who we should believe. Do we believe Scripture, or do we believe man? Which is to say, do we believe God or do we believe man?

Definition of Ordinary Providence and Natural Order

Since the theory of theistic evolution is based on the presupposition that Genesis 1 is not factual or historical, it is necessary to show how they alter Scripture to omit the parts of Scripture that contradict evolutionary biological processes. So, it will be helpful to define how theistic evolutionists apply the assumed principle of ordinary providence or natural order to the creation narrative. They assume that the same natural processes we presently observe prevailed during God's work of creation. For example, today we observe that the sun is a source of light. Consequently, based on the principle of natural order or ordinary providence Genesis 1 cannot be read as factual. It must be mythological because on a natural basis you can't have light without a natural source of light.

Additionally, they assert that Genesis 2:5 contradicts Genesis 1 because according to their interpretation, God did not put any plants on the earth "before there was an atmosphere and rain." Thus, they start with Genesis 2:5 rather than Genesis 1 and assert that Genesis 2:5 establishes the principle that God's providence during the creation period operated in the same manner as it does at the present time. Therefore, based on this premise, natural order replaces supernatural order as the prevailing hermeneutical approach. This is what we mean by ordinary providence and natural order as it pertains to this analysis.

Scripture & Tim Keller's Theistic Evolution

Findings

Theistic evolutionists have a strong foothold in the PCA. Pastor Tim Keller, for example, a well-known theologian in the PCA, is a theistic evolutionist. William VanDoodewaard, in his book, *The Quest For The Historical Adam*, classifies Dr. Keller as a theistic evolutionist based on Keller's written contributions to *Biologos* and his public position as

a delegate to the General Assembly of the PCA with regard to the issue of theistic evolution.

VanDoodewaard provides a sobering revelation of the state of the PCA by contrasting the position of the ARP on the issue of theistic evolution with that of the PCA. The 2012 minutes of the General Synod of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church show that theistic evolution was denounced by a score of several hundred to three.

VanDoodewaard writes:

“In 2012, the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, the oldest American Presbyterian denomination, exemplified its movement from a mainline to a more confessional evangelical direction by overwhelmingly passing a synodical teaching statement declaring:

1. We affirm that Adam and Eve were special, unique direct creations of God, created in His image, with Adam being formed from the dust of the ground and Eve being made from his side; as such, they were real human beings and the first man and woman;
2. We affirm that the account of the creation of Adam and Eve as found in Genesis 1 and 2 is history;
3. We deny any teaching that claims that the account of creation of Adam and Eve, as found in Genesis 1 and 2, is mythological;
4. We deny any theory that teaches that Adam and Eve descended from other biological life forms and that such a theory cannot be reconciled with either the Standards of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church or Holy Scripture.

By contrast, within the much younger and larger Presbyterian Church in America, efforts at its General Assembly to present a similar teaching statement in response to the ongoing controversy failed. This failure appeared to be due to a convergence of those in two broad camps. Some argued that the confessional standards of the Westminster confession of Faith and Catechisms provided sufficient clarity on the topic—positing that if there were concerns, they ought to be pursued through the means of church discipline. Other delegates held that belief in evolutionary biological processes in human origins, as circumscribed by Collins, Keller, or others, was harmonious with Scripture and represented a legitimate latitude of ecclesiastical theology.”

Tim Keller’s written position is partially contained in an article published in *Biologos, Creation, Evolution, and Christian Laypeople*. Dr. Keller’s presentation and discussion of three hypothetical questions affirms that we have accurately defined the issue. The first question and answer are indicative of Pastor Keller’s approach to Scripture.

Question: “If God used evolution to create, then we can’t take Genesis 1 literally, and if we can’t do that, why take any part of the Bible literally?”

Answer: “The way to respect the authority of biblical writers is to take them as they want to be taken. Sometimes they want to be taken literally, sometimes they don’t. We must listen to them, not impose our thinking and agenda on them.”

Regardless of one’s position on this very important issue, precise language should be used to express that position. Tim Keller’s answer appears amorphous at best. Biblical authority does not reside in its human authors. It is surprising to see a theologian of Keller’s stature use this language unless he has a highly diminished view of biblical authority and has used these words to precisely reflect his approach to Scripture.

Also, theistic evolutionists inherently impose their thinking and agenda on Scripture. No one, be he layman or Scholar extraordinaire, can read Genesis 1 and conclude that he has just read about the evolution of the biosphere.

Dr. Keller then adds: “The way to take Biblical authors seriously is to ask ‘how does this author want to be understood? [...] the way to discern how an author wants to be read is to distinguish what genre the writer is using.’”

The traditional answer has been to exegete the text. Genre might play a role but elements such as original grammar, context, and other places in Scripture must be included. Tim Keller does not discuss these elements but says just identify the genre and you will understand how the author wants to be read. In light of the seriousness of the issue, and the expectation that someone in Dr. Keller’s position would “take their best shot”, his discussion of genre is very amorphous, vague, and weak. In support of his position, he uses an example that seems irrelevant. Dr. Keller cites Luke 1:ff writing, “we read the author insisting that everything in the text is an historical account checked against the testimony of eyewitnesses. That again is an unmistakable sign that the author wants to be taken “literally” as describing actual events”.

Again, this example seems irrelevant. Luke simply spells out his intent. Genre has nothing to do with discerning Luke’s intent. So, how does this inform a lay person dealing with interpretation of Genesis 1? We don’t want to create a straw man, but it appears Tim Keller is saying that without a specific statement of intent we should avoid a literalistic hermeneutic. But what happened to the simple formula based on distinguishing genre to discern intent? Consider Psalm 136 for example, where the writer does not announce his intent. Psalm 136 is poetical but also factual and historical. Does the genre help discern the authors intent or does the content tell us how the writer wants to be read? Genre is simply the mode not the content and genre should not be used to override other exegetical considerations when seeking the truth on this issue.

For his definition of genre in Genesis Dr. Keller cites C. John Collins, professor of Old Testament studies at Covenant Theological Seminary St. Louis, who says in reference to Genesis 1 that it is:

“what we may call exalted prose narrative. This name for the genre will serve us in several ways. First, it acknowledges that we are dealing with prose narrative...which

will include the making of truth claims about the world in which we live. Second, by calling it exalted, we are recognizing that...we must not impose a "literalistic" hermeneutic on the text."

So how should we apply this definition of Genre in Genesis 1 to its interpretation? In the paragraph immediately preceding this definition statement Keller provides his recommendation.

..."Genesis 1's prose is extremely unusual. It has refrains, repeated statements that continually return as they do in hymn or song. There are many examples including the seven-time refrain, 'and God saw that it was good' as well as ten repetitions of 'God said', 'let there be', seven repetitions of 'and it was so,' as well as others. Obviously, this is not the way someone writes in response to a simple request to tell what happened. In addition, the terms for sun (greater light) and moon (lesser light) are highly unusual and poetic, never being used anywhere else in the Bible, and "beast of the field" is a term for animal that is ordinarily confined to poetic discourse."

This statement comes with a footnote identifying the source as Henri Blocher, *In the Beginning: The Opening Chapters of Genesis*.

The assertion that we don't reply to a simple request to tell what happened using language similar to Genesis is reasonable, but certainly not evidence that the author of Genesis 1 did not want to be taken factually. Most of us don't write or speak Hebrew, we didn't create the universe and we were not inspired by the Holy Spirit to write an account of its creation. God's work of creation is in fact very unusual to say the least. It is not "natural" or usual so usual or natural methods of communication may not be the best way to write an account of it. However, this account was written by a Holy Spirit inspired human in perspicuous language and the language is actually not very unusual except that it is about a one-time never to be repeated incomprehensible event.

The repeated refrains are inherent in the narrative because multiple elements of the cosmos and biosphere are addressed with specificity, a characteristic of factual literature. "After his kind" is in fact a scientific statement that agrees with the science of genetics. Repetition is due to the fact that the creation of each kind is a separate creative act of God, the main character in the narrative. Additionally, repetition of the qualifier after his kind, following the creation of that specific kind, is antithetical to evolution. The narrative distinguishes various kinds of plants and animals. These distinctions indicate the author is being factual, and no matter how unusual they seem, they should not be interpreted as nonfactual and mythological.

Thus, Genesis 1 is antithetical to an evolutionary biological process because it reports the separate and distinct creation of various kinds of life by special divine fiat. The data from the text of Genesis 1 does not support Blocher's conclusions about the language nor does it support evolution. The term "beast of the field" is not unusual at all taken in its context. Blocher and Keller fail to include the subsequent qualifying statement, "after his kind." Additionally, they omit the fact that the phrase containing "beast of the field"

also includes "cattle," which teaches more specificity and separateness by divine fiat, not gradual evolutionary creation of one from the other.

Obviously, this is the manner of prose One would use to report the supernatural creation of all things in a summary form but with enough detail to make it clear that it is factual and not mythological. God created mind boggling diversity so it was necessary for the author of Genesis 1 to use a simple summary word to account for giraffes, elephants, lions, leopards, tigers, hippopotamuses, antelopes, mountain goats, badgers, ad infinitum. Beast of the field functions both as a general and specific expression because the phrase "after his kind" takes the general phrase, "beast of the field" and adds specificity to it.

Thus, the phrase beast of the field seems appropriate for the situation. Certainly, it isn't evidence that the author was writing a myth and did not want to be taken factually. As observers of creation, we see that God created the great plains of Africa with innumerable beasts; and the great Plains of north America with enormous herds of Bison and numerous other "field dwellers." We see beasts dwelling in fields! "Beast of the field" is not so unusual after all.

Thus, Dr. Keller's proposition regarding genre and the historical nature of Genesis 1 based on Blocher's analysis is surprisingly weak. We must assume Keller and Blocher are taking their best shot. The problem for Tim Keller and others is that the genre bullet is a blank.

Next Dr. Keller posits that Genesis 1 and Genesis 2:5 are contradictory and incompatible, therefore a literalistic hermeneutic can't be applied to both. He writes,

"Perhaps the strongest argument for the view that the author of Genesis 1 did not want to be taken literally is a comparison of the order of creative acts in Genesis 1 and Genesis 2. Genesis 1 shows us an order of creation that does not follow a 'natural order' at all. For example, there is light (Day 1) before there are any sources of light -- the sun, moon, and stars (Day 4). There is vegetation (Day 3) before there was any atmosphere (Day 4 when the sun was made) and therefore there was vegetation before rain was possible. Of course, this is not a problem *per se* for an omnipotent God. "But Genesis 2:5 says: 'When the Lord God made the earth and the heavens - and no shrub of the field had yet sprung up, because the Lord God had not yet sent rain on the earth, and there was no man to work the ground.'"

Dr. Keller continues,

"Although God did not have to follow what we would call a 'natural order' in creation, Genesis 2:5 teaches that he did. It is stated categorically: God did not put vegetation on the earth before there was an atmosphere and rain. But in Genesis 1 we *do* have vegetation before there is any rain possible or any man to till the earth. In Genesis 1 natural order means nothing--there are three 'evenings and mornings' before there is a sun to set. But in Genesis 2 natural order is the norm. The conclusion - we may

read the order of events as literal in Genesis 2 but not in Genesis 1, or (much, much more unlikely) we may read them as literal in Genesis 1 but not in Genesis 2:5. But in any case you can't read them both as straightforward accounts of historical events."

Does this mean that Genesis 1:1 is not historical and factual? If Genesis 1:1 is factual, at what point in the Genesis 1 narrative does it morph into myth?

Thus, Tim Keller concludes that Genesis 1 and Genesis 2:5 are incongruous with Genesis 1 being nonliteral because it does not follow ordinary providence or natural order. Keller's conclusions contain some obvious contradictions. He says Genesis 2 is literal but Genesis 2 says that Genesis 1 contains the completed account of God's creation of the heavens and the earth. If Genesis 2 is to be read on a straightforward basis we must also read Genesis 1 as straightforward because Genesis 2 says so. Genesis 2:1 states categorically, "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished and all the hosts of them." This verse does not say just the physical elements of creation were finished but also "all the hosts of them". Also, the statement in 2:5 that, "the Lord God had not caused it to rain," seems to make the needed rain dependent on the supernatural activity of God and not the natural process that Keller says is categorically required. The interpretation that Genesis 1 is an objective, factual, and historical account of God's supernatural work of creation is also supported by scholarly exegesis of the text.

E.J. Young, for example, the Hebrew scholar, using a traditional exegetical approach to Genesis 1 and 2:5 concludes that Genesis 1 and 2:5 are very compatible. In fact, Young says that Genesis 2:5 presupposes Genesis 1. Keller's article contains one reference to Young on the issue in which Keller says that Young "admits" that Genesis 1 is written in "exalted, semi-poetical language" implying that Young, who taught a factual, historical interpretation of Genesis 1, is admitting that the genre of Genesis is problematic to such an interpretation. However, Dr. Young never even hints that genre precludes a factual reading of Genesis 1, he does the opposite. Young writes,

"Genesis one is written in exalted, semi-poetical language; nevertheless, it is not poetry. But neither is Young saying that poetic genre is problematic to a factual, historical interpretation, because he immediately compares Genesis one to Job 38:8-11 and Psalm 104:5-9 saying that "the Bible does contain poetic statements of creation."

The point of Young's comparison is that Genesis one is not poetic based on the absence of parallelism present in Job 38:8-11 and Psalm 104. In the same context, Young adds: "Genesis one is the prelude to a severely historical book, a book so historical that it may be called genealogical. Indeed, the first chapter stands in intimate relationship with what follows."

Dr. Young then shows how the grammar of Genesis 2:4 serves as a bridge to connect the prelude, Genesis 1:1-2:3 to the genealogical section of the book. Based on his grammatical exegesis Young concludes:

“Genesis 2:4a connects the prelude (Genesis 1:1-2:3) with the genealogical section of the book. It is an intimate relationship, for chapters two and three clearly presuppose the contents of chapter one...Furthermore, chapter two assumes the creation of the earth, the heaven and the sea, the account of which is given in chapter one...The chapter (one) is thus seen to constitute an integral part of the entire book and is to be regarded as sober history. By this we mean that it recounts what actually transpired. It is reliable and trustworthy, for it is the special revelation of God.”

Dr. Young summarizes the unique nature of Genesis one as follows:

“Genesis one is a document *sui genesis*; it's like or equal is not to be found anywhere in the literature of antiquity. And the reason for this is obvious. Genesis one is a divine revelation to man concerning the creation of heaven and earth. It does not contain the cosmology of the Hebrews or of Moses. Whatever that cosmology may have been, we do not know. Had they not been the recipients of special revelation their cosmology probably would have been somewhat similar to the Babylonians. There is no reason to believe that their ideas would have been more 'advanced' than those of their neighbors. Israel, however was favored of God in that he gave to her a revelation concerning the creation of heaven and earth, and Genesis one is that revelation.”

Next, Dr. Young examines Genesis 2:5 from the original language to answer the assertion that Genesis 2:5 demands that we interpret the creation process through the lens of natural order. Dr. Young's words help to both define and clarify the question:

“The question to be considered is whether upon the basis of Genesis 2:5 we are justified in believing that the method in which divine providence operated during the creation period was the same as that in effect at present. To answer this question, it is necessary to consider briefly the relation of Genesis 1 and 2. In the first place Genesis 2 is not, nor does it profess to be, a second account of creation. Although it does mention creative acts, it is a sequel to the creation narrative of Genesis one and a preparation for the history of the fall contained in chapter 3. This is proved by the phrase 'These are the generations of the heavens and the earth (Gen. 2:4a).’

To understand the significance of this phrase we must note the Hebrew word for generations, *toledot*, and the Hebrew word from which it is obviously derived, meaning to bear and in the Hiph' il stem with which it is related, the meaning is “to beget.” The generations are therefore “those things which are begotten” and Genesis 2:4a should be translated literally, 'These are the things begotten of heaven and earth.' The section of Genesis beginning with 2:4 is an account of those things which are begotten of heaven and earth. This is not to say that it is silent on the

subject of the heaven and earth themselves, but it is not an account of their origin. It deals rather with what was begotten of them, namely, man whose body is of the earth and whose soul is of heavenly origin, inbreathed by God himself.”

As an example, Young points out that the same word for generations, *toledot*, is used in Genesis 11:27, “these are the generations of Terah”. Young explains,

“This does not mean that we are now introduced to an account of Terah; rather the account of Terah is completed. There may indeed be certain statements about Terah to follow, but the section before us is concerned with an account of those things begotten of Tera, in this case, Abraham...Genesis 2:4 in effect declares that the account of the creation of heaven and earth is completed, and the author is now going to focus his attention upon what was begotten of heaven and earth, namely, man.”

If Genesis 2:4 means that the account of creation was completed before God’s subsequent actions revealed in 2:5, it means that creation was completed by special, divine, supernatural creative fiats. In other words, God speaking rather than completion by evolutionary biological processes. Evolution is not revealed in Genesis 1 but rather the opposite. Therefore, evolutionary presuppositions require that Genesis one be neutralized; but genre doesn’t negate Genesis 1 and neither does Genesis 2:5 because the assumed contradictions are based on evolutionary presuppositions not biblical data.

Keller and other theistic evolutionists insist that Genesis 2:5 teaches that divine providence or the *modus operandi* of natural forces operating as they do today, prevailed during the process of creation. Thus, they assert that Genesis one cannot be factual. Dr. Young, however provides a through discussion of the various exegetical issues surrounding Genesis 2:5 and reaches several conclusions that get to the heart of the issue. His conclusions are as follows:

“The appeal to Genesis 2:5a, it must be remembered, to establish the thesis that during the days of creation the *modus operandi* of divine providence was the same as is at present in effect, can only have validity if it proves that there was no supernatural intrusion such as might be found in the working of miracles. But such supernatural intrusion was certainly present in the creation of man (Gen. 2:7). And the only works ascribed to the third day are creative works, not those of ordinary divine providence. Indeed, on no viewpoint can it be established that ordinary providential working prevailed on the third day. The only works assigned to this day were the result of special, divine, creative fiats. If ordinary providence existed during the third day it was interrupted at two points by divine fiats. Even apart from any considerations of Genesis 2:5, therefore, it cannot be held that the present *modus operandi* of divine providence prevailed on the third day, nor does the appeal to Genesis 2:5 prove such a thing. On the contrary, all that is stated of the third day (Gen. 1:9-15) shows that the works of that day were creative works and not those of ordinary providence.”

Thus, we see that Dr. Young's method of interpretation is based on the principle that Scripture interprets Scripture. Hebrews 11:3 says, "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that the things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." It is clear, evolutionary creation as the origin of species is clearly antithetical to Scripture.

Herman Hoeksema has an insightful comment on the method of interpretation that renders Genesis 1 mythological.

"For that reason, we cannot go along with their method, which wants to listen first of all to the testimony of science, in order then to distort the testimony of Scripture to bring it in harmony with science. This method is not the method of faith, but that of the wisdom which is from below, which is earthly. Even dogmatics may not dominate exegesis of Scripture: much less modern science. Even though it were true that with an honest explanation of Genesis 1 so called science cannot receive satisfaction, and although it is certainly true that also we will not be able to solve every problem in this connection, yet we must always proceed from the clear expression of Holy Writ, and in its light develop a believing conception of the origin of the world."

With Hoeksema's wisdom we should see that even though some mysteries may be present in Genesis, it is absurd to leap from mystery to evolution of the biosphere. Mystery is no basis for grandiose evolutionary conclusions. Evolution is not in the text but rather the opposite, special, distinct creation by divine fiat. The method of faith starts with Scripture and Scripture starts with Genesis 1. Genesis 1 is history. Evolution is a myth. Dr. Keller clearly violates his own admonition not to impose an external agenda on the text. Evolution is not contained in the text of Scripture; rather, it is clearly external, even alien to the text.

Hoeksema points to another distinct reality from the text of Genesis 1 that negates any evolutionary interpretation by use of the principle of ordinary providence. Tim Keller poses a question regarding the literal nature of Genesis 1 because it says there was light (Day 1) before there were sources of light, the sun, moon, and stars (Day 4). But the distinct reality revealed in Genesis 1 is that the work of creation is a series of supernatural events. Antithetically, Dr. Keller and other theistic evolutionists inject the created forces of nature into the narrative to accommodate their evolutionary presuppositions.

Hoeksema's answer regarding the issue of light is that "light is a creature of God that was not certainly annihilated at the end of every day, but received existence through the Word of God and through that Word was undoubtedly preserved from the very first day of creation. In the third place, on the fourth day the heavenly bodies were indeed created as bearers and centers of the light that had been created on the first day".

According to Keller's reasoning, the reality of light before there is a created or natural source of light is problematic, even though he does say it is not a problem for an omnipotent God per se. So why not simply lean on the text and not science? If you lean

on the straightforward revelation of Genesis you also have the rest of Scripture for support since the revelation that light is dependent on God and not the sun is not limited to the Genesis narrative. This reality pervades the Bible from beginning to end. "For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." (2 Corinthians 4:6) The commanding of the light and the creation of the sun are distinct events. God spoke directly into the darkness which was absolute darkness; and the fruit of God's command was not dependent on any created instrument such as the sun. Revelation 22:5 and Genesis 1:3 are bookends sustaining the standing truth that from the beginning light was a creature of God. Revelation 22:5 says, "And there shall be no night there; and they need no candle, neither light of the sun; for the Lord God giveth them light: and they shall reign for ever and ever."

In conclusion, this blending of the ordinary and extraordinary or the natural with the supernatural is simply an attempt to insert evolution into the creation narrative. The problem for Keller and others is that this insertion or superimposition of evolution can only be done by amputating Genesis 1 from the body of Genesis. Regardless of genre or self-imposed contradictions, it is obviously absurd to dismiss Genesis 1 on the basis that it is inconsistent with nature. The text does not allow this dismissal and neither does natural revelation. Scientifically speaking, evolution is impossible, absurd, and unsupported.

Science & Theistic Evolution

Introduction

God is infinite. Creation does not measure God but God points us to creation to give us a visual illustration of His incomprehensibility. When God said to Job, "Hast thou perceived the breath of the earth? declare if thou knowest it all" (Job 38:18), His purpose was not to give Job a lesson in physics but rather a lesson in the One who created physics. God is truth itself and the various sciences He created are in truthful harmony with Holy Scripture, His word of truth to us. Because of the infinite nature of God and his infinite brilliance as Creator, it is inevitable that we can't know it all. But we must approach all scientific investigation with an open Bible because it is impossible for God's special revelation of Himself in Scripture and His revelation of Himself in nature to disagree. The God of Scripture is revealed by both special and natural revelation. To this point, Cornelius Van Til says: "The first point that calls for reflection here is the fact that it is, according to Scripture itself, the same God who reveals himself in nature and in grace." Van Til continues and shows that God's revelation of himself in nature and Scripture are harmonious because, in fact, they constitute one grand scheme of God's covenant revelation of himself to man. In Van Til's words: "God's revelation in nature, together with God's revelation in Scripture, form God's one grand scheme of covenant revelation of himself to man. The two forms of revelation must therefore be seen as presupposing and supplementing one another. They are aspects of one general philosophy of history."

Therefore, God's work of creation, the covenant of works, the fall of man, and the covenant of grace stand together because Scripture says they stand together. Consequently, any scientific presupposition that contradicts or attempts to negate the Genesis narrative of creation also attempts to negate the covenant of grace. Theistic evolution is such a presupposition because it severs natural revelation and science from their Scriptural context and connection and uses them to refute Scripture. If theistic evolution is true, if we reject Genesis 1 and accept evolution, everything must be redefined because the fall of man and the covenant of grace are defined and understood by their context in Scripture. The creation narrative contained in Genesis 1 is an integral part of that context.

However, we don't reject Genesis 1 so we have both the light of nature, since we are made in God's image, and we have the light of Scripture to see clearly that Romans 1:19-20 is absolutely true.

Scripture and Science Agree: Life Comes Only from Life

"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life", (Genesis 2:7). Molecules do not have life in themselves. The Spirit of God gives life. God created our souls to live forever and our mortal bodies will be quickened by the Holy Spirit at the resurrection, (Romans 8:11).

Even contemporary secular scientists agree that life comes only from life. Sylvia S. Mader, author of *Biology, Tenth Edition* says on page 5: "Life comes only from life. Every type of living thing can reproduce, or make another organism like itself." Mader explains that DNA contains genes that contain specific information for how an organism is to be formed. Then Mader says that the DNA of organisms over time undergoes mutations (changes) that may be passed onto the next generation. "These events help to create a staggering diversity of life, even within a group of otherwise identical organisms."

Next, without reference to any scientific data or scientific research showing how mutations in DNA can produce staggering diversity with all kinds of adaptations, Mader describes various adaptations, such as penguin wings used for swimming, and then proceeds to superimpose evolutionary dogma over the biosphere.

Mader's book is biologically factual in many ways except it fails to include some significant findings that seriously question the central dogma of evolution. The central dogma says DNA contains the information (genes), the information is transcribed to RNA, then RNA through a complicated but efficient process directs its molecular agents to assemble amino acids into proteins that form complicated organisms with an immense diversity of complicated machinery.

Consequently, this simple linear downhill model proceeding from DNA only needs changes in DNA to facilitate macroevolution. But the molecular biology associated with DNA is not that simple. In fact, DNA is not in complete control so mutations in DNA, even if they resulted in new body plans, would not accomplish macroevolution. A well written article by Dr. Jonathan Wells, *Why DNA Mutations Cannot Accomplish What Neo-Darwinism Requires* provides an excellent summary of why mutations in DNA cannot account for the diversity in the biosphere. Wells' summary is not speculative. His conclusions are based on long established basics and recent discoveries in molecular biology that are contradictory to the central dogma of evolution. Wells summarizes as follows:

“According to Neo-Darwinism evolution takes place because of the natural selection of slight, successive changes in DNA.

- Some variations arise through the reshuffling of existing DNA sequences but for continuing evolution, Neo-Darwinism requires that existing DNA sequences mutate into new sequences.
- This assumes that DNA contains a program for embryo development: DNA makes RNA makes protein makes us.
- Mutations in the program could then produce novel anatomical structures, and natural selection could preserve favorable ones and eliminate unfavorable ones.
- But DNA sequences do not even fully specify RNA much less proteins.
- And the three-dimensional arrangement of proteins in a cell requires spatial formation that precedes their synthesis and is specified independently of DNA.

Therefore, DNA does not contain a program for embryo development and mutations in DNA cannot provide the raw materials for anatomical evolution.”

Wells also points out that since natural selection cannot create new variations in DNA, Neo-Darwinians suppose that accidental mutations are responsible for new variations. But Wells says that scientific critics have accurately pointed out that accidental mutations are overwhelmingly harmful.

Part of what Wells addresses in his summary is that after a given sequence of DNA is transcribed by RNA, several processes can modify the RNA so that it does not match the original transcript. The result is that DNA does not specify many RNAs. Two processes that can accomplish this are RNA splicing and RNA editing. RNA splicing involves cutting out or removing of non-coding sections called introns and splicing back in coding sections called exons. One or more of the exons can be duplicated or deleted producing a final messenger RNA that no longer corresponds to the original DNA sequence. What we see is that something else is acting as the blueprint because the process is now operating independent of the sequences that were originally transcribed by RNA.

This subject is too complicated to cover in detail but it is becoming more obvious based on increasing knowledge of molecular biology that the central dogma cannot be

supported scientifically. Obviously, DNA plays a major role. After all, DNA contains the genes. However, geneticists can now see that DNA is similar to the hard drive in a computer. You have to have it but the software is essential. The field of epigenetics involves many molecular functions that constitute the software. These include: methylation, glycosylation, the bioelectric code, membrane heredity plus others.

Epigenetic research in the field of membrane heredity by Stephen Ng and Joseph Frankel (1977) led them to conclude: “The cell as an architect thus not only makes use of the genomic information to produce the appropriate building blocks, but, in addition, also arranges the building blocks according to the blueprint as defined in the preexisting architecture.”

The implication from Ng and Frankel’s research is that when gametes come together to form a zygote, the cells that comprise the embryo function as their own blueprint. This is analogous to the construction of a house with wood which comes in long boards or planks. Protein molecules are made of long chains and give cells their shape. But protein molecules have to be folded or shaped to fit the specific environment where they are needed just as a carpenter has to cut, shape, and customize wood for its role in the house and thus conform the materials to the preexisting blueprint of the house. It really is obvious. Mindless molecules don’t accidentally assemble themselves into complex reproducing organisms. Intelligent visualization, imagination and engineering calculations are necessary for an architect to design and write a blueprint for buildings with different functions such as banks, hotels, and restaurants. Accidental causes don’t work. How much more impossible is it for hummingbirds, eagles, whales, tigers, lions, and elephants to have originated from accidental randomness. Each one has functional coherence and they fit together into a functionally coherent biosphere.

Douglas Axe, in an article titled *Three Good Reasons for People of Faith to Reject Darwin’s Explanation of Life*, writes:

“Life in all its forms is obviously the work of genius, and clueless causes are as far removed from genius as the east is from the west—complete opposites. So, for these causes to just *happen* to behave like genius would be an unbelievable coincidence—literally unbelievable. There’s a strict limit to what can be excused as coincidence, and things like fireflies and hummingbirds and humans are way beyond that limit.”

Returning to the flow of life’s biological construction process compared to the construction of a house we see that a builder goes to the lumber store after someone opens the store and gets his raw material and brings it back to the construction site. Similarly, the DNA double helix is opened by complex enzyme activity and then RNA transcribes the information needed for codons that will select the specific amino acids needed for protein formation. After transcription, RNA then travels through a nuclear pore to the cytoplasm outside the nucleus which is analogous to the construction site. At this point the transcribed portions of DNA are not the construction supervisors.

As the work proceeds, genes are turned on and off at the appropriate time by other epigenetic mechanisms such as methylation. This is a simplified picture of something too complex and efficient to describe in this paper, but it is clear from just cursory examination of embryology that cell differentiation and location occurs so that we have eyes, ears, lungs, hearts, amazing brains and each one of these complex entities contains complex components. Furthermore, all of the complex machinery gets located where it needs to be located. Our eyes, ears, noses, mouths and their connections to the nervous system, for communication, and circulatory system for nourishment, are all symmetrically and securely positioned so we can perform at an amazing level.

Obviously, this complicated biological construction process requires complicated intensely customized tools. The epigenetic tool cabinet contains these tools. One more example of such a tool is glycosylation. Jonathan Wells cites the research of Gordan Lauc et. al. to summarize the glycosylation process.

“In glycosylation, a glycan is first attached to a protein during or after its synthesis. Then complex enzymatic networks involving dozens of interacting proteins, modify the glycans depending on the needs of the cell. The resulting modifications enable the cell to adapt to a given environment or configure it to a specific stage in embryo development...the final glycosylated form of a protein is thus far removed from direct specification by a DNA sequence.”

Conclusion, DNA does not contain a program for embryo development so mutations in DNA cannot be the source of the exponential diversity in the biosphere even if mutations in DNA were beneficial. But our knowledge of genetic mutations indicates that mutations do not produce new body plans and they are not beneficial when they occur. Wells provides several very succinct summary statements of the relation of DNA to embryo development that are highly problematic for the central dogma of macroevolution. At the end of his article under the heading of "why Neo-Darwinism fails," Wells says:

“An even more serious problem for the central dogma is that proteins must be localized in a cell in order for them to function properly. But DNA does not specify spatial coordinates. Instead, they are specified by the architecture of the cell and by patterns in the membrane that precede transcription and translation. So even if DNA completely specified the final form of proteins, there must still be information that is independent of DNA.”

Thus, Wells' summary conclusions are based on scientific realities. The above molecular realities and activities involve dozens of complex enzymes. Douglas Axe, an enzymologist and author of the previously reference article, *Three Good Reasons for People of Faith to Reject Darwin's Explanation of Life*, published in the book *Theistic Evolution*, explains the basic role of enzymes. Axe says that enzymes are the proteins that do life's chemistry and they cannot be invented by any accidental evolutionary process. Axe says this in reference to friendly debates with another biochemist and friend, Keith Fox, whose expertise is not enzymology. Axe explains,

"In criticizing my claim that evolution cannot explain the origin of enzymes, Fox has repeated the standard idea that evolution builds gradually from small beginnings. According to him, weak enzyme function can be produced by linking a mere *two* amino acids together, and this can serve as an evolutionary starting point. From there, natural selection can build the exquisite enzymes we see in life, he thinks. In other words, according to Fox, 'One doesn't have to start with an unlikely polypeptide [i.e., amino acid chain] with a billion-fold activity, but from (say) a specific dipeptide (of which there are only 400 using the natural amino acids), with a few fold improvement.'"

Axe responds,

"There's a serious problem here, though most people need help to see it. Scientists who know about enzymes and the various attempts to use selection to enhance them would never join Fox in this claim, for one good reason: *they know they can't back it up!* Fox was hazarding a wild guess that, for reasons I explained elsewhere, happened to be wildly wrong. Of course, had he openly called it a wild guess, there would be no reason for concern. Wrong guesses are harmless, provided we know they are only guesses. But when people of Fox's scientific stature pull scientific claims out of thin air without saying so, people naturally take these claims more seriously than they should. That is cause for concern".

Amazingly, the broader context for Axe's discussion is his idea that the failure of Darwin's explanation of life is a commonsense fact which Axe elaborates on in his excellent book, *Undeniable*. Axe says you don't have to be an expert in one of the complicated fields of molecular biology to see the obvious. Axe explains: "I've argued at length that the failure of Darwin's explanation of life is a commonsense fact—a plain truth testified to by our strong intuition that life is designed, and by a lifetime of experience that confirms that intuition".

Without knowing anything about DNA it is obvious that random accidental collisions of complex chemicals could not have produced the beauty, order, form, functionality, and tremendous productivity that we observe every day. But we do know something about DNA, amino acids, polypeptides, and proteins; so, we only need to apply commonsense to this knowledge to reach the same conclusion. The following is an effort to take some of the complicated elements and reduce them so that we can apply commonsense to some of the scientific details.

DNA constitutes an enormous search space that must be searched by RNA to obtain the information and materials needed to build an organism. Some of the search space is comprised of noncoding zones. These noncoding zones, also referred to as gibberish, by some, would necessarily be the source of new genes because tinkering with an existing gene would only make it worse based on what we know about genes. Thus, the formation of a new gene from noncoding sequences of nucleotides can be examined mathematically because these nucleotide sequences, while chemically complex, are

similar to a simple strand of beads numerically, with each bead being analogous to a nucleotide, the basic building block of DNA.

In *Giving Up Darwin*, Dr. David Gelernter provides such a mathematical assessment of the chances or probability that new proteins and new genes could come from a random process. First, he examines these probabilities by looking at proteins. Remember, as we go through the following mathematical analogy that both DNA and proteins are similar to a string of beads. In DNA, a unit or element as Gelernter explains is a nucleotide. Nucleotides are linked together to form a strand of DNA. The human genome contains six billion of these nucleotides. Some of these nucleotide sequences constitute genes or coding zones along the DNA strand.

Proteins are also formed by the linking of basic building blocks. In proteins these building blocks are amino acids. These amino acids are put together to form a polypeptide chain. These polypeptide chains are then put together to form the protein that is used to construct a biological organism.

Concerning formation of new proteins Gelernter writes:

“How to make proteins is our first question. Proteins are chains: linear sequences of atom-groups, each bonded to the next. A protein molecule is based on a chain of amino acids; 150 elements is a modest-sized chain; the average is 250. Each link is chosen, ordinarily from one of 20 amino acids. A chain of amino acids is a polypeptide—'peptide' being the type of chemical bond that joins one amino acid to the next. But this chain is only the starting point: chemical forces among the links make parts of the chain twist themselves into helices; others straighten out, and then, sometimes, jackknife repeatedly like a carpenter's rule into flat sheets. Then the whole assemblage folds itself up like a complex sheet of origami paper. And the actual 3-D shape of the resulting molecule is (as I have said) important.”

By the way, this is important because this folding and shaping process is how our various components are created and maintained.

Next, Gelernter sets up a mathematical test case based on the fact that 20 amino acids are used in various combinations to form polypeptide chains that are used to form proteins. Remember, as stated above these amino acids form polypeptide chains averaging 250 elements (amino acids) per chain, but for the propose of his calculations Gelernter uses 150 units.

Thus, Gelernter's test is based on a protein with 150 amino acid units similar to a chain of 150 beads, with each bead chosen from 20 varieties. As already stated, the final shape is very important and the final shape is determined by how the different beads are situated in the linear sequence. Thus, the questions posed by Gelernter are crucial. “So how hard is it to build a useful, well-shaped protein? Can you throw a bunch of amino acids together and assume that you will get something good? Or must you

choose each element of the chain with painstaking care?" It happens to be very hard to choose the right beads.

But before getting to the math, Gelernter suggests that inventing a new protein means inventing a new gene. Because it is the codons derived from transcription of DNA that specify amino acids, that constitute polypeptides, that form proteins. It is helpful to see the complexity of the process that Neo-Darwinians attribute to randomness and time.

Remember, Gelernter said, "how to make proteins is our first question." But this comes down to the definition of the task, which is to invent a new gene by mutation. A mutation which will result in the accidental change of one codon to a different codon, because codons select amino acids that form proteins.

Remember also, the gibberish or nonsense sequences must be the source of the new genes. As Gelernter says, "if you tinker with a valid gene, you will almost certainly make it worse. Consequently, for evolution to get its necessary mutations, they must come from mutations of these vast noncoding or gibberish portions of DNA."

Gelernter adds that using 20 varieties of beads to form a 150-link sequence, "it is easy to see that the total number of possible sequences is immense and the subset of useful sequences—sequences that create real, useable proteins—is, in comparison, tiny. But we must know how immense and how tiny." Gelernter's answer: The total count of possible 150-link chains, where each link is chosen separately from 20 amino acids, is 20 to the 150th power. So, the total number of possible sequences obtainable from 20 different amino acids forming a 150-link chain comes down to 10 to the 195th power, and, Gelernter points out that there are only 10 to the 80th power atoms in the universe.

But we need to ask one more question: What proportion of these many polypeptides are useful proteins? Referencing the research of Douglas Axe, Gelernter responds:

"What proportion of these many polypeptides are useful proteins? Douglas Axe did a series of experiments to estimate how many 150-link chains are capable of stable folds—of reaching the final step in the protein-creation process (the folding) and of holding their shapes long enough to be useful. Axe is distinguished biologist with five-star breeding: he was a graduate student at Caltech, then joined the Centre for Protein Engineering at Cambridge...He estimated that, of all 150-link amino acid sequences, 1 in 10 to the 74th power will be capable of folding into a stable protein. to say that your chances are 1 in 10 to the 74th power is no different, in practice, from saying that they are zero. It is not surprising that your chances of hitting a stable protein that performs some useful function, and might therefore play a part in evolution, are even smaller. Axe puts them at 1 in 10 to the 77th power.

In other words, immense is so big and tiny is so small, that neo-Darwinian evolution is—so far—a dead loss. Try to mutate your way from 150 links of gibberish to a

working useful protein and you are guaranteed to fail. Try it with ten mutations, a thousand, a million—you fail. The odds bury you. It can't be done."

The statement that "it can't be done" is in reference to the process that results in the formation of very complex body parts such as eyes, livers, lungs, kidneys, brains and so on. "It" could not have happened randomly.

Gelernter provides more scientific data in a condensed form but it is still too much to present all of it at this time. But we can say, it is clear that the scientific data refuting macroevolution is abundant and clear. Gelernter provides additional clear and conclusive evidence from Axe and then cites German geneticists Christiane Nusslein-Volhard and Eric Wieschaus. These two won the Nobel Prize in 1995 for the "Heidelberg screen," an exhaustive investigation of every observable or inducible mutation of *Drosophila melanogaster*, the common fruit fly. Conclusion: "[W]e think we've hit all the genes required to specify the body plan of *Drosophila*," said Wieschaus in answering questions after a talk. Not one, he continued, is "promising as raw materials for macroevolution".

Gelernter says there is a general principle here which Steven Meyer explains: "genes that are obviously variable within natural populations seem to affect only minor aspects of form and function—while those genes that govern major changes, the very stuff of macroevolution, apparently do not vary or vary only to the detriment of the organism."

Gelernter adds a comment from the philosopher of biology Paul Nelson to summarize the body-plan problem: "Research on animal development and macroevolution over the past thirty years—research done from within the neo-Darwinian framework—has shown that the neo-Darwinian explanation for the origin of new body plans is overwhelmingly likely to be false—and for reasons that Darwin himself would have understood."

Gelernter concludes: "Darwin would easily have understood that minor mutations are common but can't create significant evolutionary change; major variations are rare and fatal."

The term minor mutation refers to shuffling of nucleotide sequences during the production of haploid gametes essential for reproduction. This shuffling occurs within a species or kind and can over time with geographic isolation result in sub-speciation, a form of microevolution. However, major changes in DNA sequences, changes that result in new functional genes that produce new functional body plans are antithetical to what we know about genetics. The biosphere is not only diverse but it is also interrelated and interdependent; randomness could not produce it.

Reproduction, growth, and survival are the nuts and bolts of biology. A significant mutation within an embryo means mortality that cancels growth and survival and therefore future reproduction. As Gelernter stated above, minor mutations are common and do not account for significant evolutionary change while macro-mutations are uncommon and typically fatal. These minor variations are inevitable within a species

because reproduction occurs within a species and reproduction involves shuffling of DNA. Consequently, even though we resemble our parents we are not exact replicas; but we are still the same species. Variation within a species is not the origin of a species.

Darwin observed microevolution as a very talented and skilled naturalist, but he did not observe macroevolution and neither has any naturalist or molecular biologist. Furthermore, the fossil record is not a picture of macroevolution. The fossil record and macroevolution are incompatible because the transitional species are not present in the record. Darwin himself was aware of this fact and depended on future discoveries to provide the missing links; yet, the missing links are still missing.

Conclusions

The above discussions reference one major scientific given. Major mutations are rare and when they occur the results are typically harmful. Consequently, a species is contained or limited to itself. Minor variations occur within a species but species do not mutate themselves into other species. Thus, glaring questions are immediately obvious. How many trillion beneficial functional mutations would it take to produce the biosphere? Does anyone honestly think that a single primordial cell mutated its way into plants and animals, invertebrates and vertebrates, reptiles and amphibians, dogs and cats, elephants and giraffes, whales and otters, hummingbirds and falcons while also mutating into 1.5 million beetle species and an estimated 5.5 million insect species overall.

So, how diverse is the biosphere? Could its diversity be the result of a non-functional hypothesis based on randomness? This is why Douglas Axe, the brilliant enzymologist, states you don't have to be an expert to answer these questions. Common science says the answer is an emphatic no! A process that does not exist, infinite mutations, could not randomly produce that which does exist, namely the biosphere with innumerable varieties that are not only functionally coherent but also coordinated to function together. Macroevolution is obviously absurd.

A common science and common-sense comparison of Darwin's tree of life to the reality of life shows that Darwin's tree is an illusion, like a clever magic trick. We are invited to look at his tree but if you look at the divergence of life in the biosphere it is impossible to represent it as limited to the image of a tree. Genetics controls diversity or divergence. The word divergent means to move away from what is expected. Genetics controls what is expected. What is expected is that each kind produces another like itself. Consequently, the existence of extreme divergence and the determinative stability of genetics proves that the divergence or diversity in the biosphere was created and did not evolve.

Ultimately, genetic molecules and mechanisms are tools in the hand of the Creator. The complex molecules that comprise genes do not have minds and tools are neither

blueprints nor are they constructors in the ultimate sense. The DNA double helix is opened by an enzyme, RNA moves in for transcription, transcription results in codons that select amino acids so that a shopping list of materials is provided and selected. Subsequently, the materials are assembled into incomprehensible complexities by mechanisms that are far removed from DNA sequences, showing that the idea of DNA as the ultimate determinative blueprint is not accurate. The blueprint comes from the mind of God and He simply transfers the blueprint to the creature He has created. Thus, the Creator's command becomes law; each kind reproduces another like itself. It is obvious! Each mature created species, variety, or kind is its own blueprint and the molecular tools needed to enforce the blueprint are embedded in the embryo formed as the result of sexual reproduction. The creature itself is the blueprint regardless of whether or not molecular science can demonstrate it. However, the basic knowledge pertaining to DNA, RNA, and associated enzymes indicates that the chicken came first. The mature creature is the blueprint. God created each and commanded each mature organism, plant or animal, to be fruitful and multiply; in another words, make another like yourself because you are the blueprint and I have equipped you with the molecular tools that I will use to enforce my command. "And it was so!" And by the way, it is still so, and it will continue to be so until the end of God-created time.

Modern day evolutionists are no closer to the truth than was Darwin with his Lamarckian ideas. A given organism is more likely to just mutate from one kind to another than through the mechanism of DNA mutations. Of course, both propositions are absurd. Remember, Darwin knew nothing about DNA and molecular biology and his willingness to make grand speculations is very much the same type of thinking displayed by modern day Neo-Darwinians including the theistic variety. The difference is that Darwin had no molecular science to deny.

As fallen humans we love to exult in our intellectual gifts. Gifts given by the Creator that are used to deny Him and suppress the obvious truth. The obvious truth is that each kind reproduces another like itself. This truth is obvious without any knowledge of molecular biology but the details of molecular biology agree with this obvious truth but evolutionary dogma attempts to establish the idea that DNA mutates like mosquitos reproduce. This method of thinking is the great, great grandchild of Darwin who had no scientific basis for his rebellious speculations. Actually, this way of thinking has been around since the fall but it should be clear that Darwin and his modern followers are both suppressors of the truth even though theistic Neo-Darwinians attempt to hide their suppression in the complexities of molecular biology.

Science has not vindicated Darwin. Science and God's special revelation in Scripture agree, life comes only from life and each kind reproduces another like itself.

Bibliography

- Axe, Douglas. *Undeniable: How Biology Confirms Our Intuition That Life Is Designed*. Harper Collins, 2016.
- Axe, Douglas. "Three Good Reasons for People of Faith to Reject Darwin's Explanation of Life." Chapter 1 of Section 1 in *Theistic Evolution: A Scientific, Philosophical and Theological Critique*. Crossway Books, 2017
- Blocher, Henri. *In the Beginning: The Opening Chapters of Genesis*. Inter-Varsity Press, 1984.
- Collins, Francis. *The Language of God: A Scientist Presents Evidence for Belief*. New York: Free Press, 2006.
- Gelernter, David. "Giving up Darwin." *Claremont Review of Books*, no. Spring 2019, <https://claremontreviewofbooks.com/giving-up-darwin/>.
- Hoeksema, Herman. *Reformed Dogmatics*. Reformed Free Publishing Association, 1966.
- Keller, Timothy. "Creation, Evolution and Christian Laypeople." *The Biologos Foundation*, 2012, www.biologos.org/projects/scholar-essays.
- Mader, S, Sylvia. *Biology Tenth Edition*. McGraw Hill, 2010.
- Van Til, Cornelius. "Nature and Scripture." *Essay pages 263-201 in The Infallible Word: A Symposium by the Members of Westminster Theological Seminary*, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1967.
- VanDoodeward, William. *The Quest for the Historical Adam: Genesis, Hermeneutics, and Human Origins*. Reformation Heritage Books, 2015.
- Watts, Malcom H. *The Lord Gave the Word; A Study in the Biblical Text*. Trinitarian Bible Society, 1988.

Wells, Johnathan. *Why DNA Mutations Cannont Accomplish What Neo-Darwinism Requires.*” Chapter 7 in *Theistic Evolution: A Scientific, Philosophical and Theological Critique*, Crossway Books, 2017.

Young, Edward, J. *Studies In Genesis One*. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1964.