

A

Puritans' Home School Curriculum

**CONCISE STUDY OF
'THE CASE AGAINST
DARWIN'**

TEACHER'S MANUAL

J. Parnell McCarter

“The fool hath said in his heart, [There is] no God.” - Psalm 14:1

SECOND EDITION

©2005 J. Parnell McCarter. All Rights Reserved.

6408 Wrenwood

Jenison, MI 49428

(616) 457-8095

The Puritans' Home School Curriculum

www.puritans.net

**TEACHER’S MANUAL FOR
A PURITANS’ HOME SCHOOL CURRICULUM
CONCISE STUDY OF ‘THE CASE AGAINST DARWIN’
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Section One : Course Instructions.....p. 4

Section Two : Course Check-off List.....p. 6

Section Three : Assignmentsp.8

Section Four : Answer Keys.....p.22

SECTION ONE: COURSE INSTRUCTIONS

Purpose

A Puritans' Home School Curriculum Concise Study of 'The Case Against Darwin' provides a Christian rebuttal to the abominable lie called Darwinian evolution. It also serves as introduction to the philosophy of science from a reformed Christian perspective.

Prerequisites

The student should have completed elementary courses in philosophy and science in order to be able to understand the terminology employed in the readings for this mini-course.

Outside Resources Required

The only outside resource required for this mini-course will be James Perloff's 2001 article in WorldNetDaily entitled "The case against Darwin". It is available on the internet at http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=21776 .

Check-Off List

Students should record when they have completed assignments on their check-off list, and teachers should record grades on the check-off list. A master of the check-off list has been included in this manual, from which copies can be made and distributed to students.

Assignments

An assignment consists of readings and exercises. Teachers should grade the exercises for completeness and correct answers. Masters of the assignments have been included in this manual, from which copies can be made and distributed to students.

The exercises may be performed in 'open book' fashion.

Grading

The average grade of the two assignments should be calculated in order to determine the overall grade for the mini-course.

SECTION TWO: COURSE CHECK-OFF LIST

Puritans' Home School Curriculum
CONCISE STUDY OF 'THE CASE AGAINST DARWIN'

Student Name: _____

Teacher Name: _____

Assignment Check-Off List

Assignment #	TOPIC	ASSIGNMENT COMPLETED? (X)	GRADE (ON A 100-POINT SCALE)
1	<i>The Philosophical Case Against Darwin</i>		
2	<i>A Review of the Natural Data</i>		
3	<i>An Examination of Creation Science</i>		
<i>Total Score of all 3 Assignments</i>			
<i>Average Score (Total Score / 3)</i>			
<i>Letter Grade Equivalent of Average Score*</i>			

* Grading in this course should be done on a 100-point scale, with letter grades assigned as follows:

Letter Grade	Score on 100-Point Scale
A+	97 - 100
A	94 - 96
A-	90 - 93
B+	87 - 89
B	84 - 86
B-	80 - 83
C+	77 - 79
C	74 - 76
C-	70 - 73
D	60 - 69
F	0 - 59

SECTION THREE: ASSIGNMENTS

ASSIGNMENT 1 : PHILOSOPHICAL CASE AGAINST DARWIN

Reading:

There is a distinct difference between a presuppositionalist versus evidentialist approach to the science of origins. An evidentialist approach- whether carried out by an evolutionary scientist or a creation scientist- pretends we can prove from the natural data alone the order and timing of biological and geological origins. The presuppositionalist approach recognizes the variables are so many, the possible explanatory models are so great, the data is often so vague, and human nature is so fallen, that man cannot prove from natural data alone the order and timing of origins. Men should be able to recognize that nature was created by God (though sinful men often even deny this), but this is quite different from knowing the order and timing of origins. An evidential approach to the science of origins also shares the general deficiencies of evidentialism overall. A primary flaw of the Darwinian evolution theory is that it relies upon this flawed evidentialist approach to science.

Presuppositionalism in general recognizes the limits of man's ability to acquire knowledge apart from presuppositional faith in the divine revelation of scripture. This general distinction stems from at least four clear and significant differences between the presuppositional and evidentialist apologetic approaches. One underlying difference concerns a different perspective on the condition of man in his unregenerate state. The presuppositionalist views man as totally depraved and totally corrupted by sin, whereas the evidentialist views man's corruption in a more limited fashion. The evidentialist believes there is enough remaining capacity for sound reasoning in the unregenerate man to bring him through rational evidence to the point of faith. The evidentialist would acknowledge the presence of sin in man, but would deny that it is so great that it must be totally transformed before it can attain a living and true knowledge of God. It does not acknowledge that the unregenerate man's will is totally bent against acknowledging the truth. On the other hand, the presuppositionalist regards unregenerate man as lacking such a capacity for sound reasoning. He views man as willfully bent against acknowledging truth (Romans 3:11), and as wholly bent on suppression of the truth (Romans 1:18).

Flowing out of this different perspective on the nature of man is a different perspective on the danger of autonomous reasoning. The evidentialist implicitly acknowledges the legitimacy of human autonomous reasoning, whereas the presuppositionalist explicitly rejects it. Evidentialism permits man to stand back, weigh the evidence for and against God and the truth of his word, and arrive at a judgment. Now, of course, the Christian evidentialist would assert that the judgment that should be arrived at is for God and the Bible. But the presuppositionalist argues the ends do not justify the means. The presuppositionalist argues that Eve's sin began when she put herself in the role of judge and jury of God. Man does not have a right to such a vaulted position as a creature of God to question him (Romans 9:20), but should always embrace God and his word in faith.

One reason why they have a different view on autonomous reasoning is their different view on the antithesis between God's kingdom and the kingdom of this world. This antithesis blurs along the edges in the evidentialist conception, but remains quite separate and distinct in the presuppositionalist conception. According to the evidentialist conception, there are more areas of neutrality which serve as the common ground of believer and unbeliever. Reason and logic are considered by the evidentialist as one such neutral territory. Since it is considered neutral territory, it is also regarded as fertile ground to arrive at Biblical truth. But the presuppositionalist denies that this is neutral territory, but rather argues that fallen human wisdom is thoroughly darkened and corrupted by sin (Romans 1:21). Fallen man is dispositionally averse to being truly logical and consistent. It asserts fallen human wisdom and divine wisdom then are diametrically opposed and antithetical (I Corinthians 1:21).

Finally, the evidentialist assumes faith can come through reasoning and understanding, whereas the presuppositionalist affirms that right reasoning and understanding can only be attained through faith. The presuppositionalist points out how "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom". Without such an embrace of God in faith, man is left to grope in darkness and futility. Without presupposed faith in God and his word, the most mundane aspects of human experience- from the laws of ethics to the laws of science- cannot be rationally understood and explained.

With regards specifically to the science of origins, the factors against knowing the order and timing from natural data alone are overwhelming. When considering the order and timing of events in the distant past, there are a multitude of variables to consider. Perhaps most fundamental concerns the state and beginning of the creation itself. If God created a fully functioning universe *ex nihilo* (which is what He did), then it has a built-in appearance of age from an evolutionist perspective. (From a creationist perspective, it has a built-in appearance of what it is.) But even with this knowledge, there is still question as to the exact details of what the world looked like at creation. From the evolutionary perspective, the world was not created fully functioning *ex nihilo*, but this is an assumption of his model, and hence a variable. There is further the variable of the uniformity of the laws of nature. From a scriptural perspective there are dis-uniformities (e.g., man not subject to death), but it is not certain the extent of these in the pre-fall and pre-flood world from afterwards. Was there refraction of light as we know it since it is stated that God made the rainbow as a sign after Noah's flood? Were there different laws operating to extend man's life span? Were there other dis-uniformities? We simply do not know. Of course, the evolutionary model assumes uniformity, but this is an assumption and a variable. There is nothing in the materialistic conception of the Darwinian view to even commend laws of nature, much less their uniformity. Laws of natural science are not physical. But since they are not physical, then they must only exist as the thoughts of men trying to impose an order upon the chance reactions of atoms and molecules. According to the naturalistic conception, there is certainly no omniscient mind to fall back upon to say the way atoms and molecules behave in a particular space and time is universally the case. Therefore, such laws must be reduced to the conceptions of finite men: mere conventions, not uniform laws. Beyond these two variables, there are variables about conditions on and off the earth, and how they inter-

relate. Furthermore, in almost every scientific study of origins there is some data that does not fit the model proposed. Explanations are generally given for this divergent data. But the explanations are generally unproved and even untestable. These are additional variables. There are variables relating to rates of decay, beginning conditions of objects, etc. Sometimes the data is not even clear. It may be hard to identify a specimen, or it may be hard to tell if it was tainted by its environment. Assumptions are often made in these circumstances about the specimen, adding an additional variable to the mix. In summary, there are a multitude of variables.

Math, like the scientific method, is a powerful tool to learn. But math has its limits when there are too many variables. If one is trying to solve two equations with three or more variables, it is not possible to determine the value of the variables. Of course, one can assume a value for one of the variables to know the other two, but then that is not a solution to the original problem, but only one of many possible solutions. Similarly, using the scientific method to know the timing and order of origins has such a multitude of variables that all that one can do is derive possible models to explain the natural data. And there are numerous possible models which could be proposed to explain the natural data if one is allowed to make unproved and untestable assumptions about many of the variables.

Add to all these difficulties the human nature of those engaging in science, and the pull against deriving a firm conclusion based only on the evidence is overwhelming. Humans have their agendas, due to economics, pride, social pressures, group and social biases, and - most importantly- sin and depravity. All these factors mitigate against deriving detailed knowledge of origins from the natural data.

In order therefore to attain any knowledge of the order and timing of origins we must begin with a presuppositional faith in God's word and in its account of origins. We may be able to hypothesize beyond the Biblical account, but we should recognize there are some significant obstacles to our deriving any firm conclusion from the natural data itself. Darwin's theory of evolution fails most fundamentally because it fails to recognize the necessity of presuppositional faith and it fails to acknowledge the limitations of deriving knowledge of the timing and order of origins from the natural data alone.

Exercise:

Answer the following questions:

1. What is an evidentialist approach to the science of origins?
2. What is a presuppositionalist approach to the science of origins?
3. Which of the two approaches characterizes the Darwinian theory of evolution?
4. What are the flaws of the evidentialist approach to the science of origins?

5. What are some of the assumptions of the evolutionist model which are contrary to what we read in the Genesis account of creation?

ASSIGNMENT 2: A REVIEW OF THE NATURAL DATA

Reading:

James Perloff's 2001 article in WorldNetDaily entitled "The case against Darwin" does a good job of concisely presenting the record of natural data as it relates to Darwin's theory of evolution. So peruse this article which is available on the internet at http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=21776 .

Now it must be stated, that for each of the difficulties presented by Perloff for the theory of evolution, evolutionists can posit answers that are consistent within a naturalist framework. For example, some evolutionists have responded to the lack of transitional forms by suggesting punctuated evolution in which lower life forms suddenly and dramatically evolve to higher life forms. However, such explanations have not themselves been proved from the natural data. After all, when has such massive macroevolution ever been observed by man? Such unproved, *ad hoc* explanations only serve to demonstrate how naturalist evolution is really *presuppositionally* committed to evolutionary naturalism. This is where they have placed their faith, analogous to the way Christians have placed their faith in God's word.

However, unlike the Christian faith, presuppositional faith in evolutionary naturalism leads to destructive irrationalism. As Perloff notes in his article, if man is nothing more than another animal, "the product of chance mutations from an ancient slime", then absolutist human ethics classifying actions as good or bad are unwarranted. Under evolutionary naturalism, it is incoherent to assert that 'murder and theft are evil in an absolute sense'. But in reality, social human interaction is dependent upon and predicated upon absolutist human ethics. Societies that have sought to deny them, such as various communist and fascist experiments in history, have descended into destructive irrationalism.

Exercise:

Answer the following questions:

1. What is the significance of Darwinian evolution to societal ethics?
2. What would be the genetic mechanism creating higher life forms if Darwinian evolution were true?
3. In terms of the *observed* evidence, how have genetic mutations affected information in the genetic code?

4. What is 'irreducible complexity' and what is its significance for the evolutionary theory?
5. Cite an example of irreducible complexity.
6. How would the presence of free oxygen in the atmosphere complicate a process involving evolution from basic organic compounds formed from a primordial soup?
7. What are transitional fossils?
8. What had Darwin predicted about transitional forms in the geologic record?
9. What is embryology?
10. Why would intermediate creatures tend to be disfavored by natural selection?

ASSIGNMENT 3: AN EXAMINATION OF ‘CREATION SCIENCE’

Reading:

Below are two articles examining ‘creation science’. Read these articles before performing the exercise after the articles:

Article #1:

I received this request for advice recently from a university student:

“I managed to get into two philosophy classes: Classical (Ancient) Philosophy and Philosophy of Natural Science. The first is very interesting, but the second course I find rather difficult. For instance, we have to do a paper on "Is Creation-Science Really Science?" But under the criteria of most (maybe all) philosophers, creation-science is clearly excluded. Yet I can't see any way that Creation-science can be excluded! Indeed, creation-science has to be foundational to all the other sciences! So I was wondering, are there any definitions of science from a Biblical perspective? The professor gave us something from J.P. Moreland, to give us a creation-science perspective, but he's not a 6-day creationist, and seems to have some holes in his arguments. Well, I would much appreciate your advice. Your advice about philosophy has been very helpful!”

My advice is as follows:

I would recommend that you avoid semantic arguments relating to the definition of ‘science’. Rather, I would recommend that you take the standard definition of ‘science’ as it is found in such sources as the Webster’s Dictionary, and analyze it. Here is the definition I find:

Science - knowledge or a system of knowledge covering general truths or the operation of general laws especially as obtained and tested through the scientific method and concerned with the physical world and its phenomena ([Source: Merriam-Webster Medical Dictionary](#), © 2002 Merriam-Webster, Inc.)

Now, let’s analyze the definition. (At this point I would encourage you to buy a tape of what is called the “Great Debate” between the late Dr. Greg Bahnsen [Christian] and Dr. Gordon Stein [naturalistic atheist]. Much of what I am now going to say is taken from that debate on tape.) Various terms are used in this definition of ‘science’ from Webster’s Dictionary, including ‘knowledge’, ‘truth’, and ‘general laws’. Now the question to ask is this: if ‘science’ depends upon ‘knowledge’, ‘truth’, and ‘general [natural] laws’ for its existence (as the Webster’s definition implies), is ‘science’ an intelligible concept apart from the Christian Biblical worldview?

Let's take the alternative worldview of naturalistic atheism (which reduces all reality down to the material level and denies the existence of the omniscient, revelatory God) that dominates many university campuses, for instance. How are 'knowledge', 'truth', and 'general [natural] laws' humanly possible with such a worldview? If the only thing that exists is material (as naturalism suggests), are 'general [natural] laws' material? 'General [natural] laws' are not material, for laws are not characterized by materiality. Laws are ideas and principles known only by intelligent beings. And the very notion of 'laws' governing how the physical universe behaves presumes an intelligent Governor of the universe who ordinarily governs according to those laws. As the Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary so eloquently expresses, "Law implies imposition by a sovereign authority and the obligation of obedience on the part of all subject to that authority." But the existence of an intelligent Governor and sovereign authority over the physical universe is quite contrary to the naturalistic worldview. Again, the naturalistic worldview of Darwinian evolutionary theory reduces all ontological reality down to the level of the material, and asserts that all that really exists are physical objects behaving according to chance reactions. If consistently applied, there would be no room for 'general [natural] laws' in such a worldview. And if there is no omniscient, revelatory God, how can there be 'knowledge' and 'truth', if all that exists is finite and fallible. 'Truth' is that which is known for certain, but without an omniscient, revelatory God, man can know *nothing* for certain. Even that which a finite, fallible being thinks he knows is subject to error, so without an omniscient God, 'truth' is an unattainable, irrelevant concept. And without a revelatory God, man can have no true knowledge, for there is no sure foundation for knowing truth for man. And if 'knowledge', 'truth', and 'general [natural] laws' are not possible for man, then neither can 'science' be, according to the standard definition of 'science' found in the Webster's Dictionary.

In contrast, the Christian Biblical worldview can account for 'knowledge', 'truth', and 'general [natural] laws'. 'Knowledge' is that true understanding of the universe in the mind of the God described in the Bible, who imparts knowledge and the means to attain more knowledge to man. 'Truth' is that which the omniscient God of the Bible knows for certain. 'General [natural] laws' are the principles in the mind of God by which He ordinarily governs the physical universe. The omniscient, revelatory God of the Bible has indicated the scientific method of science is possible for attaining true knowledge- within limits.

We could also analyze other worldviews, and show how their internal contradictions are opposed to principles of 'knowledge' and 'truth', for knowledge and 'truth' presuppose the absence of such internal contradictions. Contradiction is contrary to truth, and the existence of truth implies the absence of contradiction. Other worldviews are plagued by internal contradictions, but the Biblical Christian worldview alone among worldviews is absent such internal contradictions. (Worldviews which purport to be Christian, yet deny 6-day Creation, are examples of self-contradictory worldviews, for the Christian Bible teaches 6-day Creation, and Christ adhered to the truth of the Bible.) And so the Biblical Christian worldview alone among worldviews admits 'science', while also recognizing the limits of the scientific method for the attaining of true knowledge.

We should next consider the limits of human science. We had already pointed out that we can infer from scriptural principles that the scientific method is valid within certain limits. Specifically, how far can human science take us when it comes to the timing and order of origins? As I argue in the book at <http://www.puritans.net/curriculum/darwin.pdf>, science has not shown it can penetrate this barrier. While the scientific method is valid for ascertaining ‘general [natural] laws’ (i.e., principles by which God ordinarily governs the physical universe) of an on-going basis, scripture reveals at Creation, as well as at various other times and places, He has supernaturally intervened, governing the physical universe in miraculous ways. The scientific method is ill suited to ascertain such. There are no repeatable scientific experiments which would detect miracles of the past, for miracles represent occasions when God deviates from the ordinary laws by which He governs the physical universe.

But that is not the only limitation of the scientific method. The scientific method is not useful for attaining knowledge of many sorts of historical events. Could we conduct some scientific experiment to ascertain that George Washington crossed the Delaware, or that Julius Caesar conquered Rome? No. To attain historical knowledge of historical events, we must rely upon credible eye-witness accounts. Scientific experiments are of little value in attaining knowledge of history. The way we have to attain knowledge of historical events, including the historical event of the resurrection of Jesus Christ (witnessed by many faithful men) and the historical event of the Creation (witnessed by Jesus Christ, His Father, and His Spirit), is different from the way we attain knowledge using the scientific method. But historical knowledge is as valid as scientific knowledge, including historical knowledge of miracles attested by credible eye-witnesses.

So where does that leave ‘creation science’? ‘Creation science’ has been defined this way: “The effort to provide scientific evidence supporting the account of the creation of the universe related in the Bible.” (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition Copyright C 2004, 2000 by Houghton Mifflin Company. Published by Houghton Mifflin Company.) If, as I have argued, ‘creation science’ is ill suited for revealing the timing and order of origins, is it of any use? I would argue its usefulness as a movement has primarily been in the realm of critiquing certain aspects of the materialistic evolutionary theory, rather than ‘proving’ the creation of the universe related in the Bible, which it is ill-equipped to do. The evolutionary theory has not been proved by science consistently applied, as I argue in the book at <http://www.puritans.net/curriculum/eden.pdf> and the book at <http://www.puritans.net/curriculum/darwin.pdf>. To ascertain the order and timing of origins, we are left to rely upon the revelation of the Triune God in the Bible, since the Triune God alone was eyewitness of the origin of the physical universe, and since it involved various miraculous events.

So perhaps I must disappoint you and say that I too have intellectual reservations that ‘creation science’, as it is generally defined, is ‘science’. For me to be intellectually comfortable with ‘creation science’, it would have to be re-defined to simply mean the study of the physical

universe which recognizes the limits of the scientific method within Biblical parameters. So long as ‘creation science’, as generally defined, claims more than this, I must remain skeptical of creation science taken as a whole. But that does not mean I disagree with the revelation of scripture, such as the fact that the world was created in the space of six days. The universe was created in the space of six days, a fact I know not through science, but through the infallible historical account inspired by the God of the universe (i.e., the Bible).

Article #2:

In my previous article on science and creation science I had written this:

“So where does that leave ‘creation science’? ‘Creation science’ has been defined this way: “The effort to provide scientific evidence supporting the account of the creation of the universe related in the Bible.” (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition Copyright C 2004, 2000 by Houghton Mifflin Company. Published by Houghton Mifflin Company.) If, as I have argued, ‘creation science’ is ill suited for revealing the timing and order of origins, is it of any use? I would argue its usefulness as a movement has primarily been in the realm of critiquing certain aspects of the materialistic evolutionary theory, rather than ‘proving’ the creation of the universe related in the Bible, which it is ill-equipped to do. The evolutionary theory has not been proved by science consistently applied, as I argue in the book at <http://www.puritans.net/curriculum/eden.pdf> and the book at <http://www.puritans.net/curriculum/darwin.pdf>. To ascertain the order and timing of origins, we are left to rely upon the revelation of the Triune God in the Bible, since the Triune God alone was witness of the origin of the physical universe, and since it involved various miraculous events.”

Let me further explain what I have written, by considering this question: can we prove young earth creationism from the natural data alone, without reference to the Bible?

I think not, but much of the creation science community differs with me. For instance, one of the leading creation science organizations, ICR, seems to answer in the affirmative, in an article <http://icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-017.htm> excerpted below:

“...In Table I have been listed 76 different processes for calculating the age of various integral parts of the earth and, thus, presumably of the earth itself. All of them yield an age of much less than a billion years, whereas the present standard evolutionary estimate is approximately five billion years.

The presently-favored geochronometric methods (that is, those that give long ages, such as uranium-lead, rubidium-strontium, and potassium-argon) have not been included in the

tabulation, nor are they discussed in this paper. However, it has been shown elsewhere (1, 5, 6, 7) that these can also easily be reconciled with young-age concepts.

The most obvious characteristic of the values listed in the table is their extreme variability—all the way from 100 years to 500,000,000 years. This variability, of course, simply reflects the errors in the fundamental uniformitarian assumptions.

Nevertheless, all things considered, it seems that those ages on the low end of the spectrum are likely to be more accurate than those on the high end. This conclusion follows from the obvious fact that: (1) they are less likely to have been affected by initial concentrations or positions other than "zero"; (2) the assumption that the system was a "closed system" is more likely to be valid for a short time than for a long time; (3) the assumption that the process rate was constant is also more likely to be valid for a short time than for a long time.

Thus, it is concluded that the weight of all the scientific evidence favors the view that the earth is quite young, far too young for life and man to have arisen by an evolutionary process. The origin of all things by special creation—already necessitated by many other scientific considerations—is therefore also indicated by chronometric data.

Finally, the reader should note that these conclusions were reached with no reference at all to the testimony of the Bible relative to chronology..."

This article illustrates why I cannot say that I agree with 'creation science' – as it is commonly understood- without qualification or reservation. Contrary to the article above, I do not think we can conclude a young earth or an old earth from the natural data alone. I deny that we can conclude, from the natural data cited in the article above, young earth creationism. The data are too scattered to make such a conclusion, and the assumptions to make such a conclusion are unproved from the natural data alone. According to Genesis, God created a fully functioning universe during creation week. Therefore, anyone looking at the natural data after creation week, and assuming constancy of natural operations back in time, would reach wrong conclusions. Mankind has not had to wait millions of years to see stars that are millions of "light-years" away. Though Adam may have looked 30 years old on day 7 of creation week, he was only one day old. And most likely the same could be said for many other things. We, like Adam, have to depend upon the testimony of God to know the age of the world, for we cannot make a conclusive inference from the natural data alone, and the natural data alone does not lend itself to such conclusive inferences.

How can I look at the stars, the sky and the rocks and know from them alone that the world was created some 6000 years ago, or whether birds were created before or after fish? I cannot. The timing and order of origins is simply not determinable from the natural data alone. Science is a valuable tool, but its usefulness is limited to those times and places when God has governed his universe according to His ordinary laws. It is analogous to the usefulness of a

microscope. A microscope is useful within limits, but beyond those limits it is not useful. For instance, one could not use a microscope to study the stars.

Although there have been numerous young earth creationists ever since the time of Adam, the 'creation science' movement as such is rather young. It developed in America during the twentieth century. Most of its leaders have been Arminian and Baptist, so that the public perception of 'creation science' has largely been molded by them. Most Americans, and especially most Americans of Arminian and Baptist persuasion, have been wedded to the proposition that we could have a sound government and educational system, without those systems being explicitly wedded to Reformed Biblical Christianity. The USA itself is an experiment in the proposition. So we should not be surprised that a large and dominant contingent of the 'creation science' movement has reflected this philosophy. The following proposed resolution is a manifestation of this philosophy (excerpted from <http://icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-026.htm>):

“A Resolution to encourage equitable treatment of alternate scientific concepts of origins in the public schools and other institutions of the state -

I. WHEREAS, it appears that most, if not all, state-supported educational institutions require students to take courses in which naturalistic concepts of evolution are taught as scientific explanations of origins of the universe, life and man;¹ and

II. WHEREAS evolution is not demonstrable as scientific fact or testable as a scientific hypothesis, and therefore must be accepted philosophically by faith;² and

III. WHEREAS there is another concept of origins ³namely, that of special creation of the universe, life, and man by an omnipotent personal Creator ³which is at least as satisfactory a *scientific explanation* of origins as is evolution, and is accepted as such by a large number of scientists and other well-informed people;³ and

IV. WHEREAS many citizens of this State believe in the special creation concept of origins and are convinced that exclusive indoctrination of their children in the evolutionary concept (including so-called "theistic" evolution) is inimical to their religious faith and to their moral and civic teachings, as well as to scientific objectivity, academic freedom, and civil rights;⁴ and

V. WHEREAS even most citizens who are not opposed to the evolution concept at least favor a balanced treatment of these two alternative views of origins in their schools, thus allowing students to consider all of the evidences favoring each concept before deciding which to believe.⁵

Now, therefore, Be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That the State Higher Education Commission and the State Board of Public Education be, and hereby is, urged to recommend to all state-supported educational institutions that a balanced treatment of evolution and special creation be encouraged in all courses, textbooks, library materials and museum displays dealing in any way with the subject of origins, such

treatment to be limited to the scientific, rather than religious, aspects of the two concepts.

...The suggestion seems in order, therefore, that creationists should normally work through persuasion rather than coercion and should emphatically stress the scientific (rather than religious) aspects of creationism, as well as the basically religious nature of evolutionism.¹ When a political approach is followed in a particular state or community, then I.C.R. suggests that a *resolution* be proposed, rather than a legislative bill or an administrative or judicial directive. A resolution *encourages*, rather than *compels*, the teaching of creation, and so should not encounter the usual bitter opposition of the educational and scientific establishments. Also, if the resolution stresses (with documentation) that creation and evolution are both *equally* scientific and/or religious, and that fairness and constitutionality warrant an equitable treatment of both, then hopefully responsible officials will support it. Accordingly, I.C.R. has prepared the foregoing sample...”

While such a resolution may on its surface seem an improvement over current affairs, it is actually an improper compromise. God does not permit schools to take a neutral posture with respect to Reformed Biblical Christianity. All schools are commanded to teach the Biblical truth and to suppress wicked heresies and lies. And all schools and all governments are commanded to profess King Jesus as their Lord. God has spoken in His word, and men must obey that word. That must be our message, for the word of God does not permit another message.

Furthermore, fallen, sinful men need the word of God in order to enjoy sound government and sound education and sound science. The Bible is necessary for true science, but science is not necessary for a true Bible. Fallen man is totally depraved, and without the word of God cannot come to true knowledge.

It would not be fair, however, to suggest the errors cited in this article are true of all of the creation science movement. For example, it seems that <http://www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v22/i1/creation.asp> is more sound. Furthermore, we should repeat again the significant good organizations like ICR have done in defending 6-Day creation, when much of purported “reformed” Christianity has fallen for heresies like the Framework Hypothesis. We must acknowledge the good in the creation science movement, and call for reformation where that is needed.

Exercise:

Compose an essay analyzing and comparing ICR’s philosophical approach to creation science (<http://icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-017.htm>) and the philosophical approach of Answers in Genesis (<http://www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v22/i1/creation.asp>). Indicate how they follow either an evidentialist or presuppositionalist approach. Show the strengths and weaknesses of

argumentation.

SECTION FOUR: ANSWER KEYS

ASSIGNMENT 1 EXERCISE ANSWER KEY

1. What is an evidentialist approach to the science of origins? An evidentialist approach- whether carried out by an evolutionary scientist or a creation scientist- pretends we can prove from the natural data alone the order and timing of biological and geological origins.
2. What is a presuppositionalist approach to the science of origins? The presuppositionalist approach recognizes the variables are so many, the possible explanatory models are so great, the data is often so vague, and human nature is so fallen, that man cannot prove from natural data alone the order and timing of origins. The presuppositionalist recognizes the necessity of faith in divine revelation in order to come to a knowledge of the timing and order of origins.
3. Which of the two approaches characterizes the Darwinian theory of evolution? The evidentialist approach
4. What are the flaws of the evidentialist approach to the science of origins? The variables are so many, the possible explanatory models are so great, the data is often so vague, and human nature is so fallen, that man cannot prove from natural data alone the order and timing of origins.
5. What are some of the assumptions of the evolutionist model which are contrary to what we read in the Genesis account of creation? That God did not create a fully functioning universe *ex nihilo* and uniformitarianism

ASSIGNMENT 2 EXERCISE ANSWER KEY

1. What is the significance of Darwinian evolution to societal ethics? It contradicts Biblical Christianity, replacing it with a materialistic conception of the universe.
2. What would be the genetic mechanism creating higher life forms if Darwinian evolution were true? Chance mutations
3. In terms of the *observed* evidence, how have genetic mutations affected information in the genetic code? Deleted information
4. What is 'irreducible complexity' and what is its significance for the evolutionary theory? The condition of being so complex and the components of the complex system being so inter-connected, that a system or life form so characterized could not plausibly have evolved step-by-step; many life forms and systems we observe are so irreducibly complex that Darwinian evolution is an implausible explanation
5. Cite an example of irreducible complexity. Blood clotting, vision, immune system
6. How would the presence of free oxygen in the atmosphere complicate a process involving evolution from basic organic compounds formed from a primordial soup? It would oxidize such basic organic compounds, in effect destroying them.
7. What are transitional fossils? Fossils of dead creatures which would demonstrate how they evolved in small steps from lower life forms
8. What had Darwin predicted about transitional forms in the geologic record? There would be many transitional life forms.
9. What is embryology? The study of the development of maturing human embryos, from conception to birth
10. Why would intermediate creatures tend to be disfavored by natural selection? In its intermediate steps the non-functioning part would be a hindrance to survival, making progressive evolution of life forms in small steps implausible.

ASSIGNMENT 3 EXERCISE ANSWER KEY

The student's essay should address all the points asked for in the exercise. It should recognize that ICR follows a more evidentialist approach to the topic of creationism, whereas Answers in Genesis follows a more presuppositionalist approach.