

Theistic Evolution: The Failure of Neo-Darwinism

Dr. Ray Bohlin provides an overview of the first section of a landmark book on theistic evolution, showing why evolution doesn't hold up to scrutiny.

Three Good Reasons for People of Faith to Reject Darwin's Explanation of Life

In this article I'm discussing the first of four sections in the book, *Theistic Evolution: A Scientific, Philosophical, and Theological Critique*.^[1] I'll be covering five chapters from the section, "The Failure of Neo-Darwinism." First we'll look at Doug Axe's chapter titled, "Three Good Reasons for People of Faith to Reject Darwin's Explanation of Life."

I need to let you know from the start that I totally disagree with any theistic evolutionary perspective. As a biologist, I see no reason for any accommodation since Darwinism should be rejected on purely scientific grounds.

But moving along, Axe makes three points in this chapter. First, that there is a cost to any theistic evolution position. Second, Darwin's view of life is false. Third, the reasons for the accommodation are confused. I want to focus on his first point that accommodating Darwin's view of life within traditional faith is costly. He begins with a familiar quotation from the Book of Job 39:26-27. "Is it by your understanding that the hawk soars and spreads his wings toward the south? Is it at your command that the eagle mounts up and makes his nest on high?" Eventually, Job was appropriately humbled as he responded later in Job 42:3, "I have uttered what I did not understand, things too wonderful for me, which I did not know." And if you *don't* agree, then *you* should try to make an eagle. Oh, we can create flying toys with flapping

wings and all, but these don't come close to an actual eagle or hawk. These toys must be made on an assembly line with humans adding parts until the "eagle" is complete. With only the yolk and white of the egg as its nutrition, true eagles are formed within the egg by a seamless automated process. No human interference needed.

If a part breaks in the flying toy, it must be replaced by a human. Eagle's bodies can mostly heal themselves and true eagles reproduce on their own. No flying toy will ever reproduce itself. Job's response was correct. He didn't respond, saying "Actually, God, hawks and eagles could have appeared by accident over millions of years." As Doug states, "I see no way around the fact that the arresting awe we're meant to have for the maker of the majestic eagle is lost the moment we accept that accidental physical processes could have done the making instead Neo-Darwinism and the Origin of Biological Form and Information Now we turn to discussing Stephen Meyer's chapter on the origin of biological form and genetic information.

Neo-Darwinism and the Origin of Biological Form and Information

Before we begin, I need to discuss what a body plan is. The body plan of an animal is the overall structure of the body. For instance, the butterfly and the polar bear have very different body plans. The butterfly has its skeleton on the outside, what's known as an exoskeleton. The polar bear has an endoskeleton; the skeleton is on the inside of the body. Butterflies have wings, polar bears don't. In fact, all the major organs, limbs and other body parts are arranged very differently. So, each of these animals will need to form along very different pathways to arrive at the final product. The question becomes, "How does the evolutionary process form such different body plans from similar beginnings?"

Studies in developmental biology, the study of how organisms develop from fertilized egg to final product, show that changes in biological form require attention to the timing, especially those steps involved in developing the body plan. Also, there is a need for careful choreography in the expression of genetic information, not just when, but how much, how long lived, the proper sequence.

There are real problems here for Neo-Darwinism. Major evolutionary change requires changes in the body plan which is formed very early in embryonic development. So, mutations need to occur early. Mutations that may occur late have no effect on body plan. But numerous studies have shown that early mutations are inevitably lethal. Late mutations don't produce body plan changes. As Meyer puts it, "The kind of mutations we need, we don't get. The kind we get, we don't need."

There isn't just a need for new genes and proteins for new functions of the organism. Polar bears can endure freezing temperatures, butterflies can't. But new regulatory pathways are needed. Early development is controlled by developmental gene regulatory networks, or dGRNs. These networks regulate the time and perform the choreography. Any mutations here are always inevitably lethal. Neo-Darwinism can't explain the origin of new animal body plans.

Are Present Proposals on Chemical Evolutionary Mechanisms Accurately Pointing toward First Life?

Now we will review Dr. James Tour's discussion on the origin of life. Dr. Tour is the foremost authority on organic chemical synthesis. That is, he makes chemical products based on the element carbon. This background makes him just the scientist to critique the chemical origin of the first life, since life is also based on the element carbon.

Tour begins by describing the start and stop necessity of making something as simple as a carbon-based car and a car that also contains a motor and then an even better motor. These nano cars take many steps to build. Usually Tour and colleagues run into a roadblock necessitating, before moving to the next step, that they back up several steps and redirect the process. He also documents that each stage usually requires different chemical requirements. This makes it necessary to purify your product. What he demonstrates is that making something comparably simple as a nano car requires intelligent input at every step. This will not happen by chance. Tour emphasizes that the undirected chemical synthesis to make useful biological molecules, and even a cell, is far more complex with no opportunity to start over again when you hit a dead-end.

After walking the reader through the many and enormous roadblocks a prebiotic chemist faces in trying to form the building blocks—sugars, amino acids, fatty acids, and nucleotides—and then the macromolecules; carbohydrates, proteins, lipids, DNA and RNA, and *then* trying to assemble these very different parts into a functioning, reproducing cell, Tour comes to a final conclusion.

“Those who think scientists understand how prebiotic chemical mechanisms produced the first life are wholly misinformed. Nobody understands how this happened. Maybe one day we will. But that day is far from today. It would be more helpful (and hopeful) to expose students to the massive gaps in our understanding. Then they may find a firmer—and possibly a radically different—scientific theory.”

Why DNA Mutations Cannot Accomplish What Neo-Darwinism Requires

Now we discuss Jonathan Wells's chapter on why DNA mutations are insufficient to account for the arrival of new organisms

through evolution. Mutations acted on by Natural Selection are what provides the variation, when given enough time and continued mutations with selection, to provide new types of organisms.

Dr. Wells begins his chapter by making sure we understand what is meant by the "Central Dogma." It goes something like this: DNA makes RNA, makes protein, makes us. It was thought that all the instructions for building organisms was in the sequence code of DNA. But DNA never leaves the nucleus. The sequence of DNA that codes for a protein is transcribed into a molecule of RNA. The messenger RNA then leaves the nucleus and enters the cell, where molecular machines called ribosomes, translate the RNA code into protein code. Proteins are made of long chains of amino acids. Proteins are the workhorse of the cell. They speed up necessary chemical reactions the cell needs and provide structure and support. Our bodies are composed of organ systems, which are made up of organs, which are composed of tissues, and tissues are composed of cells that perform their functions through the proteins each cell makes. Therefore, DNA makes RNA, makes protein, makes us.

Over the last few decades, this analogy has fallen apart. Initially, a stretch of DNA that coded for a single protein was called a gene. One gene, one protein. We now know that the RNA transcribed from a gene can be split up into two or more segments and these segments put back together in several different ways. The RNA then doesn't match the original sequence of DNA. About 95% of human genes can be spliced into more than one RNA and more than one protein. Proteins can also be modified with sequences of sugar molecules that are specific to a particular tissue. What controls the splicing and the addition of sugar molecules is still not fully known. But for various reasons, it's not the DNA alone that determines these variations on a central theme.

Evidence from Embryology Challenges Evolutionary Theory

Finally, I'll cover the final chapter for this article, "Evidence from Embryology Challenges Evolutionary Theory." Sheena Tyler states early that Darwin thought that "Embryology is to me by far the strongest class of facts in favor of change of form."² Tyler goes on to indicate that in Darwin's time, embryology was largely a black box of which little was known.

The section I'll be covering is titled "Development is Orchestrated." Tyler makes a comparison to a mystery novel where the author plans to ensure the different characters come together at the right place and time to resolve the mystery. Embryological development is very much like that. She mentions a four-dimensional pattern of stored information. The first three dimensions of this pattern revolve around being in the right place, the fourth dimension is time. So embryological proteins, chemicals and even electrical fields need to be available at the right time and place. Any deviation and the structures are ill-formed, or the embryo could even die.

Skeletal development in vertebrates starts with an electrical field that begins the process. And from there she quotes an embryologist indicating that the size and shape of skeletal elements in the embryo are "exquisitely regulated." Another word used to describe the sequence of events is "precise." This doesn't sound like something that was cobbled together by chance over a few million years. There is a definite plan and prepattern that *must* be followed.

The central nervous system requires, again, a "precise and exquisitely regulated gene expression." Another expression used is "intricately orchestrated." Each developing neuron anticipates where a connection with another neuron will need to be before contacting the other neuron.

Last, she mentions the heart and circulatory system. One embryologist reports that cardiac transcription factors (small proteins that help initiate the expression of a gene) *choreograph* the expression of *thousands* of genes at each stage of cardiac development. Every blood vessel ends up in the right place every time along with the proper architecture for veins or arteries. Just amazing!

Notes

1. J.P. Moreland, Stephen C. Meyer, Christopher Shaw, Ann K. Gauger, and Wayne Grudem, *Theistic Evolution: A Scientific, Philosophical, and Theological Critique*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2017.

2. Quoted in Sheena Tyler, Evidence from Embryology Challenges Evolutionary

Theory, in *Theistic Evolution: A Scientific, Philosophical, and Theological Critique*, Moreland, J.P., Meyer, S.C., Shaw, C., Gauger, A. K., and Grudem, W., editors.

©2022 Probe Ministries

Darwinism: A Teetering House of Cards



Steve Cable examines four areas of recent scientific discovery that undermine evolution.

The Origin of Life: A Mystery

Confidence in Darwinism erodes as new discoveries fail to produce supporting evidence. Three books released in 2017,

- *House of Cards* by journalist Tom Bethel
- *Zombie Science* by biologist Jonathan Wells
- *Undeniable* by biologist Douglas Axe

address areas where Darwin's grand idea is weaker now than 150 years ago. As Bethel states, "Today, it more closely resembles a house of cards, built out of flimsy icons rather than hard evidence, and liable to blow away in the slightest breeze."[\[1\]](#) It

is not just critics who recognize this weakening. In 2016, the Royal Society in London convened a meeting to discuss "calls for revision of the standard theory of evolution."[\[2\]](#)



Four areas where Darwin hoped future work would support his theory will be examined. The first area is the origin of reproducing beings.

Darwin only hoped that life may have originated in a "warm little pond." But as one scientist states, "The origin-of-life field is a failure—we still do not have even a plausible coherent model, let alone a validated scenario, for the emergence of life on earth."[\[3\]](#)

Darwin assumed the first reproducing cells were very simple. In truth, the simplest cells are composed of impressively complex machines which could not have arisen directly from inorganic components. But there are no known simpler life forms. As Michael Behe commented, "The cell's known complexity has increased immeasurably in recent years, and points ever more insistently to an intelligent designer as its cause."[\[4\]](#)

The probability of even one of the amino acids necessary for life appearing by random mutations is effectively zero even given billions of years. As Doug Axe writes, "(Examining how) accidental evolutionary processes are supposed to have invented enzymes without insight, we consistently find these proposals to be implausible."[\[5\]](#)

Another professor states, "Those who think scientists understand the issues of prebiotic chemistry are wholly misinformed. Nobody understands them. . . . The basis upon which we . . . are relying is so shaky we must openly state the situation for what it is: a mystery."[\[6\]](#)

Facing insurmountable odds against life appearing, some materialists propose an infinite number of parallel universes.[\[7\]](#) With infinite chances, even the most unlikely events could occur. But, as Axe points out, "The biological inventions that surround us (are) fantastically improbable, with evolution explaining none and the multiverse hypothesis explaining only those absolutely necessary for wondering to be possible, . . . this hypothesis fails to explain what we see."[\[8\]](#)

Even after resorting to unobservable fantasy situations, the challenges presented by the origins of life cannot be overcome. A Darwinian model begins with a self-replicating life form. Currently, this appears to be a hill that no one knows how to climb.

An Example of Macro-evolution: Still Searching

Darwin's theory is dependent upon the unobserved concept of macro-evolution, i.e. intergenerational differences accumulating into different species over time. Darwin believed his magic wand of natural selection could direct this process toward increasingly complex beings. Has further research confirmed his belief?

Let's begin with fossil evidence.

The number of fossils studied has blossomed over the last 150 years. All the types of species which exist today appear in the fossil record over a relatively short period of time.[{9}](#) And, in most cases, with no transitional forms between them undermining Darwin's theory. As science historian Stephen Meyer concludes, "As more . . . fossils are discovered (failing) to document the great array of intermediate forms, it grows ever more improbable that their absence is an artifact of either incomplete sampling or preservation."[{10}](#)

And evolution proponent Stephen Gould wrote, "The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology. The evolutionary trees . . . have data only at the tips and nodes of their branches; the rest is inference."[{11}](#) *Nature* editor Henry Gee put it this way: "To take a line of fossils and claim that they represent a lineage is not a scientific hypothesis that can be tested, but an assertion that carries the same validity as a bedtime story."[{12}](#)

Clearly, the fossil record challenges rather than supports conventional evolutionary theory.

Let's continue by looking at experimental evidence.

Perhaps someone has recreated macro-evolution in the lab.

Studies of fast replicating populations have shown no ability to accumulate multiple changes. Attempts to create macro-evolution in fruit flies, bacteria and viruses concluded “Neither in nature nor under experimental conditions have any substantial effects ever been obtained through the systematic accumulation of micro-mutations.”[{13}](#)

Bethel points out, “The scientific evidence for evolution is not only weaker than is generally supposed, but as new discoveries have been made . . . , the reasons for accepting the theory have diminished rather than increased.”[{14}](#)

Yet biology departments still spout their unfounded belief in the “magic wand” ability to produce an unimaginable array of advanced creatures in what “amounts to the triumph of ideology over science.” Even some materialists see through this charade. One geneticist at Harvard wrote, “If scientists are going to use logically unbeatable theories about the world, they might as well give up natural science and take up religion.”[{15}](#)

“Darwin might well have been dismayed (at) the meager evidence for natural selection, assembled over many years. . . . It is worth bearing in mind how feeble this evidence is any time someone tells you that Darwinism is a fact.”[{16}](#)

The Challenge of Irreducible Complexity

Darwin wrote his theory would “absolutely break down” if an organ could not be formed by “numerous, successive, slight modifications.”[{17}](#) Have such organs been found? Irreducible complexity and functional coherence say yes.

Irreducible complexity means that some known functions require multiple parts that have no purpose without the other parts. For a Darwinian process to create these functions would require useless mutations to be indefinitely maintained until combined with other useless mutations. Michael Behe’s analysis

has shown the 4 billion years of the earth's existence are not sufficient for such complex functions to be created by random mutations.

Even if an improbable series of events occurred allowing **one** of these complex forms to arise through a set of random mutations, it would need to happen thousands, if not millions, of times to produce our complex life forms.

In *Undeniable*, Axe introduces "functional coherence," defined as "The hierarchical arrangement of parts needed for anything to produce a high-level function—each part contributing in a coordinated way to the whole." Axe examines the role of functional coherence as a microscopic level and concludes, "The fact that mastery . . . of protein design is completely beyond the reach of blind evolution is . . . evolution's undoing. . . . The evolutionary story is . . . something much less plausible than hitting an atomic dot on a universe-size sphere over and over in succession by blindly dropping subatomic pins."[18](#)

In *Zombie Science*, Jonathan Wells considers the number of irreducibly complex subsystems required to evolve fully aquatic whales. These features include flukes with specialized muscles, blowholes with elastic tissues and specialized muscles, internal testicles with a countercurrent heat exchange system, specialized features for nursing, and many others. For Darwinism, these changes are insurmountably large. Whales certainly appear to be the product of design, not unguided evolution.

He also points to advanced optical systems. The process by which light detection becomes an intelligent signal to the brain is irreducibly complex. Two scientists wrote, "the prototypical eye. . . cannot be explained by selection, because selection can drive evolution only when the eye can function at least to a small extent."[19](#) These scientists determined the eye was irreducibly complex and could not be

developed by natural selection.

Richard Lewontin, a committed materialist, does not believe natural selection can explain complex life forms. He cannot conceive of any gradual set of useful incremental changes resulting in a flying being. Unless a small change gives an advantage, “the change won’t be selected for, and obviously, a little bit of wing doesn’t do any good.”[\[20\]](#)

So we can agree with Darwin on this issue: his theory “absolutely breaks down.”

DNA and Molecular Science Muddy the Scenario

Has uncovering the role of DNA filled the gaping holes in Darwinism or created more?

A species’s DNA sequence, we are told, contains all the information needed to create new members. But Douglas Axe states, “(We) would be shocked to know the . . . state of ignorance with respect to DNA. The view that most aspects of living things can be attributed neatly to specific genes has been known . . . to be FALSE for a long time.”[\[21\]](#)

The higher-level components making up a species are not entirely specified by its DNA. As Wells explains, “After DNA sequences are transcribed into RNAs, many RNAs are modified so they do not match the original transcript. . . . (changing) over time according to the needs of the organism.” The claim that “DNA makes RNA makes protein” is false.”[\[22\]](#)

Creating new complex functions requires multiple changes in the DNA sequence AND in other elements making the chance of random mutations creating new species untenable.

The original conflicting “trees of life” were created examining the morphology, i.e. the structures of species. These trees suggest different major nodes but almost no

transitional forms. Can DNA analysis help? Research has shown that groupings based on morphology are not supported by DNA analysis. As Wells notes, these conflicts “are a major headache for evolutionary biologists.”[\[23\]](#)

This disconnect from recent gene research is not limited to a few cases. As reported in 2012, “incongruence between (trees) derived from morphology . . . , and . . . trees based on different subsets of molecular sequences has become pervasive.”[\[24\]](#)

But DNA analysis alone has a great degree of uncertainty. In one study looking at fifty genes from seventeen animal groups, multiple conflicting ideas on the evolutionary relationship between the animal groups were proposed.[\[25\]](#) All had seemingly absolute support from the DNA evidence, but all could not be true.

Originally scientists thought DNA was primarily junk sequences not contributing to the characteristics of a species. This junk represented functions which were replaced or had no current usefulness. As Francis Crick, one of the discoverers of DNA’s structure, said, “The possible existence of such selfish DNA is exactly what might be expected from the theory of natural selection.”[\[26\]](#)

But recent research shows at least eighty percent of the human genome contributes. As Wells reports, “The evidence demonstrates that most of our DNA is transcribed into RNA and that many of those RNAs have biological functions. The idea that most of our DNA is junk, . . . is dead.”[\[27\]](#)

The facts uncovered about the functioning of DNA and other elements in passing on characteristics to the next generation appear to make more holes in evolutionary theory.

A Philosophy Props Up Its Poster Child

Recent, scientific insights have weakened Darwin's theory. Yet many are unwilling to discuss its weakness. Why this reluctance? It falls into two camps: 1) a commitment to materialism and 2) a desire for academic acceptance. Materialism is a religious viewpoint where everything has a natural explanation. A spiritual component or events resulting from an outside force are rejected. Science is not materialism. Science attempts to identify and quantify the forces that make the universe. A materialist scientist adds a religious restriction: only natural forces can be considered.

Bethel states, "Although Darwinism has been promoted as science, its unstated role has been to prop up the philosophy of materialism and atheism."

Wells suggests, "Priority is given to proposing and defending materialistic explanations rather than following the evidence wherever it leads. This is materialistic philosophy masquerading as empirical science, . . . zombie science." [\[28\]](#)

Atheist Colin Patterson offers an honest view regarding the theory of evolution as "often unnecessary" in biology. Nevertheless, it was (taught as) "the unified field theory of biology," holding the whole subject together. Once something has that status it becomes like religion." [\[29\]](#)

Until they have a better theory, they will stand behind it rather than consider alternatives. They fear any uncertainty will lead to questioning other aspects of materialism, such as that free will and love for others are simply a façade promoted by natural selection.

Bethel points out, "If our minds are . . . accidental products of a blind process, what reason do we have for accepting materialist claims as true?" [\[30\]](#) After all, our minds are selected to improve our survivability, not to discern what

is true.

Many scientists are not die-hard materialists. They believe there may be a spiritual aspect of our existence. Yet they promote the materialistic view. For most, this inconsistent approach is a reaction to the threat of censure from the establishment.

Axe claims, "The religious agenda is the enemy that threatens science. . . . Everything that opposes the institutionalized agenda is labeled 'anti-science.'" [\[31\]](#)

The same arguments used against intelligent design apply more accurately to Darwinism. Bethel states, "(Some) have said that design can't be measured and therefore it is a religious belief. . . . They might also have said the macro-evolution has not yet been measured, or so much as observed." [\[32\]](#)

In this review, we have seen

1. No materialistic concept for life's origin
2. Little evidence of transitional life forms
3. Strong evidence complex functions could not arise through random changes
4. DNA playing havoc with the basic tenets of Darwinism.

Now we wait for the façade raised by supporters of a flawed concept to collapse.

Notes

1. Tom Bethel, *Darwin's House of Cards: A Journalist's Odyssey Through the Darwin Debates*, Discovery Institute Press, 2017, page 20.
2. Ibid, page 20.
3. Eugene V. Loonin, *The Logic of Chance: The Nature and Origin of Biological Evolution*, FT Press, 2011, page 391.
4. See Behe, back cover comment for Thomas E. Woodward and James P. Gills, *The Mysterious Epigenome* (Grand Rapids, MI:

Kregel Publications, 2012).

5. Douglas Axe, *Undeniable: How Biology Confirms Our Intuition That Life Is Designed*, HarperOne, New York, 2016, page 63.
6. James Tour, "Animadversions of a synthetic chemist," *Inference* 2:2, May 19, 2016.
7. Axe, page 227.
8. Axe, page 230.
9. Meyers and other quotes on the Cambrian.
10. Stephen Meyer, *Darwin's Doubt*, New York, Harper Collins, 2014, page 70.
11. Gould, *The Panda's Thumb*, page 181.
12. Henry Gee, *In Search of Deep Time: Beyond the Fossil Record to a New History of Life*, New York: The Free Press, 1999, p. 32, 113-117.
13. Soren Lovtrup, *Darwinism: The Refutation of a Myth*, New York, 1987, page 351.
14. Bethel, page 45.
15. Richard Lewontin, "Testing the Theory of Natural Selection," *Nature* 236 no. 5343, p. 181-182.
16. Bethel, page 79.
17. Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, 2nd ed., 1860, page 189.
18. Axe, page 184.
19. Gehring and Ikeo, "Pax6: mastering eye morphogenesis and eye evolution," *Trends in Genetics* 15, 1999, 376.
20. James Schwartz, "Oh My Darwin!: Who's the Fittest Evolutionary Thinker of All?", *Lingua Franca* 9, no. 8 (1999).
21. Axe, page 271.
22. Wells, page 90.
23. Wells, page .
24. Liliana Dávalos, Andrea Cirranello, Jonathan Geisler, and Nancy Simmons, "Understanding phylogenetic incongruence: Lessons from phyllostomid bats," *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 87, 2012.
25. Antonis Rokas, Dirk Krüger, and Sean B. Carroll, "Animal evolution and the molecular signature of radiations compressed in time," *Science* 310, 2005.
26. Francis Crick, *What Mad Pursuit: A Personal View of*

Scientific Discovery, New York, Basic Books, 1988, page 147.

27. Wells, page 128.

28. Wells, page 17.

29. Bethel, page 149.

30. Bethel, page 174.

31. Axe, page 54.

32. Bethel, page 161.

©2018 Probe Ministries