

10 Questions for Evolutionists

Chuck Colson's Ten Questions about Origins

1. What fossil record is there of any transitional fossils indicating that one order evolved into another order?
2. Is there any evidence of an order that was at one time a different order? I recognize that there is adaptation within an order, different breeds of dogs for example, but I don't know of any case where there is any evidence of a dog becoming a horse.
3. What scientific evidence is there to support a natural origin of life? (The evolutionist may point to the Miller-Urey experiments in 1953, much celebrated at the time. They initially said they had reproduced the precise conditions under which in the primordial soup life could have arisen. But after experts looked at it, it turned out that there was frequent human intervention and had the process been left to itself, it could not have worked. In short, there is no evidence.)
4. How does one support the conclusion of the American Society of Biological Teachers that evolution is "unsupervised, impersonal and random?" What *scientific* (as opposed to philosophical) basis is there for this statement?
5. (A follow-up question for 4) Is this not inconsistent with discoveries about DNA, which indicate that there is a mathematical formula determining the complexity of human beings? Do mathematical formulas have naturalistic origins?
6. How do we reconcile the second law of thermodynamics with the universe as we know it? If the universe is indeed winding down, does that not presuppose that sometime and by some means it was being wound up? By what means?
7. What is your answer to Dr. Michael Behe's findings (*Darwin's Black Box*) about the irreducible complexity of the cell structure, that is, his mousetrap example? All the parts of a cell had to work at once otherwise the cell doesn't work. Thus evolution of one part at a time is not reasonable.
8. What caused the Big Bang?
9. What did Einstein mean when he said, "God does not play dice with the cosmos?" If he considered evidence of intelligence in the universe, why shouldn't we?
10. What evidence is there for genetic mutations that increase the *biologically useful* information of the genome? Or to put it another way: What evidence is there for genetic mutations facilitating macroevolutionary change?

When you ask these questions, beware. Aggressive evolutionists will attempt to intimidate you, dismiss the questions, laugh at them, claim that they're ridiculous, or say that you're basing it on your faith. Stand your ground. This is not based on your faith. These are common sense inquiries that anybody in an academically free environment ought to pursue. They are not unreasonable questions, even though that is what your adversary will say. Or he will tell you that you really don't understand or that you have to be more into science to grasp this, or it's too complex a concept to explain. If it's too complex to explain, how could anyone teach it?

The one you must never let evolutionists run away from is Einstein. Naturalists in the evolutionist lobby do not allow anybody to talk about intelligent design because they say it comes from faith. It doesn't. There is a respectable school of science and Einstein raised these questions. So why should they be stricken out of inquiry?

If you can get a naturalist to acknowledge that they can be discussed, he's finished, which is why he'll fight so hard to reject the questions. He's finished because there is much more *scientific* evidence for design than there is for natural origin.

Everything we say about natural origin is speculation, just as the God hypothesis that we believe in is speculation because nobody was there at the creation. But we can look at the character of the universe and draw certain conclusions. Because of a prior *philosophical* commitment to naturalism this is precisely what the naturalist refuses to do.