

EXAMINE THE EVIDENCE
“SCIENCE, DARWINISM and the BIBLE”
Rev. Lee E. Johnson
Bethel Baptist Church
October 23, 2007

INTRODUCTION.

It is believed that Abraham Lincoln said that you can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time. When it comes to the question of the origins of life, especially human life, it does seem that Lincoln’s statement remains true. He probably uttered those words about the same time that Charles Darwin published his famous book entitled: On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life. A lot of people have bought fully into Darwin’s idea over the past 150 years but today ever more individuals, and especially even those who have been trained in the sciences, have come to the conclusion that there is no possibility that we are here simply as the product of time and chance. There are a lot of individual men and women on each side of the debate so who, after all, has been fooled? I think that is our question.

The tricky thing about evolution, of course, is that it obviously does work to a certain point. So it is foolish to say that everything about the evolutionary process is false when the fact of the matter is that natural selection and survival of the fittest, the engines that drive the process, are proven to work. But the way I see it those who come to understand what we know as microevolution make a giant philosophical assumption when they proclaim that it therefore works on the macro scale as well. I will explain the difference between micro- and macroevolution shortly.

But first, it seems to me that an underlying suspicion of “the other side” enters into the equation and destroys the dialogue. Those of us who are creationists suppose we can clearly see a conspiracy, nefarious motives behind the scientific community whose real desire is to destroy the Bible, the Christian faith, the traditional Judeo-Christian view of morality, and ultimately just to do away with God. On the other side, many Darwinists believe that everyone who questions the ability of natural forces to create life according to the laws which Darwin proposed is an ignorant buffoon who secretly wants to impose a Christian world-view on society that will stifle science and impose a Gestapo type of morality that will make the Taliban seem mild by comparison. So the debate is usually framed in a way that makes both sides become more deeply entrenched and ends any possibility of anyone really hearing what the other side is saying. I hope to avoid that.

So let me say at the outset that I do understand that it is probably impossible for me to be unbiased on this matter but I am going to do my best to present a fair and reasoned argument. However, there is no question on where I stand. So with that said, let me quote Dr. Phillip Johnson on the state of the issue. *“Darwinian evolution... makes me think of a great battleship.... Its sides are heavily armored with philosophical barriers to criticism, and its decks are stacked with big rhetorical guns ready to intimidate would-be attackers... But the ship has sprung a metaphysical leak...”* (Darwin on Trial, Johnson, 1993, p. 169). The purpose of this paper is to explain why I believe that leak exists, and why it is fatal to Darwinism. One of the criticisms that Darwinists love to throw at creationists is that our belief is not falsifiable. But the fact of the matter is that evolution on the big scale is in exactly the same way not falsifiable. In fact, creationism is falsifiable in that all one would have to do to falsify it is to show that macroevolution actually works.

The first thing I must clarify is what we mean by the term evolution, and why some of us believe we need to make the distinction between microevolution and macroevolution. So allow me to share two definitions of evolution.

“Evolution: The gradual process by which the present diversity of plant and animal life arose from the earliest and most primitive organisms, which is believed to have been continuing for the past 3000 million years.” Oxford Concise Science Dictionary. This definition is probably what most people understand when they hear the word used. In the final analysis it means that life arose by chance, and by the force of natural means over the past eons of unrecorded time. This is what I mean by macroevolution.

However, when I think of microevolution I would use a definition more like this:

“In the broadest sense, evolution is merely change, and so is all-pervasive; ... Biological evolution ... is change in the properties of populations of organisms that transcend the lifetime of a single individual. The ontogeny of an individual is not considered evolution; individual organisms do not evolve. The changes in populations that are considered evolutionary are those that are inheritable via the genetic material from one generation to the next.” - Douglas J. Futuyma, Evolutionary Biology.

More specifically, “microevolution is defined as the change of gene pair frequencies (that is, genetic variation due to processes such as selection, mutation, genetic drift, or even migration) within a population.” Timothy Wallace, “*Five major evolutionist misconceptions about evolution.*”

So, just to make this point crystal clear, macroevolution means that living things came from non-living things, totally by chance and natural selection, over vast ages of time. Microevolution means that already living things have the ability to change to something different over time but they cannot become more complex; they will not move beyond their given species boundaries. To put this in the form of a word picture, dogs can be bred to become very different from a wolf, but they can never become a cat. Therefore, microevolution is what we have seen to occur within the dog species for example, but macroevolution, living things arising from the mythical non-living primordial soup, or one species changing into another species, has never occurred – at least not apart from a direct act of God.

“Macroevolution means evolution on the grand scale, and it is mainly studied in the fossil record. It is contrasted with microevolution, the study of evolution over short time periods, such as that of a human lifetime or less. Microevolution therefore refers to changes in gene frequency within a population Macroevolutionary events are much more likely to take millions of years. Macroevolution refers to things like the trends in horse evolution ... or the origin of major groups, or mass extinctions, or the Cambrian explosion Speciation is the traditional dividing line between micro- and macroevolution.” Mark Ridley, Evolution.

Before I move to the next seven points I want to mention that I have not documented most of what I’m going to present because it is general knowledge. Due to the scope of the paper I do not have the time, nor do I feel it is necessary, to cite sources for everything included here. However, where I have directly quoted someone I will note that. Along with the paper I have also included a bibliography which includes much of the materials that I have read on the subject over the years. As you read I hope you will see that the scientific claims I make are simple and honest. Anyone who is seriously interested can read these materials for the details.

1. Darwinism is a philosophy.

We have engaged in a battle of world views and philosophy. As much as Darwinists want to maintain that what they believe is strictly scientific, and that evolutionary scientists deal only with empirical facts, the bottom line is that Darwinism is a philosophy. In order to be a scientific theory it would have to be able to be replicated. Furthermore, to the extent that it is empirical it is based on the study of fossils, and, as we are going to hear in a later presentation in this series, the study of fossils has actually served to bring the major tenets of Charles Darwin into serious doubts. Perhaps the greatest challenge is what is commonly known as the Cambrian explosion which demonstrates that life appeared on this earth relatively suddenly and in a whole variety of diverse forms.

The proposed theory goes something like this. Life originated on earth completely by chance and has now existed here for nearly four billion years. During that time it has gradually changed from very simple forms into ever more complex forms, and those changes can be seen in the fossils left in the rocks. Darwin himself said that the study of archaeology would either prove or disprove his theory.

Their problem is that we now know it wasn't quite that simple. For most of this time life was hardly anything more complex than bacteria and a few forms of multi-celled plants. Then, between about 570 and 530 million years ago (during the geological period known as the Cambrian period) there was an "explosion" of all sorts of fully developed life forms, many of which are directly related to groups that populate the earth today. Where these fossils came from is not only a puzzle, it is a real problem for the philosophy of Darwinism. But it is not the only problem for their theory as I will now explain.

2. The second law of thermodynamics.

Even those of us who have not made the study of science our life-long occupation probably recall the first and second laws of thermodynamics simply because they were drilled into our heads as so vital to science. The first law is the law of conservation of energy; it has also been described as the law of symmetry and simply states that you can neither create nor destroy energy.

But the second law is the one we should be concerned with in this study. This law is also known as the law of entropy and simply says that, when left to itself, everything moves from a state of order to disorder unless acted upon by an outside force. The impact of what this law means to us was seen in my college biology class when I questioned the professor on the validity of his evolutionary hypothesis. The two of us actually debated the issues for probably more than half of one class period. His second to the last words to me were: "Everything you are saying is based upon your religious presuppositions, there are no scientific reasons whatsoever for you to reject evolution." I raised my hand one last time and silently prayed that he would allow me to respond, which he did. So I simply asked him, "What about the second law of thermodynamics which says that everything in this universe is running down?" After a few seconds of silence his last words to me were: "This discussion is over, evolution is too big a subject for freshman biology."

Now I understand something about what he was saying, but there was also something to what I was saying. Look at the following quotation that I ferreted off the internet.

"The laws of thermodynamics are special laws that sit above the ordinary laws of nature as laws about laws or laws upon which the other laws depend (Swenson & Turvey, 1991). It can be successfully shown that without the first and second laws, which express symmetry properties of the world, there could be no other laws at all."

www.entropylaw.com

The fact of the matter is that Darwinian evolution runs afoul of the second law of thermodynamics. And I understand that there are some noble attempts made to say that the sun is adding energy to the earth every day and who would deny that? However, the “Law” says what it says but in the interests of honesty I will include the following quotation.

“According to the old view, the second law was viewed as a 'law of disorder'. The major revolution in the last decade is the recognition of the "law of maximum entropy production" or "MEP" and with it an expanded view of thermodynamics showing that the spontaneous production of order from disorder is the expected consequence of basic laws.” www.entropylaw.com

In my opinion this is a not so thinly veiled attempt to avoid the fact that the philosophy of Darwinism runs smack into the tremendous implications of the serious road block erected by the law of entropy. Of course everyone is free to make up their own mind based on their own biases I suppose.

3. The universe had a beginning.

In the presentation done last month Randy Hroziencik commented on this point so I’m not going to spend a lot of time here. But it is so germane to our discussion that I feel compelled to mention it. It has to do with the really big picture, with the cosmic understanding of the entire universe and where EVERYTHING came from.

I suppose that just about everyone reading this is aware that the Bible says that there was a beginning to the universe. Genesis 1:1 starts the debate with the bold claim that in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth, and that everything that now exists came into being as the result of a mighty creative act by God. The Jewish and Christian teaching for many centuries is that this was done ex nihilo, or “out of nothing.” Psalm 33:6 and Hebrews 11:3 are just two of the Bible passages used to justify this claim.

When Charles Darwin published his work in 1859 the prevailing scientific view was that the universe was eternal; it was just always here and therefore no one had to answer the question of where all this stuff came from. If the universe is eternal one does not have to deal with a question that is even more profound than the question of how life came to be. The really big question about origins was therefore neatly avoided by evolutionists for more than a century.

However, in 1965 Arno Penzias and Robert Wilson, two scientists working to develop a new antennae for the Bell Laboratories, pointed their instrument toward the heavens and heard something they could not explain. They eventually worked it out and received the Nobel Prize in Physics in 1978 for their discovery of cosmic microwave background radiation, we know it today as the echo of the big bang. While this seems insignificant to most laymen it rocked the scientific community. The universe had a beginning! Call it the Big Bang or whatever you like but the shock waves are still reverberating.

Something called the *Kalam Cosmological Argument* picks up the ball from there. It goes like this: “Whatever begins to exist has a cause. The universe began to exist. Therefore, the universe has a cause.” If you want to read a full description of the implications of this then I would suggest that you study Chapter 5: “The Evidence of Cosmology,” in Lee Strobel’s book, The Case for a Creator. It is powerful evidence for God alone being eternal and pre-existent, and the Creator of all things.

4. The vast amount of information necessary for life.

Darwinism as a philosophy requires time (a lot of time) and chance to work hand in hand with natural selection and survival of the fittest to produce life. It is all about the results of a lot of wrong roads traveled with a few right roads interspersed, and then the results of those right roads being added together until, presto, we have the human brain smart enough to figure out that it all happened totally by chance. That's the story.

But for any story to be passed on it is necessary to store and transmit the information. So a giant problem with the evolutionary story is information. Where did all of it come from? And how did it get to be so very precise? And how did it come to be stored so it could be passed on? You can find all sorts of fantastic theories designed to help grasp the possibility of this all happening by chance. But there is a vast gap between imagined stories and reality when it comes to this topic.

Who hasn't heard about the DNA molecule? It was unknown until almost a full century after Darwin wrote his famous book and it is utterly amazing. We are told that if we could see some it would resemble a twisted ladder. The rungs of the ladder are made up of just four different nucleotides which somehow hold the key to how all the vast information needed to make a living body works together. If we were able to stretch it out it would be finer than the finest hair but roughly six feet in length. In sexual reproduction one side of the "ladder" comes from the mother while the other side is contributed by the father. You came from this information molecule!

Many years ago I read in the newspaper that the amount of data the DNA molecule contains is staggering. If one were to type it out on standard sized paper, filling every sheet completely, the pile would be as tall as the Washington Monument, 555 feet! Where did all of that information come from? And how did it come to be stored in a form that could be transmitted to the next generation completely by chance?

When Dr. Phillip Johnson visited Galesburg in 2006 he made the point that the Search for Extra-Terrestrial Intelligence (the SETI Institute) is constantly scanning the skies listening for intelligible information to come drifting in from outer space. His point was well made – the whole basis of that ongoing experiment rests on the supposition that the presence of even a tiny bit of information demands intelligence behind it. Darwinism is faced with a tremendous problem in the DNA molecule. There is in that molecule a VAST amount of very precise information and we are told that it is all happened by accident, that it was stored by accident, and that the mechanism to pass it on occurred as well, you guessed it, simply by accident. And this brings me to the next point I would like to make.

5. Irreducible Complexity.

In 1996 a book called Darwin's Black Box was published by Dr. Michael Behe, professor of biochemistry at Lehigh University. This book made quite a stir in the public debate over Darwinism. In it Behe presented an overwhelming case against the workings of the tired old theory based on the incredibly complex inner workings of every living cell. The main premise of the tome is summed up in a two word phrase coined by Dr. Behe, "Irreducible Complexity."

In Darwin's day there were many limitations when it came to understanding the "how" of the inner workings of living things. The tools they had to work with were primitive by today's standards and the collective knowledge of how life works is now far surpassed by what is taught in many high school courses, especially when it came to how the cell works. For Darwin the cell was a "black box," a simple blob of protoplasm, something like a living brick that they couldn't understand. Today we know that every cell is an incredibly complex microscopic factory

specifically and precisely designed to work together with other cells to make up living organisms. There is virtually nothing simple about any living cell. As we were told in the presentation made last month, each and every cell contains one billion compounds and the simple cell actually isn't so simple after all.

Behe's premise is that even single-celled bacteria depends upon mind boggling complexity, and for any single cell to live a multitude of parts must dance together "all at once" in precise harmony. Take away any one component and death occurs. So Behe asks the obvious question, how could literally dozens of necessary components, each component itself irreducibly complex, have possibly come together all at once to form just one living cell?

We also see this principle at work in the systems of the human body. Look at a chart in your doctor's office detailing how we humans hear, or see, or how the spinal column is put together for example and you will see it. Take away one component and the whole system fails. Then think of the many systems of the human body which must all work together and you see Behe's principle at work on the macro scale: we have a skeletal system, a muscular system, a digestive system, a circulatory system, a respiratory system, the nervous system, the endocrine system, the renal system, etc., etc. – the list goes on and on! Take away one part of a complex system and it doesn't work, then take away that system and the result will probably be death for the organism. Darwinism makes a spectacular leap of faith in the assumption that somehow all of these systems came together, first on the cellular level but then on a massive scale all working together in unbelievable harmony. By the way, it is estimated that there are somewhere between ten and fifty trillion cells in the human body, all of which work together in mechanical, chemical, and biological harmony. Behe, of course, details this in a fascinating way and this is one book that I would certainly encourage anyone to read.

Before I move on I want to note two things about Behe's premise. Late in 2006 I visited the Field Museum in Chicago and saw Sue, the famous skeleton of a Tyrannosaurus Rex that is located in the main atrium. As I walked around those huge remains of that ancient animal I was struck with how complex just the skeleton was. I am aware that a number of people have given up on the Christian answer to origins because they didn't know what to do with dinosaurs. My question to them is, why? There is no doubt that dinosaurs existed, and there is also no doubt that they didn't happen by chance because they, too, are irreducibly complex.

The second thing is this. Two years ago I was invited to a philosophy class at Knox College where I was paired against a biology professor to discuss the topic of intelligent design. When I turned the conversation to what Dr. Behe wrote the "final word" I heard from my opponent was that the other biology professors at Lehigh University had posted on their university web site that they didn't agree with Dr. Behe's conclusions. So I later visited the site and, sure enough, they said they didn't buy into what their colleague had published. Of course no reason was given as to why he was wrong, damn the facts he was just wrong because everyone knows that Darwinism is a fact. I was reminded of the criticisms that have been leveled against dogma of the Roman Catholic Church during the days of Copernicus and Galileo and now, I think, we have come full circle. And can you imagine what putting something like that onto the official web page of a university does to the supposed academic freedom to disagree with the status quo?

6. Life cannot arise from non-living things.

This topic was covered last month but I want to touch on it as well. The theory of spontaneous generation, the idea that life just happens, has been casually adhered to for most of human history. But by Darwin's day the idea had been seriously challenged for almost 200 years since the work of Francesco Redi, an Italian physician who was the first person to empirically debunk the theory that life could arise from non-living things. Interestingly enough, the experiment that Louis Pasteur performed which finally put an end to the debate was done in 1859, the very year that Darwin's book was published. Ironic, isn't it?

In our own time the most famous effort to show that Pasteur was ultimately wrong was done by Stanley Miller and Harold Urey in 1953 at the University of Chicago. By reproducing what they said was the atmosphere of the primitive earth, and then shooting bolts of electricity through it, they were able to make amino acids, the building blocks of life. The results were boldly disseminated for many years by evolutionists – until it was shown that their supposed primitive atmosphere was impossible. If you want to read about it I recommend that you go to Lee Strobel's book, [The Case for a Creator](#), and read chapter three. There is no doubt but that this question is going to be debated for a long time to come because it is imperative for Darwinists that our old friend Louis ultimately got it wrong.

7. The amazing fine-tuning of the universe.

This topic was also well covered in the previous presentation so I'm not going to say anything more than that numerous mathematical models have shown that the chances against the literally dozens of different parameters necessary for life having happened by chance are so astronomically vast that they are really zero. The largest number of these that I had read about prior to last month was fifty, but then Mr. Hroziencik quoted that the number today is 128, more than double what I had previously heard!

Think about the implications. If any one of these things were even minutely different there would be no possibility of physical life existing anywhere in this universe. So I think this means that the odds against macroevolution having occurred rests upon 128 things, each one of which has zero probability of having taken place by chance, but the lack of any one of them will destroy either the whole universe, or our solar system, or the earth as a place that can support carbon based life, or any type of life existing period. The charge has been leveled that creationists must have a "god of the gaps" but there is simply no way that time and chance can ever bridge this chasm. To be a Darwinists today requires absolute faith in a philosophy which we now know is purely absurd!

WHAT ABOUT THE BIBLE?

To this point I have hardly quoted the Bible but the topic I was assigned does include what the Bible has to say on the question of origins so let me turn our attention there. What does the old book really have to say about where everything came from? In the presentation we scheduled for January of 2008 we are going to examine the case for the validity of the Bible. So I'm not going to here defend the Bible as a source book, I'm just going to try to share what it says about where things, and life, came from.

I first want to note that not all creationists believe the same thing, not even all Christian creationists agree on how we should interpret both what the Bible says and what the universe itself says back to us. In fact, there are many distinct Judeo-Christian variations on the specific details of origins. These include a literal seven day creation week, a literal seven day week with a

gap inserted between two of the days – and even then there is disagreement on where that gap should come – and then something called the soft gap. Some Christians have also proposed progressive creation, the day age theory, theistic evolution, and the list goes on. More recently Dr. Gerald Schroeder, a Jewish physicist, has proposed that the whole debate about the creation days reported in Genesis chapter one is meaningless because God is not bound by time and also because time is relative to where one is located in the universe. So Schroeder says that the first “day” of twenty-four hours somewhere in the universe lasted for about 8 billion years where we are in the universe today. Day two, and each succeeding day, was then half of the previous day and we end up with a universe that is still in the seventh twenty-four hour day somewhere else - but here on the earth the universe is fifteen and a half billion years old and the earth itself is four billion. Are you confused yet? In addition to those of us who fuss about what the Bible says and means, the intelligent design movement also encompasses quite a few individuals who declare that they are not in the least interested in the Bible but who have come to the conclusion that there has to be a Designer simply because of what they have seen and learned.

While I understand very well what the theological arguments are that result in divisions between Christians, I wonder when we are going to realize who our “allies” are and who the “enemy” is? Until we agree to disagree and respect some people who hold different theological views I doubt that there is going to be any movement or growth toward a consensus. Let’s face it, we who believe that God created everything constitute the vast majority of Americans. But when we get all splintered and fight each other the tiny minority, probably not even 10% of the population of America, is going to continue to run the show.

Dr. Phillip Johnson told us when he was here in March of 2006 that the text we need to begin with is John 1:1, not Genesis 1:1. While that is likely true strategically, both the Old and the New Testaments begin with the declaration that God, who existed prior to the beginning of the universe, created everything out of nothing. The Bible is clear on the question of origins and consistently says that our Creator God is eternal. The stuff that makes the stars and all living things including people is not eternal; it was made by God who is not a physical being but the eternal Spirit, John 4:24. That is a heady and philosophically important thought.

From Genesis to Revelation the Bible message is consistent, since God made everything he deserves to be praised and worshiped for it. These declarations spring up unexpectedly and are found in every part of Scripture. For example, in Nehemiah 9:6 we are privileged to read a corporate prayer of confession by the people of Israel for not recognizing God as Creator. The petition begins by acknowledging that God made all the heavenly bodies, that he created the earth and the sea and all life that abounds on this earth, as well as life in the heavenly regions – I think that must mean the angels - and Nehemiah repented for not worshiping! Job 26:7 informs us that the earth is suspended over nothing... how did the author know that? Creation is a theme that runs throughout the Psalms and the Jews started a practice that Christians have continued from New Testament times onward, the singing of hymns of praise to God as Creator.

One of my favorite Psalms is number nineteen. The first half of it says we can learn about God through what he created; the second half tells us that we learn about God through the Book he has given. I believe the Apostle Paul had Psalm 19 in mind when he wrote Romans 1:20, ²⁰“*For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse.*” That is heavy in more ways than one. Is not the ultimate evil that results from an acceptance of Darwinism the fact that it causes us to not worship God?

In Acts 14:15 pagan people were averted from worshipping Paul and Barnabas only when Paul strongly appealed to the fact that God was the creator of heaven and earth and all life and that God alone deserves to be worshiped for it. In Athens, Greece the Apostle Paul stood before the philosophers of that great city and said to them,

²⁴"The God who made the world and everything in it is the Lord of heaven and earth and does not live in temples built by hands. ²⁵And he is not served by human hands, as if he needed anything, because he himself gives all men life and breath and everything else.

²⁶From one man he made every nation of men, that they should inhabit the whole earth; and he determined the times set for them and the exact places where they should live.

²⁷God did this so that men would seek him and perhaps reach out for him and find him, though he is not far from each one of us. ²⁸'For in him we live and move and have our being.' As some of your own poets have said, 'We are his offspring.'" Acts 17:24-28

I have already made the point that the Bible says God created out of nothing, Psalm 33:6 and Hebrews 11:3, etc. How did ancient people know that? Who would think of something like that? But thanks to Einstein, Hubble, Penzias & Wilson and many, many other people the prevailing theory is that this whole universe began from a singularity, actually from nothing! The theory today is known as the Big Bang. So Who did that? How could something that didn't exist before begin without a Creator? Remember the *Kalam Cosmological Argument*: "Whatever begins to exist has a cause. The universe began to exist. Therefore, the universe has a cause."

I'm going to end here but the topic of origins is going to continue to be debated. As a Christian minister I will do my best to stand up and say that God made us and we ought to worship Him alone. But what our community and our country needs is for people who claim to be Christians to come to understand how important this issue is and to stand up in the marketplace and say the same thing. So we need educators, people in medicine, and science, business, and even over the dinner table or across the backyard fence visiting with friends and neighbors who will say the same thing. It is so vitally important for us to get back to our Judeo-Christian answer of origins and to publicly declare that God is Creator of all. Only when we understand this can we correctly answer the four questions that Ravi Zacharias said are foundational to all religions: Origins, where did we come from? Purpose, why are we here? Morality, how should we treat each other? And Destiny, where do we go from here? These four questions are so tied together that if we answer the first one wrong we are doomed to answer the other three wrong as well. So my prayer is that we will all get it as right as we possibly can – to the glory of God through Christ whom we believe to be both the Creator and the Re-creator of fallen man.

Bibliography

- Behe, Michael J. Darwin's Black Box. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.
- Behe, Michael J., Dembski, William A. and Meyer, Stephen C. Science and Evidence For Design In the Universe, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000.
- Copan, Paul and Craig, William Lane. Creation out of Nothing. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004.
- Dembski, William A. Intelligent Design. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1999.
- Geisler, Norman L and Turek, Frank, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, Crossway Books, 2004.
- Glynn, Patrick. God The Evidence. Roseville: Prima Publishing, 1997.
- Hunter, Cornelius G. Darwin's God. Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2001.
- Johnson, Phillip E. Darwin On Trial. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993.
- Johnson, Phillip E. Objections Sustained. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1998.
- Johnson, Phillip E. Reason in the Balance. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1995.
- Johnson, Phillip E. The Wedge of Truth. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2000.
- Kreeft, Peter. How To Win The Culture War. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2002.
- Morris, Henry M. The Scientific Case for Creation. San Diego: Master Book Publishers, 1977.
- Morris, Henry M. The Bible and Modern Science. Chicago: Moody Press, 1951.
- Morris, Henry M. Scientific Creation. Green Forest: Master Books, 1985.
- Rana, Fazale and Ross, Hugh. Origins of Life. Colorado Springs: NavPress, 2004.
- Schroeder, Gerald L. Genesis and the Big Bang, Bantam Books, 1990.
- Schroeder, Gerald L. The Science of God. New York: Broadway Books, 1997.
- Strobel, Lee. The Case For A Creator. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004.
- Woodward, Thomas. Doubts About Darwin. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2003.