

Ten Questions To Ask Your Biology Teacher About Evolution

by
Jonathan Wells

- 1. ORIGIN OF LIFE.** Why do textbooks claim that the 1953 Miller-Urey experiment shows how life's building blocks may have formed on the early Earth - when conditions on the early Earth were probably nothing like those used in the experiment and the origin of life remains a mystery?
- 2. DARWIN'S TREE OF LIFE.** Why don't textbooks discuss the "Cambrian explosion," in which all major animal groups appear together in the fossil record fully formed instead of branching from a common ancestor -- thus contradicting the evolutionary tree of life?
- 3. HOMOLOGY.** Why do textbooks define homology as similarity due to common ancestry, then claim that it is evidence for common ancestry - a circular argument masquerading as scientific evidence?
- 4. VERTEBRATE EMBRYOS.** Why do textbooks use drawings of similarities in vertebrate embryos as evidence for their common ancestry - even though biologists have known for over a century that vertebrate embryos are not most similar in their early stages, and the drawings are faked?
- 5. ARCHAEOPTERYX.** Why do textbooks portray this fossil as the missing link between dinosaurs and modern birds - even though modern birds are probably not descended from it, and its supposed ancestors do not appear until millions of years after it?
- 6. PEPPERED MOTHS.** Why do textbooks use pictures of peppered moths camouflaged on tree trunks as evidence for natural selection - when biologists have known since the 1980s that the moths don't normally rest on tree trunks, and all the pictures have been staged?
- 7. DARWIN'S FINCHES.** Why do textbooks claim that beak changes in Galapagos finches during a severe drought can explain the origin of species by natural selection - even though the changes were reversed after the drought ended, and no net evolution occurred?
- 8. MUTANT FRUIT FLIES.** Why do textbooks use fruit flies with an extra pair of wings as evidence that DNA mutations can supply raw materials for evolution - even though the extra wings have no muscles and these disabled mutants cannot survive outside the laboratory?
- 9. HUMAN ORIGINS.** Why are artists' drawings of ape-like humans used to justify materialistic claims that we are just animals and our existence is a mere accident - when fossil experts cannot even agree on who our supposed ancestors were or what they looked like?
- 10. EVOLUTION A FACT?** Why are we told that Darwin's theory of evolution is a scientific fact - even though many of its claims are based on misrepresentations of the facts?

[Source](#)

Ten Questions To Ask Your Biology Teacher About Design

by
William Dembski

See *The Design Revolution* by William A. Dembski for detailed background regarding these questions. To order this book or read other articles by William Dembski, visit the Access Research Network website at www.arn.org.

1. DESIGN DETECTION. If the universe, or some aspect of it, is intelligently designed, how could we know it? Do reliable methods for detecting design exist? What are they? Are such methods employed in forensics, archeology, and data fraud analysis? Could they conceivably detect design in biological systems?

2. RELEVANCE OF SETI. The search for extraterrestrial intelligence (SETI) is a scientific research program that searches for signs of non-human intelligence from distant space. Should biologists likewise search for signs of non-human intelligence in biological systems? Why or why not?

3. BIOLOGY'S INFORMATION PROBLEM. What explains the origin of complex information-rich patterns in biological systems? Could biological systems exhibit informational patterns that cannot be adequately be explained by natural selection and other material mechanisms? What would such patterns look like?

4. MOLECULAR MACHINES. Can you give examples of structures in the cell that resemble machines designed by humans? Does the complexity of these molecular machines rival artifactual machines made by humans? Is there any solid evidence that such machines could have arisen apart from actual design?

5. IRREDUCIBLE COMPLEXITY. Are there complex biological systems whose parts are all indispensable for the systems to perform their functions? If so, are such "irreducibly complex" systems evidence of intelligent design? If not, why not?

6. REUSABLE PARTS. Human designers reuse designs that work well. Life forms likewise reuse of structures that work well (the camera eye, for example). Is this evidence for common descent, evolutionary convergence, common design, or a combination of these? How do we decide among these options?

7. REVERSE ENGINEERING. In trying to understand biological systems, molecular biologists need to "reverse engineer" them. In other words, they start with functional biological systems and then use their knowledge of engineering to determine how the systems could have been designed and built. Is this evidence that the systems were engineered to begin with?

8. PREDICTIONS. Do intelligent design theory and neo-Darwinian theory make different predictions? Consider, for instance, junk DNA. For which of the two theories would the idea that large stretches of DNA are junk be more plausible? Which theory is more likely to look for unknown uses of seemingly useless biological structures?

9. FOLLOWING THE EVIDENCE. What evidence would convince you that intelligent design is true and that neo-Darwinism is false? Could such evidence even exist? What would it look like? If no such evidence exists or indeed can exist, how can neo-Darwinism be a testable scientific theory?

10. IDENTIFYING THE DESIGNER. Can we determine whether an object is designed without knowing anything about its designer? If an unidentified intelligence was responsible for designing biological systems, how could we know it?

[Source](#)

Ten Questions About Origins

by
Chuck Colson

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? (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?)
5. Do mathematical formulas have naturalistic origins?
6. How do we reconcile the second law of thermodynamics with the universe as we know it?
7. 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?
8. 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.
9. What caused the Big Bang? 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.

[Source](#)