



Enter terms then hit Search...



PROFESSOR SAYS HE CAN "SLAM DUNK" CREATIONISTS

## PROFESSOR SAYS HE CAN "SLAM DUNK" CREATIONISTS

November 2, 2017

TBC Staff

Paul Braterman, Honorary Research Fellow at the University of Glasgow, recently claimed that evolutionists can “slam dunk” creationists by simply confronting them with the evidence for evolution.<sup>1</sup> What evidence is he referring to?

Braterman noted that evolution skeptics have sometimes claimed that “evolution is just a theory” and have argued that since theories are uncertain, then evolution is also uncertain. He takes issue with this reasoning because when scientists use the word theory, they are usually referring to a hypothesis “supported by a vast body of evidence.”<sup>1</sup> So, those who criticize evolution by calling it “just a theory” are implying that it’s an uncertain hypothesis even though scientists generally use the word theory to mean a hypothesis strongly supported by observations, not just *any* hypothesis.

But actually there is no convincing evidence for evolution despite the blustery claims made in his editorial, some of which are discussed below. Hence, evolution should not be classified as a theory by this definition.

It’s worth noting in passing that scientists are not perfectly consistent in their use of the word theory. As one observer astutely pointed out while commenting on Braterman’s editorial, physicists have devised “theories” that currently have zero experimental evidence to support them—string and multiverse theories being prime examples.<sup>2</sup>

Nevertheless, Braterman correctly argues that the focus of the debate should be on the evidence for or against evolution, not on semantics. Actually, creation scientists wholeheartedly agree with this approach! In fact, creationists have long urged against using the “evolution is just a theory” argument.<sup>3</sup>

So, what actual evidence does Braterman present for evolution? For starters, he asserts that similar characteristics imply common descent. But a Designer might very well use similar features in different organisms, not because the organisms are related, but because the feature works so well!

Braterman also claims that evolutionary family trees constructed from fossils agree well with family trees constructed from molecular data. But this is patently false; such family trees often strongly disagree.<sup>4</sup> In fact, this disagreement is strong evidence against his earlier claim that similar structures imply common descent.

Braterman also claims that the breeding of tame foxes and the emergence of pesticide resistance are examples of evolution.<sup>1</sup> But Braterman is here using the word evolution to mean minor variation within a basic kind of organism. No one disputes that such minor observable changes occur. Rather, the debate is over a special kind of change, the change of one basic kind of life form into another—the kind of change that can transform molecules into men over billions of years. Hence, Braterman is using the word evolution to mean “molecules to man” change at one point in his editorial but then to mean simple change at another. So, Braterman is committing what is known as the logical fallacy of equivocation.

Even more important, molecules-to-man evolution requires enormous increases in new genetic information. But the very process of mutation in DNA that evolutionists invoke to achieve this actually corrupts and decreases information. If this is evolution, then it's going the wrong way!

There are other errors in Braterman's editorial, many, if not all, of which have already been addressed by creation scientists.<sup>5,6,7,8</sup> For instance, the caption for one of the accompanying photos in his article repeats the old canard that human and chimpanzee DNA are 99% similar.<sup>1</sup> Yet, evolutionary anthropologist Jonathan Marks has publicly charged that the original research upon which this claim was based was fraudulent.<sup>9</sup> And ICR's own geneticist Dr. Jeffrey Tomkins soundly refuted this claim with his own independent examination of the data, showing that an unbiased comparison of human and chimpanzee DNA puts their true similarity at 85% at best.<sup>10</sup>

Creation scientists agree with Dr. Braterman that the creation-evolution debate should focus on evidence, not rhetoric. We are confident that an honest examination of the evidence completely rules out evolutionary explanations for the origin of life.

## References

1. Braterman, P. How to slam dunk creationists when it comes to the theory of evolution . The Conversation. Posted on the conversation.com August 2, 2017, accessed August 10, 2017.
2. Anonymous. Prof claims to know how to slam dunk creationists . Posted on uncommondescent.com August 8, 2017, accessed August 10, 2017.
3. Arguments we think creationists should NOT use . "Evolution is just a theory." Creation Ministries International. Posted on creation.com, accessed August 15, 2017.
4. Thomas, B. and F. Sherwin. 2009. Darwin's Withering Tree of Life. *Acts & Facts*. 38 (5): 16.
5. Tomkins, J. P. 2017. Evolutionary Clock Futility. *Acts & Facts*. 46 (3): 16.
6. Guliuzza, R. 2016. Major Evolutionary Blunders: Are Whales and Evolution Joined at the Hip? *Acts & Facts*. 45 (3): 12-14.
7. Thomas, B. 2017. Did Humans Evolve from Apes? *Acts & Facts*. 46(1): 20.
8. Thomas, B. 2017. Why Do Kangaroos Live Only in Australia? *Acts & Facts*. 46 (2): 20.
9. Marks, J. The Rise and Fall of DNA Hybridization, ca. 1980-1995, or How I Got Interested in [Science Studies](#). In Workshop on "Mechanisms of Fraud in Biomedical Research," organized by Christine Hauskeller and Helga Satzinger. The Wellcome Trust, London, October 17-18, 2008.
10. Tomkins, J. P. 2017. DNA Science Disproves Human Evolution. *Acts & Facts*. 46 (6): 10-13.

<http://www.icr.org/article/10241>

 [Printer-friendly version](#)

## MEDIA LIBRARY



The Harbinger



## KEEP IN TOUCH!

[Click here to see our updated Privacy Policy](#)

There are quite a few options for keeping in touch with us:

### Email Options

[Subscribe to our email updates here](#), and choose if you want daily, weekly, or monthly updates.

### The Berean Call Mobile App

Most of our content is published in our app for iOS, Andoid, Windows, and Kindle. [Click here to get the app!](#)

### Parler:

<https://parler.com/profile/thebereancall>

## Facebook:

<https://www.facebook.com/thebereancall/>

## Twitter:

<https://twitter.com/thebereancall>

## Instagram:

<https://www.instagram.com/thebereancall/>

## Youtube:

<https://www.youtube.com/user/TheBereanCall/videos>

## Livestream:

<https://livestream.com/bereancallconference>

## Vimeo:

<https://vimeo.com/thebereancall>

## Podcasts:

- [Apostasy Update](#) (iTunes)
- [Apostasy Update](#) (Google)
- [Apostasy Update](#) (Amazon)
- [TBC Podcast](#) (iTunes)
- [TBC Podcast](#) (Google)
- [TBC Podcast](#) (Amazon)
- [Get Biblical Understanding](#) (iTunes)
- [Get Biblical Understanding](#) (Google)
- [Get Biblical Understanding](#) (Amazon)
- [What Love is This?](#) (iTunes)
- [What Love is This?](#) (Google)
- [What Love is This?](#) (Amazon)
- [Mind Invaders](#) (iTunes)
- [Mind Invaders](#) (Google)
- [Mind Invaders](#) (Amazon)
- [Newsletter Podcast](#) (Amazon)

## Paper Options

*The Berean Call* is available by postal mail each month for free. We are willing to send the newsletter to you by regular mail but encourage you to read it online to save printing and mailing costs. [Send us a message](#) to add or change your paper mail address.

*The Berean Call* is also available in a large-print edition at a nominal cost.

If you are outside the U.S. *The Berean Call* is available by paid subscription .



## FINDING THINGS ON OUR WEBSITE

[Donate to TBC](#)

[Try our topic pages](#)

[Try our "finder" page](#)

Example: [Newsletters about the End Times](#)

Example: [Radio Programs from 2003](#)

Example: [Most Popular Items from 1999](#)

Example: [Text includes "Bethel"](#)

## ONLINE STORE

[Book Downloads](#)

[Books](#)

[DVD](#)

[Large Print Books](#)

[Support TBC](#)

[Berean Bites](#)

## FEATURED TOPICS

[Calvinism](#)

[Catholicism](#)

[End Times](#)

[Islam](#)

[Israel](#)

[Salvation](#)

[Psychology](#)

## HELP

[Contact Us](#)

[Main Website](#)

[Privacy Policy](#)

[Online Store](#)

[TBC Conference](#)

[Radio Program](#)

[Mobile App](#)

slam-dunk verb [T] (ALSO dunk) to jump up and force a basketball down through the net in order to score. (from Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary). I don't know the translation for this. Maybe someone else could help??? G. gotitadeleche. As the others have said, a slam dunk is a basketball move where the player jumps up with the ball and jams it in the basket. In the sentence you show, a slam dunk is defined as "guaranteed winner, exciting, entertaining". They are saying his show is guaranteed to entertain such as a slam dunk does in basketball. P. Piano\_boy\_chile. See also: Teaching evolution to creationist students: Why would anyone who was embarking on teaching evolution as a serious project in good faith try to involve a virulently anti-religious figure like Dawkins in the argument? Tales of the Tone Deaf, featuring dim profs writing in dozy journals about why people doubt Science and how to fix them. All Shubin found was an organism that was adapted to its environment. And what he found doesn't say anything about a mechanism. Yours is an untestable claim and as such not part of science. 7. Mung says: August 9, 2017 at 8:28 am. I know how to slam dunk a basketball, but I don't know how to slam dunk a creationist. I'll need to read that article. 8. Definition of slam dunk in the Idioms Dictionary. slam dunk phrase. What does slam dunk expression mean? Definitions by the largest Idiom Dictionary. He was wide open and scored on an easy slam dunk. 2. Fig. an action or accomplishment that is easily done. Finishing that project with all his experience should be a slam dunk for George. Professor Says He Can "Slam Dunk" Creationists. By jake hebert, ph.D. \* | Thursday, september 21, 2017. Paul Braterman, Honorary Research Fellow at the University of Glasgow, recently claimed that evolutionists can "slam dunk" creationists by simply confronting them with the evidence for evolution.1 What evidence is he referring to? Braterman noted that evolution skeptics have sometimes claimed that "evolution is just a theory" and have argued that since theories are uncertain, then evolution is also uncertain.