

## Evolution Versus Creation

Darwin's theory of evolution has been one of the most powerful forces shaping our modern world. With its widespread acceptance among scientists, the theory of evolution has revolutionised the way people think about life and human origins. Today, the concept of evolution from simple to complex by natural processes has extended beyond biology to include the origins of the entire universe. For the evolutionist, it is nature, and not God, that created and sustains life. Evolution supports the atheistic view that God does not exist, and is not required to explain how the universe came into being or how life arose on earth.

The influence of evolution has extended into every area of life: science, philosophy, religion, law, politics, and even economics. It is largely embraced as a fact and taught in our schools as if it were beyond question. In recent decades, however, the whole concept of evolution from simple to complex has struggled to maintain credibility under scientific scrutiny.<sup>1</sup> The theory of biological evolution appears to be fundamentally flawed.

In contrast, the creationist view that the universe was created by God has gained increasing support from discoveries in the natural sciences of the appearance of intelligent and purposeful design in everything; from the minute world of atoms to the vast universe, from the extraordinary complexity of life to the equally astonishing laws of physics, the appearance of intelligent and purposeful design is everywhere evident.

This paper provides an examination of these competing views of the origin of the universe and life.

### Two Opposing Beliefs

The modern theory of biological evolution holds that all forms of life on earth have evolved from the same rudimentary forms over a long period of time by means of random genetic mutations and natural selection. It pictures the development of life as a tree with the most basic forms at the base branching out into progressively more complex and diverse forms. Thus, the evolutionist view is that life arose spontaneously from non-living matter by way of natural processes.

The theory of biological evolution runs counter to the Bible's description of God having created the universe in a special act of creation. However, interpretation of the creation texts in Genesis is controversial. Some creationists insist that they must be interpreted literally, but this view is not consistent with our modern understanding of the world. Other creationists hold that they are allegorical, in which case Adam and Eve, for example, would be representative of all mankind. Both positions have led to interpretations which are little more than wild speculations. The reality is that the Bible is not at all clear on *how* God made the cosmos, only that he did.

Neither evolution nor special creation can be *proven* by science. Both views rely on the interpretation of historical evidence, such as fossils, and appeal to known natural laws, such as adaptation, to suggest a model for the origin of life. The reality is that everyone interprets historical evidence through the lens of their personal worldview. This may be summed up in the following equation:

$$\text{data (i.e., evidence) + worldview = interpretation.}$$

If the data are of good quality and quantity (i.e., consistent, reliable and sufficient), and if few presuppositions are made (i.e., the worldview influence is minimal), then a high degree of confidence in the interpretation is warranted. On the other hand, if the data are sparse and inconsistent, and their interpretation requires questionable assumptions, then the resulting

---

<sup>1</sup> See for example *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (Adler and Adler, US, 1986), and *Evolution: Still a Theory in Crisis* (Discovery Institute Press, US, 2016) by Michael Denton.

interpretation should be treated with scepticism. Both views of the origin of the universe and life are dominated by a lack of reliable scientific data, and are heavily influenced by personal biases.

The claim that creationists are unduly biased by their religious beliefs while evolutionists are influenced only by the facts of science is completely wrong. Evolutionists are equally biased by their atheistic worldview, and scientists often favour certain theories and philosophies for various personal reasons. Belief that God does not exist is just as theological and philosophical as belief that he does exist. Therefore, it is incorrect and prejudicial to view one or other belief as any more or less religious, or any more or less scientific, than the other. However, it is reasonable to examine both views and draw conclusions about which one best fits the available data.

## **Where Did the Theory of Evolution Come From?**

Evolutionary ideas first arose among the ancient Greeks. Anaximander taught that men had evolved from fish, and Empedocles asserted that animals had been derived from plants. Neither theory caught on. But another theory about the origin of living things put forward by Aristotle and others became very popular and held sway for many centuries. This was the view known as “spontaneous generation” in which it was believed that creatures could arise from mud and slime. This view was challenged by a number of eminent scientists over the centuries, but continued to be believed until finally disproved by Louis Pasteur. It has reappeared, however, in the modern theory of evolution which holds that life arose spontaneously from non-living matter in a primeval chemical “soup”.

The starting point for the revival of evolution was a new theory of geology put forward by James Hutton. He proposed that the layers in sedimentary rocks were formed by slow processes of deposition over long periods of time. This was contrary to the long held view that the sedimentary rocks had been laid down in the global flood described in the Bible (Genesis 6-8). Hutton’s ideas were further developed by Lyell in his work *Principles of Geology* which greatly influenced Darwin.

The modern theory of biological evolution was first proposed by Charles Darwin in his book *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or The Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* in 1859. Darwin theorised that biological evolution was possible by means of “natural selection” or “survival-of-the-fittest”. This meant that any individual creature that had a slight advantage over others in the struggle for survival would be preserved, and this advantage passed on to its offspring, thereby improving and strengthening the species. With their greater knowledge of genetics, scientists after Darwin proposed that beneficial genetic mutations were the prime source of these slight advantages. Given enough time, the evolutionists believe that all these successful ongoing variations produced entirely new features, which gradually transformed one creature into another of a different kind. This meant that there was a continuous and gradual process of evolution from the first life form to every other creature in existence.

Most of the elements contained in Darwin’s theory had been suggested before *The Origin of Species* was published, but had never been presented so coherently or with so much supporting evidence. Many creationists at the time believed that species were immutable, but in *The Origin of Species* Darwin convincingly argued that this view was false. Creationists today readily accept variation within species, but hold that variation between different kinds, or types, of organisms is not supported, and indeed is contradicted, by the scientific evidence.

The heart of the creation-evolution debate revolves around the evidence for or against the possibility of variations between types of organisms.<sup>2</sup>

Despite the many problems in Darwin's theory, which he freely admitted, it quickly gained wide acceptance. The idea of survival-of-the-fittest was clearly evident in nature, and appealed to the natural selfishness of human beings. Also, principles of human evolution conveniently supported racism and classism which were widely accepted at the time. But the most powerful support came from those who were opposed to the church and to belief in God – the atheists, communists, radical socialists and humanists. It is a matter of public record that such bodies played a decisive role in marshalling and mobilising scientists and academics on a global scale to oppose and eradicate the creationist view.

Biological evolution soon became the cornerstone for a revival of the Aristotelian concept of a self-creating and self-sustaining universe. But over time serious flaws in the theory have emerged. Some of these are philosophical in nature, but many stem from a lack of scientific evidence in support of the theory.

## Battle of the Origin-Worldviews

In the battle of the origin-worldviews, creationists have a decided advantage over evolutionists. Uncertainties in the creation model can simply be attributed to our ignorance of the ways of God, whereas critical flaws in the evolutionary model must be addressed before the theory can be considered credible. In practice, the theory of evolution suffers from a number of critical flaws.

From the outset, evolution requires a great leap of faith in believing that matter somehow created itself out of nothing, or else, is eternal. Evolutionists must then appeal to unknown natural laws as the means by which mindless matter transformed itself into the enormously complex and well organised universe in which we live. These unknown laws must be capable of the spontaneous creation of order out of chaos, of life from non-living matter, and of complex organisms from supposedly simple, primitive forms. But no such laws have been observed in the real world. And even the most simple life forms contain highly complex structures that have no conceivable simpler form that would be functional. Furthermore, the transitional links between the various types of organisms that Darwin was unable to find, are still missing after more than 150 years of paleontological investigations.

The evolutionist paradigm attempts to supplant the God of the Bible with another kind of god – an all-powerful, unguided, and uncreated grand unified law of nature from which all the other laws of nature emerge. Interestingly, the more we learn about the laws of nature, the more mysterious and unfathomable they appear to be. Creationists would argue that the author of these laws is the God of the Bible, “Who does great and unsearchable things, wonders without number” (Job 5:9, NASB).

The hope of the atheists is that this grand unifying natural law can explain the origin and evolution of the cosmos and of life without the need for a Creator. A key feature of these natural laws, however, is that the physical processes they describe must be entirely random and yet, at the same time, highly probable. Creationists, in contrast, interpret them as evidence of intelligent and purposeful design. In short, creationists look for evidence of “smart design” in the cosmos, while atheists look for evidence of “dumb design”.

The world in which we live bears all the hallmarks of having been intelligently and purposely designed for life of the kind we see in the world. Conversely, there is a striking lack of support for the idea of design by accident. Nothing in the physical sciences supports the idea that random-chance interactions can give rise to increasing complexity in the absence of pre-

---

<sup>2</sup> Variations between types is often called *macroevolution* and variations within species *microevolution*. The latter term, however, is misleading because it implies a similarity to macroevolution when in fact variations within species only reshuffle pre-existing genetic information.

existing information, or to retain that complexity even if it were to arise accidentally. In fact, the opposite is true, that the law of entropy causes ordered structures to devolve towards a state of maximum disorder. Nature is simply unable to blindly perform the kinds of creative “miracles of nature” required by evolutionary theory.

## **Critical Flaws in Evolutionary Theory**

In recent decades, a number of critical flaws in evolutionary theory have been identified. This section provides a summary of the most important of these.

### 1. Matter Cannot Arise Out of Nothing

Evolution requires that matter created itself out of nothing. This is simply not possible. There are no physical laws that we know of by which something can create itself out of nothing. The only reasonable explanation for the fact that the universe exists at all, is that it was created by a powerful and intelligent Creator who is greater than, and external to, the Creation itself. Therefore, the very existence of the universe sits well with the creationist model and contradicts the evolutionary model.

*If there was ever a time when there was truly nothing, there could never be anything – R. C. Sproul.*

### 2. Order Cannot Arise Out of Chaos

No physical laws have been identified to support the notion that chaos can transform *itself* into order. In fact, one of the most fundamental laws of nature, the law of entropy indicates the reverse – that any complex system will naturally tend towards a state of chaos (i.e., minimum energy and maximum disorder) unless external energy is input to maintain the system or build it up.

By contrast, the Bible reveals that it was God who filled darkness with light, emptiness with creation, and formlessness with a myriad of wondrous forms. And it was God who cursed his creation because of the sin of mankind:

*For the creation was subjected to frustration, not by its own choice, but by the will of the one who subjected it, in the hope that the creation itself will be liberated from its bondage to decay and brought into the glorious freedom of the children of God (Romans 8:20-21).*

### 3. Life Cannot Arise From Non-Living Matter

Nothing in biology or chemistry indicates that life can arise spontaneously (i.e., naturally and unaided) from non-living matter. Even the most basic forms of life turn out to be highly complex and unable to be produced by random chance processes. Life is a property of organisation, not matter. It is having all the right molecules arranged in exactly the right way in exactly the right quantities and at exactly the right times that transforms mindless matter into a living organism.

The process of creating life is like building a house. It requires intelligent design to plan the process, the manufacture and delivery of the required components (some of which are highly complex in their own right), and assembly of the components in the right order according to the plan. The creationist model again fits the bill by requiring God to be the designer and builder of all living things.

*To their chagrin [scientists] have no clear-cut answer, because chemists have never succeeded in reproducing nature’s experiments on the creation of life out of non-living matter. Scientists do not know how that happened ... Scientists have no proof that life was not the result of an act of creation – Robert Jastrow (astronomer and evolutionist).*

#### 4. Living Things Are Too Complex

Even the simplest, single-celled organisms are extremely complex. For a start, the DNA or RNA molecules required to store and transfer genetic information are themselves astonishingly complex, and beyond anything that could be produced by random-chance chemical reactions. But there are many other complex structures and components in living cells – the nucleus containing the DNA, ribosomes for making proteins, lysosomes which contain powerful enzymes, mitochondria for respiration, cilia to move things around the cell, flagella to move the cell around, and various types of membranes each with its own specific function. All this cellular “machinery” works together in a precisely organised way to carry out the chemical processes needed for life. If any one component is missing, the cell will die.

The same is true of the larger components of an organism, such as the eye. Unless all the parts of the eye existed from the outset, it would not function properly, and therefore would have no “survival” value.

*The eye appears to have been designed; no designer of telescopes could have done better ... It is hard to accept the evolution of the human eye as a product of chance; it is even harder to accept the evolution of the human intelligence as the product of random disruptions in the brain cells of our ancestors – Robert Jastrow (astronomer and evolutionist).*

Creationists use the term “irreducible complexity” to describe the requirement for a high degree of complexity in living things to ensure their survival. This means that life could not have evolved by a gradual process of transformation from simple to complex, since complexity is required from the outset. Instead, irreducible complexity points to intelligent design.

#### 5. Random Processes Cannot Create

Random processes are not observed to create increasing order and complexity. Instead, the observation of life is that random processes (i.e., accidents) tend to break things – they do not create complexity, they destroy it!

*An accident, a random change, in any delicate mechanism can hardly be expected to improve it. Poking a stick into the machinery of one’s watch or one’s radio set will seldom make it work better – Theodosius Dobzhansky.*

For evolution to create a single useful feature, not one accident but a whole series of them would be required. Furthermore, each subsequent accident would have to add something useful to the previous ones in order to transform very simple things into very complex things. The laws of mathematical probability show that the chances of getting even a few accidents of this nature occurring in series and in a favourable way are effectively zero.

*The probability of life originating from an accident is comparable to the probability of the unabridged dictionary resulting from an explosion in a printing shop – Edwin Conklin (biologist).*

#### 6. Time Does Not Help

The evolutionary formula is:

$$\text{time} + \text{matter} + \text{chance} = \text{life}.$$

But time does not help to create complexity. For one thing, it does not increase the chances of creating order out of chaos. Any order derived by an accident at any point in time could just as easily be lost with ongoing time. In an ever changing random-chance process, nothing exists to ensure that any order created is subsequently retained as a basis for increasing order and complexity.

Furthermore, the enormously complex features evident in life require all the various components to be present at the same time in order to function properly (i.e., irreducible

complexity). A half developed eye, for example, is completely useless, and has no survival value at all. In this sense time is the *enemy* of evolution, since it demands impossible numbers of highly improbable accidents to occur at the same time and in the correct order.

*If one is not prejudiced either by social beliefs or by a scientific training into the conviction that life originated [spontaneously] on earth, this simple calculation [the mathematical odds against it] wipes the idea entirely out of court – Sir Fred Hoyle and Prof. Chandra Wickramasinghe (astronomers).*

## 7. Biology Does Not Indicate Evolution

The numerous examples in biology of complex and sophisticated features and behaviours, such as the various types of eyes and methods of communication, do not indicate development from simple forms. The consistent evidence is that there are no simple forms, or precursory steps, from which even relatively simple features could have arisen while remaining useful and functional (i.e., in accordance with the principle of irreducible complexity).

The numerous examples of symbiosis (organisms that live in partnership with each other) also point clearly to design in creation. For example, there are certain small fish and shrimp that eat the parasites in the mouths and gills of larger predatory fish. This relationship clearly has survival value for both partners, but only if they both understand the rules of the relationship at the same time. Symbiotic relationships also exist between less intelligent organisms including insects, bacteria and plants. These behaviours could not arise by chance, but must have been designed into the organisms from the outset.

The numerous examples of so-called “parallel evolution” in which completely different species are supposed to have developed similar features or skills on different evolutionary paths also contradict the random-chance premise of evolution. It is not reasonable to conclude that the improbable accumulation of accidents to create some useful feature in one species also occurred independently, but at a similar time, in other species. It is much more reasonable to accept the creationist view of there being a common designer who has elected to use common design features in different organisms.

The observation of biology is that living organisms are the product of specialised design, and not random-chance evolutionary processes.

*To suppose that the eye [with so many parts working together] ... could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree – Charles Darwin.*

*It was a beautifully simple and attractive theory. The only trouble was that, as Darwin was himself at least partly aware, it was full of colossal holes ... We have here the supreme irony that a book [Darwin's Origin of the Species] which has become famous for explaining the origin of species in fact does nothing of the kind – Christopher Booker (journalist).*

## 8. Natural Selection Has Never Created a New Organism

It is well known that natural selection helps to ensure the survival of species against changing environmental conditions. When a significant change occurs, the species which are less suited to the new environment (i.e., less “fit”) will tend to die off, allowing the better adapted species to take over. However, natural selection has never been observed to produce new kinds of creatures which would require the creation of new genetic information. It has only ever been observed to produce variations within existing kinds – merely shifts in population. The evidence from experiments is that natural selection encourages existing genetic potential to emerge (i.e., the variability is already in the gene pool), but does not give rise to new genetic information.

Scientists also now recognise the difficulty of defining “fitness”. Survival depends on far more factors than just strength or aggression. For example, beauty, isolation, cunning, caution, size, and, more often than not, sheer luck are important factors.

### 9. Genetic Mutations Do Not Give Rise to New Features

Darwin recognised that natural selection alone could not explain the origin of new traits. He believed that the way animals interacted with their environment caused changes in their genes which were subsequently passed on to the offspring. Scientists today completely discredit this idea, but modern evolutionists believe that random-chance genetic mutations can explain the process of gradual, upwards progress.

Genetic mutations are mistakes that occur when the DNA molecule is being copied during reproduction. They are fairly rare, but are certainly real, and have been observed to cause changes in traits. However, they have never been observed to create *new* traits, which would require new genetic information to be added to the DNA.

In regard to speciation, genetic mutations are either “neutral” or “destructive”. Neutral mutations simply rearrange existing genetic information to produce variations within existing kinds, but never give rise to new information which could lead to new features or new kinds of creatures. Destructive mutations result in deformities, diseases, impairments, and over-specialisation, all of which result from a *loss* of genetic information.

Studies have also shown that cells manufacture special enzymes to repair genetic damage to DNA. While variations in the DNA of the offspring are successfully achieved by the shuffling of genetic material from the parents, variations due to genetic mutations are resisted. This is because accidental changes are more likely to result in negative outcomes which do not favour an organism’s chances of survival.

Another critical flaw with appealing to genetic mutations as a primary agent of change, is that they presuppose special creation. Mutations point back to creation because they are only changes in already existing genes. This begs the question: “Where did the genes come from in the first place so that they could be subject to change?”

### 10. Evolution Has Never Been Observed

Perhaps the strongest argument against evolution is that it has never been observed. In thousands of years of domestic breeding and observation of nature there has never been a single example recorded of one type of creature transforming into another. Nor is there any evidence from the fossil record of creatures in the past that were in the process of becoming another kind of creature. Nor have the countless experiments carried out in the last century provided a single piece of evidence to support evolution. It is a scientific theory without scientific evidence.

*For all its acceptance in the scientific world as the great unifying principle of biology, Darwinism, after a century and a quarter, is in a surprising amount of trouble – Francis Hitching (author and evolutionist).*

## **Evidence in Support of Special Creation**

All of the fatal flaws of evolution noted in the previous section point to the need for a Creator to explain the Creation, and therefore provide evidence to support the creationist view. However, there is also evidence which supports special creation in its own right as described in this section.

### 1. The Creation Requires a Transcendent Creator

The very fact that the universe exists at all points to a Creator who is greater than, and external to, the Creation itself. Only a supernatural agent could create the natural universe out of nothing. This is not a statement of religion, but of logic and reason.

## 2. The Creation Requires an Intelligent Creator

Perhaps the clearest and simplest evidence for special creation is the marvellous design we see in the world around us. The myriad wonders of plants and animals, of the sky and the sea, of planets and galaxies, of atoms and molecules – all of these things point to an intelligent and purposeful Creator. Again, this is not a statement of religion, but of simple observation. No building, or car, or computer was every created by random-chance processes. Instead, enormous amounts of human intelligence went into the making of them. Yet they are all very simple compared to a human being, or an eye, or the chemical machinery in a living cell. It is not reasonable to conclude that things made by people require intelligent design while the much more sophisticated things of nature do not. The design evident in the world around us is powerful evidence for the existence of a Creator God.

## 3. Life Requires Pre-existent Information

Information is an essential prerequisite for everything that exists in the universe, along with matter and energy. All three – information, matter and energy – must have existed at the outset for the universe to exist at all. For example, plants grow by using sunlight, water, and carbon dioxide because their DNA contains instructions for the use of these energy sources. In the same way, mouse DNA contains all the instructions needed for the proper functioning of a mouse. There is nothing in its DNA that will allow it function as some other kind of creature.

The experience of science and industry is that information requires an intelligent prime source. It cannot arise by itself even if matter and energy are already present. The complex and precise instructions and mechanisms that exist in all living things point to a pre-existent, external, and intelligent agent.

*By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, their starry host by the breath of his mouth (Psalm 33:6)*

## 4. The Fossil Record Supports Special Creation

Fossils are the remains or traces of plants and animals preserved in rock. They provide some of the most reliable, albeit limited, information into what life was like in the distant past. If evolution is true, then the fossil record should indicate very simple life forms gradually appearing and transforming into more complex ones. There should be many transitional “links” between different kinds (e.g., a reptile on its way to becoming a bird), and the beginnings of new body features (e.g., scales on their way to becoming feathers). For special creation to be true, we would expect to find complex life forms suddenly appearing in the fossil record with variations within kinds, but no transitional links, and no partial body features; all parts complete.

After more than 150 years of intensive investigation, the fossil record overwhelmingly supports special creation, and contradicts evolution.

*Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely-graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and serious objection which could be urged against the theory – Charles Darwin.*

*No transitional forms are known between any of the major phyla of animals and plants – G. Ledyard Stebbins (geneticist).*

*It is not even possible to make a caricature of an evolution out of palaeobiological facts. The fossil material is now so complete that ... the lack of transitional series cannot be explained as due to the scarcity of material. The deficiencies are real; they will never be filled – Heribert Nilsson (botanist).*

## 5. The earth's Geology Supports Special Creation

Evolutionists believe that the layers of sedimentary rock comprising the earth's geology were laid down slowly over long periods of time. They assign millions of years to each layer and conclude that the earth is billions of years old. Particular fossils are also associated with the various rock layers to form a geological timescale over which evolution is supposed to have occurred. In contrast, creationists believe that the predominant geology was formed suddenly during the biblical flood.

The geology of the earth does not support slow and gradual formation. The sequence of rock layers (strata) on which the geologic timescale is based is conceptual only, and is not observed anywhere in the world.<sup>3</sup> What *is* commonly observed, however, are variations in the idealised sequence with supposedly older rock layers sitting above younger ones. Fossils are also commonly found in the “wrong” rock layers, and some fossils, such as trees in coal seams, often span vertically across many rock layers of different geological ages (called *polystratic fossils*). This is impossible, because the trees would have rotten away long before the subsequent rock layers were deposited.

The observation of catastrophic events involving water provide a better explanation. Water is capable of moving huge quantities of soil during the peak of a flood, and depositing it in uniform, and often very fine, layers as the speed of the flow reduces. The earth's geology and the distribution of fossils within the rock layers are perfectly consistent with formation by a global flood. The general geology has been modified since then by many localised catastrophic events (e.g., earthquakes, local floods, landslides), but the predominant geology looks to have been formed by a massive, global flood.

## **Why Do So Many People Accept Evolution?**

The weight of scientific and observational evidence shows that evolution is not only questionable, it is highly improbable. On the other hand, the creationist view is entirely consistent with the evidence. Why, then, do so many people reject creation and accept evolution?

One reason is indoctrination through the schools. Students are taught evolution as if it were a fact, rather than an unproven theory. Any student brave enough to question evolution could find themselves subjected to ridicule and criticism. Evolutionary views also permeate the media. Books, television documentaries, movies, and news items treat it as an established fact. Thus, people are conditioned to accept evolution as a fact, and contrary evidence is dismissed.

The weight of authority that is brought to bear on evolution's behalf is another major reason for its general acceptance. When leading educators and scientists assert that evolution is a fact, and imply that only the ignorant refuse to believe it, how many lay people are going to contradict them? As an example, consider this assertion by evolutionist Richard Dawkins: “Darwin's theory is now supported by all the available relevant evidence, and its truth is not doubted by any serious modern biologist.” But is this really the case? A little research will reveal that many scientists, including “serious modern biologists”, not only doubt evolution, but do not believe it. They believe that the evidence for special creation is far stronger. Thus, sweeping statements like these are in error, and reflect a lack of faith in the evidence of evolution to stand on its own merits.

This kind of unscientific attitude was noted and deplored by W. R. Thompson in his forward to the centennial edition of Darwin's *The Origin of Species*. Thompson stated: “If arguments fail to resist analysis, assents should be withheld, and wholesale conversion due to unsound

---

<sup>3</sup> Interestingly, around 90% of geologic time is associated with igneous and metamorphic rocks which don't provide stratigraphic information of the same quantity or quality as the overlying sediments (refer to *Rocks Aren't Clocks* by John K. Reed, Creation Book Publishers, 2013).

argument must be regarded as deplorable.” He went on to say: “The facts and interpretations on which Darwin relied have now ceased to convince. The long-continued investigations on heredity and variation have undermined the Darwinian position.” Thompson also observed: “A long-enduring and regrettable effect of the success of the Origin was the addiction of biologists to unverifiable speculation ... The success of Darwinism was accompanied by a decline in scientific integrity.” He concluded: “This situation, where scientific men rally to the defence of a doctrine they are unable to define scientifically, much less demonstrate with scientific rigour, attempting to maintain its credit with the public by the suppression of criticism and the elimination of difficulties, is abnormal and undesirable in science.”

*In fact, evolution became in a sense a scientific religion; almost all scientists have accepted it and many are prepared to ‘bend’ their observations to fit in with it – Prof. H. S. Lipson (physicist).*

*Evolution is a fairy tale for grown-ups. This theory has helped nothing in the progress of science. It is useless – Prof. Louis Bounoure (biologist)*

*Scientists who go about teaching that evolution is a fact of life are great con-men, and the story they are telling may be the greatest hoax ever. In explaining evolution, we do not have one iota of fact – Dr. T. N. Tahmisian (physicist).*

Perhaps the most significant reason why people accept evolution is because they *want* to believe that God does not exist. Beneath its cover of science, evolution is fundamentally an atheistic religion. Like any religion it is dominated by a relatively small number of “high priests” of evolution, the evolutionary scientists, while the masses faithfully adopt their teachings without question or discernment. Why would anyone question a belief that supports their hope in the non-existence of God? Even for people not opposed to the idea that God might exist, it is easier to accept the popular consensus that evolution is true, or even that it might be true, than to investigate the evidence and draw their own conclusions. So by choice they remain ignorant on one of the most critical questions of life – “Does God exist?”

*Enter through the narrow gate. For wide is the gate and broad is the road that leads to destruction, and many enter through it. But small is the gate and narrow the road that leads to life, and only a few find it (Matthew 7:13-14).*

## Conclusion

Darwin’s theory of evolution was originally, and still is today, accepted because of its philosophical implications, and not on the basis of any scientific evidence. It is, in truth, an atheistic dogma. The evolution paradigm has simply transferred the attributes of God to nature. The evolutionist trinity of “mother nature”, “father time”, and “lady luck” have all the capabilities of a divine miracle worker, able to change anything into everything, and everything into anything. By contrast, the creationist view holds that behind the cosmos lies an intelligent, purposeful, and powerful designer and law-maker, the God of the Bible.

*The heavens declare the glory of God; the skies proclaim the work of his hands. Day after day they pour forth speech; night after night they display knowledge (Psalm 19:1-2).*

The theory of evolution does not stand up to critical examination. It is a Creation myth which eliminates the need for a Creator. But the observational evidence does not support evolution. The creationist view is still the most rational and realistic explanation for the cosmos. All that has ever been directly observed is a well-designed universe governed by immutable laws. The most logical interpretation is that behind the cosmos lies an intelligent, purposeful, and powerful designer and law maker, the God of the Bible.

*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 (Romans 1:20).*

If you would like to know Jesus Christ, this is what you should do:

- ❖ **Pray to Jesus Christ.** “The Lord is near to all who call on him ... he hears their cry and saves them” (Psalm 145:18-19).
- ❖ **Read the Bible.** You should start by reading the whole of the New Testament, asking Jesus to help you to understand what you are reading.
- ❖ **Join a church.** It is vital that you find a church which holds the Bible to be the final authority in all matters of faith and practice for those who believe in Jesus Christ.

## **Acknowledgments**

The following sources were used in the preparation of this paper:

*Christianity for Skeptics* by Steve Kumar and John Heinger, World Wide Press, 1994.

*What is Creation Science?* by Henry M. Morris and Gary E. Parker, Master Books, 1996.

*Bone of Contention. Is Evolution True?* by Silvia Baker, Creation Science Foundation, 1994.

*Rocks Aren't Clocks – A Critique of the Geologic Timescale* by John K. Reed, Creation Book Publishers, 2013.

Bible quotations are from the New International Version, 1984, or where indicated as NASB, the New American Standard Bible, 1977.