

Video Transcript: Evolution Versus Creation: Two Opposing Beliefs

Slide 2: Introduction

The theory of evolution has been one of the most powerful influences shaping our modern world, changing the way that people view life and God.

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 theory of evolution runs counter to the Bible's description of God having created the universe in a special act of creation, fully formed and ideally suited to life.

In this first of two videos, I argue that the theory of evolution is just as much a faith-based belief as the creationist view. In the second video, I summaries the key scientific evidence against evolution and in support of special creation.

Slide 3: Background

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 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".

Slide 4: Background

By the time of Darwin, physicists and astronomers had already shown that the cosmos functioned according to certain physical laws, and the search was on to discover the natural laws that undergirded biology and natural history.

Darwin's theory of evolution was widely perceived to be the long awaited natural law or biological mechanism which explained the origin and evolution of life by natural processes.

Despite the lack of any real evidence to support Darwin's theory, which he freely admitted, it quickly gained wide acceptance.

Slide 5: Background

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.

Slide 6: The Evolutionist View

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.

Slide 7: The Creationist View

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.

Slide 8: Evidence and Worldviews

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.

Slide 9: Evidence and Worldviews

On the other hand, if the data are sparse and inconsistent, and their interpretation requires questionable assumptions, then the resulting 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.

Slide 10: Evidence and Worldviews

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 models and draw conclusions about which one best fits the available data.

Slide 11: Evolution is Not Observed

Perhaps the strongest argument against the theory of 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.

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).

Slide 12: Special Creation is Observed

By contrast, the creationist view is strongly supported by the observational evidence. What we can plainly see, for example, is:

- An earth superbly suited to life in numerous different ways, yet wonderfully choreographed to form a single, complex ecosystem.
- A beautiful galaxy and a solar system ideally suited to be earth's neighbourhood and home, again in countless different ways.
- A universe governed by intelligible natural laws which are both immutable and yet unpredictable, permitting extraordinary variability.
- A finely tuned cosmos of unimaginable extremes, and all arising from the same fundamental elements and processes.

Consistent with the creationist view, we appear to be a special creature, living on a privileged planet, in a universe tailor-made for life of the form seen on earth.

Slide 13: 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.

Slide 14: Battle of the Origin Worldviews

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.

Slide 15: The New God

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 will explain the origin and evolution of the cosmos and of life without the need for a Creator.

Slide 16: Intelligent Design

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.

By contrast, creationists 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, as highlighted in the second video of this series.

Slide 17: Intelligent Design

Nothing in the physical sciences supports the idea that random-chance interactions can give rise to increasing complexity in the absence of pre-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.

Intelligent design is evidence of an intelligent designer:

For this is what the Lord says – he who created the heavens, he is God; he who fashioned and made the earth, he founded it; he did not create it to be empty, but formed it to be inhabited (Isaiah 45:18).

Slide 18: Conclusions

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” has 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).