

Evolution on Trial: Interrogating Its Scientific Claims

By **Billy C. Sichone**

Central Africa Baptist University

Introduction

Evolution has been assumed to be the foremost scientific theory in relation to origins (Gitt, 2001). Turn where ever you will, Darwinian evolution reigns from the lowest ranks to the highest (Craig, 1984; Thompson, 1986; Morris, 1974; Whitcomb & Morris, 1961). Children have consistently been taught increasingly that evolution is the Dogma that one dares not question, if they love their livelihood or life. Following the publication of Charles Darwin's 1859 land mark book *The origin of Species*, evolution went on to become the default established belief, supplanting theism from its past firm seat. Arguably, it (i.e. evolution) has been and is all pervasive, affecting nearly all areas of life whether academia or not. However, Evolution has had varying fortunes over its nearly two hundred years reign. There are increasingly more dissenting voices heard all over the world pointing to the multiple discrepancies, inconsistencies and the countless amendments of the theory as new discoveries come to the fore. Others even question whether Evolution qualifies to be even considered a scientific theory¹ given its nature and outstanding gaps. This paper therefore highlights several, not all, problems that the theory faces now and into the future.

Defining or describing Evolution

Evolution is the dogma that states that the world evolved from lower organisms to complex beings that we see today (Gitt, 2001; Sunderland, 1988; Price, 1925). This belief² system further asserts that the universe resulted from a 'Big Bang' that took place 14-16 billion years ago eventually leading to the formation of the universe, planets and now spontaneous generation of single celled organisms. As time went on as conditions became favourable, (by happy miraculous chance!) the single celled organisms replicated into other organisms continuously mutating over a 4 billion year period and today we have humans at the apex of the evolved organisms' landscape. Clearly, evolution negates any talk about a supreme intelligent being in favour of a random, purposeless accidental existence that we observe today. '*Evolution*' is a general term encompassing

¹ Dr. Werner Gitt categorically states that it is not a scientific theory but a philosophy of life.

² Or 'Philosophy' according to Dr Gitt.

various aspects of Evolution theories that include Darwinism. Evolution stands on and begins with several assumptions including the following, as highlighted by late Dr. Luther Sutherland and Geology Professor George M. Price:

1. Evolution is universal.
2. Evolution requires time to take place.
3. No supernatural being exists to have moulded or created the world.
4. Evolution began with the 'Big Bang' but over time, life by spontaneous generation 'by a happy accident' commenced until we reach the present levels of evolution.
5. All animals have a common ancestor; man is not special or unique.
6. Evolution has no purpose or direction. It is a random natural process.
7. All that exists is matter, which is eternal in nature.

Evolution cannot stand without the above mentioned assumptions, which are a form of faith in nature.

Darwinian evolution

Strictly speaking, Darwinism and evolution are different though connected. While 'Evolution' is general, Darwinism is an aspect of it. Evolution states what happened while Darwinism attempts to explain 'how' that which happened took place. Charles Darwin collated all the extant theories of organic evolution based on gradualism and sought to explain them using his theory through acquired characteristics, natural selection and the fossil record he collected during his five year voyage around the world on the Beagle (Price, 1925).

Possible explanation Why Evolution has been the Preferred Theory of Origins

As earlier intimated, evolution has successfully wormed itself into literary all spheres of life today and probably long into the future. But why has this theory gripped the world to the point of dislodging theism? Many reasons could be summoned but one major reason is that it claims to be scientific and was presented as an alternative explanation of origins to Creationism. It claims to explain the origins of life away from the idea of a supreme being called God that instantaneously and unilaterally created the world. Theistic evolutionists attempt to bridge the gap by taking a middle of the road stand. Another reason advanced

by Dr Gitt is that some people reject the idea of God and thus evolution eliminates this. Sir Arthur Keith is on record having opted for Evolution because the God factor was absent.

Purported scientific aspects of Evolution

Darwinian evolution claims to be scientific because proponents assert that it is testable thus falsifiable or not. Secondly, proponents claim that since evolutionary theories are subject to falsification and testability, they can and are often amended as new information becomes available. Thirdly, evolution operates in the natural world with physical things that can be verified. Although there are some gaps in several areas, as information becomes available, these gaps are increasingly being filled as has been happening with the fossil record over the last 150 years or so.

Faith aspects of Evolution

Though Darwinian Evolution has been very popular over the years and heralded as more scientific compared to Creationism, it is none the less premised on religious presuppositions, no wonder people would defend it to the bitter end. It is religious in the sense that it starts and operates on the premise of faith. Where did the ball³ that exploded to form the Universe come from? How did life begin and subsequent developments and mutations into other kinds of beings come about? Evolution claims that there has been consistent macro and micro evolution leading to what we see today, with man at the apex of the evolutionary plane. Pressed to explain further or to produce a trail, evolutionists claim that the evidence will be forthcoming as more fossils are discovered. This, in itself, is a statement of faith.

Limitations of Evolution

Evolution has limitations just like any other. Some of these limitations are so damning to its scientific claims such as the faith aspects that we have mentioned above. Secondly, Evolution claims that the fossil record should be available, given the uniformitarian nature of relics from the past that can be examined and information extracted. This is working backwards against that scientific method that examines present reality by experimentation. Further, Darwinian Evolution is not in sync with Mendalism but espoused the theory of acquired characteristics-Lamarckism that neo Darwinians and others have discarded. Microevolution certainly does take place but Macro is questionable, since science cannot prove that.

³ In reference to the 'Big Bang theory'

Weaknesses and inadequacies of Evolution

As mentioned briefly in the previous points, Darwinian evolution has serious weaknesses such as being a faith based theory, at times in contradiction with established scientific laws, ignores some clear points such as order in the universe clearly pointing to design while evolution is consistently being adjusted to conform to new findings, although, although authentic science allows for this aspect.

Why Evolution's popularity has been fluctuating

The fortunes for this theory have been fluctuating over the years. When it was first introduced in a big way back in 1859, the theory sky rocketed, quickly supplanting all other theories in about all walks of life. It continued to dominate the sciences, for instance, and still does to this day. However, within the early 20th century, people began to question its validity and claims to being a scientific theory. Increasingly, people have risen on both sides of the coin either supporting or questioning its authenticity. Some religiously believe in Evolution and will never countenance or take criticisms. One probability is that they have been stifled by the new found faith community. Secondly, it could be that their very existence and livelihood survival depends on their supporting this theory and thus continue receiving not only a pay check but funding for projects. Others fear committing academic suicide or the loss of academic promotion opportunities. Joshua S Swamidass (<https://peacefulscience.org/articles/why-i-went-public-evolution/>) attested to this fear in a 2021 peacefulscience.org report. This threat is real because a strong systematic cartel exists to flash out or reject any opposing view. The main reason however why Darwinism has been questioned and thus plummeting in popularity at times is its bankruptcy in some cases, such as the fossil record gaps, antagonism to some scientific laws or its faith based assumptions not possible to prove presently, though the recently commissioned Hydron Collider has attempted to recreate the conditions that probably happened during the first few seconds of the big bang-which itself is an assumption, a faith belief. Even more interesting, the big bang itself has been questioned by recent theories such as the one claiming that the Universe has always been, thus eternal. Bruno Bento and Salve Zalel advance this claim in a recent 2021 [express.co.uk](http://opr.news/56fe3ac6211015en_zm?link=1&client=news) report (http://opr.news/56fe3ac6211015en_zm?link=1&client=news).

Concerns about Evolution by Scientists and others alike

That Evolution has been and continues to be the favoured theory of origins is beyond doubt. From the day Darwin unleashed his monumental book, to a keen waiting public, Darwinism has rapidly wormed its way into the public domain,

literary taking over about every aspect of life. It has been heralded as the most all-pervasive theory to affect all spheres of life. For nearly 150 years, Darwinian evolution by natural selection has reigned supreme. Although Charles Darwin was not the original thinker of evolutionary processes in the gradualism sense, he certainly tied together the various ideas⁴ posited by other giants before him, including thoughts from his grandfather Erasmus Darwin. The sad thing about this gentleman is that he got all the credit, accolades and glory when others before him, including Wallace, with whom he co-authored a paper are hardly acknowledged! That said, there are some aspects that continue to worry some scientists and others in relation to the weaknesses and issues raised earlier in this paper. We here allude to some aspects already touched on. Firstly, Darwinism is clearly not correct about the claim of acquired characteristics as taught by Lamarck and imbibed by Charles Darwin to his dying day. Secondly, gradualism is an assumption that cannot be clearly and authentically proved today. This alone makes Darwinism fall off as a scientific theory. However, this is assumed to be true in the scientific community. Thirdly, Mendelism wiped away some claims attributed to Darwinism but the evolutionists hardly acknowledge this fact, preferring to explain the problem away. At best, they claim that these two are complementary views approached from differing perspectives! Fourthly, studies in Biological sciences disprove Darwinism in relation to common ancestry, embryological development and complete change of organisms. Granted, micro evolution through natural selection takes place but not macro as claimed by Darwin. Fifthly, there is evidence from the scientific community to protect faulty Darwinism come what may. It is now an orthodox dogma that one dares not challenge lest they be charged with heresy!⁵ Even Scientists that have discovered the inherent lies or weaknesses in Darwinian evolution dare not raise a dissenting voice lest they are blacklisted from the leading Journals that sing the same chorus in praise of Darwinism. Of course the evolutionist will claim that as more light has come to the fore, amendments are done to the theory, away from classical Darwinism. Sixthly, it is of concern that alternative theories of evolution such as Creationism are totally blocked from being taught in public schools. In many senses, creationism makes more sense given credible supporting evidence but the atheists will not allow it anywhere near the journal turfs! Seventhly, Darwinism claims that organisms evolved from simple to complex beings but the reality in nature is that organisms degenerate. The Darwinian view goes against the grain of the established laws of science of entropy or nature of matter. The incomplete fossil record is yet another. Among evolutionists, they are not agreed. Voices like Dr Gould have clearly admitted that gradualism or even uniformitarianism does not hold water. Evidence shows serious gaps as well as there having been a major catastrophe (flood) of global proportions (Thompson, 1986; Whitcomb & Morris, 1961). Evolution is an act of faith commencing on a presupposed premise. As can be seen, Darwinian Evolution cannot qualify to be scientific, let alone more credible than creationism. The challenge is how to ensure truth freely flows, is disseminated and people allowed to believe what

⁴ And strand so thought

⁵ Or commit 'intellectual suicide' as some call it.

they observe based on facts. At the moment, the cartels in the scientific community forbids free "Objective" pursuit and interpretation of scientific knowledge, which the great theistic army of scientists began in generations gone by. A time will however come when suppressed truth will fly out of its present cage.

What Others have Said or Written about the Weaknesses of Evolution

Of the many who have taken time to write on the nature and weaknesses of Darwinian evolution, Dr M. Price stands among the giants. Dr Price, a trained Geologist himself, has exposed some of the most damning weaknesses of the theory. He points out, for instance, that there are some hidden weaknesses that the scientific community never wants discussed or disclosed because these could potentially harm the standing of the theory. Among these include the contradiction between Mendalism, some fundamental laws of science with classical Darwinian theory; the gap in the evolutionary fossil record; the inconsistencies in the uniformitarian dogma; the order in the universe; the basic faith presuppositions undergirding the theory and the failure of the theory to even qualify as a scientific theory among other weak spots. Price points out that in its over 150 year history, the theory has had fluctuating fortunes of popularity but is clearly the foremost accepted theory in about every arena of life. Another, Dr Girt Werner, has written on theistic evolution, exposing it for what it is. In that work, he first states the presuppositions of Evolution and Creationism before proceeding to demolish evolution with potent argumentation and proof. He demonstrates that Creationism clearly seems to make more sense than its rival theories, which he asserts, are not scientific in nature at all.

But there is a fair share of views to be encountered on the other side of the spectrum as well. The world is awash with evolutionary researchers, writers and apologists (both past and present), foremost of them being Dr Stephen Hawkins, Baron Cuvier, Lyell among others. This group of thinkers and writers assert that to believe anything other than evolution is effectively to be insane, needing some attention from the psychiatrists. They claim that only what is testable, seen and material should be believed and relied on as true. As high Priests of the evolutionary dogma, Richard Dawkins and Stephen Hawkins expect to be believed by faith without question. They assert that evolution needs time and is increasingly being proved correct since it can be falsified and improved upon as evidence becomes available unlike the static Bible.

Lessons Gleaned learnt from this consideration

There are several lessons that can be hewn from this most revealing exploration. Below are some of the major highlights we learn from this research. The reader

is encouraged to verify these assertions with other equally formidable sources as they assimilate this material;

1. Geology cannot help evolution as anticipated or as Charles Darwin hoped. Some facts/evidences/fossils remain at large and may not be found to fill in the yawning gaps. What is there sometimes appears forced or artificial evolutionary stages from a homological perspective. New Geology is no longer evolutionary per se but catastrophic. The 1912 paleoanthropological piltman hoax remains firmly fixed in our memory.

3. Disagreements of Religion and Evolution are not merely on gradualism but about Sin and its effects. The evolutionist down plays sin affirming that human beings are not as bad but with education, the picture can change. Thus, the differences are deeper than meets the eye.

4. Several honest Scientists especially in the Biological Sciences (embryological recapitulation, genetics, homology etc.) repudiate Evolution as nonsensical or untenable.

5. Evolution posits that organisms and people have progressively evolved from simple to complex beings.

6. Mendel introduced Genetics through 1. Hereditary (inborn) & Environmental fluctuations (acquired).

7. Mendalism has been repeatedly tested and verified. Mendalism discounts organic evolution and therefore Darwinism. In fact, Mendel did not agree with Darwin's gradualism or Lamarckism of acquired characteristics.

8. Morgan rejected Darwinian evolution based on the Fruit fly experiments that pointed in the opposite direction of Darwinism. Darwin had made many assertions that were never proved at his time.

9. Despite these damaging findings (i.e. in # 7 & 8 above), against evolution, people still stick to Darwinism.

10. According to Mendel's experiments, for every sixteen bred (yellow peas), the next generation would include the following progeny: 9 tall yellow peas, others would be one green dwarf, 3 dwarf yellow and three tall greens. The last two are said to be mutants or having appeared to have changed. This alone discounts evolution. The reader is encouraged to carefully read the detailed description of the Mendelian experiment.

11. It may further be asserted that Mendalism is opposed to speculative evolutionary processes.

12. Mendalism offered an opportunity to objectively test the truthfulness of evolution which unfortunately pointed in the "wrong direction"!

13. Scientists themselves are not agreed on the factual nature and truth of Evolution but hold on to it by faith.

14. Some Scientists like Bateson reject gradualism in preference for sudden creation/appearance of families/organisms. This sorts out the fossil gap problem that has bugged evolution.

15. Nomenclature should have developed from:

1. Families to
2. Genus to
3. Species to
4. Varieties

16. There must have been a large collection of organisms at the same time to ensure equilibrium in the ecosystem. This could suggest sudden appearance of organisms.

17. Darwinians are smart by avoiding Mendalism, at least historically, preferring to stick to speculation rather than facts.

18. For gradualism to hold true, a lot of time is essential.

19. Traits are never passed on physically but genetically, unlike what classical Darwinism claimed from Lamarckism.

20. Several individuals are key to the development of gradualism, evolutionary thought. These include the following:

A. Lyell-Father of Uniformitarianism. He postulated that the older fossils would be at the bottom while newer on top. There is however some inconsistencies in nature that potentially disprove this dogma.

B. Baron Cuvier-The Genius that misled the world on some geological aspects but a great mind. In recent times, we have Dr Andrew Snelling from Australia that proves that nature evidence (via archaeology) record being consistent with the Biblical narrative.

C. Charles Darwin-Bequeathed the world with the theory of evolution by natural selection

D. Erasmus Darwin- was Grandfather to Charles. He had some of the initial ideas about evolution that Charles later adopted.

E. Thomas Huxley-A Philosophical thinker. He advocated evolution and rejected creationism.

F. Herbert Spencer

G. A. Weismann

H. Ernst Haeckel

I. Aristotle

J. Wallace, a colleague of Darwin with whom Darwin wrote the scientific paper but Darwin got all the credit.

21. If Wallace & Darwin did not hastily put forth their pagan rooted theory of evolution, others would have shortly after that. They did it in the nick of time.

22. At times, some "accidents" in nature may deceive us to believe a lie.

23. The Biologists and now Geologists, are increasingly abandoning evolution for newer theories.

24. Baron Curvier prepared the way for Darwin's evolution. The world was thus led astray by his efforts.

25. Charles Lyell set the ground for Geological Uniformitarianism smoothing the way for Darwin

26. Thomas Huxley asserts that the forerunners prepared the way for Darwin to a waiting scientific community, hence the popularity of the book.

27. A day is yet to come when scientists will realise the folly of Evolutionism.

28. The linkages for evolution are presently incomplete and weak today despite over a hundred years of search. What we have is basically faith based arrangements conveniently/artificially arranged.

29. Evolutionists create an artificial epoch for each age.

30. It is believed by Professor Newman in 10 propositions that epochs existed and towards the end of each epoch, a species developed that became dominant in the subsequent age.

31. The Fossil record remains complete to date.
32. Evolution is faith based in nature and not scientific at all.
33. Darwin made gradualism a going concern but this has been repudiated by new scientific discoveries. Darwin had made many assumptions, some of which were clearly wrong.
34. Some old proofs for evolution have been failing, hence the need to consistently change goal posts. New foundations needed for the theory to survive.
35. Among the scientists that have discarded old Darwinian evolution views include the following according to the speciality: Botanists; Dukinfield H. Scott, H.B. Guppy, J.C. Willis and A.G. Tansley. Zoologists; A. Willey, J.T. Cunningham and E.W. MacBride.
36. Although some physical features appear similar in some species, that proves nothing.
37. Some older and newer species (of the same animal) have been deliberately renamed so that they appear extinct.
38. Evolution favours gradual death of species so that the layers are found in keeping with uniformitarianism.
39. Unfortunately, the record is not uniform and in some cases point strongly to a catastrophe.
40. Some species are extinct such as dinosaurs & trilobites. Interestingly, these remains have been found side by side suggesting that they lived at the same time.
41. There are no human evidences of progression from the past except for a few scattered examples. The Ancient record of human fossils point to pretty humans not necessarily inferior as often portrayed by evolutionists. Granted, they may not have been as refined or advanced but that does not make them less intelligent or inferior for that matter.
42. Degeneration of species is the order of nature not as evolution projects. Evolution posits that evolution is upwards and progressive.
43. Evolutionists still have some gaps in their fossil record. Some fossils are yet to be discovered. Some fossil records have now been found such as the desert plants or in deeply frozen seas.

44. The ancient people were no less intelligent and as earlier suggested, good looking.
45. Microevolution does take place today but not macroevolution. Some modification in species does certainly take place today.
46. Nomenclature was started by Linnaeus (1707-1778) but later developed by Jordan. Though strictly speaking Adam was the pioneer of nomenclature.
47. Some suggest that there were Pre-Adamites in existence.
48. The issue of races still yet to be resolved but is believed to have taken place in Genesis 11.
49. Some scientists and theologians once taught fixed organisms. It is important to be honest when doing something.
50. "Species" has several meanings from Linnaeus or Jordan view.
51. Caste/class systems in insects like bees, how? Did this evolve into specialisation or what? What is the explanation?
52. Degeneration of species makes more sense than otherwise. Evolution towards complex beings goes against the laws of thermodynamics.
53. Looks can be deceiving leading to wrong conclusions. Comparing through morphology is not correct.
54. There is need to reject some theories such as humans having had a tail.
55. There are many queries directed at evolution that the theory cannot explain such as the caste system.
56. Some authorities reject the idea of repetition of forms from ancient parents and replace it with a necessary process for organic embryo organic development. The fact that stages appear same or similar does not mean organisms have common ancestry.
57. The recapitulation theory was proved bankrupt by several authorities/journals or publications such as the Scientific America.
58. During embryo development, one cell replicates too many till it reaches a kind of mulberry sort then enters the blastula stage to the gastrula and there after distinctions between organisms emerge. All animals (large and small) go through this gastrula stage.

59. William Harvey discovered that all larger animals start from Ova-eggs (1651) as well as the circulation of blood in the body. K.E. Von Baer (1792-1876) discovered the embryo stage development.

60. Ernst Haeckel (1834-1919) and others took this development to support evolution via the embryo recapitulation theory. The arguments through the embryo recapitulation was eventually proved hollow an argument.

61. After the gastrula stage, differences emerge that distinguishes organisms.

62. Some argue that similarities in embryo developments are attributable to evolution-common ancestor....."Recapitulation" means all animals go through the evolutionary stages albeit in a very rapid form/stage. Others argue that some parts of the human body are relics of the evolutionary past. The gill slits in embryos are thought to have emanated from an evolutionary stage, not so, because gills and those found in human embryo differ in nature and purpose. Some authorities like Oskar Hertwig reject the idea of recapitulation as a path to past evolutionary phases to necessary natural stages of embryonic development.

63. Evolution states *what* happened while Darwinism explains *how* evolution took place. Darwinism and evolution are different though connected.

64. Mendelism has silenced Darwinism.

65. Teleology (i.e. the argument from design, order etc. for theistic creation rather than gradual evolution of things) was attacked by Darwin.

66. More and more people realise Darwinism's weaknesses but still cling to it by faith. Evolution is bankrupt, a fallen idol. Darwinism in its essential nature is amoral and thrives through blood; survival of the fittest. The weaker species are savagely eliminated from the face of the earth in the quest to survive and self-preservation.

67. The origin of Species book was clearly atheistic. It rejects the idea of special creation in preference for gradual evolution of things. God is thrown out of the picture.

68. Freedom of expression in an Evolution packed world is suppressed. Any dissenting or questioning views are swiftly dealt with by punitive actions and measures. In some University faculties, if one is discovered to be theistic, they have been cases of one losing their post, job or tenure! One example is what happened to Dr John Whitcomb, in a theological institution, turning to theistic evolution! Dr Whitcomb stubbornly held on to literal and six day creationism and paid the price for his resolute position!

69. Some laws of evolutions are really superstitious beliefs imposed on science. People will do any and everything to protect evolution. Specialists such as Henry F Osborn hide information about the true nature of Evolution from their colleagues. Scientists protect false evolution foundations that have been found wanting. They claim evolution is true just needing modification and time to prove itself. Darwin, Wallace, Huxley and Spencer organic evolution. Darwin wrongly believed in acquired characteristics taught by Lamarck.

70. Scientists with contra view to the general populace (on evolution thought) are stifled from expressing themselves or publishing. Evidently, Evolution is now a Dogma and stifles other views. If anyone dares it, they are ostracised.

71. Evolution acts as a closed question when in fact not. It is high time for people to awake and claim freedom of conscience and expression!

72. Scoffers have always existed and will persist. There are helpless enemies of the cross like Bertrand Russell.

73. The resurrection is a fact. Christians must look forward to the resurrection.

74. Salvation must culminate into transformed body/existence at the resurrection. People must seek salvation in Christ for salvation not human ideas such as evolution.

75. Evolution and Biblical accounts point in different directions: Organic evolution; from simple to complex organisms 2. Creation; degeneration until the new creation.

77. Creation was completed in six days. What remains is sustenance.

78. Each person has some kind of philosophy by which they live/interpret the world.

79 Some people teach Eternity of matter and a finite God like William James.

80. The Christian has a blessed hope resting on the infallible truth of God.

81. People are responsible and have a free-will-culpable too.

82 Three key points to consider about Christian appeal: 1. God 2. Free will 3. The Future

83. If evolution were true, all the elements in nature would have long decayed-radioactive decay.

84. America is in the midst of the throes where God is systematically rejected from every side. People are toying with toxic poison as they relate to socialism, Marxism and ultimately evolution. Marxism and socialism are economic aspects of evolution. Paganism has made a return today on every side and many are unaware. Some Preachers such as White (New York Minister of religion in the 1920s) opt to be syncretic. Once a nation abandons the Bible, it is sure to plummet, as America is presently doing. It may take time to show but it eventually will. Christians must be wary of evolution in its various forms and shades. There is great compromise today. The Christian must separate themselves from the general apostasy.

85 Depending on our hind socialization, we develop a world view.

86. To be Born Again, a person must be regenerated by the Holy Spirit and converted.

87. There is great apostasy on every side today but the true saints are known by their fruit.

88. Outward manifestations may not exactly portray what is inward. Regenerate souls love and obey God regardless. Simply living the Christian life will render one undesirable by Heathens.

89. Evolutionists trust education not God for transformation.

90. There is need to be passionate about Christ.

91. Evolution views sin as a mere mistake or weakness. Sin is serious with grave consequences!

92. Stereotypes may mislead.

93. There are battles between right and wrong consistently going on in the world.

94. Depravity is deep rooted in people/men. The best of men are sinners, including Bertrand Russell.

95. Some liberals have embraced heathenish tendencies. The Christian should beware!

96. Leaving a particular church for another may not be the prime solution, it is a transformed heart that is essential.

Thus we can see that there is much to be learnt about Darwinian evolution, some of it very shocking and self damning to the theory, if theory it may truly be called!

Conclusion

From the foregoing, it is evident that Darwinian evolution has deep rooted issues, major ones at that. In its original or even present form, it cannot stand. It needs to be helped to stand serious objective scrutiny. Both Evolution and Creation are premised on faith representing alternative views or approaches to reality. Though evolution is currently preferred, it harbours damaging inconsistencies that Scientists have kept from the public domain in the quest to retain an atheistic hold on the major institutions across the world. The Christian does well to thoroughly investigate matters and not be deceived by the new dogmas hailing from the Gradualist high Priests such as Hawkins and Dawkins among others. The Christian has no reason to fear or dread authentic Science that is in agreement with the Christian faith. What is at play are perceptions that affect the interpretation of data and evidence thus far adduced.

References

Price G.M. (1925). THE predicament of Evolution: Scientific defence of literal 6 day creation

Sunderland L. (1988). Darwinism Enigma,

Gitt W.(2001). *Did God use Evolution?*, Ebner Ulm.

Morris H.M.(1974). *Many infallible Proofs*, Master books.

Thompson B.(1986). *The Flood of Noah*, Baker Book House.

Whitcomb J. & Morris H.M.(1961). *The Genesis Flood*

Craig W.L.(1984). *Reasonable Faith*, Crossway books.

This article is provided as a ministry of [Third Millennium Ministries](#) (Thirdmill). If you have a question about this article, please [email](#) our *Theological Editor*.

Subscribe to *Biblical Perspectives Magazine*

BPM subscribers receive an email notification each time a new issue is published. Notifications include the title, author, and description of each article in the issue, as well as links directly to the articles. Like BPM itself, *subscriptions are free*. To subscribe to [BPM](#), please select this [link](#).

