

Comparing Theories of Evolutionism and Creationism

By [Billy C. Sichone](#)

Central Africa Baptist University

Introduction

Much endless debate has surrounded the issue relating to the origins of life (Gitt, 2001; Whitcomb 1972; Schaeffer, 1972; Thompson, 1996). While the scientific community is divided over this matter relating to exactly how life began (or came from; lodged onto an extra-terrestrial meteorite or asteroid from outer space, spontaneous generation or what, questions remain open) and progressed, they are however agreed in their concerted opposition to the creationist view of origins (Dawkins, 2006). They sing from the same hymn book claiming that evolution is scientific in nature and incomparable to creation, which (i.e. Creation) they dub as being irrational and terribly subjective. Although neither of the sides can conclusively prove their position as being definitively correct and true, evolutionists have had the privilege of Government moral and funding support to carry out massive and expensive research though deluded to this day arriving at the definite answer for origin. The faith and search continues with projects like SETTI (by Carl Sagan) and myriads others beside continue the aggressive research. Their funding stream seems perennial compared to the fragile relatively poorly and privately funded creationist projects. For another fact, the said creationists on the other hand, have been latecomers jumping into the research arena, having operated from an exclusively presuppositional perspective (which, in our view, is equally plausible), that hardly resonates with the opposing camp. Be that as it may, either side claims that their view is closer to fact, asserting that their perspective is in sync with objective science. But is that claim true in all cases? Can respective claims stand serious objective scrutiny? This paper attempts to offer an objective comparison based on the best evidence available at writing time.

Creationism defined

Creationism posits that God designed and created the world *ex-nihilo* (Thompson, 1996). Although He is transcendent, he is equally immanent in sustaining the world. Creation was a finished, mature, perfect and complete work within the stipulated literal six days (*yom*) and what God now does is to preserve or sustain the world. Micro-evolution takes place as the gene pool intermingling

takes place but not towards a new creature or even generating new information added to the gene pool (Dembski, n.d.). Thus creation strongly asserts that God is the first cause of everything, the uncreated creator.

The perceived weaknesses of Creationism

Creationism is largely presuppositional (for Young Earth Creationists at least) and relies on the declarations of God's word, the Bible. Although not a scientific manual, the Bible's declarations touch on science and at times subject to incorrect interpretation by fallen humans. Subjectivity of this view is what many scientists point to as its weakness.

The strengths of Creationism

Creationism has multiple strengths especially that nearly all of its material claims have never been refuted by science per se. Problems may exist but purely on how one understands the world (i.e. World view). The other strength with creation is that its predictions have been proven correct in all circumstances with many others yet to be verified or fulfilled in time. For instance, the Bible touches on Genetics in passing as it narrates the creation story (e.g. Genesis 1:25). Creation is logical and makes sense, assuming an intelligent designer behind all things. It is consistent with science in many senses.

Evolution(ism) defined

Evolution is the teaching that holds that the world just evolved from spontaneous sources such as primordial soup, spores or clay templates (Dembski, n.d.). It rejects the idea of a supreme being having created the world but opts for random, purposeless origin and development of life. Evolution further claims that life is random, has no purpose or direction. Things have evolved over long stretches of time, adapting to their environment as well as through mutations. Simple one celled organisms progressively developed into more complex organisms until we have what we have today and yet to evolve further! Evolutionists claim that the dating techniques as well as the fossil record are an eloquent validation of their claim.

The perceived weaknesses of Evolution(ism)

Evolution claims to be scientific in nature, able to be falsified or tested. However, a careful scrutiny reveals that it is not scientific in nature but a religious dogma that people choose to believe, support and even die for! On occasion, it fundamentally goes against the grain of the very laws of science such as entropy,

unless modified. The other weakness is that it has been changing from the time it was first suggested by Darwin back in 1859. Though true scientific findings (and/or theories) may change as new evidence becomes available, evolution changes more frequently to fit what is found not vice versa. The Biblical claims have stood the test all these many thousands of years! Yet another less mentioned malady of evolution is the effect it has on the world. Being naturalistically anti-God in its essential nature, it breeds an ungodly careless society that is willing to murder or snuff out life at will in the name of good ideas like "human rights." But don't the unborn or the chronically ill in vegetative state have inalienable human rights too? Classical evolution has terrible weaknesses that must be helped by newer innovative explanations.

The strengths of Evolution(ism)

Evolution equally has some strengths worth mentioning. One of them is that attempts have been made to validate or falsify it. It changes so frequently towards the latest reasonable trending theories or findings, thus can easily escape lynching (Kuhn, 1996; Popper, 2002). Some models have been developed that can be used to test its claims although not very convincingly scientific in nature. That is a good start none the less.

What Others have Said or Written about Evolution and Creation comparison

Dr. Sunderland and Wiebe among others have made a strong case for creation. They argue that scientific evidence and mere observation seems to weigh heavily towards creation rather than evolution. They point to arguments relating to the laws of science, inconsistency in dating and the unexplained mix up in the fossil deposit among others that point away from evolution. They further argue that what may appear to represent something on the surface and face value may in fact not be meaning or implying that they necessarily have a common source, ancestry or destiny. We are aware of the genetics arguments mortals may summon. According to Popper and to some extent, Kuhn, objective science largely operates in the present (unless of course not the hard exact sciences like the physical sciences) and is about repeated experimentation before a conclusion is arrived at, unlike what evolution claims or purports. The creationism proponents make much of matters such as the fossil gap, purported development (metamorphosis) of creatures from simpler to complex organisms, uniformity of fossil deposit and uniform radioactive decay among other matters to pelt evolution. These, they claim, are sufficient to puncture mortal wounds on evolution, not to mention the repeated changes or revision of the theory. Other writers however, still assert that evolution is true, testable and closer to the scientific model (Dawkins, 2006). In fact, so they claim, evolution is science itself, unlike subjective creationism with little to offer by way of evidence. They point to

radioactive decay as relates to Carbon 14 and other tests that point not only to an old earth but a progressive evolution of creatures as they adapted, although the entire progression is yet to be established through some kind of regression or hind extrapolation, if such a thing exists. This gap, according to evolution proponents, is no cause for worry as time is the hero of the plot. Patience is enjoined.

Lessons Gleaned from this consideration

From the matters raised above, we could safely go away with some valuable lessons as highlighted in point form below:

1. Creationists have made a well-reasoned case proving that evolution is as much a faith based argument as much as creation.
2. Creation appears to make a stronger case depending on what angle one approaches the matter of origins. One needs greater faith to accept and believe in evolution on origins.
3. Evolution fares well on the issue of social development not on origins. This is an important point worth musing over.
4. Science is limited to experimentation and empirical evidence. Evolution commences with an end in mind and seeks to fill in the gaps retrospectively.
5. The multiple gaps in the fossil record terribly weaken the evolutionist cause.
6. The dating methods are premised on serious assumptions and inaccuracies. The extant dating techniques give varying answers, at times even false results.
7. According to evolution ethos, life begun either by spontaneous generation or some other theory such as the Monster theory which gave way to gradual development from simple to more complex beings. None of these claims have been proved or substantiated.
8. As alluded to in the previous point above, spontaneous generation argues that when the context was right, life spontaneously developed from the primordial soup of life. It suggests that life sprung out from non-life by a happy accident, billions of years ago. As far as we know, organic life cannot originate or emerge from the inorganic unless Ribosome manufactured protein life building blocks, themselves from the hand of *Elohim*.
9. Genetics has to do with Genes, DNA and the information stored in the double helix protein bonds. Once traced, genetics appears to reject Evolution

favouring Creation instead because DNA does not create new information but merely changes the combinations in the gene pool.

10. Both Evolution and creation are theories at best and are subjective contrary to some claims by some sources, especially evolutionary scientists.
11. Real science is premised on repeated experimentation on observable phenomena repeatedly taking place in the present and not in the past. Unless one is working on historical sciences, they cannot necessarily use the scientific method because it would be inappropriately unfair. The same holds true for creationism, a different method or approach is needed
12. Critical thinking is encouraged for all people, not just for the philosophical thinker but Christian as well. This helps clarify matters.
13. Groundless assumptions are easily identified and exposed once one adopts a clear thinking critical mindset.
14. The Christian is warned against stern attacks they will receive from all and sundry but they must stand firm remaining focused.
15. There has been an unprecedented increase of people that avowedly oppose creation. The Christian apologist must beware of this and adequately prepare for mental combat.
16. Humans share common ancestry amongst themselves but not completely with other creatures such as apes, monkeys or rats. The evolutionary ladder is an imaginary claim with no valid claim.
17. God created the world *ex-nihilo*, according to the creationist perspective.
18. The order and preciseness in nature tends to suggest an intelligent designer behind it not a purposeless random existence to things as claimed by the evolutionist.
19. Randomness never guarantees order or design. The evolutionist must think again.
20. According to creation as stipulated in the Bible, there was a sudden appearance of created beings and things as God spoke. Evolution with its demand of vast stretches of time cannot stand.
21. Catastrophism makes more sense if we are to argue about the preserved fossil record, sedimentation or any other matter related to origins.
22. Archaeology has proved a helpful friend to creationism unlike evolution.

23. If we are to arrive at the truth, we need to consult the designer who happens to be God.
24. Amino acids make up life forms. Proteins are essential to cell life and development. *“20 common amino acids constitute the building blocks of life. Proteins consist of amino acids linked together with only peptide bonds. Amino acids can also combine with non-peptide bonds just as easily. In fact, origin of life experiments in the laboratory yield only about 50% peptide bonds”*-Wiebe.
25. Excess water is essential for amino acid/peptide reactions to form life.
26. There is an ongoing debate as to which came first, whether DNA/RNA or Amino acids/Proteins. This is a deep debate with consequences on the route one takes.
27. Some evolutionists claim that life began elsewhere, another planet was brought to earth by spores. Others point to some clay template as the origin of life.
28. Mutation in cells can be random and most often leads to bad results and effects on the organism. Not everything is a random mutation, the environment may trigger some things.
29. According to some sources, the strength of the Earth's magnetic field has declined since 1835. This has effects on the assumptions people make such as on carbon decay/radioactivity. Besides, the original contents of the respective elements decaying is unknown.
30. Ordinarily, many comets should have fizzled out and ceased to exist if the world was billions of years old, but they are still around!
31. Some hoaxes have existed such as the famous Piltdown man (*Eanthropus Dawsoni*). This was a fake claim and lasted over 41 years-England from about 1912. People can turn desperate to prove a point.
32. According to Wiebe, faith is not necessarily a religious term.
33. Extra-terrestrial discussions do not cease despite not having found any life form so far. Thus far, only a blank page exists. Now attempts are being made to find life on Mars, (given water discovery), or Jupiter's moon IO that is suspected to harbour an ocean of frozen water beneath its surface. Many exo-planets are candidates of hosting life. One way to detect life is the generation or emission of energy that is detectable from the far flung places

of space, from the insignificant blue dot revolving around the sun! The SETI project, started by Dr Carl Sagan years ago aims at discovering ET life.

34. A Ribosome is a “machine” that manufactures proteins for cell development. Thus, Ribosome is a factory of sorts. Despite being a small organism, it accomplishes much.
35. Life could not have evolved from the inanimate or inorganic substances. Further, evolution falls flat when we remove the common ancestry dogma.

Conclusion

Having surveyed both the creation and evolution landscape, it would be reasonable to conclude that Evolution, in its original or current form, cannot stand a fair scrutiny of science. From the evidence so far adduced, creation seems to make a stronger and more sustained case. Creationists deserve a greater and fairer hearing.

References

- Ackerman P.D. (1986). *It's a young world after all*, Baker book House.
- Burge T.(2005). *Science and the Bible; Evidence-based Christian Belief*, Templeton Foundation Press.
- Dawkins R.(2006). *The God Delusion*, Bantam Press.
- Dembski W.A.(n.d.). In defence of Intelligent Design, *Southern Baptist Theological Seminary*.
- Dembski A. W.(n.d.).Why Natural selection can't design anything, *Baylor University/Discovery Institute*.
- Gitt W.(2001). *Did God Use Evolution?*, Ebner Ulm.
- Gitt W.(2006). *Stars and their purpose*, Master Books.
- Kuhn T.(1996). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, The University of Chicago Press.
- Popper K.(2002). *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, Routledge Classics.
- Morris H.M. (1974). *Scientific Creationism*, Master books.

Schaeffer F.(1972). *Genesis in Space and Time: the flow of Biblical history*, Intervarsity Press.

Sunderland Luther D. (1984). *Darwin's Enigma*, Master books.

Thompson B.(1996). *The Flood of Noah*, Baker Book House.

Whitcomb J.(1972). *The Early Earth*, Baker book house.

Wiebe D. G.(1997). *Creation V Evolution*,

Wright J.(1994). *Designer Universe: Is Christianity compatible with Modern Science?*, Monarch Publications.

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](#).