

Science, Evolution and Biblical Creation by Rev. Tom Aicken

Science is based on observation, testing and re-testing, and any theory of how the natural world began, if it does not meet this investigative standard, is not science. Let's then begin with two of the fundamental postulates of evolution, and carefully examine each one as we do so to see whether or not it measures up to this well-established principle.

Postulate No. 1, *Life in the natural world came from non-living matter*. Clearly, this is not observable to anyone today, nor is it subject to any kind of testing, and is not therefore the science that so many would have us to believe it is. It was not even witnessed by any generation of people before us who might then at least have left a record of what they observed for posterity. In fact, the notion that life came from any kind of non-life is a faulty premise in itself, one that is contrary to everything we learn from science and without the least bit of evidence to support it. The only conceivable reason for even suggesting such a thing would be to undermine and dismiss the notion of a Supreme Being and Creator who is both eternal and sovereign over all.

The very idea that life came from non-living matter is utterly irrational, and it's important to understand two of the reasons for saying so. First, all life comes, as we observe from everything around us, from what was living before it; it does not spring out of nothing, or out of lifeless objects. Is it not then an extreme stretch of the imagination to suppose that life in the natural realm sprang out of what was not living when everything in what we have already learned from real science argues so vehemently against that?

Second, to affirm that life came from non-living matter begs the question of how even those inanimate entities which are said to produce life came into being. Science demands that everything we see all around us, whether living or not, was either created, constructed, or somehow brought into existence outside of itself; nothing in the natural realm appears on its own. If we are not willing to acknowledge a Creator from the supernatural realm who made everything, therefore, the only alternative is to insist that one or more of those objects

already in nature which is said to have produced this life must have been self-existent. But again, that is contrary to everything we know from real science.

Teachers may use such familiar terms as “time and chance” and “the survival of the fittest” to convey evolutionary ideas to their students, and may do so without even realizing how deceptive these phrases are. Take, for example, the catch phrase “time and chance,” which is what many presume to be a driving force of evolution. If any student doubts that life could ever proceed from non-living matter, he is immediately told that it could happen (and must have happened) given enough time – if not over thousands, then perhaps over millions or even billions of years – and this is intended to make the impossible seem not so absurd after all. If he should then combat that argument, he is told that, however unlikely something may appear to be in terms of our own limited perception of it, yet given enough time and opportunity there may still be a chance that even the most improbable occurrence could have happened after all, and, seeing the world for what it is today, it must have done so. Yet, in point of fact, the premise that life in the natural world came from non-living matter, despite these well-chosen phrases, does not stand up under careful scrutiny but falls apart under the light of the very science it purports to uphold.

Postulate No. 2, Complex life forms have developed from single-cell life forms.

Where is the observation, the testing and re-testing of such a premise? It does not exist. Once again, therefore, this is not science; it is but idle speculation.

There are single-cell organisms, such as bacteria, and there are many multi-cell organisms, but there is a long distance between these two and no evidence that the latter ever developed from the former. There is evidence of cross-breeding, of course, but this is very restricted. There is cross-breeding of dogs, for instance, and cross breeding of cats, but no cross-breeding of dogs with cats is even remotely possible. In other words, cross-breeding of any type is limited to those species within its own kind.

Take now the other catch phrase, “the survival of the fittest,” mentioned earlier. If anyone questions whether complex life forms could ever develop from single-cell life forms, he is immediately told that it could happen (and, again, it must have

happened), even if only in the rarest of circumstances – perhaps one in several billion – and this is presented as the only rational explanation for all the complex organisms we see in the world today. (Notice, the “impossible” is always disguised as the “exceptional” in evolutionary argumentation, yet this clever manipulation of the known facts is still impossible, and that’s what we need to understand.) Moreover, if anyone should wonder why it is that none of the so-called “in between” life forms no longer exists, the quick and easy response of the evolutionist is that they were not fit to survive; they came, served their role in the biological chain, and then disappeared. How convenient. We are to assume that they did exist though there is no evidence for them. This premise that complex life forms have developed from single-cell life forms, like everything else in the evolutionary worldview, is not science and falls to pieces under careful scrutiny.

Let’s move on now to two of the postulates of biblical creation, and let’s see if they measure up any better to what is required for scientific investigation. (Notice, I’m not referring here to theistic evolution, or to any compromised notion of creation which might be associated with it, but only to what God Himself has revealed to us about the subject of beginnings.)

Postulate No. 1, *Where there is design there must be a designer*. This is immediately apparent in everything we observe and is demonstrated by everything that can be tested. This is a premise that is so obvious in every picture that is painted, in every building that is constructed and in every vehicle that travels the roads around us. We see it also in the blooming flower and in the face of a newborn child. It’s how the psalmist was able to say, “The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament shows His handiwork” (Psalm 19:1-6). Indeed, to deny this premise would be to jump from the ledge of common sense and reason into the pit of the absurd. (For more on this, please read my article, [A Message Which Cannot be Silenced](#).)

Instead of “time and chance,” therefore, we need to study creation and providence; instead of “the survival of the fittest” we need to study natural selection. Natural selection was discovered before evolution ever became a theory, and, while many evolutionists claim it as their own, it actually debunks

every such theory. What natural selection shows us is that God created complex organisms to change and adapt through reproduction and to suit ever-changing environments. Clearly, He knew from the beginning what devastation man's fall into sin would bring upon every living thing in the natural realm, and how without natural selection most species could not survive the trying ordeal and changing circumstances that such a fall would bring upon them. Seeing all this beforehand, therefore, He made these creatures with a capacity, not to escape trouble, no, but to endure it and move on. And so it is that life will continue under the dominion of fallen man in a broken world until the Second Coming of Christ.

Postulate No. 2, *The age of the earth is measured in thousands of years, not millions of years and beyond.* Many argue against this, calling it a blind supposition without any evidence to support it, but in point of fact all the latest and ever-expanding evidence of science we already have does support it. If we follow the genealogy of the Bible carefully – counting the years from Adam to Noah, from Noah to Abraham, from Abraham to Moses, from Moses to David, from David to the birth of Jesus of Nazareth and from Jesus to the present time – we learn that the earth is only a little over 6,000 years old. Now let's consider two examples of evidence recently discovered which lend support to that.

First, we have been told repeatedly by evolutionists that the Grand Canyon, which gives access to the waterway of the Colorado River, could not have been formed in anything less than millions of years. This is scientific fact, they insisted, and this was drilled into us until we could not imagine anything else. In 1980 Mount St. Helens in the state of Washington erupted, and it has since been dubbed "Little Grand Canyon" because it demonstrates how a similar event of nature, something once presumed to take many millions of years, can happen in a period of countable days. Mount St. Helens does not prove the biblical account of how old the earth really is, but it does underscore the serious error of attempting to use carelessly supposed "scientific" evidence to deny it.

Second, let's look now at another example of equally impressive evidence for a young earth. The 1980's also brought to light the study of DNA. Again, we have been told repeatedly by evolutionists that dinosaurs lived and disappeared

millions of years ago. This is scientific fact, they said, and all the means we have of dating artifacts prove it to be so. But let's take a closer look at that. We have known about dinosaur bones for a long time, of course, but recent tests have discovered the presence of DNA in some of them. We now know, too, that DNA does not last more than a few thousand years – that it declines rather quickly at first, and then more slowly over time – and that these dinosaurs disappeared about 4,500 years ago or so. That was the period in history of Noah's worldwide flood, and so of course the dinosaurs would have died out at that time.

Why is all this so important? It's important, first of all, because God – our Maker, Sustainer and Judge – calls us to believe everything He has revealed to us. We are to believe everything He has told us in His Word (Genesis 15:6; 2 Timothy 3:16,17), as well as everything He has confirmed to us by genuine scientific evidence in creation itself (Job 38,39). (For more on this, please read my article, [Compelling Evidence for the Existence of God.](#))

It's important, secondly, because it serves as a dire warning to us all. Evolution is a subject that was once questioned, yet that is no longer the case in today's world because it's now just taken for granted that it must be true. Is this not so? The "experts" have talked so much about it, telling us repeatedly how evolution is a scientific fact, that the vast majority of people (who, by the way, have never looked into this themselves and never will) have naively concluded that it really must be so. Sadly, this is not an advancement in education but an intoxication of indoctrination, and has been described as "the most extensive – and most expensive – marketing campaign in history" (Creation Ministries International).

The Bible tells us that Satan blinds the minds of unbelievers lest the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ should shine on them (2 Corinthians 4:4), and that is as true today as ever before. In evolution, in the present climate hoax – and now also in woke mythology – what is so clearly displayed is the gullible nature of our minds that we are willing to believe almost anything. This is indeed the work of Satan, and the way of the world about us, but the gospel call to seek and find refuge in Christ is still freely and sincerely offered to all the fallen race of Adam, and anyone who dismisses it does so to the peril of his own eternal wellbeing.

