



Darwin revisited: arguing **against** evolution

understanding required



An evolutionist reconsiders

In 1965, I arrived at Sussex University to study biology in the department of world-famous evolutionist, Professor John Maynard-Smith. I was a committed Christian and firmly believed the Bible. However, I was also convinced that I needed to interpret Genesis 1 to fit in with evolutionary theory because, so I had been led to believe, the evidence was overwhelming.

Three years later, I left with a good degree, having in the meantime become a convinced creationist. I found that when I got up close to it, the 'overwhelming evidence' for evolution just wasn't there! What was there was an atheistic framework within which all the biological evidences were being interpreted.

Forty years later, having closely followed and taken part in the debate all that time, I am more convinced than ever that the theory of evolution is an atheistic view of origins that is incompatible with both the Bible and the observable facts of biology and geology.

An important point

One very important point needs to be made. When using the term 'evolution', I am not referring to the adjustments to the environment that the created

Until the end of the eighteenth century, Christians were virtually unanimous in the belief that the earth was about six thousand years old according to the teaching of Scripture

kinds of creatures are able to make whether by natural selection or other means. A dark peppered moth is still a moth. A resistant bacterium is still a bacterium. A finch with a differently shaped beak is still a finch. These are very minor variations caused by environmental pressures acting on existing genetic information.

The 'overwhelming evidence' usually refers to such situations as these, but evolution proper is of an entirely different order and requires vastly more to substantiate it. It needs to explain where the genome came from in the first place. It then needs to explain the addition of complex information to the genome so that the organism can develop a feature that was not in existence before. For this kind of radical change there is no evidence whatsoever, nothing to indicate that it has ever happened and great conceptual difficulties in trying to imagine how it ever could happen. To name just one of these, it is becoming increasingly clear that the whole highly complex internal structure of the cell is involved in inheritance, not just the DNA. This makes it even more unlikely that minor changes to the DNA of the kind required by Darwinism could ever lead to the acquiring of new, previously non-existent, characteristics.

I am more convinced than ever that the theory of evolution is an atheistic view of origins that is incompatible with both the Bible and the observable facts of biology and geology

Sylvia Baker holds two biology degrees and worked in biological research in the 70s. Subsequently, she entered school teaching, teaching science and mathematics for 27 years. She was a founder and headteacher of one of the new Christian schools and a founder member of the Biblical Creation Society. She is the author of the best-selling publication *Bone of Contention – is evolution true?* Her current role involves writing and research.

I cannot imagine why any Christian would want to believe such a negative and destructive theory as that of evolution unless the evidence was truly overwhelming

Attempts to induce the type of radical change required by evolution in the laboratory have failed. For 150 years, scientists have experimented with bacteria. The generation time for many bacteria is just 20 minutes. Think how many generations are represented by 150 years! Yet all attempts to induce evolution have been unsuccessful. The bacteria are still bacteria; in fact, they are still the same bacteria that we started with.

Another important point

Until the late eighteenth century, Christian and Jewish scholars alike had virtually unanimously taken Genesis 1 at face value. The Christian geologist and Bible scholar, Dr Davis Young, believes the earth to be ancient and wishes to be able to interpret the Bible this way. Nevertheless, in chapter 1 of his book, *Christianity and the Age of the Earth*, he openly admits 'Divergence of opinion on this question is recent, for until the end of the eighteenth century, Christians were virtually unanimous in the belief that the earth was about six thousand years old according to the teaching of Scripture' and 'It cannot be denied... that the almost universal view of the Christian world until the eighteenth century was that the earth was only a few thousand years old.'

The evidence for evolution does indeed have to be overwhelming if it is to cause us to contradict thousands of years of Biblical interpretation, but the age of the earth is not the only issue. As Nigel Cameron points out in his book *Evolution and the Authority of the Bible*, whatever the age of the earth might be, '...the doctrine that Scripture teaches, the



essential structure of Christian truth, is at heart irreconcilable with evolution... Hanging in the balance is the fate of orthodox Christianity. The implications of evolution for Christian theology... are devastating.' He is referring to such essential Christian truths as the nature of death and its relationship to sin, the goodness of God and His original creation and the need for a literal first Adam if Christ's work as the 'second Adam' is to have any meaning. Once I had rejected the 'old earth' paradigm and accepted that Genesis 1 could be trusted to be read at face value, my respect for the authority of Scripture, and my confidence in all its teachings, increased immensely.

Vague statements

Have you ever noticed how vague the statements are when the evidence for evolution is being discussed? I am not referring to descriptions of minor adjustments to existing kinds. I mean those grand, sweeping statements (such as 'At this point in history, the fish gave rise to the amphibians...') that are often said in such a way as to imply masses of supporting evidence. In reality, a story is being told. The reasoning goes like this:

- Evolution has been proved by overwhelming evidence.
- Therefore the amphibians must have evolved from the fish.
- Therefore we can state this as though it was an absolute fact.

But where *is* the overwhelming supportive evidence? I certainly haven't been able to find it.

What about Darwin?

Evolution 'took over' as a public response to Charles Darwin's book, *The Origin of Species*. Read this publication today (how many people ever have?) and you will realise that it does not 'prove' evolution at all. Darwin was well aware of this and trusted that the evidence would follow, but it has not. In chapter 19 of the first edition he says: 'Why does not every collection of fossil remains afford plain evidence of the gradation and mutation of

In its very essence, evolution is not a scientific theory: it is an attempt to explain the existence of living things without reference to a Creator. It is essentially atheistic

the forms of life? We meet with no such evidence, and this is the most obvious and forcible of the many objections which may be urged against my theory.' Nearly 150 years after these words were first published, the situation remains exactly the same; the fossil record does not show what the theory of evolution would predict, but it does show evidence of a global catastrophe, as the Bible would predict. There are debates amongst 'young earth' creationists as to exactly how the fossil record should be interpreted, but all of us agree that the biblical Flood is the root cause of most of the remains that are found. It is obvious to all who study the fossils – evolutionists and creationists alike – that the gradual emergence of major new forms of life required by Darwinism is never seen.

Every teacher should read *Icons of Evolution* by Jonathan Wells. The subtitle reads 'Science or Myth? Why much of what we teach about evolution is wrong'. The book goes through all the usual textbook evidences for evolution and shows how they have all been called into question, or sometimes disproved outright, not by 'fundamentalist creationists' but by 'the peer-reviewed work of hundreds of scientists, most of whom believe in Darwinian evolution'.

Much more understanding is needed

We need to think more deeply if we are ever to understand why able and honourable scientists persist in promoting a theory for which there is so little evidence. The answer lies in the nature of evolutionary theory itself. It was this which became clear to me all those years ago at Sussex University. We were not allowed to discuss the nature of evolutionary theory, much less question it. Suddenly, it did not seem like science, an insight that forty years of study have confirmed. In its very essence, evolution is not a scientific theory: it is an attempt to explain the existence of living things without reference to a Creator. It is essentially atheistic. It is a process based on random-

An internet search will find you the names of hundreds of highly qualified scientists who have rejected evolution in the face of the strength of the arguments for ID

ness, meaninglessness, purposelessness and chance. The evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould wrote an entire book, *Life's Grandeur*, the main aim of which was to show that evolution is random, not heading in any direction, and that therefore humans do not have any significance.

Contrast this with what the Bible portrays on almost every page – order in the universe, design evident all around, profound purpose and meaning to everything that has been made:

'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.' Romans 1:20 (NIV)

It is this worldview that motivated Isaac Newton, a convinced creationist if ever there was one, and continues to motivate the admirable Intelligent Design movement that is beginning to have so much influence in academic circles. An internet search will find you the names of hundreds of highly qualified scientists who have rejected evolution in the face of the strength of the arguments for ID.

I cannot imagine why any Christian would want to believe such a negative and destructive theory as that of evolution unless the evidence was truly overwhelming. Understand how the evidence is being interpreted and you will realise that it most certainly is not.

■ Sylvia Baker

References

Nigel Cameron (1983) *Evolution and the Authority of the Bible*. Paternoster Press.
Stephen Jay Gould (1996) *Life's Grandeur*. Jonathan Cape.
Jonathan Wells (2000) *Icons of Evolution*. Regnery Publishing.
Davis A Young (1982) *Christianity and the Age of the Earth*. Zondervan.

Information

The Discovery Institute (www.discovery.org) on its website, under the heading 'Scientific dissent from Darwinism', details 400 scientists, listed by doctoral degree or position.
A website listing nearly 500 scientists opposed to evolution can also be found at: www-ac.sci.ucsd.edu/~idea/scidoubtevol.htm

