




The Darwinian Theory of Evolution and Creation Account of Genesis: Contradiction or Complementary?

Isaac Boaheng ¹ 

¹ Senior Lecturer in Christian Theology and Ethics, Christian Service University College, Ghana; Research Fellow University of the Free State, South Africa.

ABSTRACT

The question of the origin of humans has been fiercely contested for a long period. One perspective is the creation model, which asserts that the Universe and all its components emerged through the deliberate actions of God, driven by design and purpose. Conversely, the evolution model posits that the Universe's formation occurred solely through mechanistic processes, devoid of any supernatural intervention. Narrowing the scope to humanity, the evolution model contends for the gradual evolution of the human species through a process of descent with modification from an ancestor shared with apes, while the creation model proposes the direct creation of humankind by God in his image. Certainly, the implications either model has on human dignity are very important for human existence. Whether God created humankind directly or through evolution from an ape-like ancestor has a bearing on human dignity. It raises, for example, the question as to whose image humanity bears: God's or apes'? The way one answers this question will definitely affect his or her human-divine and human-human relationships. A literary research approach was used to gather data from books, articles, and dissertations. The data were critically examined to consider the arguments for either side of the debate. It was found out that both biblical and scientific data may allow for variations within a particular species (microevolution) but not the production of one species from another (macroevolution). The findings suggest that the creation model must be accepted with its attendant implications for human dignity.

Correspondence

Isaac Boaheng

Email:

revisaacboaheng@gmail.com

Publication History

Received: 14th February, 2024

Accepted: 18th April, 2024

Published online:

21st May, 2024

Keywords: *Evolution, Creation, Human Dignity, Origin*

INTRODUCTION

Until the mid-nineteenth century, the prevailing Christian worldview depicted a created world characterized by short duration. This perspective was rooted in the belief in an omnipotent God responsible for the creation of the entire universe; a belief known as creationism. According to this belief, everything in the present world remains unchanged from its initial creation.¹ The concept of creationism was initially a logical conclusion drawn from the understanding of the world at the time the Bible was written. However, as scientific knowledge advanced, conflicts between creationism and scientific observations emerged. The Scientific Revolution, beginning in the seventeenth century, brought forth numerous discoveries that challenged the literal interpretation of biblical creationism. This discrepancy led to a weakening of the credibility of biblical stories as more conflicting evidence

¹ Ernst Mayr, *What evolution is* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2002), 4.

surfaced. The Copernican Revolution marked the first notable attempt to suggest that not all statements in the Bible should be interpreted literally. This opened the door to a more nuanced understanding of scripture in the light of scientific findings. The field of Astronomy—pertaining to the scientific study of the sun, stars, planets, and other celestial bodies—served as the primary frontier of scientific inquiry.² Amidst this period of transition marked by conflicting evidence, various compromises were made to reconcile these seemingly contradictions.³ As the evidence supporting the idea of an ever-changing world grew increasingly compelling, it became impossible to deny. This shift in understanding led to the proposal and eventual acceptance of a new worldview—one that views the world as enduring over long periods and undergoing constant change. This change is referred to as evolution⁴—a theory which affects every branch of science, every realm of research, every school of philosophy, and reaches into religion.

With this background, the study proceeds to consider the concept of evolution as propounded by Charles Darwin.

What is Darwinian Evolution?

Darwinian materialistic evolution rejects the notion of creation by God's command, proposing instead that matter and natural laws are eternal. According to this theory, the ordered universe and its living forms emerge through natural laws and natural selection. Evolutionists initially suggested that the early Earth's atmosphere lacked oxygen and was rich in methane, hydrogen, ammonia, and water vapour.⁵ However, many scientists now argue that it primarily consisted of carbon dioxide, water vapour, and nitrogen.⁶ Despite these differences, evolutionists assert that molecules formed spontaneously and randomly due to factors like ultraviolet rays, electric discharges, and particle bombardment.⁷ These molecules, including sugars, amino acids⁸ and pieces of deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA)⁹, came together and “formed increasingly larger molecules and molecular chain.”¹⁰

Evolutionists propose that the universe spontaneously originated through random chance occurrences. This perspective inherently dismisses any notion of intelligent design or purpose in life. The foundational idea of evolutionary belief is rooted in the notion that plants and animals develop new traits and capabilities through a sequence of random mutations and subsequent natural selection in response to environmental demands.¹¹ By natural selection, it is meant that nature itself, acting

² Mayr, *What evolution is*, 4-5.

³ An example of this effort was the concept known as the scala naturae, or the Great Chain of Being, where all entities in the world were organized in a rising hierarchy. It commenced with inert materials like rocks and minerals, progressed through plant life such as lichens, mosses, and plants, advanced to lower animals like corals, and further ascended to higher animals, eventually culminating in mammals, primates, and finally humans.

⁴ Mayr, *What evolution is*, 6.

⁵ Mayr, *What evolution is*, 70.

⁶ McDowell, *Answers Five Tough Questions*, 156.

⁷ McDowell, *Answers Five Tough Questions*, 156.

⁸ In living organisms, all amino acids are left-handed. However, in non-living matter, amino acids exist in equal proportions of left-handed and right-handed forms. Currently, there is no natural process known to selectively isolate either form. Proteins, which are composed of amino acids, cannot form when oxygen is present. Therefore, the presence of oxygen prevents the formation of the first protein. Conversely, without oxygen, ozone cannot form in the upper atmosphere. In the absence of ozone, living organisms would be exposed to lethal ultraviolet rays from the sun, leading to their demise. See Richard E. Dickerson, “*Chemical Evolution and the Origin of Life*,” *Scientific American*, Vol. 239, September 1978.

⁹ The DNA of each species serves as the blueprint that defines its characteristics, distinguishing it as a dog, cat, or plant. Alterations in DNA are referred to as mutations, with approximately 99.7 to 99.9 percent of mutations being detrimental. Babies born with defective organs like livers, lungs, or hearts typically have reduced life expectancy. The remaining fraction of mutations is either neutral or duplicative, resulting in minor variations such as an extra finger or toe. Contrary to the commonly held notion of “survival of the fittest,” which implies the evolution of new species, the reality is that the strongest and most well-adapted individuals within a species survive while maintaining the original genetic blueprint provided by a divine creator.

Have mutations ever been observed creating new structures for natural selection to act upon? No evidence exists for the emergence of nascent organs. Neither direct observation nor controlled experimentation has demonstrated natural selection manipulating mutations to generate new genes, hormones, enzyme systems, or organs. See Michael Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, London: Rider, 1984, 67–68. Mutation is any inheritable alteration in the genetic material, most commonly an error of replication during cell division, resulting in the replacement of an allele by a different one. In addition to such gene mutations, there are also chromosomal mutations, i.e., major chromosomal changes, including polyploidy.

¹⁰ McDowell, *Answers Five Tough Questions*, 156

¹¹ Jobe Martin, *The Evolution of a Creationist* (Texas: Biblical Discipleship Publishers, 2002), 16.

unintelligently, tends in all its reproductive processes, to select those individuals which are most adapted to each other by survival of the fittest. Nature ordains, equally sans intelligence, that the fittest or the most competent posterity shall survive at the expense of the inferior. Due to variations in survival and reproductive rates among its members, every population experiences ongoing genetic changes due to both random chance and natural selection. Consequently, natural selection functions as a mechanism for the elimination of less favourable traits. Darwin himself offers valuable insight into the workings of natural selection.

In every generation, a surplus of individuals is born within each species, surpassing the capacity for survival. This surplus initiates a continuous struggle for existence. Consequently, any organism that exhibits advantageous variations under the diverse and fluctuating conditions of life stands a higher probability of survival, and thus be NATURALLY SELECTED. Due to the robust principle of inheritance, selected variations tend to perpetuate their newly acquired and modified traits.¹²

Darwin's point is that, in natural selection, nature favours "organisms that evolve adaptively and reproduced abundantly" while "it judges the unfit with sterility and death."¹³ Darwin claims that with enough time, continuous modification of organisms leads to the emergence of an entirely new species, "which appears through a gradual process of incremental change."¹⁴ The theory of evolution is based on the following assumptions:

1. Non-living matter transitioned into living organisms through spontaneous generation.
2. Spontaneous generation occurred as a singular event.
3. Viruses, bacteria, plants, and animals share a common ancestry.
4. Single-celled organisms (protozoa) evolved into multicellular organisms (metazoa).
5. Various groups of invertebrates are interconnected in their evolutionary history.
6. Invertebrates gave rise to vertebrates.
7. Among vertebrates, fish evolved into amphibians, amphibians into reptiles, and reptiles into birds and mammals.¹⁵

Charles C. Ryrie mathematicalizes the process of evolution as Mutations + Natural Selection X Time = Evolution.¹⁶ Evolution is of two types. They are Macroevolution and Microevolution. Microevolution is the evolution at or below the species level. Macroevolution encompasses evolutionary changes that occur beyond the level of individual species, including the evolution of higher taxa and the development of novel evolutionary features, such as new anatomical structures.

Some Major Evidence Evolutionists Claim to Support of Evolution

Evolutionists marshal a lot of evidence to support their claim. First is to consider fossil records. Archaeologists have unearthed the remains of the biota, comprising both fauna and flora, that inhabited a specific geological era in the past. These remnants are preserved as fossils within the layers of sediment deposited during that period. Typically, earlier sediment layers contain the ancestors of the biota found in later layers. Fossils discovered in the most recent sediment layers often bear striking resemblance to currently existing species or, in some instances, are virtually indistinguishable. Consequently, the further back in time a fossil is found within older sediment layers, the greater the divergence from modern representatives. Evolutionists reason that this is to be expected if the fauna¹⁷ and flora¹⁸ of the earlier strata had gradually evolved into their descendants in the later, more recent strata.

¹² Darwin, *Origin of species*, (introduction), 3. The original words have been paraphrased.

¹³ Douglas Groothuis, *Christian Apologetics: A Comprehensive Case for Biblical Faith*, (Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 2011), 276.

¹⁴ Groothuis, *Christian Apologetics*, 276.

¹⁵ Kerkut cited in Martin, *The Evolution of a Creationist*, 44. However, he states that many evolutionists ignore the first six assumptions and only consider the seventh.

¹⁶ Charles C. Ryrie, *Basic Theology* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1999), 198.

¹⁷ The totality of the animals naturally inhabiting a certain country or region, or which have lived during a given geological period.

¹⁸ The totality of the plants growing naturally in a country, or during a given geological period.

Another indicator of evolution is the radioactive clock. Some rocks, primarily of volcanic descent (such as lava flows), harbour radioactive minerals like Potassium, Uranium, and Thorium. Each of these minerals undergoes decay at a distinct rate, with physicists having established their respective half-lives.¹⁹ For example, Uranium-238 has a half-life of 4.5 billion years, transforming into Lead 206 during decay. By analyzing the ratio of Uranium to Lead within a particular rock, scientists can determine its age. From this dating system, it has been discovered that the Earth is billions of age. Such a long period is a necessary condition, although not a sufficient condition, for the evolutionary process to have taken place.

Again, evolutionists claim support from embryology.²⁰ Perceptive anatomists of the eighteenth century noted that embryos of various organisms share striking similarities in their earliest developmental stages, to the extent that they cannot be reliably distinguished without prior knowledge of their origin. For instance, an early-stage human embryo closely resembles those of other mammals (such as goats, dogs, and mice), as well as embryos of reptiles, amphibians, and fish. Evolutionists interpret this observation as evidence suggesting that all organisms share a common ancestor.

Furthermore, the evolutionary process finds support in the presence of vestigial organs. Many organisms possess structures that are either partially functional or entirely non-functional. Examples include the human cecal appendix, rudimentary teeth in baleen whale embryos, and vestigial eyes in numerous cave-dwelling animals. Evolutionists argue that these vestigial structures represent remnants of once-fully functional organs in ancestral species, now greatly reduced due to changes in their ecological niche. It is the result of the “use it or lose it” principle. As these structures become non-functional due to lifestyle changes, they lose the protective influence of natural selection and undergo gradual degradation. Therefore, the presence of such organs gives information about the previous course of evolution.

Response to Evolution from Christian

The idea of a self-created universe is the most impossible of all the options. To accept an eternal universe is to ignore two fundamental laws of Physics: The law of conservation of energy and the law of entropy. The law of conservation of energy states that, “The total sum of mass and energy in this universe is neither created nor destroyed.”²¹ This means that no creation or destruction of mass or energy can take place in the physical universe. The law of entropy states that, “Every process in the universe tends towards non-recoverable energy loss.”²² This law implies that the physical universe is growing old, wearing out and running down. It also testifies equally that the universe had a beginning because “growing old” implies that it must once have been young. Similarly, if it is wearing out then it means it must once have been new.

Genesis 1 clearly rejects the idea of an eternal universe. The first verse teaches that the universe began to be at a particular point in time. It must, however, be stated that Genesis 1:1 does not state the time when the universe began to be or was created. Peter W. Stoner opines that “...it does not matter whether everything started five or six billion years ago, ten billion years ago, ... What matters as far as Genesis 1:1 is concerned is that the universe had a beginning.” The following comment by Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset and David Brown is apt: The opening verse serves as a broad introduction to the inspired text, affirming the fundamental truth that everything had a starting point; nothing in nature existed eternally or by chance, but rather the entire universe originated from the creative force of God. This underscores the divine origin of all existence (Ac 17:24; Ro 11:36).²³

Keil and Delitzch have noted that Genesis 1 is a historical record meant to acknowledge as factual truth, encompassing not only the declaration of God's creation of the heavens, earth, and all

¹⁹ Half-life is the time taken for a radioactive element to decay to half its original amount. For example, if an element has a half-life of 2 seconds then it means that for every 2 second, half of its original amount would decay.

²⁰ The study of the development of the embryo.

²¹ Steven Horst, *Laws, Mind, and Free Will* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2011), 124.

²² Don Stewart and Josh McDowell, *The Creation* (California: Here's Life Publishers, 1984), 37.

²³ Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset and David Brown, *Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1978), 17.

living beings but also providing a detailed account of the creation process across its various stages.²⁴ The universe could not have created itself because for it to have created itself, the universe would have had to exist before it existed. It would have to be and not be at the same time and in the same relationship. Such an idea violates the law of non-contradiction. To re-phrase this option by saying that “chance” created the universe does not solve the problem either. What is chance? Chance is not a thing. Chance is nothing— nothing is nothing— and so has not and cannot cause anything to occur. Chance, nothing, nothing could not create the universe. Such a view is a denial of the principle of first cause and final cause. Obviously, there is a design in the universe and a purpose for it.

Regarding the fossil record, if evolution were accurate, one might anticipate a gradual, continuous transition from ancestral forms to their descendants. However, palaeontologists often encounter gaps in nearly every evolutionary lineage. New types of organisms frequently emerge abruptly, with their immediate ancestors absent from the earliest fossil-bearing layers. Discovering an unbroken series of species gradually transitioning into descendant species is rare. Instead, the fossil record often presents discontinuities, seemingly indicating sudden jumps or saltations from one organism type to another. This poses a perplexing question: Why does the fossil record not exhibit the gradual change expected from evolutionary theory?

In the fossil record, distinct species are observable as discrete entities—there are clearly identifiable fish, turtles, and cockroaches. Transitional forms, such as a creature halfway between a beetle and a mouse or halfway between an ape and a human, are notably absent. There is no evidence of lions evolving fins or fish evolving wings. The discrete entities observed in the fossil record do not appear to be transitional forms as predicted by evolution. If evolution were true, why are these creatures so easily distinguishable? This question poses a challenge that proponents of evolution must address.

Furthermore, there is circular reasoning²⁵ concerning the determination of the age of fossils and their corresponding rock strata. The geologist dates the age of the rocks by the fossils found in them, and then in turn, the evolutionist dates the age of the fossils by the rocks identified with them. In the words of J. E. O'Rourke, “The intelligent layman has long suspected circular reasoning in the use of rocks to date fossils and fossils to date rocks. The geologist has never bothered to think of a good reply, feeling the explanations are not worth the trouble as long as the work brings results.”²⁶

In my opinion, fossils provide evidence for creation rather than evolution. Why? Because God informs man that he created every plant and animal according to its kind (Genesis 1:11, 12, 21, 24, 25). From a biblical standpoint, the fossil record should reveal distinct, recognizable living and fossilized organisms that were or are fully operational, intricately designed, and fashioned by the wisdom and power of Almighty God, the Creator. Since God created every species in the kind seen today, we should not expect any intermediary forms. What the fossils show is exactly what humans expect to see based on biblical viewpoint. There are no transitional (in-between) forms. As the fossils can confirm, no plant or animal is evolving into a higher form. “Even in living forms, we do not see any chickie-ducks or duckie-chicks!”²⁷ Richard Dawkins, an atheist and an evolutionist, even concurs, saying:

And we find many of them already in an advanced state of evolution, the very first time they appear. It is as though they were just planted there, without any evolutionary history. Needless to say, this appearance of sudden planting has delighted creationists... the only alternative explanation for the sudden appearance of so many complex animal types in the Cambrian era is divine creation...²⁸

One can also respond to evolution based on evidence from molecular Biology. Molecular Biology has revealed that even at the cellular level of living organisms there are significant differences that distinguish between basic kinds of flesh. For instance, the cells that make up the flesh of a snail

²⁴ Keil and Delitsh *Genesis*, <http://207.44.232.113/~bible/comment/ot/k&d/gen/gen-BkMrk.html>, 1. (pdf)

²⁵ Ryrie, *Basic Theology*, 203. By circular reasoning we mean a logical fallacy in which the reasoned begins with what he or she is trying to end with. The components of a circular arguments are often logically valid because if the premises are true, the conclusion must be true.

²⁶ J. E. O'Rourke, “Pragmatism versus Materialism in Stratigraphy.” *American Journal of Science*, vol. 276, 1976: 47-55, 51.

²⁷ Martin, *The Evolution of a Creationist*, 94.

²⁸ Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, (Cambridge, 1986), 229-230. (pdf)

are different from those that make up the flesh of a snake. This observation from the study of Molecular Biology resonates with Paul's assertion that "Not all flesh is alike, but there is one flesh for humans, another for animals, another for birds, and another for fish" (1 Cor. 15:39 NRSV). The following helpful insight comes from Davis and Kenyon:

The exploration of living organisms at the molecular level represents a relatively recent scientific endeavor. Molecular biology provides researchers with valuable insights that can be utilized in the field of biochemical taxonomy, enabling the comparison and classification of different organisms. By employing biochemical analysis, taxonomy stands to become a more precise discipline, as it allows for the quantification and measurement of variations between various species.

One significant advancement offered by biochemistry is the ability to mathematically assess the similarities among groups of organisms. However, when these similarities are examined closely, they often defy expectations based on evolutionary theory. For instance, according to traditional evolutionary terminology, amphibians are viewed as intermediates between fish and other terrestrial vertebrates. Nevertheless, analysis of their amino acid compositions does not support this intermediary position. Regardless of the species of amphibian selected for comparison, they consistently exhibit the same distance from both fish and reptiles.

The emergence of molecular biology has provided us with novel, quantifiable data on the similarities among living organisms. Remarkably, this data consistently aligns with a conceptual framework of the organic world that supports the theory of intelligent design.²⁹

Obviously, microbiologists are aware that the genetic disparities between species pose significant challenges for evolution. Consequently, given the lack of evidence for evolutionary connections at the molecular level—the fundamental constituents of nature—it becomes apparent that the notion of evolution occurring within enzymes, proteins, plasma, and tissue is entirely nonsensical.

Concerning vestigial organs, recent research has raised many questions. For example, the human coccyx or tailbone which was considered as a remnant of the tail that no longer serves any purpose is found to be a critical "point of contact with muscles that attach to the pelvic floor."³⁰ Again, the human appendix which was regarded by evolutionists as functionless has been shown to be a "functioning component of the immune system."³¹ Further, "the pineal gland, once thought to be a degenerate eye serving no function", is shown to be "an endocrine gland with important functions."³² Groothuis does not only contend that organs such as the "eyes" of some salamanders and fish are vestigial but also points out that such a phenomenon could hardly prove Darwinian macroevolution.³³ For Groothuis, all these underscore that some present-day species have lost certain functioning organs that their ancestor species possessed. He argues further, saying, "Losing a function is not the same as evolving entirely into new functions (or new species from previous species)."³⁴

Since evolution depends on chance, it is subject to the law of probability. Applying the law of probability to evolution reveals that it is almost impossible to have happened. Bert Thompson posits that:

The late Carl Sagan estimated that the chance of life evolving on any given single planet, like the Earth, is one chance in $1 \times 10^{2,000,000,000}$ [that is one chance out of 1 followed by 2 billion zeroes]... This figure is so large that it would take 6,000 books of 300 pages each just to write the number! A number this large is so infinitely beyond one followed by 50 zeroes (Borel's upper limit for such an event to occur) that it is simply mind-boggling. There is, then according to Borel's law of probability, **absolutely no chance** that life could have "evolved spontaneously" on the Earth.³⁵

²⁹ Percival Davis and Dean H. Kenyon, *Of Pandas and People as quoted in Martin, The Evolution of a Creationist*, 99. I have paraphrased the original text but have left it in block form to aid reading.

³⁰ Groothuis, *Christian Apologetics*, 295.

³¹ Dembski and Wells as quoted in Groothuis, *Christian Apologetics*, 295.

³² Groothuis paraphrases Milton; Groothuis, *Christian Apologetics*, 295.

³³ Groothuis, *Christian Apologetics*, 296; see also Jerry Bergman and George Howe, *Vestigial Organs Are Fully Functional: A History and Evaluation of the Vestigial Organ Origins Concept*, (Terre Haute, Ind.: Creation Research Society, 1990).

³⁴ Groothuis, *Christian Apologetics*, 296.

³⁵ Thompson, *The scientific case for creation*, (Alabama :Apologetics Press, Inc. , 2004), 200.

Claude Tresmontant, an eminent philosopher of science from the University of Paris, stated that no random theory can adequately explain the origin of the world.³⁶ Before chance can set atoms into motion within an infinite void, those atoms must first exist. What demands explanation is the existence of the world and matter itself. It is illogical to suggest that chance alone can justify the creation of existence.³⁷

Another point that disproves evolution is irreducible complexity. Irreducibly complex means a single system comprising multiple interconnected parts that work together to perform a fundamental function. If any one of these parts is removed, the system ceases to function effectively.³⁸ Martin draws attention to several organisms which could not possibly have evolved because of their irreducible complexities. One such organism is the Bombardier Beetle. He begins his argument by referring to Metcalf and Flint's assertion that, "The bombardier beetle, *Brachinus*, ejects an acrid fluid which is discharged with a distinct popping sound and a small cloud of vapour that looks like the smoke from a miniature cannon."³⁹ About this beetle, it is also reported:

...the bombardier beetle stands out as truly unique in the animal kingdom. Its defense mechanism is remarkably complex, resembling a combination of tear gas and a rapid-fire weapon. When the beetle senses danger, it internally mixes enzymes from one body chamber with concentrated solutions of seemingly harmless compounds, hydrogen peroxide and hydroquinones, held in a separate chamber. This chemical reaction produces a noxious spray of caustic benzoquinones, forcefully expelled from its body at a scalding 212°F. Adding to its defense, the fluid is ejected through paired rear nozzles, which can be maneuvered, much like the turret of a B-17 aircraft, ensuring precise targeting of potential threats such as ants or frogs.⁴⁰

How does evolution, characterized as a mindless, directionless, and purposeless process of random chance, achieve the feat of "creation"? Martin rightly points out the significant challenges evolutionary theory faces when attempting to account for the existence and intricate complexity of organisms like the bombardier beetle solely through random chance occurrences.⁴¹ This beetle possesses unique chemicals that, when combined violently, produce an explosion-like reaction, serving as its defence mechanism.⁴² It is perplexing to envision how the bombardier beetle could have evolved such a sophisticated defence mechanism without inadvertently causing harm to itself in the process. According to one evolutionary principle, the ability to maintain a trait hinges on its utilization—a concept often summarized as "use it or lose it." However, it raises the question: How could the beetle have employed this defence mechanism if it had not already developed it in a fully functional and complete form?⁴³

This dilemma leaves two contrasting perspectives: One suggests that a mindless and random process somehow produced precisely what was necessary for the creature's survival and defence, while the other asserts a belief in a wise and sovereign God who intricately designed and created the beetle with its survival needs encoded within its genetic makeup.⁴⁴ From the evolutionary perspective, one must assume that new biological features, such as enzymes, chemicals, organs, or appendages, evolve randomly and without explanation until the organism gains a beneficial improvement.⁴⁵ Conversely, as creationists, humans affirm that God created the organism in its present form. This sentiment was echoed by von Braun, a renowned scientist of the space age.

³⁶ Thompson, *The scientific case for creation*, 206.

³⁷ Thompson, *The scientific case for creation*, 206.

³⁸ Michael Behe, *Darwin's Black Box*, as quoted in Groothuis, *Christian Apologetics*, 306. Darwin seems to have sensed of a possible refutation of his theory when he wrote: "If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down. But I can find out no such case. Darwin, *Origin of species*, as quoted in Groothuis, *Christian Apologetics*, 308

³⁹ Metcalf and Flint as quoted in Martin, *The Evolution of a Creationist*, 39.

⁴⁰ As cited by Martin, *The Evolution of a Creationist*, 39.

⁴¹ Martin, *The Evolution of a Creationist*, 39.

⁴² Martin, *The Evolution of a Creationist*, 39.

⁴³ Martin, *The Evolution of a Creationist*, 39.

⁴⁴ Martin, *The Evolution of a Creationist*, 40.

⁴⁵ Martin, *The Evolution of a Creationist*, 40.

Exposure to the laws and order governing the universe inevitably leads one to acknowledge the presence of design and purpose behind it all. As our understanding of the complexities within the universe deepens, so does our appreciation for the inherent design upon which it operates.

Insisting on the sole conclusion that everything in the universe arose by chance would undermine the very essence of scientific objectivity. Consider the intricate complexities of the human brain or the sophisticated system of the human eye—can these truly be attributed to random processes?

Evolutionists challenge science to provide evidence for the existence of God, yet must we truly ignite a candle to perceive the sun's brilliance? They claim an inability to envision a designer, yet can a physicist truly visualize an electron? What peculiar logic allows some physicists to accept the abstract concept of an electron while dismissing the reality of a Designer simply because they cannot grasp Him conceptually?⁴⁶

Concerning the assertion that life originated from non-living things, Christians respond with a big “NO.” God created life on the third “day” of creation. On the third day, God created the first life on earth:

Then God said, “Let the land produce vegetation: seed-bearing plants and trees on the land that bear fruit with seed in it, according to their various kinds.” And it was so. The land produced vegetation: plants bearing seed according to their kinds and trees bearing fruit with seed in it according to their kinds. And God saw that it was good.”

Despite the creation of the Sun on the fourth day, the photosynthetic plants formed on the third day were enabled by the light that God had created on the first day. The law of biogenesis states that “life comes from life,” emphasizing the impossibility of bridging the gap between living and non-living through purely materialistic means. According to this principle, life cannot originate from non-life. Henry Morris has extensively discussed this subject and presents the following conclusion.

Biochemists intrigued by this field have approached the issue both analytically and experimentally. Their aim is to grasp enough knowledge about the structure of living materials to understand how life might have originated spontaneously. Subsequently, they attempt to replicate this hypothetical abiogenesis in laboratory settings, mimicking conditions presumed to have existed on early Earth. Despite the optimism expressed by many scientists regarding the eventual resolution of this challenge, the reality is that a solution remains elusive and may never be achieved. This is primarily due to the immense difficulties associated with synthesizing, through natural means, a structure of such extraordinary complexity as even the simplest living organism, either analytically or experimentally.⁴⁷

Similarly, Stanley Miller’s attempt to evolve life in the laboratory failed. He placed the necessary ingredients for the evolution of life (as evolutionists claim) into a glass jar which was heated and into which he sent sparks of electricity. The result was a pink fluid that contained some amino acids. Even though amino acids are the building blocks of proteins and are very much a part of living tissue, they are not life itself. More so, the amino acids produced were poisonous. Even to produce such a poisonous substance, Miller used intelligent design, not random, mindless, accidental, non-purposeful processes. Miller’s experiment therefore proves the need for intelligence in the generation of life-building chemicals. How much more is the generation of life itself? Any claim of a laboratory proof of evolution is false. Evolution is unproved and unprovable.

Additionally, there is a need to underscore the bottom line of evolution, namely faith. Evolution is based on faith just as creation is based on faith. This persuasive argument comes from Martin:

Why is this belief based on faith? Because it lies beyond the scope of scientific testing. There are no experiments capable of determining who or what existed at the beginning of the universe. Therefore, when discussing origins, neither the creation nor evolution model can undergo testing or verification

⁴⁶ Werner von Braun quoted in Martin, *The Evolution of a Creationist*, 51. I have paraphrased the original text but have left it in block for to enhance reading.

⁴⁷ Morris, *Scientific Creationism, as quoted in* Stanford E. Murrell *An Introductory Study of Systematic Theology* (Np: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2013), 56. I have paraphrased the original text but left it to stand as a block to enhance reading.

through reproducible scientific experiments. This places both models of origins outside the realm of science and into the domain of faith generated by religious beliefs.⁴⁸

Ask a scientist if he/she believes in electrons. He will answer, “YES.” Ask that same scientist if he or she has ever seen an electron, and he or she will say, “NO.” You see, scientists believe in the existence of “electrons by faith as they observe the results of electron activity.”⁴⁹ Is this not similar to our faith in God? Even though we do not see God physically, we “see” him through his works. Two Scientists hit the nail right on the head when they aver that:

Biologists remain just as distant as ever in their endeavors to elucidate the origin of the first protoplasm. The evidence put forth by those advocating for life's origin through the accidental combination of appropriate chemical elements is no more concrete than that presented by proponents of Divine Creation as the explanation for life's development. Clearly, both sides have equal justification for their beliefs.⁵⁰

The Defender’s Study Bible puts it this way:

If there is one certainty in this world, it is the absence of evidence supporting the occurrence of evolution today—specifically, true vertical evolution from simpler to more complex forms. No observation exists of a star evolving from hydrogen, life emerging from chemicals, a higher species evolving from a lower species, or humans evolving from apes. Despite numerous experiments attempting to replicate such evolution, none have succeeded. Furthermore, the mechanics of evolution remain elusive; no viable mechanism has been proposed to explain it. Thus, the absence of observable evidence suggests that evolution, at least as it pertains to the present world, has been discredited. While this doesn’t disprove its occurrence in the past, it underscores that evolution lacks scientific validity due to its unobservability. Consequently, acceptance of evolution necessitates faith rather than empirical evidence.⁵¹

Can Evolution and Creation be Harmonized?: A Look at Three Major Evangelical Positions

Since the time of Charles Darwin, a debate has raged within the Christian community as to whether or not total evolution can be harmonized with the historical biblical accounts of origins. This section considers three of the major evangelical views regarding the relationship between evolution and creation.

Theistic Evolution

The concept of theistic evolution suggests that God initiated the creation of matter, established its laws, infused life into certain organisms, and, through his continuous providence and inherent power, shaped the diversity of life on Earth.⁵² Norman L. Geisler characterizes this perspective as the notion that God employed evolution as the mechanism for generating various forms of physical life on Earth, including human life.⁵³ Theistic evolutionists maintain a clear distinction between scientific inquiry and religious scripture, regarding the origins of the universe as the combined work of natural processes and divine intervention. They assert that scientific exploration pertains to physical processes and the developmental history of phenomena while the fundamental truths concerning the ultimate origin and governance of the world are addressed by Scripture. Crossing these boundaries as they claim, will lead to confusion. Theistic evolutionists claim that “God could have used the Darwinian mechanism” as his method of creating “species and the eventual evolution of human beings”⁵⁴ They argue further that the Genesis account of creation was only meant to speak to us about the “‘ who’ and the ‘why’ of creation” while Science on the other hand speaks to us about the “‘ how’ and the ‘when’ of creation”⁵⁵ For theistic evolutionists, God intervened at key points in creation by creating matter and the simplest form

⁴⁸ Martin, *The Evolution of a Creationist*, 22. I have paraphrased the original text but left it to stand as a block to enhance reading.

⁴⁹ Martin, *The Evolution of a Creationist*, 52

⁵⁰ Fuller and Tippo quoted in Ryrie, *Basic Theology*, 204. I have paraphrased the original text but left it to stand as a block to enhance reading.

⁵¹ The Defender’s Study Bible, Appendix 3, as quoted in Martin, *The Evolution of a Creationist*, 279. I have paraphrased the original text but have left it in block form to enhance reading.

⁵² Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology* 3rd edition (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1998), 504.

⁵³ Norman L. Geisler, *Systematic Theology* (Minneapolis: Bethany House, 2011), 644.

⁵⁴ Groothuis, *Christian Apologetics* 270.

⁵⁵ Groothuis, *Christian Apologetics* 270.

of life at the beginning; he also created humankind.⁵⁶ He then allowed evolution to occur to produce other forms. They argue that God created the human soul and infused it in one of the higher primates to transform it into the first human being. This means that even though God was the one who created Adam's spiritual nature, his physical nature was a product of the process of evolution.⁵⁷

As a way of critique, the following points could be made. First, there are a lot of scientific arguments that are not in favour of "Darwinian macroevolution or abiogenesis."⁵⁸ For this reason, to assert that God used Darwinian evolution to create the universe is not grounded on facts. Again, the assumption that "God supernaturally intervenes in history after evolution" has taken place "but that God fails to leave evidence of his design in life itself"⁵⁹ seems more deistic than theistic. Perhaps theistic evolution was invented to squeeze evolution into the Bible.⁶⁰

Scientific Creationism

A second evangelical position is the Scientific Creationism, a model championed by Henry Morris (1918-2006). This position asserts that the creation of the universe and life in Genesis 1 was done by God in six literal twenty-four-hour days not more than ten thousand years ago.⁶¹ Adherents of this view strongly contend that since Genesis 1 numbers each day and marks it with evening and morning, the writer must be referring to 24-hour days. Interpreting the days of the creation week as any period longer than solar days, according to this view, does not fit the context of Genesis 1.

As a way of evaluation, the following points could be made. Creationism does well in questioning the reliability of Darwinian evolution especially regarding the fossil records.⁶² However, the literal interpretation given to the days of creation is debatable. The genealogies in the Bible cannot be taken as chronologies. There are gaps in the genealogies and hence they cannot be used to determine the age of the universe.

Progressive Creationism

Progressive creationism posits that God's creative work involves a combination of direct creation (de novo) and gradual processes.⁶³ God intermittently created entirely new species, distinct from existing life forms, while allowing for evolutionary development between these special acts of creation. Unlike theistic evolutionists, proponents of progressive creationism reject the idea of macroevolution as how God brought about the original kinds mentioned in Genesis 1. This development, termed "intra-kind" (microevolution), occurs within species boundaries rather than crossing into entirely new kinds (macroevolution).⁶⁴ The Hebrew term for "kind" is interpreted broadly, allowing for flexibility in understanding biblical statements about creation.

Additionally, the concept of "day" in Genesis is interpreted more loosely, allowing for extended periods for evolutionary processes. They interpret the six-day creation narrative of Genesis not as symbolic or allegorical but as a factual account of six distinct epochs, presented in chronological order. However, they contend that each of these six creation "days" lasted significantly longer than 24 hours, potentially spanning millions or even billions of years each. Consequently, progressive creationists embrace the notion of an ancient universe. When it comes to human origins, progressive creationism maintains that God directly created Adam, both physically and spiritually, without deriving him from pre-existing creatures.⁶⁵ The biblical account of forming Adam from the "dust" of the ground is understood symbolically rather than as literal soil, suggesting a special act of creation.

⁵⁶ Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology: Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Nottingham: IVP, 2011), 276.

⁵⁷ Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 504.

⁵⁸ Groothuis, *Christian Apologetics* 271. Some of these are discussed under the section "A Christian Response to Evolution.

⁵⁹ Groothuis, *Christian Apologetics* 272

⁶⁰ Jobe Martin, *The Evolution of a Creationist* (Texas: Biblical Discipleship Publishers, 2002), 96.

⁶¹ Groothuis, *Christian Apologetics* 273.

⁶² Groothuis, *Christian Apologetics* 273.

⁶³ Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 505.

⁶⁴ Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 505.

⁶⁵ Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 505-506.

While Progressive Creationism attempts to blend religious belief with scientific understanding, it often lacks empirical evidence to support its claims. The interventions of a divine being in the evolutionary process are not observable or testable, making them difficult to validate through scientific methods. Also, Progressive Creationism raises theological questions about the nature of God's involvement in the natural world. Critics argue that the concept of a deity intervening at various points in the evolutionary process raises theological concerns about the consistency and predictability of God's actions, as well as the theological implications for human free will and responsibility.

A Proposal

The author, like some other evangelical scholar, takes a position based on the following axioms.⁶⁶ A coherent Christian worldview should attempt to bring together “the book of nature” (Psalm 19:1-6, Rom. 1:19-20) and “the book of Scripture”⁶⁷ (Psalm 19:7-10, 2 Timothy 2:15-17). In this regard, it is believed that what Genesis actually teaches perfectly harmonizes with every truth concerning that matter of origin. Why? The reason is that the same true non-contradicting God authored both Scripture and nature. Hence, when both texts are accurately interpreted following sound principles, apparent contradictions can be reconciled. It is essential to recognize that all truth originates from God. Therefore, any genuine understanding acquired from nature, whether through science or any other discipline, should not conflict with authentic insights gleaned from a faithful interpretation of scripture. Sharing this view, Josh McDowell avers that:

While all truth proceeds from God, who is truth, and while scientific truth can never contradict biblical truth, scientific suppositions and theories can contradict the truth in numerous ways. The author of the Bible is the God of truth; scientists are not infallible. Likewise, when fallible humans interpret the Bible incorrectly; their views may contradict accurate science.⁶⁸

Among other things, it can be deduced from McDowell's assertion that there may be a wide difference between what some people have believed that Genesis teaches and what it actually teaches. Similarly, there may also be a wide difference between a scientist's interpretation of facts and what the facts themselves are. Science once taught that the atom was the smallest indivisible part of matter but today, however, discoveries have been made that quarks and leptons are smaller than the atom. Christians once thought that the Earth was flat and that the sun moves around the Earth with the Earth in the middle of the universe. This, as is now known, is not the reality. The Bible did not make any mistake, interpreters did. When the Bible recorded the rising of the Sun, it was using the common everyday language of the people at the time of writing.⁶⁹ It was not teaching that the Earth is at the centre of the universe and that the Sun revolves around the Earth.

It, therefore, follows that before it can be convincingly said that science conflicts with Genesis, what the Bible truly means must be clarified, as what science has observed, and what the correct interpretation of the truly observed scientific facts truly are. If purported knowledge contradicts the Bible and the teachings of the Church, one can trust that if this new knowledge genuinely conflicts with the Christian faith, it will ultimately be proven false. The interpretation of Scripture must take precedence over delving into the natural sciences and addressing questions of scientific origins. Properly interpreting the initial chapters of Genesis, a crucial aspect of this article's subject matter, forms the foundation of Scriptural hermeneutics. In doing so Christians must strongly affirm the inerrancy of Scriptures.⁷⁰ From the principles laid down above, Christians believe progressive creation must be accepted as the true reflection of biblical and scientific data.

CONCLUSION

While macroevolution is not supported by scientific facts and is also unbiblical, hence false, the Bible allows for microevolution. There are observable variations, known as micro-evolution, such as

⁶⁶ For more information see, Norman L. Geisler, *Systematic Theology* (Minneapolis: Bethany House, 2011).

⁶⁷ Groothuis, *Christian Apologetics*, 273.

⁶⁸ McDowell, *Answers Five Tough Questions*, 136.

⁶⁹ Isaac Boaheng, *Is the Bible Really the Word of God?* (Accra: Noyam, 2024).

⁷⁰ Biblical inerrancy means the absolute historicity and truthfulness of the Bible in all matters, not just in matters of faith and practice.

different breeds of dogs or cats resulting from crossbreeding. However, it is crucial to note that cats do not evolve into dogs, which would be an example of macro-evolution. If evolution were accurate, one would expect to see life originating from inorganic matter or creatures evolving into entirely different species. Despite the vast diversity of species around, mankind does not witness these processes occurring today. A harmony of macroevolution and the biblical creation account are irreconcilable. This conclusion should not lead the reader to think that the bible is not compatible with Science. The Bible and Science teach the same thing about nature. However, macroevolution is unscientific because there is no scientific evidence that truly supports it, as it has been discussed above. More so, it has not been proven in any laboratory. No one has observed macroevolution before and no one can demonstrate it for all to see. It is something that moves beyond the realm of science to the realm of religion because it is only accepted through faith and through any observable repeated proof on which science relies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bergman, Jerry and Howe, George. *Vestigial Organs Are Fully Functional: A History and Evaluation of the Vestigial Organ Origins Concept*, Terre Haute, Ind.: Creation Research Society, 1990.
- Boaheng, Isaac. *Is the Bible Really the Word of God?* Accra: Noyam, 2024.
- Dawkins, Richard. *The Blind Watchmaker*, Cambridge, 1986.
- Dembski and Wells, *Design of life*. As quoted Groothuis, Douglas. *Christian Apologetics: A Comprehensive Case for Biblical Faith*, Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 2011.
- Dickerson, Richard E. "Chemical Evolution and the Origin of Life," *Scientific American*, Vol. 239, 1978.
- Fuller and Tippo, *College Botany* as quoted in Charles C. Ryrie, *Basic Theology*, Chicago: Moody Press, 1999.
- Groothuis, Douglas. *Christian Apologetics: A Comprehensive Case for Biblical Faith*, Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 2011.
- Jamieson, Robert. Fausset, A. R. and Brown, David. *Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible*, Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1978.
- Keil and Delitsh *Genesis*, <http://207.44.232.113/~bible/comment/ot/k&d/gen/gen-BkMrk.html>,
- Kerkut, G. A. *Implications of Evolution*, in Martin, *The Evolution of a Creationist*, Texas: Biblical Discipleship Publishers, 2002.
- Martin, Jobe. *The Evolution of a Creationist*, Texas: Biblical Discipleship Publishers, 2002.
- Mayr, Ernst. *What evolution is*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2002.
- McDowell, Josh. *Answers Five Tough Questions*, Illinois: Tyndale House Pub., 199
- Metcalf, C. L. and Flint, W. P. *Destructive and Useful Insects*, 4th ed. As quoted by Martin, Jobe. *The Evolution of a Creationist*, Texas: Biblical Discipleship Publishers, 2002.
- Stanford E. Murrell *An Introductory Study of Systematic Theology*. Np: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2013.
- Norman L. Geisler, *Systematic Theology*, Minneapolis: Bethany House.
- O'Rourke, J. E. "Pragmatism versus Materialism in Stratigraphy." *American Journal of Science*, vol. 276, 1976: 47-55
- Ryrie, Charles C. *Basic Theology*, Chicago: Moody Press, 1999.
- Thompson, Bert. *The scientific case for creation*, Alabama: Apologetics Press, Inc., 2004.

ABOUT AUTHOR

Isaac Boaheng holds a PhD in Theology from the University of the Free State, South Africa. He is a Senior Lecturer in Theology and Christian Ethics at the Christian Service University College, Ghana, and a Research Fellow at the Department of Biblical and Religion Studies, University of the Free State, South Africa. He has many peer-reviewed publications.