



Darwin or Design?

Looking at the faith of Evolution,
and the faith of Creationism

By: R. Chip Denief

For over **150 years** the world has been offered the idea that man is the product of accident, not intelligent design. It has been suggested that belief in man as a created being by an all powerful God is superstitious, old fashioned, and unscientific. Many “educated” individuals have embraced the godless ideas of Darwin’s design less universe, and his faith in the evolutionist belief of life by cosmic accident.

Perhaps the greatest falsehood of Darwin’s “theory” is that it is scientific, and that life by design is faith. In truth, both Darwinism (evolution) and Creationism are faith based belief systems, neither of which is truly a theory. A theory, by definition, relies upon a hypothesis that can be tested. Neither evolution, or creation can be “tested”, since we cannot go back to non-life and create exact environments similar to the beginnings of life. Instead, we must rest upon the evidences that are provided, and, ultimately, upon faith.

Many would argue that Darwin’s idea of evolution has scientific evidence to back up its claims, and that Creationism has only the Bible as evidence. Actually, both Evolution and Creation have the same scientific evidence to examine... the faith of Creation enjoys the added “bonus” of eyewitness testimony of the creation account through the Bible.

Numerous sources of evidence support creation as the origin of life, and cause tremendous “pains” to the faith of evolution. Darwin proposed a transition between species, yet to be discovered in any fossil evidence. In fact, fossil evidence poses serious problems to the evolutionist, since species of “lower evolution” are intermingled in the fossil record with species of more complexity... something that could never be allowed if evolution were true.

Many in the Darwin faith camp have touted such “evidences” as carbon dating to support their idea of an old earth. (An old earth would be necessary to support the mathematical improbability of evolution.) However, little is publicly exposed regarding the numerous flaws in the process of carbon dating, such as the assumptions made during the process of dating, the rate of decomposition, the elements matter was exposed to, exacting temperatures and on and on. Basically, it is impossible to “re-enact” the origin of life without bias toward a personal faith.

Numerous avenues could be followed in our tour of these two faiths, but the one we will tread today is the path of biology. Without getting too technical, I’d like to point out some of the common “scientific” ideas & practices of Darwin’s era:

- **Bats** navigated by touch.
- The **moon** was populated by furry humans with wings.
- Decaying **meat** spontaneously turned into maggots.
- **Grain** changed to rodents.
- **Mud** became frogs.
- Human **conception** was a mystery.

- **Menopause** was almost unheard of, since women rarely lived beyond 50.
- The use of **chloroform** as an anesthetic was deemed anti-religion.
- Broken legs were treated with **amputation**.
- People were **transfused** with blood from cows & dogs... and died.

Darwin had almost no knowledge of cells, and certainly not the details that modern science now affords. His “theory” about the origin of life is nothing more than a godless faith, based upon lack of credible scientific evidence, which attacks the sovereignty of God.

If Darwin is right, millions of coincidences would have had to happen millions of times, each in a beneficial manner, and each in cooperation of equal amounts with the opposite gender of each species... else each species would die. It isn't possible.

On a cellular level alone, humanity confounds the concept of evolution with precise mathematics that could never occur even one time by chance, let alone millions of times throughout the history of man.

Often, in this great arena of faith debates, evolutionists cite the ape as our closest “relative”. The ape is believed to share the greatest amount of common characteristics with humanity. It is not an issue of debate in terms of obvious similarities between apes & humans. Scientists say that the DNA of humans and the DNA of chimps are between 95 and 98% the same. The real issue is not the similarities, but, rather, the differences between the species. Although similar in DNA makeup, chimps cannot compose symphonies, write literature, compose poetry, apply advanced mathematics, appreciate humor or speak a logical language.

Is it biologically possible for these numerous differences to be bridged, given enough time and perfect conditions? Can the differences be bridged gradually in a manner that would not be detrimental to each species? A simple examination of the claims will provide enough evidence, by comparison, for a logical thinking person to determine the possibility.

First, consider the differences between apes & humans:

- Assuming that the above projection is true (that 98% of Human & Chimp DNA is alike) there is still a **huge chasm** of difference that cannot be spanned, since this 2% difference amounts to 120,000,000 chemical bases that are different.
- Chimp feet, toes, arms and legs are **different** from humans, allowing them to do certain tasks that humans cannot do.
- Chimps have a **wraparound** mouth, which prevents them from showing emotion with facial gestures, other than to bear their teeth in anger.
- Humans have **chins**, chimps do not.
- Humans have a **longer childhood** than chimps, a fact that seems to stand opposed to the evolutionary thought of survival of the fittest.
- Human **gestation** is the longest in the “primate” world, another fact that doesn't cooperate well with survival of the fittest.
- Chimps have **tails**... humans do not. There is no fossil evidence for “in-between tails”.
- Humans have only **46 chromosomes**, apes have 48.
- By comparison, human bodies are nearly **hairless**, apes are completely covered in hair.
- Apes don't **sweat**.
- Apes lack the **fatty inner layer** of skin that humans share with aquatic mammals.
- Humans are the **only primates** with breasts that are apparent when not nursing.

- Humans are the only creatures who **weep**.
- Chimps (and other mammals) have a **baculum** (bone) in their penis that humans lack.
- The **hymen** is not found in apes.
- Human and ape **bone structure** is dramatically different.
- Having **blue eyes & curly hair** is unique to humans, among the primates.
- The human nose **protrudes**, a characteristic unique to humans.
- Penguins, sea mammals and humans are distinct in ability to **consciously** hold their breath.
- Only humans and the Pilot Whale go through **menopause**.
- Humans **blush**, and respond to **humor**.
- **Predisposition** toward oral speech is distinct to humans.

The list of differences goes on and on, with each difference representing a vast genetic gap between the species. It is obvious that our closest “relative” (according to evolution) is really not a relative at all, but a unique, designed species.

The evolution concept of gradual change is genetically interesting as well. Darwin suggested that the different species gradually “mutated” in genetic composition, evolving into higher forms of life. There is absolutely no scientific evidence to support such a concept, in spite of several generations of attempt and advances in science. In fact, just the opposite is known to be true, life does not change from lower life forms to more complex life forms, but, life changes from more complex to less complex.

Consider the following:

There is a little experiment that I would challenge you to try. It requires a calculator and a little time, but proves a wonderful point. Suppose that I gave you 1 penny on day one, and told you that I would be willing to double the total amount each day for thirty days, or, I would give you one dollar each day for thirty days. Which is the better offer? Applying math, we know that 1 dollar for each of the thirty days equals a total amount of 30 dollars. In contrast, beginning with a penny, doubling the amount each day for thirty days amasses a total of nearly 5.5 million dollars. It doesn’t seem possible, but it is a mathematical truth.

Now, as amazing as the previous experiment seems, consider the genetic changes which occur in just thirty days following conception. Beginning with one cell at conception, the human fetus will multiply into nearly 500 million cells by the end of the thirty days. This will eventually diversify into the 200 different kinds of 10 to 75 trillion cells that will eventually make a viable human.

By the fourth week of an embryo’s life, 250,000 nerve cells per minute start migrating outward, knowing exactly where to locate and cooperate with neighboring nerves. Some neurons may have as many as 10,000 connections, essentially making them like a small city on their own.

All of this evidence suggests that a **designer** was intimately involved with the origin of life. But, if this hasn’t brought enough food for thought, consider this:

As mentioned above, science has shown that a **decrease in genetic information** is passed along through species “changes”, not an increase of genetic information. In other words, some species have shown some change over time, but the changes amount to a lower form. Also, these changes do not create new species, only lower classes within the species. For evolution to be correct, these changes would have to add to the genetic makeup of a species, not take away from the species. However,

modern science clearly shows that a decrease in genetic information actually occurs.

In addition to the problem of change within the species, evolution cannot deal with the fact that nearly every species of creature has a unique set within it, in that there are both male and female in almost every species of creature. This means that the gradual changes within the species which evolution requires would have to be:

- Changes **beneficial** to the species.
- Changes **adding** to the genetic code, in order to evolve into higher life forms.
- **Equal changes** at an **equal pace** within **both genders** of **every species**, or the genders would become non-compatible & die out.
- The **previous** "lower" genetic composition would have to die out.

Science shows just the opposite in every case. Genetic changes are referred to as **mutations** in science, and are **never** beneficial, generally amount to a **lack** of genetic information being passed (or at least a deficiency of quality) and are **never** a lasting change. These changes generally die out, since they are not beneficial or compatible with the species.

All of this only highlights another significant deficiency in the evolution line of thought. Even if beneficial changes occurred, they would still be a change **within** a species, not a creation of a **new**, distinct species. Evolution demands that new species of higher complexity were increasingly added to the variety of life. Consider the human and ape comparison... if mankind has been evolving for 500,000,000 (or more) years as evolution suggests, why have humans increased in complexity and apes haven't? Also, where are the **transitional** life form evidences in the **fossil record**?

There are no transitional life forms in the entire fossil evidence, but there are an abundance of fossils which promote the creation model of life origins. Not one single fossil promoting transition.

You see, the issue is not lack of evidence for creation, rather, it is one of science **interpreting** the evidence with bias toward evolution. It is bad science. Such leaps of application are destructive to the integrity of science.

Why is there such a debate in the public arena? If creation is right (as the Bible teaches it is) then man is accountable to a higher moral entity. Many people are not willing to accept creation, because this makes them accountable to the Creator, demanding a lifestyle of morality as God has defined it, not as they personally define morality.

If one happens upon a pocket watch in the middle of the forest, one does not assume that it evolved from lower forms into a watch. One would observe its precision in design and accuracy in timekeeping and rightly determine that a watchmaker skillfully crafted the watch to do exactly what a watch does... keep accurate time.

One cannot consider the complexity of human composition (short of influence from personal bias) without seeing the signature of a skillful Creator who designed man to be human. David so accurately wrote about this Creator:

**I will give thanks to You, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made;
Wonderful are Your works, And my soul knows it very well.**

Psalm 139:14, NASB'95