

Thoughts on Creation vs. Evolution

Evidence and rationale for creation:

1. The holy scripture - being the inspired record of God as the creator and controller of all life, all matter, all natural laws, and phenomena (absolute and abstract), and
2. Logic - that the fact of creation is self-evident; verifiable by reason.

But the authenticity of the biblical revelation can only be comprehended and confirmed by Christians—because the truths are only understandable and believable by those with minds endowed with the spirit of God.

All other interpretations, theories, concepts—in fact, any strictly unregenerate, human determinations, or ideas are essentially only carnal (unspiritual) considerations of the questions, and answers to the mysteries of life, and the universe; especially as relating to their eternal meaning and significance.

The “facts” of the so-called science of evolution as merely posits of not only an unprovable, but ridiculously illogical theory of the origin and development of life and material forms, including the laws and principles of physics, and other existing phenomena.

So, then, the idea or theory of evolution is an abstraction; imaginary, and void of any empirical evidence to substantiate it.

And, while supernatural creation is not physically provable, either, it is or should be convincingly evident, logically. There are no fanciful ideas inherent in the postulate of creationism. The term “postulate” is used in the sense of being laid down as self-evident. A key scripture speaking to both the divine domain, and human capacity and ability to understand the mysteries of life is Deut. 29:29: “The secret things belong unto the Lord our God, but the things that are revealed belong to us, and our children forever”.

If, as the dictionary defines it, “logic” is the science of reasoning, why wouldn’t a “scientist” naturally use it to its fullest possible conclusion? Yet, even elementary reasoning should convince one of the truth of supernatural creation.

Characteristics of evolutionary science proponents:

1. Conceptualism - abstract ideas, and theories.
2. Iconoclasm - attacks (whether reasoned, or not) on the cherished beliefs of others, or the

exclusionary effect of the intelligentsia syndrome.

3. Acataphasia - difficulty, or inability in expressing ideas logically, including:

(1) non-sequiturs (conclusions and inferences which do not [can not] follow from the premises).

4. Unreality (or fantasy) - dealing with ideas, or matters in a way that is not reasonable, but impractical and visionary.

Consider the following scenario:

1. Only two people on earth.
One, lets call him E, picks the idea of evolution, and the other, whom we will dub C, adopts the tenet of creation—as their respective beliefs about the mysteries of life.
2. They have open, objective minds. No biases, ideologies, trappings, etc.
3. No religion, or spiritual beliefs are established.
4. Sole means of consideration: observation, and thoughtful reasoning.

Which idea, or proposition has the most logical rationale?

E thinks that there is no supernatural being, with creative, controlling powers—only a mysterious process that develops into different higher life forms, or substances.

And, yet, he may—in view of certain otherwise unexplainable phenomena—concede to some higher power or force (though impersonal, and not of a moral, spiritual, or divine nature).

He would come to observe that there are laws of nature, or consistent causes and effects of natural extraordinary developments that cannot be honestly denied to be the result of some purposeful, designed institution.

And while he might ascribe these things to the aforementioned strange power or force, how could he begin to explain the mystery of human creature intelligence and personality as resulting from a nondescript, happenstance, imaginary source, or process of biology that cannot be demonstrably or rationally explained?

Honest scholarship should have to acknowledge an overwhelmingly obvious, and incontrovertible lack of logic in the theorized, unproven processes of the hypothesis of evolution. There are too many gaps, missing links, and giant leaps of faith in such a system to be anything

but essentially incredible, as an answer to the questions of life regarding origin , and causes, and associated phenomena and mysteries of the universe.

I think what bothers me the most about evolutionists is the bigotry and arrogance they often exhibit toward creationists, especially Christians!

Yet, when their theory is examined for logic and consistency of principles, it is found seriously deficient of integrity and credibility.

In the promulgation of their theory, subtlety of reasoning can be seen as a key characteristic of their methodology.

They start with a skeletal model (a scheme) of their philosophical assumptions, and then by inquiry and study—resulting in supposition versus actual discovery, try to put flesh on the skeleton. An example of their specious, obsessed mind-set is their unconscionable practice of feigning discovery for proof, by creating “facts” as they need them to further their futile cause.

Futile, because despite the prodigious output of suspect reasoning, and sophistry it is completely void of authenticity as evidence or support for their propositions. If the premise is false, the product must be false as well! However much of a counter-punch this is to their effrontery (read: overbearing intellectual elitism), they have spent and will continue to spend their lives trying to “make a silk purse out of a sow’s ear.” And no matter how convincingly real the fabrication may look, it is not, cannot be silk—but a synthetic substitute for the real thing.

Many evolutionists make the ridiculous comment, in effect, that the idea of creation can’t be scientific but is only a claim of Christianity, or faith, or religion. Yet, why isn’t the zealous, diligent devotion of evolution’s disciples essentially a religion of its own? Is not nature, in the guise of evolution, their God?

If we look again at our two earth inhabitants, E and C, who start from square one to try to understand or determine the truth behind the universe and its complexities—and with no predisposition (religious, or scientific)—the only means of consideration are reason and logic.

Brother E (the evolutionist) bound by those two principles would have to acknowledge early on that his mental powers are so superior and unique compared to all other life forms and creatures, that the idea of evolving from anything without at least comparable inherent intelligence is logically impossible. If he were a truly honest student, he would proceed no further with such a futile fantasy.

Brother C (the creationist) makes an elementary observation that something so intricate and complex in its mental and physical properties, capacity, and functions that a human being is,

could not possibly be explained apart from being a designed creation by some supremely great and powerful being; a seemingly awesome reality.

Enter the scriptures—and at least for argument’s sake—allow the possibility that they are the God-inspired revelation of the true answers to life’s fundamental mysteries.

The heretofore uncorroborated reasoning of inhabitant C is now affirmed and further attested to by communication from God, the creator and controlling authority of the entire universe, and all its inhabitants and components.

Is the truth in question knowable? E may believe it is eventually determinable, but in the intervening centuries there is no assurance that his beleaguered theory and its devotees have any credibility, or promise of it.

As to C’s confirmation from God of his belief in supernatural creation, the secret of his understanding of the subject truth is the cognitive power imparted to him in his spiritual regeneration; to wit, his new life principle as a Christian.

While E can as well reason logically that some kind of supernatural creation is the only sound conclusion to arrive at, he cannot—being unregenerated; that is, void of the indwelling spirit of God that the Christian possesses—have any spiritual capacity to understand the reality of the truth in question.

The phenomenon of a restored relationship with God that Adam had—and which was lost to him in Eve’s and his fall from grace—is a direct act of God performed only in those whom He has chosen and predestinated to receive it, in His appointed time.

It is, therefore, a dimension of life exclusive of all who are not designated to participate in it.

The decree of God, establishing the eternal condemnation of man for his sin, and the decree to redeem certain elected ones from that just retribution is due only to His grace, and without any merit in the ones selected.

I can understand why an evolutionist, from an unenlightened natural human standpoint, is driven to try to prove what he believes, or to keep alive the hope of such confirmation, especially if he is agnostic or atheistic.

Having again recently read comments from certain members of the sometimes stuffy intelligentsia, on the subject of the “fact” of evolution vs. the simplistic idea of supernatural creation, I as one of the latter class would like to add more of such supposedly nonintellectual thought to the

discourse.

When I referred to the elitist element of the evolutionist movement as stuffy intelligentsia, one continually repeated putdown they use will support the label.

Whenever the subject of creationists' term of "intelligent design" is mentioned (attacked, spoofed, ridiculed, etc.) by them, they immediately connect it with religion (especially Christianity) in a negative, derogatory way. Which is nothing less than bigotry!

This typical arrogant, intolerant attitude of evolutionists toward creationists (and yes, it goes the other way around sometimes) reveals a serious lack of moral principle that belies honest scholarship and debate over what is obviously the greatest philosophical controversy of all of life.

And they almost constantly state that religious people who argue or are proponents of "intelligent design" are only injecting an article of their faith vs. science into the discourse; implying that they either don't or couldn't logically make their own judgment on the subject, and not merely parrot a position of their faith.

Regardless of all the claims that evolution is a "fact", there is no proof! It is nothing more than an unproven theory or concept—no matter how intellectually developed and advanced its specious scholarship has taken it.

Admittedly, so too is there no way to demonstrably verify the belief of creation as the real answer to the mysteries of life and the universe.

This, then, since the question is really abstract puts it on the only basis or ground that it can be reasoned on, whatever belief or theory is to be considered.

It is a one word method of thought and study, that should be fundamental to every pursuit of knowledge in life. And that is: logic!

In Webster's New World Dictionary, 4th Ed., the first entry for the meaning of logic is: 1 the science of correct reasoning, and 5 the system of principles underlying any art or science. Under 'reason' is given: vt 1 to think logically about

What gives anyone the right, or justification, to deny that creation is a clearly conceivable cause of life, and even far more logical than the idea of evolution?

Whenever the proposition is raised about whether to include the teaching of creation in schools in addition to evolution—the E's cry foul and say it is just religion and has no place in a science class. Whereas, as a basic concept, it has nothing to do with religion, And who says, or should

imply that religious people can't think as well as secularists?

Now, can we unfetter the current-day controversy, by re-assuming a simple, primitive situation without any of the biases, acquired influences, trappings, etc. of today—whether secular, religious, scientific, or whatever?

Our two characters, E and C, agree to try to stay objective, and not adversarial, by letting honest, open reasoning help them to decide which theory or idea becomes definitively (if possible) more logically and rationally convincing.

Note the contrast to today's controversy over the subject. There is practically no dialogue, no mutually fair debate, or attempts to engage in conscientious discourse.

It follows the pattern of the ideological, partisan relationship of political parties—mainly Republican, and Democratic. Dedication to pursuit and establishment of the truth is obviously not a principle that both sides are guided by.

As to our life origin question, the prospect today of eventual concession or yielding to one theory or school of thought is virtually impossible for the foregoing reasons, but neither is any kind of serious consensus any more likely to occur. By which I do not mean some kind of amalgamation or combination of the two systems. I mean one, or the other; not syncretism.

And let's allow both E and C to have adequate and comparable IQ's, which would be a sharp contrast to the evolutionist hierarchy's assumed superiority today.

What basic observations could they make and acknowledge?

For example:

1. That life's species and forms, and the material or physical universe are great mysteries. An elementary but assumed common ground.
2. Any concept adopted or considered as attempted answers to such deep questions, cannot be physically proven, or disproved.
3. But whether evolution or creation can be logically decided or established may not be similarly impossible to accomplish.
4. It should be agreed that the evolution of the human species far superior to its impersonal, unintelligent life form progenitor is a whole lot harder to conceive of—even a preposterous idea—than human and all other life and matter being designed and formed by a far more superior being, even one with infinite creative powers.

In other words, it really requires much more faith to believe in the scheme of evolution than supernatural creation. By faith, I mean natural human faith, not spiritual faith, which is a deeper faculty imparted to Christians in their regenerative experience.

As to the closed-mindedness of evolutionists, someone once said, in effect—that he who refuses to consider a different opinion than his own on a subject, denies himself the right to change his mind! Which is especially pathetic if he is wrong!

That is why I referred to it as specious, dishonest scholarship, which equates to a shameful abuse of responsibility toward other fellow human beings; filling their minds with fictitious science!

As for religion—the authentic, biblically correct kind—it confirms the truth of a living, personal, all-powerful God, as both Lord and creator of all living creatures, and the entire universe.

Speaking to the voluminous output compiled on the subject of evolution, note a quote from the theologian John Calvin: “Experience teaches that the human mind is a soil fertile in false inventions, and that when sowed even with the smallest grain, as if all its powers combined, yields an immense increase.”

The truth, however, already exists in the scriptures, and in the mind of Christians, and will, in God’s appointed time, universally prevail!