

Creation Versus Evolution: Religion vs. Science or Religion vs. Religion?

by Dr. Jay L. Wile

Qualifications

- Ph.D. in Nuclear Chemistry
- University Professor 1990-1995
- NSF-sponsored scientist with >\$200,000 in research grants
- Published over 30 articles in nationally recognized peer reviewed journals
- Currently writes science curriculum for homeschoolers

Evolution is Part Religion

A. Faith is required

“...life arose spontaneously by natural processes - a necessary assumption if we wish to remain within the realm of science...”

-Dr. Christian de Duve, Nobel Prize winner

[Christian de Duve, *American Scientist* September/October 1995, p. 428]

“The fact of evolution is the backbone of biology and biology is thus in the peculiar position of being a science founded on unproven theory. Is it then a science or a faith? Belief in the theory of evolution is thus exactly parallel to belief in special creation. Both are concepts which the believers know to be true, but neither, up to the present, has been capable of proof...The theory is so plausible that most biologists accept it as though it were a proven fact, although this conviction rests on circumstantial evidence; it forms a satisfactory faith on which to base our interpretation of nature.”

-Dr. L. Harrison Matthews

[L. H. Matthews, Introduction to the 1971 edition of Charles Darwin's *The Origin of Species*]

The irony is devastating. The main purpose of Darwinism was to drive every last trace of an incredible God from biology. But the theory replaces God with an even more incredible deity - omnipotent chance

-Dr. Theodore Roszak

[T Roszak, *Unfinished Animal: The Aquarian Frontier and the Evolution of Consciousness*, (Harper& Row 1977), p. 101-102]

“Let me summarize my views on what modern evolutionary biology tells us loud and clear . . . There are no gods, no purposes, no goal-directed forces of any kind. There is no life after death. When I die, I am absolutely certain that I am going to be dead. That’s the end for me. There is no ultimate foundation for ethics, no ultimate meaning to life, and no free will for humans, either.”

-Dr. William B. Provine

[William B. Provine, *Origins Research* 16:9, 1994]

“Evolution is ...more than mere science. Evolution is... an ideology, a secular religion — a full-fledged alternative to Christianity, with meaning and morality. I am an ardent evolutionist and an ex-Christian, but I must admit that...Evolution therefore came into being as a kind of secular ideology, an explicit substitute for Christianity.”

-Dr. Michael Ruse

[Ruse, M., “How evolution became a religion: creationists correct?” *National Post*, pp. B1,B3,B7 May 13, 2000]

B. Evolutionists must ignore FACTS:

“...contrary to what is widely assumed by evolutionary biologists today, it has always been the anti-evolutionists, not the evolutionists, in the scientific community who have stuck rigidly to the facts and adhered to a more strictly empirical approach.”

-Dr. Michael Denton

[Michael Denton, *Evolution a Theory in Crisis*, (Adler & Adler 1986), pp. 353-354]

Facts Evolutionists Have to Ignore

(1) At its simplest, life is still ridiculously complex

Mycoplasma genitalium is considered by many scientists to be about as simple as a free-living organism can be. It has 582,970 base pairs in its DNA and 525 genes.

In order to be able to SIMULATE what we THINK this cell does in the same amount of time that the cell takes to do it required *a cluster of 128 computers!*

[Jonathan R. Karr, *et al.*, “A Whole-Cell Computational Model Predicts Phenotype from Genotype,” *Cell* **150(2)**:389-401, 2012]

(2) DNA looks nothing like what evolution predicts

Junk DNA has been a fundamental idea in evolution for quite some time.

“...the vast majority of human DNA exists not as functional gene regions of any sort but, instead, consists of various classes of repetitive DNA sequences, including the decomposing corpses of deceased structural genes...To the best of current knowledge, many if not most of these repetitive elements contribute not one iota to a person’s well-being.”

-Dr. John C. Advise

[John C. Advise, *Inside the Human Genome: A Case for Non-Intelligent Design*, Oxford University Press 2010, p. 107.]

We Now Know the Vast Majority of the Human Genome Is Functional!

A scientific initiative that so far has analyzed 1,640 data sets generated for 147 different human cell types has revolutionized our understanding of the human genome. In an overview, the journal *Nature* declared:

“Among the many important results there is one that stands out above them all: more than 80% of the human genome's components have now been assigned at least one biochemical function.”

[Magdalena Skipper, Ritu Dhand, and Philip Campbell, “Presenting ENCODE,” *Nature* **489**:45, 2012]

Note that this is a lower limit, as they haven't analyzed all cell types at all stages of development!

Some of the Scientists on the Team Expect The Percentage of Functional DNA to Rise Significantly

“It's likely that 80 percent will go to 100 percent,” says Birney. “We don't really have any large chunks of redundant DNA. This metaphor of junk isn't that useful.”

[<http://blogs.discovermagazine.com/notrocketscience/2012/09/05/encode-the-rough-guide-to-the-human-genome/#.U8-7NLHDWng>]

(Dr. Ewan Birney is the project's Lead Analysis Coordinator.)

While evolution is dependent on the concept of “junk DNA,” creationists have always maintained that there is little of it in nature.

(3) DNA and fossils don't agree when it comes to evolution

“That molecular evidence typically squares with morphological patterns is a view held by many biologists, but interestingly, by relatively few systematists. Most of the latter know that the two lines of evidence may often be incongruent.”

–**Dr. Masami Hasegawa**

Hasegawa, Jun Adachi, Michel C. Milinkovitch, “Novel Phylogeny of Whales Supported by Total Molecular Evidence,” *Journal of Molecular Evolution*, **44**:S117-S120, 1997

A Couple of Examples

Most evolutionists say the chimpanzee is our closest living relative, because our DNA is more similar to chimpanzees than any other primate.

Based on physical characteristics, it is the orangutan. We share 28 unique primate physical characteristics with them and only 2 with chimpanzees.

[John R. Grehan and Jeffrey H. Schwartz, “Evolution of the second orangutan: phylogeny and biogeography of hominid origins,” *Journal of Biogeography* **36(10)**:1823–1844, 2009]

Fish Evolution

The most recent genetic analysis (using evolutionary assumptions) indicates that almost all currently-living SALTWATER fish evolved from FRESHWATER fish.

[Greta Carrete Vega and John J. Wiens, “Why are there so few fish in the sea?,” *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 10.1098/rspb.2012.0075, 2012.]

However, according to the fossils, SALTWATER FISH CAME FIRST!

“Our results suggest that ancient extinctions in the marine environment may have wiped out the earliest ray-finned fishes living in the oceans, that the oceans were then recolonized from freshwater habitats, and that most marine fish species living today are descended from that recolonization.”

[“SBU Researcher Finds Surprisingly Low Fish Biodiversity in the Earth’s Oceans,” Stony Brook University Press Release, Feb 10, 2012 – 10:36:20 AM]

Worse Yet, The Genes Don’t Agree with EACH OTHER!

Michael Syvanen compared 2,000 genes that are common in a diverse set of animals like frogs, fruit flies, tunicates, nematodes, and sea urchins. He also included people in the analysis. He couldn’t determine evolutionary relationships because:

“The problem was that different genes told contradictory evolutionary stories... Roughly 50 per cent of its genes have one evolutionary history and 50 per cent another.”

-Graham Lawton

[Graham Lawton, “Why Darwin was wrong about the tree of life,” *New Scientist* (January 21, 2009).]

(4) There are all sorts of exceptions to the rules.

The same “rule” that says dinosaurs and people lived at different times also says that people didn’t live at the same times as the Coelocanth, Wollemi Pine, and Tuatara. However, living version of each exist today.

C. Evolutionists excommunicate those who are not ideologically pure:

Dr. Kevin Haley, Ph.D. in biology, taught science at Central Oregon Community College in Bend, Oregon. His department chairman called him "an excellent teacher." In evaluations written by his students, he was one of the most popular--as well as challenging--instructors at the college. **He was fired because he refused to state in class that evolution is a fact!**

The Tangipahoa Parish Board of Education (Louisiana) required teachers to read a statement which, in part, said that students were to “exercise critical thinking and gather all information possible and closely examine each alternative toward forming an opinion

regarding the origin of life and matter.” Federal courts, on the urging of evolutionists, outlawed this statement.

High School Teacher Rodney LeVake was demoted and reassigned because he discussed data that contradicts evolution in class.

A professor of biology at San Francisco State University was forbidden to teach the introductory biology that he had been teaching for more than a decade because he began stressing the design elements that are prevalent in the world around us. The biology department thought that this would “confuse” students when they later reached a course on evolution, so they forbade him to teach that course.

Forrest M. Mims had written some freelance articles for *Scientific American* in 1990. When he applied for a full-time position, he was not hired because he was a creationist. Nevertheless, *Scientific American* admitted that his work was “fabulous,” “great,” “first rate,” and “should be published somewhere.”