

Creation, Evolution, and Evidence Based Thinking

written by Tim Jennings, M.D. | October 14, 2012



As a Christian physician and scientist (one who forms beliefs based upon objective evidence, which is testable and reproducible, while remaining open to modifying those beliefs as more evidence becomes available), I am struck by the level of non-evidence-based thinking and believing rife within both religious and scientific communities.

There are many well-meaning Christians who have innocently promoted the idea that faith is believing without evidence. And therefore, it is not surprising to find a certain resistance amongst Christians to evidence-based thinking. But, I have been dismayed and disappointed by the practice of “blind” non-thinking, non-evidenced based “faith” within the scientific community since the scientific community purports to base its beliefs upon testable evidence.

I suspect the majority of scientists when asked which is more scientific (based on testable evidence), the theory of evolutionary origins or creation origins, would confidently state “evolution.” But how many of those same scientists would be willing to allow their belief to be subjected to testable evidence? If we are scientific, followers of testable evidence, we don’t fear examining our ideas in light of testable evidence, so let’s test these two competing theories (Evolution and Creation origins).

The big bang cannot directly be reproduced or tested and neither can God. Therefore, we are relegated to testing the premises both theories rest upon. As we pursue our answers I want to expose two points: 1) what we find when we test the premises these two theories are built upon, 2) which group, evolutionists or creationists, is willing to be scientific and follow the testable, reproducible evidence in the formation of their beliefs? And which group will deny the evidence in order to hold to preconceived beliefs?

Let's examine the premises each theory is built upon and find out:

Evolution	Creation
Something came from nothing (Big Bang)	Something came from something (Creation)
Life came from non-living matter	Life came from living matter
Complexity comes from chaos randomly with no intelligent input	Complexity comes from chaos with intelligent input
Random mutation of genetic code adds vitality and genetic fitness causing a species to develop over time	Random mutation damages the genetic code reducing fitness and degrading a species over time
Selection can select out the damaging mutations leaving the next generation more fit than the previous	Selection occurs, but it is insufficient to select out all the damaging mutation, so despite selection, the next generation is less fit than previous generations

Can any scientist demonstrate something coming from nothing? I can show you a world filled with evidence of new things coming from something that already exists.

Can any scientist demonstrate life coming from non-living matter? I can show you a world teeming with life coming from living matter.

Can any scientist demonstrate complexity coming from chaos by random forces without any intelligent input? I can demonstrate a world filled with complex machines, computers, and technology, all of which is a result of intelligent design and input.

Can any scientist demonstrate random genetic mutation that has added genetic fitness? I can show you millions of genetic mutations that destroy fitness.

Can any scientist demonstrate selection that removes enough genetic damage to cause a species to become more genetically fit than the preceding generations? I can show you that despite selection the accumulation of genetic damage increases with each subsequent generation thereby degrading the species.

Further, which theory is in harmony with known laws of physics? The first law of thermodynamics, energy is conserved, rules out the first premise of evolution origins. Something cannot come from nothing if energy is conserved.

The second law of thermodynamics, things tend toward disorder unless energy is put into a system, simply states that left to its own things decay over time. This law rules out the premise that complexity comes from chaos without intelligent input. It also rules out the idea that genetic mutation results in

increased fitness.

Both of these scientific laws of thermodynamics support the premises of creation origins but fail to support evolution origins.

So, which theory is actually built upon testable, reproducible evidence, in harmony with known laws, and which theory is demonstrated, by the evidence, to be inconsistent with testable evidence and laws? Then which theory is more scientific?

I find it fascinating that Creationism is actually founded upon scientific premises and beliefs, and supported by testable laws, whereas evolutionism origins is founded upon “blind faith,” premises that are disproved by objective testable science. Yet, scientists refuse to follow the evidence and instead persist in proclaiming evolutionary origins are actually scientific.

Whether you are currently a creationist or evolutionist I challenge you to become an evidence-based thinker. There is nothing to fear in following the evidence, for all evidence, when rightly understood, will lead us to greater enlightenment – back to the source of all light and truth, our amazing Creator!