

Chap
IN the beginning God
heaven and the earth.
2) And the earth was without
void and darkness was without
the deep. And the Spirit of
upon the face of the waters
God said, Let the

Can a Christian believe in Evolution?

By Daniel Janosik

In a *New York Times* book review, evolutionist Richard Dawkins asserted, “It is absolutely safe to say that if you meet somebody who claims not to believe in evolution, that person is ignorant, stupid or insane (or wicked, but I’d rather not consider that).”¹ In a later article Dawkins defended his words and wrote that the “100 million U.S. citizens [who] believe that humans and dinosaurs were created within the same week as each other, less than ten thousand years ago... are contradicting—influentially and powerfully—vast fields of learning in which their own knowledge and reading is indistinguishable from zero.”² The irony of Dawkins’ statement is that he is the one who is woefully ignorant of the facts. Most of these 100 million U.S. citizens that he cites actually do believe in evolution, but in a form that does not violate the scientific method or contradict the Bible.

What do I mean by this? Can a person believe in both the biblical account of God’s creation of the world and in evolution? I believe they can, but not without differentiating between microevolution and macroevolution. For years now the mantra of evolutionists has been that “evolution is a fact.” Anyone who opposed this belief was painted as an ignorant, pseudo-scientific Bible thumper. However, there was never any attempt by the proponents of evolution to explain that evolution must be understood on two levels.

The first level, microevolution, describes a variation within a biblical kind, such as the Dog Kind, that can be measured and supported through scientific endeavors. Examples of microevolution are the small changes in Darwin’s finches, the adaptive changes in the varieties of pigeons or dogs, the genetic range found in humans, and the tremendous variety of living things in the world today. These are adaptations and changes that have been documented through the use of the scientific method.

In contrast, macroevolution asserts that one species, a dinosaur for example, can develop into an entirely different species, perhaps a bird. Macroevolutionary changes like these are still without verifiable scientific support. The missing links are still missing.

Understanding the differences between microevolution and

macroevolution allows Creationists and Intelligent Design proponents to accept the inferences from the data supporting microevolution. Because of this, it is accurate to say that biblical Creationism accepts and supports microevolution.³

One tendency of macroevolutionists that has caused confusion in our classrooms is their tendency to play the old “shell game.” They tout the scientific evidence of microevolution and use an extrapolation of that evidence as support for macroevolution. For example, a teacher may have his students look at the evidence for the changes in beak sizes of the finches living on the Galapagos Islands, a microevolutionary change. He will then ask them to extrapolate backward in time and imagine the many changes that had taken place for the previous creature to evolve into becoming a bird, which would be a macroevolutionary change.

The first part of the exercise is scientific, but the second part is purely speculative. These different types of evolution are taught to be part of the same sequence of change, however, with the only difference being the amount of time involved. This is not only non-scientific, since the actual evidence only refers to the small microevolutionary changes that occur within the finch family, but it borders on being deceptive. Students are led to believe things have happened when the evidence does not support the conclusion at all.

1 Richard Dawkins, *New York Times*, April 9, 1989, Sunday, Late City Final Edition Section 7; Page 34, Column 2; Book Review Desk

2 Richard Dawkins, *Free Inquiry Magazine*, Volume 21, Number 3, summer 2001.

3 This is the case when the parameters are set by natural biological limits and the definition of microevolution is compatible with the concept of *Variation within a Biblical Kind*. See Ray Bohlin and Lane Lester, *The Natural Limits to Biological Change*, Probe, 1989, and Scott Huse, *The Collapse of Evolution*, Baker Books, 1997.

We see a very clear example of this in the so-called evolution of man from an ape-like creature. Many people today believe that in some way man has evolved from previous primates, who themselves evolved from other tree-dwelling creatures. The evidence, however, does not support this conclusion at all. When we look at the actual evidence of the most famous “ancestors” of man proposed since the time of Darwin, we find that these so-called “missing links” are still missing, by the admission of the evolutionists themselves.⁴ Indeed, the fossil remnants turn out to be either true men, misinterpreted animals, or combinations of human bones mixed with animal bones. Some, like the Piltdown Man, were simply elaborate hoaxes.⁵

Moreover, the theory of macroevolution, or the belief in the changes of population groups to bring about new creatures over time, has actually been an impediment in the progress of science. It is ironic that the so-called “unifying force” in science has actually neither unified science nor brought about any practical results.

You may be thinking I am committing modern day “scientific anathema” for stating that macroevolution has no “practical value in the world of real science,”⁶ but even Philip Skell, a researcher who contributed to the early production of penicillin, stated in *The Scientist*, “My own research with antibiotics received no guidance from insights provided by Darwinian evolution... I recently asked more than 70 eminent researchers if they would have done their work differently if they had thought Darwin’s theory was wrong. The responses were all the same: ‘No.’”⁷

Ironically, the scientific method we use today was developed by Bible-believing Christians who accepted the inherent design in the world as their starting point. Isaac Newton, Johannes Kepler, Louis Pasteur, and Galileo started from the assumption that the consistent, rational laws of the scientific world came from the consistent, rational

Designer who brought all these forces together in a way that not only showed magnificent design, but also a grand purpose.

As I reflect upon our present macroevolution-monopolized science classes, the thing that saddens me the most is that as the Creator has been removed not only from the classroom, but also from the hearts of the students, there has been a growing sense of despair and purposelessness.

I am reminded of the maxim that “ideas have consequences and bad ideas have bad consequences.” I think we are entering a time in which we are seeing the devastating results of macroevolutionary thinking on our society (abortion, euthanasia, nihilism, communism, atheism, materialism and liberal, anti-God theology, and we need to turn the tide before our society collapses. I still believe that the “truth will set us free.” I also believe it is time to allow true science into the classroom, or perhaps I should more accurately say a “true view” of science. Why should we settle for less? **ROC**

Dr. Daniel Janosik recently received his Ph.D. in Historical Theology from the London School of Theology. Dr. Janosik has taught Biology, Apologetics, Bible, and various other topics at Ben Lippen High School and Columbia International University. He now serves as the Director of Online Education and Associate Professor of Apologetics at Southern Evangelical Seminary in Charlotte.



4 Marvin Lubenow, *Bones of Contention: A Creationist Assessment of Human Fossils*, Baker Books, 2004.
 5 Daniel Janosik, *How to Think about Evolution and the Fossil Record of Man*, CIU, 2001.
 6 Henry Morris, “The Struggles of Michael Ruse.” *Back to Genesis*, No. 206, February 2006, p. 2.
 7 Philip S. Skell, “Why Do We Invoke Darwin?” *The Scientist* (vol. 19, August 29, 2005). P. 10.

The Gospel

“...For I was hungry and you gave me something to eat, I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink, I was a stranger and you invited me in, I needed clothes and you clothed me, I was sick and you looked after me, I was in prison and you came to visit me.”

“Then the righteous will answer him, ‘Lord, when did we see you hungry and feed you, or thirsty and give you something to drink? When did we see you a stranger and invite you in, or needing clothes and clothe you? When did we see you sick or in prison and go to visit you?’

“The King will reply, ‘I tell you the truth, whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers of mine, you did for me.’”

Matthew 25:35-40

Please contact the volunteer coordinator at (803) 667-4943 for contributions or to volunteer.
 DoingtheMostGood.org • Facebook.com/SalvationArmyMidlands



Located in
**Forest Park
 Shopping Center**
 4711 Forest Drive
 (803)787-6165

www.MaryandMarthaSC.com
M-F 10-6; Sa 10-5

...all your kitchen needs to Prepare,