Evolution versus Creation:

A Debate

University of the Nations

Markus Reichenbach October 2016

Contents

1 Introduction

Science has tried to find the best natural explanation for phenomena, which appear in our world. Christians should not fear science. They should be open to follow the evidence. Nothing that science proves, will contradict the source of science. God created the world with natural laws. Thus, science will not contradict God or Christianity. If it does contradict it, it is either no longer science or a misunderstanding by Christianity. People should understand what science can do and what not, what they know and what not?

2 What does Evolution mean?

In his book "Darwin's gift to Science and Religion", Francisco J. Ayala explains three aspects of evolution[1].

2.1 First, the term Evolution

"It is the process of change and diversification of living things over time, or basically the idea that living organisms descended from previous living organisms with modifications." This means that organisms can change over time by selection or mutation. The same process happens when breeders generate new plants or animals. Also, scientists can modify genes and change organisms.

Similarly, science can explain how different species of animals originated from an original animal. Different dog breeds came from an original wolf. Over time, the animal that lived trapped in a house evolved differently than a wild wolf. The wolves, which would survive even in winter, became more aggressive and dangerous. Over time, different races developed from the original wolf.

With evolution, it can be explained how the different skin colors of humans originated. All humans are descended from a primitive man. This man carried all the color pigments in himself. Through inheritance in the next generation, some people have inherited more dark pigment colors and others less. In the next generation the specification became even stronger. Over time, skin colors have separated from one another more and more until people in Africa became black and white in Europe.

Therefore, we know that evolution is a real process that happens in nature and Christians should not have any problems with it.

[1] Francisco J. Ayala, Darwin's gift to Science and Religion, 2007

2.2 Second, History of Evolution

The Tree of Life exemplifies the Thesis of Common Ancestry (TCA). Ayala states, "that evolution in this second sense is very uncertain." Ayala believed in such a tree, but he admits that this assumption rests on uncertain ground and that science has not yet been able to reconstruct it.

2.2.1 Darwinism (Theory of Evolution)

Darwin came up with the idea of common ancestry. Every living being must have had the same ancestor. However, he didn't develop the whole theory on his own. He read a book by Jean-Baptiste Lamarck[2], who claimed that life came into existence through purely natural processes. Darwin refined his theory of common ancestry, which is now known as the theory of evolution. He observed finches on the Galapagos Islands and found that the finches with a thin beak were able to survive in dry seasons and that the other population died. For this reason, he claimed that those organisms, which suit their natural habitat best, would always be the ones to survive. Through this process new living organisms arise. Nature selects suitable organisms – just like breeders would – but in this case it is a purely natural process.

2.2.2 Fossils

Darwin was asked the following question: if this theory is accurate, why do we only find fossils from organisms that became extinct or from organisms that still live today? Why do we not have any fossils, which show the transition between past organisms and the ones living today? Darwin thought that all these fossils would be discovered in the future. Instead, paleontologists found plants and animals, which were already extinct. There are indeed certain transitional forms like the Archaeopteryx, which is a bird that shows certain reptilian features such as claws on its wings and teeth on its back. But in the "Tree of Life" the birds are on another branch than the reptiles. Also, in the case of the feathered dinosaurs, Troodontids, we would have to ask whether they had evolved into birds. If this common ancestry theory is accurate, millions and millions of transitional fossils should have been found by now, but paleontologists have hardly found any at all. Therefore, the fossil record clearly contradicts this theory of common ancestry. Darwin's thought was wrong.

[2] Jean-Baptiste Pierre Antoine de Monet, Chevalier de Lamarck (1744-1829) a French naturalist presented his theory in the book 1809 Philosophie Zoologique

2.2.3 Ages of the fossils[3]

Darwin concludes that there had to be millions and millions of years between the very first organism and today's living organisms. How old is the world? How did biologists determine the age of the fossils? There are three types of age determination methods.

First- relative dating: In the late 18th and early 19th century, geologists studied rock layers and the fossils in them to determine relative age. William Smith was one of the most prominent scientists of his time.

Material, gravel, sand and mud are deposited and will petrify. This deposit can be measured and through this the ages of the rock layers can be determined. There was not enough information about the radiometric decay until the 20th century. Therefore, they could only analyze the sequence of the layers and they weren't able to determine the actual age.

Second- absolute dating: Some elements (called isotopes) have unstable atomic nuclei that tend to change or decay. One example of such an unstable isotope is U-235. Through a series of changes, it transforms into a stable state. This is called lead (Pb-207), which is the daughter isotope of U-235.

- Uran238U transforms into lead206Pb (half-time 4,5 Billion years)
- Uran235U transforms into lead207Pb (half-time 704 Million years)

Concerning the radiometric method, scientists have to make some presuppositions, for example that the decay of the material is always the same, which has only been tested in a protected environment. But in nature this decay doesn't happen in a protected environment. Has this process always been linear notwithstanding big catastrophes such as earthquakes or flooding? Or do scientists know the concentration of the isotope ratios of the initial elements? Do scientists have a stable calibration to give us reliable dates? This method also seems to have a lot of uncertainty. As well when we look to the dating of the same material with different methods the cap between the ages are really big. (see in the example before)

Third- the change in nature:

Nature also gives us some hints as to how man can find out how old the world is. Seawater has a certain percentage of salt. The Baltic Sea contains an average of 1.2 percent, the North Sea 3.0 percent, the Mediterranean Sea 3.8 percent and the Dead

[3] Frank K. McKinney, Bryozoan Evolution, 1991

Sea 28 percent salt. Salt has its origin in the erosion of rocks. Through rainwater, the anions and cations enter the groundwater, get into flowing water and finally into the sea. Using this calculation, one finds that the world has to be less than 62 million years old[4].

Also, the levels of sludge, sand and gravel can be measured in lakes. Over time, rivers bring these materials into the lakes. On the basis of these calculations the earth would only be a few thousand years old[5].

This method also has several uncertainties and gives us a very different age compared to the other methods. It seems that science is not the right tool to determine the age of the world.

2.3 Mechanism of Evolution

Darwin believed that there was a mechanism of evolution through natural selection. He went on to explain this mechanism, which supposedly happened by way of a purely natural process without intelligent design. Ayala states that, “it was Darwin’s greatest accomplishment to show that complex organisms and functionality of living beings can be explained as the result of a natural process, natural selection, without any need to resort to a creator or another external agent[6].”

According to Ayala, “the mechanisms accounting for these changes are still undergoing investigation. Evolution of organisms is universally accepted by biological scientists, while the mechanism of evolution is still actively investigated and is the subject of many debates among scientists[7].”

2.3.1 Selection

Darwin believed that organisms that suit their environment would survive and organisms, which were not suitable, would become extinct. Nature would select the strongest ones. This is called the "survival of the fittest".

Breeding actually exemplifies the limits of natural selection. Natural selection never brings forth a higher compeer organism.

Ayala points to the discovery of Darwin’s finches on the Galapagos Islands. The population of birds with stronger beaks increased when there was no rain. Those birds were able to survive in the dry season. But as the rain came back the weak

[4] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seawater

[5] Hansruedi Stutz, die Millionen fehlen, 1996

[6] Francisco J. Ayala, Darwin’s gift to Science and Religion, 2007

[7] Francisco J. Ayala, Darwin’s gift to Science and Religion, 2007

population returned. But nothing really evolved. Darwin's observation didn't explain that natural selection can bring about a new complex organism successfully? Some doubted Darwin's scientific conclusion, claiming that he only wanted to prove what he already believed.

2.3.2 Mutation of Deoxyribonucleic acid DNA (Genetic Code)

Deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) is a molecule that carries the genetic information of living organisms. DNA is copied through mutation and builds new organisms. Dennis Venema specifies three genetic phenomena[8].

2.3.3 Three observation of DNA (Genetic Code)

1. **Almost all living organisms share the same genetic code**

The genetic evidence that all living organisms share the same genetic code seems to be most the convincing argument supporting the claim of common Ancestry.

All living beings have the same genetic code. But this does not mean that all of them have the same ancestor. By using wood, one can build a house and a bridge. With the same material different things can be built, but they don't necessarily have or need to have the same builder. It would be absurd to claim the bridge and the house have the same ancestor. They could be built absolutely independently of one another.

2. **The organization of related organisms suggests a common ancestor**

Different related organisms share not only the same genetic code but also a similar organization. But it is not necessarily true that organisms with the same order have the same ancestor. It makes sense but it is not necessarily true. A house in India and a house in America have a similar design and are built with the same material, but they are built completely independently from one another. They both have walls, a roof, a foundation and so on, but to claim that they have the same builder is not right.

3. **Shared so called pseudogenes**

Organisms, which are closely related, share the same non-functional pseudogenes. These are genes that are deactivated by mutations. But to say that this proves that they have the same ancestor is also incorrect. It could be true but it is not necessary.

[8] Dennis Venema, How I Changed My Mind About Evolution, 2016

2.3.4 Malaria, HIV and E.Coli-bacterium

Malaria and HIV create bad cells that drugs cannot overcome. Michael Behe concludes that the study of HIV and malaria shows what natural mutation can do. Mutations are hardly ever beneficial to nature what Malaria and HIV prove. He states that, “we have studied trillions of organisms that show that Darwinism cannot do much, even if we have billions of years[9].”

Doctors cannot stop these diseases because the problem is not a physical one; it is a problem in the genetic language. The genetic code is ordered in a wrong way and therefore it brings wrong information and the cell is damaged. Biologists now do research on how to manipulate DNA and how to change the information to stop these diseases.

Richard Lenski did research on 40000 Bacterium E.Coli genes[10]. He discovered only a couple beneficial mutations. Almost every mutation was destructive and not beneficial to nature. This means that there is always a loss of genetic information during the mutation, a loss of protein function. There is no evidence that some new complex organism could evolve out of these bacteria. It is evident that there are mutations, but we can see that there were almost only destructive mutations and that no new complex systems evolved.

Michael Behe states that, there is no evidence that the Darwinian process can build new molecular mechanisms. The argument that organisms are able to develop drug resistance seems to have completely backfired[11]. Far from providing evidence of the power of the Darwinian mechanism to produce grand evolutionary change, the experience of science with drug resistance in bacteria, viruses and malaria reveals the severe limits of that mechanism.

Now, malaria, HIV and E. Coli represent three fundamentally different forms of life. The malaria organism is a eukaryote that has a nucleus. HIV is a virus and E.Coli is a bacterium (prokaryote without a nucleus). But all of them show hardly any positive mutation. When the main three organisms show, in almost every attempt, that there are hardly any positive mutations, one can conclude that mutations cannot evolve into new complex systems. Thus, mutations are generally destructive and cannot lead to higher living organisms.

[9] Michael Behe, Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution, 200

[10] Richard Lenski, How Evolution Shapes Our Lives, 2016

[11] Michael Behe, Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution, 2006

Ayala says: "the mutations occur irrespective of the needs of the host organism, whether or not they are of benefit to that organism[12]."

In his book, "Signature in the cell[13]" Steve Meyer states that the odds of getting a single functioning protein molecule by chance (not even a living organism) are about 10^{164}. Protein function depends upon hundreds of specifically sequenced amino acids and the odds of a single functional protein, arising by chance, are too low.

Francis Crick, the one who discovered DNA, says that the origin of life on earth is almost a miracle. Thus, life on this planet didn't evolve through chemical evolution[14].

2.3.5 The law of science: The second thermodynamic law

The second law of thermodynamics (thermodynamic entropy) states that heat always moves from warm to cold and never the other way. Order naturally transforms into disorder. Any complex system will decay over time if left untouched. Thus, the creation of a complex system always requires an input of energy by some intelligent entity.

As a natural law, entropy applies everywhere. Every house decays over time, turns into ruin, then into a pile of rubble, and finally grass grows over it. A garden will be a jungle without someone putting some creativity and energy into it. Darwin's theory of evolution contradicts this fundamental physical principle. According to the theory of evolution, life sprang out of the primitive, without the influence of some intelligent entity. But this is not possible: nothing can become more complex or even come into existence merely through a purely natural process. Therefore, the law of entropy contradicts the thesis of Common Ancestry (Evolution theory) and requires and other explanation how life came into existence.

2.3.6 Bacterial flagellum

Microbiologists found that the bacterial flagellum is an absolutely essential organism. This bacterium is like an engine that makes the cells move. But it can only function if the different parts of the bacterium work together. That means that all the different parts of the bacterium flagellum have to exist at once. How is it possible that it came into existence through an evolutionary process? It looks like someone must have put it together. No biologist can explain this by way of a purely natural process.

---

[12] Francisco J. Ayala, Darwin's gift to Science and Religion, 2007

[13] Steve Meyer in his book, "Signature in the cell, 2010

[14] Simon & Schuster, Life Itself: Its Origin and Nature, 1981

All the research available right now shows us that the mechanism of Darwinism is not able to explain the complexity of life. Through mutations, life can hardly ever develop into higher life forms. Therefore, mutations cannot produce life. Life seems to come from another source, one that science cannot explain. Therefore, the thesis of Common Ancestry cannot explain live.

What then can explain the origin of life? If nature cannot explain it, it would be wise to look for an unnatural explanation and find out if this can explain the origin of life.

3 What is live?

Let us take a closer look to find out this immaterial part in humans to see that there is a lot what is not explainable by natural science. It is empirically proven that humans are different from animals. But why. It seems obviously that humans have another source than animals.

Animals cannot speak they do not build civilizations and do not develop. Also, animals do not produce new material and invent new technologies. Animals just continue living like their ancestors did thousands of years ago. A bird builds a nest, as it has always done. But people are different. At the time of ancient Egypt, the world was very different. People did not live that long and many died of diseases that can be treated today. People took water from the river, transported it on their heads to their house. Nowadays, cars drive around and planes move through the sky. One might wonder whether our world is better now. In any case, it is different and man has caused it. It seems that man has something that animals don't have. What is this thing that natural science cannot explain?

Where does this immaterial thing come from that makes man so unique, so that he is independent of nature and is able to change it? Perhaps scientists must realize that not everything can be explained by purely natural causes. Humans consist of mind and body: they have an immaterial part, which science cannot explain. I do not claim that animals do not have an immaterial part, but they are definitely different from humans. The question now remains, where does this immaterial part come from and how can we explain it? To me, this question seems to be the best evidence for the claim that life cannot come into existence merely through natural processes. But now, let us look at what scientists found out about this immaterial part in animals and humans.

3.1 The pain levels of organisms

Michael Murry came up with a pain level hierarchy[15] of organisms that can help us understand some differences between living things.

3.1.1 First level: Pain is only a reaction in the nervous system.

The first level of pain is observed in animals that have no sentience or do not experience pain. There is no consciousness in such animals. Pain is only a reaction in the nervous system. They don't suffer when they experience pain. Spiders and insects fall into this category.

3.1.2 Second level: First order of pain experience

There are subjects that experience pain. When a sheep is attacked by a wolf it experiences pain because it has sentience.

Immanuel Kant said that animals cannot express pain with words[16]. They don't have a second order awareness of pain. Even though animals experience pain, there is no evidence that shows that animals are aware that they are in a state of pain. Murry says that it would be useless to spend an afternoon with a blind man in an art gallery.

Nowadays, people anthropomorphize animals for instance by creating movies like "Bambi" where animals suffer and feel pain like humans do. I am not sure how these animal-human movies shape our generation.

The constitution commands us not to murder and this refers, of course, to humans. Animals don't have moral obligations. But humans have an obligation to treat animals according to the mandate they have been given by God. But when people don't believe in God anymore, they need some other approach or spiritual guideline as to how they should treat animals. That would of course include plants, trees and so on. A tree doesn't have rights because it has no obligation or free will. Ayala said "I think this approach is the best way to look at nature is a try to find some ethics in the absence of a God[17]."

3.1.3 Third level: Second order of pain experience

Humans can feel pain and can vocalize it. They can communicate it with words and can find the right medicine for it. Humans have a mandate and a moral obligation to react to someone who feels pain. Humans can speak and have a free will. Therefore,

[15] Michael Murry, The Encyclopedia of Natural Medicine, 2012
[16] Immanuel Kant, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant/
[17] Professor William Lane Craig http://www.reasonablefaith.org/

humans are on a different level of pain experience. In my view, this seems to be the most important distinguishing factor in the debate between those believing in an intelligent creator and those in favor of a natural chemical mutation as an explanation for the origin of life. Humans are different from animals, because humans have unique attributes in contrast to animals. This makes man unique.

3.2 Darwinism and social Darwinism

Darwinism argues the development of complex life through natural selection[18]. If this is true, then death is a necessity for the evolution of life. The stronger organisms survive and the weaker ones become extinct through natural selection. Darwin wanted to prove that it is not necessary to posit a higher being – other than nature – who would bring life into existence. But this thought has had significant consequences on our society. It is called Social Darwinism. When humans are the same as other organisms, who merely survived the evolutionary process, why should we think that they are different? Why should humans not behave like their ancestors?

Why does the West care so much for the weak? If Darwinism is true and there is nothing from outside of nature that gives us a guideline for moral behavior, humans should act according to nature. But humans stand up for human rights and not just go with the flow of 'survival of the fittest'

Why should humans not act according to nature then? Kill when they feel like killing and hate when they feel like hating. Dictators should conquer and kill and the stronger would survive. Why should a dictator, who eliminates the weak, be wrong? Without the ability to love or to overcome natural forces, man would become something like an animal. He would not have free will and his behavior would be predicted by natural forces. He would become a victim of nature.

However, people in the West certainly think that Hitler was wrong. When Westerners think like this. It contradicts Social Darwinism and Darwinism as such. But if it would no longer be clear that Hitler was wrong, the question arises whether there is any moral standard at all?

Darwinism brought us Social Darwinism where human behavior is just predicted by nature. Darwinism destroyed all moral standards by saying that death is just a normal process. Death is just a part of reality and brings about progress. Darwin brought a new social understanding. Before this, the churches told the people to

[18] Charles Darwin, the origin of species, 1859

fight against natural tendencies by not just following one's feelings and instincts. Killing was not allowed. But for Karl Marx, a firm believer of Darwinism, it was clear that the end justifies the means. Eliminating the weak is just a necessary process in order to reach the next evolutionary level[19].

Darwinism destroyed all the thousand-year-old beliefs of society. It is destroying the Western world.

Professor Craig's criticism is appropriate. Darwin had not behaved scientifically in the first place, but only wanted to show that there was no God. Darwin did not devise the theory of evolution on his own. He adopted these theses from Lamarck. He was excited about the theory and he had already held his presuppositions before he began scientific research. His observations had to justify his strong-minded theory: there is no God.

4 Christianity and science

Often the Bible seems to contradict science. But this is a misunderstanding. Modern science has been constructed on the basis of the Bible. Most founders of modern science like Francis Bacon, Isaac Newton and Blaise Pascal were committed Christians and found the laws of nature through their faith. They believed that there is a Creator who created the world through natural laws and that humans can find these laws by observation and analysis. These scientists didn't believe that the universe came into existence through chance or nature's caprice, but through logical thoughts of an intelligent designer. This thinking allowed them to hold on to valid absolute laws that they could trust and therefore investigate.

Before that time, people believed in an arbitrary world full of gods, who directed their world. These people were not motivated to believe in absolutes or natural laws. Although many magnificent philosophers had found out about these laws of nature, they were never applied practically in the world at that time. People didn't trust nature. In their mind, Nature was governed by arbitrary spirits who might always change things. The scientists in the Middle Ages trusted absolute laws, because there was an intellectual being who had created these laws. Therefore, they understood that humans - made in God's image - can intellectually understand these laws and use them to create new things. It was the faith of Christians, which enabled modern science to emerge.

[19] Karl Marx, the communist manifesto, 1848

4.1 The creation story in the right light

One big question we should consider is the way Christians interpret the two first chapters of the Bible. Do they see it as a literal account or more of a figurative narrative? I think when we look to the Psalms, the Prophets and the Book of Revelation we understand that not all books in the Bible can be read in a literal manner. Humans are not sheep and Jesus did not speak like a trumpet blows.

Gen 2.4 says, "in the day that the Lord made heaven and earth". This doesn't mean only one day: it means several days, at least six. The same word is uses in Gen 1.5 when it says the first day. The world for day can also mean several days. Also, in other passages in the Bible the word "day" does not have the meaning of just one day: "Day of the Lord" (Zech 14,7) does not mean one day. Another example would be Lincoln's day, which was not just a day. The word "day" can therefore also be used as a metaphor or a symbol and doesn't refer two a specific time.

The sun and the moon were created on the fourth day. The Bible does not explain how long ago the time was before.

The Church Fathers and the Rabbis mostly didn't have any problem understanding that this "day" was not a 24-hour day.

Why should theologians oppose this view today? Where does this discussion come from? Is it because people started looking at Genesis 1 and 2 through the glasses of science? They are trying to read modern science into the text. But this is not hermeneutical: it's not what the text says. God gives us the real story - in a real chronological way, but he also can speak through Psalms, songs, proverbs or figurative language. Many things can lead us to the truth.

I think the text was written by Moses in the time when Israel became a nation. There were a lot of different creation stories at this time, for example those of the Egyptians or the Mesopotamians. The biblical story was probably written in order to give a different creation account, different to all the other stories that were around. This story is unique. It shows that the Jewish God is a different God. There are three crucial differences. First, there is only one God (unlike the host of gods in the other nations). Second, man is made in God's image, both the female and the male, which stands in contrast to other nations, where men were seen as superior to women. Third, man is created in order to have dominion over the world, to be God's junior partner and to create order and civilization together with him. The story shows us

that man is not determined by nature, as the fatalistic nations around Israel believed. Instead, man should rule nature through the spiritual laws of God.

Genesis 1 is directed against polytheism, fatalism and the notion that man is made in his own image. God is feminine and masculine; he is both. To me, this seems to be the most important factor in the creation story. The bible doesn't say *how* God created the world. It is not a scientific account. It is a book, which reveals who God and man are.

Systematic theology aims to integrate the bible into scientific research. This can be very helpful, but let us be aware of what the text really says and of what we interpret into it.

4.2 Interpretation of the creation story

God created the plants and algae on the third day, that is, the first organisms. And God said: "Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yield seed, and the fruit tree yield fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth: and it was so[20]". Thus, it grows on its own as food for animals and humans. It is possible that these plants were changed by natural selection. In winter, the leaves rot and the grass dies. But every year God lets them grow again. It seems that the first organisms were created to die again and again. Then, on the fifth day, he created the fish and the birds. They ate the first living organisms. The fish eat the algae and the birds eat the plants. This seems to be a second form of living organisms. They didn't have the same ancestors, which is why God had to intervene and create a new organism structure that could not possibly have emerged merely through a natural process. On the sixth day, he created the animals. "The earth brings forth each kind of living creature, each kind of livestock and crawling thing, and each kind of earth's animals[21]!" It is not clear what kind of organism he used to create animals, but it seems that this new complex organism cannot come about merely through a natural process. Thus, God intervened to bring new life to earth.

At the end of the sixth day, he created man and blew his spirit into man. It is true that God took an existing organism to create man, but again, it needed more than just a natural process.

Now, it takes nine months for a human being to be developed inside the womb. Why would it have taken such a long time in the beginning stages of life? Thus, it makes

[20] Genesis 1.11 ISV

[21] Genesis 1.24 ISV

sense that God created man in a short time and not over a period of millions of years. The Bible gives us a significant detail in this story: God blow his spirit only into man, who he made in his image[22]. Man has a different function compared to all other organisms. He can speak, think, build, judge things and study mathematics. He also has a free will and can build civilizations. It is obvious that man is different from all the other organisms.

I think that the most significant point in this story is that man in not just matter. He is not just an organism. Man is body and spirit and this is the topic we should discuss. Christians should not fight against science but they should fight against the West losing man's uniqueness.

The theory of evolution is the best reasonable assumption for people who don't believe in a creator, but it seems to be much more reasonable to believe in a creator. Both views cannot be proven scientifically but the assumption of a creator is much more reasonable.

Evolution is built on the idea of the survival of the fittest or natural selection. This seems to fit people's perspective of the world nowadays: Lions eat other animals and dictators kill their enemies. Humans were made in God's image, but today that doesn't seem to be the case any longer: They are brutal and they will die. According to Christianity, this has not always been the case. Before the Fall, it was different. The state of the world today is a consequence of human disobedience, which we call "the Fall". Before the Fall people lived in harmony with one another. (Christianity promises that they will do so once again.)

If we assume that humans died *before* the Fall, we must conclude that it was God who caused it. If God made mortal man in his image, death would be also a part of God. He said that man – his creation – was very good and that would mean that death is something good, even very good. If death is good and a part of God, God is both life and death.

Therefore, Christians who believe in Darwinism also believe that God created death. In this view, death is not a consequence of the sin of disobedience.

If Darwinism is true, why did Jesus have to die on the cross? Jesus died on the cross to overcome death, so that people can regain eternal life. Why should Jesus have to overcome something that is in God and in his creation?

[22] Genesis 1.24

Darwinism destroyed the foundation for morality, as we discussed earlier. As Nietzsche said: without God, there is no morality[23]. If these Christians believe in Darwinism and thus destroy absolute morality, they also abolish God. If this were the case, there would be no reason to say death is bad: Death would not be worse than life.

Hence, these Christians, who believe in Darwinism, would have to believe in an absolutely new understanding of Creation, of the Fall, of Christian morality and of the death of Jesus Christ.

5 Conclusion

Processes of evolution are observed in nature and can be scientifically proven. But then again Ayala states that “evolution in a second sense is very uncertain. The evolution of organisms is universally accepted by biological scientists, while the mechanism of evolution is still actively investigated and is the subject of many debates among scientists[24].” He admits that this assumption is based on uncertain ground and that science cannot reconstruct it.

It is not possible to explain how higher organisms can develop through purely natural processes. Therefore, since higher living creatures cannot develop, we can also conclude that no living being can come into existence. Life must have a different origin.

The theory of evolution may therefore have more to do with religion than with natural science. According to Ayala, "it was Darwin’s greatest accomplishment to show that complex organisms and functionality of living beings can be explained as the result of a natural process, natural selection, without any need to resort to a creator or another external agent[25].” Darwin abolished God. Unfortunately, reality has shown us something else. Natural science indicates that there must be something higher, because it cannot explain everything. Is the theory of evolution still natural science? The evidence obviously suggests that the theory of evolution no longer corresponds to reality.

In the end, the question remains whether we can have any certainty about the beginning of life. To establish this certainty by way of science seems impossible. But because human beings cannot survive without an answer, the logical conclusion is,

[23] Friedrich Nietzsche, the Will To Power, 1881

[24] Francisco J. Ayala, Darwin’s gift to Science and Religion, 2007

[25] Francisco J. Ayala, Darwin’s gift to Science and Religion, 2007

that revelation through the Bible is the only rational alternative. The Bible, the Word of God, helps man find orientation and peace in the infinite great universe.

One should not start with the question as to whether evolutionary theory and Christianity are compatible. First, we should ask whether or not the theory of evolution and science are compatible. The theory of evolution cannot be proven scientifically, but unfortunately many people think it has already been proven. Therefore, the theory of evolution remains a theory with many open questions that cannot be answered.

The Bible is not a scientific book. The history of Creation cannot be read as a scientific report, but as a revelation who man and God are. Therefore, everything should not be read literally. One day doesn't necessarily mean 24 hours.

6 Bibliography

Francisco J. Ayala, Darwin's gift to Science and Religion, 2007

Professor William Lane Craig http://www.reasonablefaith.org/

Frank K. McKinney, Bryozoan Evolution, 1991

Hansruedi Stutz, die Millionen fehlen, 1996

Dennis Venema, How I Changed My Mind About Evolution, 2016

Michael Behe, Darwin's Black Box: Biochemical Challenge to Evolution, 2006

Richard Lenski, How Evolution Shapes Our Lives,2016

Steve Meyer in his book, "Signature in the cell, 2010

Simon & Schuster, Life Itself: Its Origin and Nature, 1981

Michael Murry, The Encyclopedia of Natural Medicine, 2012

Immanuel Kant, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant/

Charles Darwin, the origin of species, 1859

Jean-Baptiste Chevalier de Lamarck, Zoologische Philosophie, 1873

Karl Marx, the communist manifesto, 1848

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, The Gulag Archipelago, 2003

Friedrich Nietzsche, the Will to Power, 1881