

How is EVOLUTION Defined?
©Bruce Schweigerdt, MA
January 2000

- How do evolutionists define EVOLUTION?
- How do those who don't know, but should, define EVOLUTION?

EVOLUTION is CHANGE over TIME

EVOLUTION is CHANGE over TIME. Advocates frequently use this simple definition of an extremely difficult concept because it sounds so innocent. Of course, EVOLUTION means much more than these few words provide. But when analyzed fully, this straight forward and undemanding five word statement can provide a wealth of insightful information.

When someone uses this definition, the next thing they need to consider is *how much CHANGE over how much TIME*. In other words, they need to give some serious thought to the definition, something that is seldom, if ever, done. For a lie repeated often enough will eventually be accepted as truth; even so a simple — but misleading — definition, if used often enough, will be adopted by an inadequately informed culture as something that is true.

So, within one's understanding of evolution, how much CHANGE are practioners of this definition considering? Do they believe that the peppered-moth is an example of evolutionary change? If so, then they are really looking at genetic *adaptation*, rather than evolution, though some are apt to refer to this as an example of *micro*-evolution. At this genetic level, there is relatively modest change within a species to accommodate various changes in the environment.

Or does the person believe that evolution is best represented by a process whereby all living creatures evolved from a common origin resulting from the transformation of non-living to living matter? In this process a pre-biotic soup generated a protozoa which gave rise to metazoa, vertebrates arose from non-vertebrates, amphibia arose from fish, reptiles arose from amphibia, birds and mammals arose from reptiles, and within mammals, man descended (ascended?) from lower forms. If so, then they hold to the classic (and I believe actual) definition of evolution, known today as *macro*-evolution (or the General Theory of Evolution).

There is a major (and important) distinction here. Everyone knows micro-evolution to be true; for the results of adaptation are clearly seen and can be demonstrated through the process of genetic breeding within species. However, the die-hard Darwinian Evolutionists (a relatively small, but influential number) and the indoctrinated (an often intimidated) followers hold to a belief that one species evolves into another over vast — and unfathomable — amounts of time.

The issue of TIME is where the true demarcation line is drawn between dogmatic evolutionists and Recent Creationists. For, in order for Natural Selection (Darwinian macro-evolution) to work, such a process requires unfathomable amounts of time, as well as unimaginable miraculous mutations (consider the eye), and a faith that believes that the impossible is possible through natural processes alone.

The people caught in the middle of this unfortunate debate are the Old-Earth Creationist, made up largely of professing Christians who feel the need to accommodate the *Millions and Billions Mantra* in order to maintain what they feel to be a level of intellectual integrity (the secular model of science) while also holding to miraculous events such as the creation of the universe, and the birth, life, and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

There are, of course, those who feel that the Creator of the universe fashioned the evolutionary process itself to carry out the creating and sustaining of all things; but those folks — known collectively as theistic evolutionists — are largely discredited, and their system is scorned by evolutionists and recent creationists alike.

In the final analysis, there should be no reason why a believing Christian, one who holds to the Bible as God's Word and true in every instance — no reason why such a believer should subscribe to the fallacious notion that the earth and the universe evolved, and that they did so over billions of years.

There are other reasons why the believing Christian need not be intimidated into believing in Evolution and an Old-Age Model.

To begin with, the real reason for the development of Darwin's notion in the first place is now completely ignored and overlooked by his adherents. This is best represented by Hampton L. Carson in the introduction to the 1963 Washington Square Press edition of Darwin's *The Origin of Species*... and succinctly given on the back cover of that volume:

"*The Origin of Species* demonstrates that all living organisms are descended from simpler and earlier biological forms. Most important, it shows that Man is derived from lower animals. When this titanic [pun unintended, I'm sure] theory was first published in 1859, there was an immediate storm of protest and disbelief from many scientists and theologians. To them, Darwin's Theory of Evolution meant a rejection of the Bible and a denial of God.

"Nevertheless, Darwin's theory of the evolutionary process in life has grown deeper and wider over the years until it now penetrates all thought, be it scientific, religious or philosophical. The Theory of Evolution is truly one of the cornerstones of modern science. Like the works of Freud, Einstein and Marx, one cannot hope to understand the modern world without a knowledge of this important document."

In addition, it is not common knowledge that evolution and old-age notions are based on certain spurious assumptions. Evolution itself rests on the Uniformitarian Principle of Charles Lyell, a view that says that in order to understand the past one only needs to observe the present. In other words, there was no dramatic creation event (apart from the "Big Bang"); and there certainly was no universal cataclysmic Flood like the one recorded in the Book of Genesis.

Beyond that, within Evolution there are seven basic assumptions that set forth the general theory: (1) living matter arose from nonliving matter, (2) this process occurred only once in history and cannot be duplicated, (3) viruses, bacteria, plants, and animals are interrelated, (4) protozoa gave rise to metazoa, (5) various invertebrate phyla are interrelated, (6) vertebrates arose from invertebrates, and (7) within the vertebrates, amphibia arose from fish, reptiles arose from amphibia, birds and mammals arose from reptiles.

Time. Consider where all these old ages came from. In the early 1800's Darwin's grandfather, Erasmus, suggested the earth might be one million years old. In 1862 this was increased to 20 million by Lord Kelvin, and in 1897 he doubled it to 40 million. Two years later, Joly said it was 90 million. Lord Rayleigh, in 1921 upped it to one billion. Eleven years later, W.O. Hotchkiss moved the figure to 1.6 billion. Arthur Holmes, in 1947, decided it was 3.35 billion; and in 1956 raised it to 4.5 billion where it basically stands today. The harder it became to "prove" evolution to be true, the more time was needed, and subsequently added to the process.

But most importantly, a belief in an old-age model for the universe and the earth means that the Bible-believing Christian must reject the basic doctrines upon which the faith of the believer is based. If the Genesis 1-11 record is wrong then the Christian doctrine of the Scripture must be rejected (but the Scripture is true and will never change — Psalms 19:7, Matthew 5:18).

If the Genesis 1-11 record is wrong then the Christian doctrine of Man is wrong (created in God's image — James 3:8-10; Man's sin led to death, disease and suffering — Romans 5).

If the Genesis 1-11 record is wrong then the Christian doctrine of salvation must be rejected (Man was created perfect; he fell from perfection; there is judgment; he needs salvation; Christ is the only solution — the theme running consistently throughout the Scriptures).

If the Genesis 1-11 record is wrong then the Christian doctrine of God is wrong (He is Truth; He is Merciful; He is Good — Psalms 100:3-5; and He is fearful in Judgment — Psalms 33:64).

Beyond this dreadful conundrum for the believer, if the Genesis 1-11 record is wrong then whole parts of 23 of the Psalms must be disregarded, parts of 18 of the Old Testament books must be ignored, and parts of 7 New Testament Books must be expunged.

Is it any wonder that the Genesis 1-11 account must (and surely can) be taken literally? To do anything less would eventually destroy a person's faith in God, His Word, and His message of Salvation, as well as lead to a complete misunderstanding of Man in God's wonderful creation.