The notion of evolution (naturalism, biological materialism, etc.) is illogical and unreasonable. Reason demands a logical progression in order for it to function.

To the uninformed (and those who would obfuscate the issue) evolution is presented simply as change over time. But if we try to logically reason such a grand notion we end in total epistemological confusion.

First off, how much change does such a person propose? If it is a linear and progressive change from the beginning to the present, from the point of nothing to the present of everything, then logic demands a finite beginning; and such a beginning could only occur in this model either by some form of extra-terrestrial (or extra-universal!) source; or by means of spontaneous generation, a completely untenable proposal. And of course, time — and vast amounts of it — is most crucial here.

If, on the other hand, change simply means the idea that things (organisms) have a tendency to not remain static over time, to modify ever so slightly from generation to generation in order to better survive — something all would agree with — then we are not discussing evolution at all, but instead our present understanding of adaptation. And since adaptation is species-specific (the beak of the finch becomes broader or more pointed depending on food sources; the fur and hair of the mammal becomes thinner or courser depending upon the climate; the color of the peppered moth becomes lighter or darker depending upon the changing color of the tree’s bark) the issue of time is seen in generational terms and is therefore largely inconsequential.

If however, time is considered, then we need to determine how much time is proposed. Is it that amount needed for adaptation which has just been shown to be merely generational and certainly not enough duration for evolution to occur. Or is it that eons of time must be suggested in order for such a notion to appear reasonable? But it has already been shown in this short piece that the notion of evolution is unreasonable, untenable, even unfathomable within any serious logical system. So that leaves us with a rather consequential dilemma.

If one is inclined to believe in evolution as a cause/effect world view, then that person must also subscribe to the *Millions and Billions Mantra*. There can be no Young Earth Evolutionists. However, if we realize logically that limited change does occur within species over generations of time then it would appear that two choices are offered. Now consider which choice appears the most plausible.

If indeed, as I suggest, the notion of evolution is illogical and unreasonable, and therefore eons of time are not necessary, then one must of necessary logical reasoning subscribe to the belief that the singular event of Creation occurred in the recent past.

The only other choice is irrational. The idea that Creation occurred millions and billions of years ago has no logical support because the notion of eons of time is superfluous and unfathomable.