



## CREATION AND EVOLUTION

### Carry on Dawkins!

#### Jules Gomes

#### Have we been told the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth about evolution?

During my tenure as Chaplain to the Royal Naval College Chapel, Greenwich, I tried out a little experiment. I asked ten members of the congregation three simple questions:

- 1 Do you believe in the theory of evolution as a *scientifically established fact*?
- 2 If so, can you name the scientist who established evolution as a *scientifically verified fact*?
- 3 What is the *evidence* that convinces you that evolution is a *scientifically verified fact*?

Everybody I spoke to said they believed in evolution. Nobody was able to name the scientist who "proved" evolution. Only two people were able to name some evidence that they felt justifiably proved evolution. I asked both these persons if they had read any scientific evidence to the contrary – I mentioned the scientists Colin Patterson and Michael Denton. Both said they had not. I asked if those who believed in evolution would change their minds if presented with scientific evidence to the contrary. Almost every person said that they would not change their minds because their entire life would be turned upside down and because they had built so much of their belief structures around the theory of evolution.

The following Sunday I preached on the topic from the pulpit. I said that as an Old Testament scholar I did not believe that the Genesis creation accounts were to be read literally or scientifically but were to be read as polemics against the Babylonian creation myths. However, I was prepared to offer a £100 reward to anyone in the congregation who would stand up during my sermon and offer irrefutable evidence for the theory of evolution. Nobody moved. That was the week Richard Dawkins had begun his series on Evolution versus Creation. Is Richard Dawkins right in emphatically claiming that there is incontrovertible evidence for microevolution? Or is it just a good hypothesis as Darwin himself admitted?

As he wrote in concluding *The Origin of Species* (1859): 'A crowd of difficulties will have occurred to the reader. Some of them are so grave that to this day I can never reflect on them without being staggered; but, to the best of my judgment, the greater number are only apparent, and those that are real are not, I think, fatal to my theory'. These words do not sound like the "eureka" of a scientist who has discovered gravity, or thermodynamics, or radioactivity, or electricity, or DNA, or penicillin. They sound like the words of a student who has written a clever but controversial PhD thesis and is nervously waiting for the examiner to spot the lack of evidence.

Colin Patterson, senior palaeontologist at the British Museum of Natural History writes: 'Nine-tenths of the talk of evolutionists is sheer nonsense, not founded on observation and wholly unsupported by facts. This museum is full of proofs of the utter falsity of their views. In all this great museum there is not a particle of evidence of the transmutation of species.'

Why have we not been told the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth about evolution? The eminent British anthropologist Sir Arthur Keith writes: 'Evolution is unproved and unprovable. We believe it only because the alternative is special creation, which is unthinkable.' Jeremy Rifkin makes no bones about it: 'We no longer feel ourselves to be guests in someone else's home and therefore feel obliged to make our behaviour conform with a set of pre-existing cosmic rules. It is our creation now. We make the rules... We no longer have to justify our behaviour, for we are now the architects of the universe. We are responsible to nothing outside ourselves, for we are the kingdom, the power and the glory for ever and ever.'

Professor Dawkins, you can fool some of the people some of the time but not all of the people all of the time.

[Jules Gomes is the MA Course Leader at London School of Theology and Lecturer in Biblical Theology.](#)