

Ten Reasons Why Evolution is Dangerous and Evil

By W. Bredenhof, W. Geurts, G. VanPopta, J. VanPopta, J. Witteveen

Over the years, people in the Canadian Reformed Churches have traditionally viewed the theory of evolution as an enemy of the Christian faith. However, recently there have been voices encouraging us to reconsider this stance. This deeply concerns us. Now, just as in the past, we need to be firmly convinced that this theory stands opposed to the clear teachings of Scripture and that it has no place in a biblical worldview. In this article, we want to outline ten reasons why evolution should still be regarded as dangerous and evil and why it should be taught as such in our Reformed homes, schools, and churches.

Before we begin, we need to be clear about our definition of “evolution.” We understand it to refer to a theory about the origins of life and the diversification of that life into various modern-day organisms, including man. According to this theory, all forms of life are related in common ancestry through an evolutionary process thought to have taken place over billions of years. Evolution teaches that all life is descended from a single-celled organism which in turn evolved from inert chemicals. Finally, we note that evolution is not merely a scientific theory but a foundational component of many unbelieving worldviews.

Evolution Must Regard Genesis 2:8 as Mythical

In Genesis 2:4-7 we read that God formed man from the dust of the ground and then he breathed the breath of life into his nostrils and man became a living soul.

God created man (in Hebrew: *Adam*) from the dust of the ground (in Hebrew: *adamah*) and he became a living soul. This account of the creation of man resounds with the special character of this creative act of God. On the previous creation days, God said, “Let there be...!” And it was so. And it was all very good. But now in Genesis 2:7 we read of the LORD God, the covenant God, who in a special creative act, gives the breath of life to *Adam* formed from *adamah*.

Now, if evolutionists are right, then this is figurative language. Some biblical scholars have rejected a literal ‘potter’ interpretation because they see this as close to disrespect of God: “Did God fashion the liver, the lungs of clay?”, they might ask. “God was not concerned with creating a scientific text when he told us of his creative work; he just wanted to communicate that man did not descend from the gods, but that he was part of this creation,” they would say.

However, if this creation story is figurative, allegorical, mythical or some other kind of story, other than history, then at Genesis 2:8 we have a problem. For God put that man he had *formed* into a garden. There, together with the woman, he was tempted to rebel against his Creator and fell into sin. Any literary approach to the narrative would make no distinction between the *forming* of the man in verse 7, and the *formed* man in verse 8. So if this is an allegorical myth, it must continue into the following verses. It would seem disingenuous to claim verse 7 to be myth, and verse 8 to be history.

Of course the story of the fall, and the record of historical Adam are foundational to the New Testament doctrine of redemption and atonement. Paul and the Lord Jesus accept the historical reality of Adam. Paul, in Romans, works out the doctrine of substitutionary atonement based on the historical Adam. The doctrine of the covenant also is tied into a historical Adam.

Evolutionists, who claim that the human race descended from pre-adamite primates need to be clear and honest: the Reformed doctrine of atonement and covenant would need to be rewritten, for there can be no real Adam formed from *adamah*. (JVP)

Evolution Requires Pre-Adamite Human Beings -- Luke 3:38 Disallows It

The genealogy of the Lord Jesus, as Luke gives it, ends with saying that Seth was the son of Adam, and that Adam was the son of God (Luke 3:38). In the Greek, the word "son" occurs only in v. 23 ("He [Jesus] was the son, so it was thought, of Joseph, of Heli, of Matthat, etc."). But "son" is clearly implied every time. Our English translation, supplying the word "son" in every instance, is not incorrect.

To be a son of someone is to have your existence from that person. Seth had his existence from Adam. To use an old expression, he was the fruit of Adam's loins. Adam had his existence from God—of course, in a way different from how Seth was of Adam. The point of comparison is that as Seth was directly of Adam, so Adam was directly of God.

The context of this verse is very instructive. The genealogy of Jesus is preceded by the account of his baptism. There the Father calls Jesus "my Son." Context is king. As the eternal Son of God has his existence directly from the God the Father, so Adam had his existence directly from God.

Those who believe that man and chimpanzees have a common (animal) ancestor will have difficulty with the position that Adam was the direct creation of God. They will suppose that Adam had ancestors, possibly human, assuredly animal. Luke 3:38 would contradict that supposition.

The only way to get around the conclusion that Luke 3:38 teaches that Adam was the direct creation of God (and not the offspring of another creature) is to take the position that Luke 3:38 is mythological. (GVP)

Evolution Challenges God's Self-Revelation in Scripture

The Scriptural doctrine of creation is not an issue that can be pushed to the side as a "non-essential" of the Christian faith. Many will claim that Darwinian evolution and the Christian faith can co-exist as partners, or at the very least as peaceful neighbours, that the matter of "how" God created is not as important as the fact that He created. However, Scripture repeatedly

reveals that God's act of creation by the awesome power of His Word is intimately related to, and indeed one with, the central doctrines of our faith.

Why is our Lord and God worthy to receive glory and honour and power? Because He created all things, and by His will they existed and were created" (Revelation 4:11).

How can the Lord have the power to call His people, and to redeem us? He is the One who created us; He is the one who formed us (Isaiah 43:1).

What is the true nature of the Son of God? Through Him the Father created the world, and He upholds the universe by the word of His power (Hebrews 1:2,3).

In Isaiah 40, the LORD speaks through His prophet, detailing the close relationship between His creative power and His personal work of redemption. His power in creating the world and sustaining it, an infinite power and authority that had no need for millions, or billions, of years of evolutionary development, is intimately connected to His power to know His people personally, to save us, and to give us all that we need. The God who created the world in an instant, who arranged and filled the universe in an unimaginable, awesome show of power and might, is also our Redeemer (Isaiah 40:25-29).

The Darwinian doctrine of evolution takes the awe-inspiring creative power of God Almighty and places it in the hands of genetic mutations, chance, and aeons of natural selection and development. It creates a distance between God and His creation; it detracts from the power of God's creative Word; it subtracts from God's glory, and it paints a picture of the One True God that does not at all line up with His self-revelation in Scripture.

Who is our God? How should we live in the presence of such a God?

"Let all the earth fear the LORD; let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of Him! For He spoke, and it came to be; He commanded, and it stood firm." (Ps. 33:8,9).

This is the God who has revealed Himself. This is the God we worship and adore. (JW)

Evolution Surrenders the Historicity of Adam and Eve

Many people who hold to the theory of evolution don't believe in a literal Adam and Eve. For them we today are simply the result of millions of years of evolving from lower forms.

However, God's Word in Genesis 2:7 tells that He created the first man out of the dust of the ground and the first woman from a part taken out of the man. They were made specifically by God and in His image.

If there was no literal Adam and Eve, then what about the fall? Where did sin come from? Without a fall into sin, do we still need a redeemer? Without Adam and Eve, then who is Jesus Christ?

What we learn from 1 Corinthians 15:22 is that not only was there a first Adam but that because of his sin, the sin that affected not only him but all His descendants too, there had to be a second Adam.

If we start with God's Word and if we believe the testimony that it gives us about what He did in creation and in redemption, then there couldn't have been development from pre-human ancestors. If we begin with God's Word, common ancestry with modern primates is out of the question. (WG)

Evolution Eliminates the Antithesis

Our first parents' tragic fall in Paradise destroyed the unity of humanity. When man fell, the united, God-honouring human race was permanently divided into two groups – the “seed of the woman,” and the “seed of the serpent.”

“I will put enmity between you and the woman,” the Lord told the serpent in Genesis 3:15, “and between your offspring and her offspring; he shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise his heel.”

In subsequent history, that antithesis became clear, as the history of the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent is recounted on the pages of God's Word. At many points in the history of God's people, this antithesis has come under attack, as God's people have attempted to make peace with the enemy, or have simply forgotten about the importance of this “great divide.”

“What does all of this have to do with the issue of Darwinian evolution as it relates to the Christian faith?” you ask. And the answer is, “Everything!” In Romans 1:18-25, the Apostle Paul informs us in no uncertain terms about the nature of those who reject the one, true God: “For although they knew God, they did not honour Him as God or give thanks to Him, but they became futile in their thinking, and their foolish hearts were darkened. Claiming to be wise, they became fools, and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal man and birds and animals and reptiles.”

We must never forget the antithesis, the vast chasm that God has placed between His people and unbelievers for our own benefit, and for His glory. Scientists who begin by denying God and His role in the creation and preservation of the universe are, to use the words of Scripture, “the seed of the serpent.” Claiming to be wise, they are actually fools. Beginning with the presupposition that there is no God, they become futile in their thinking. There is no middle

ground; we must maintain the antithesis in every area of our lives, for the sake of God's people, and ultimately to the glory of the Almighty Himself. (JW)

Evolution Devalues Human Life

In the early part of the 20th century the province of Alberta and other Canadian jurisdictions enacted eugenics laws on the basis of evolutionary theory. Those with congenital disabilities were regularly sterilized to promote the development of the human race – in Nazi Germany, they were euthanized. Margaret Sanger, the founder of Planned Parenthood, built her pro-abortion ideology upon an evolutionary foundation. Even in the history of the Christian Reformed Church, an embrace of evolutionary dogma has often been associated with a denial of what the Bible teaches about the value of the unborn. Evolution teaches a materialistic view of humanity in which we are essentially bags of chemicals. Such a view, consistently held, results in the devaluation of human life from conception onward. (WB)

Evolution Requires Death Before the Fall

The process of natural selection within the theory of evolution requires thousands, if not millions, of generations of our ancestors, many who were not quite human. They all lived, reproduced and then died. In this process, dominant characteristics developed only by chance and others disappeared. It all led to progressively higher forms of life until human beings finally appeared on earth.

What the Bible teaches us is that not only did God create man, He created him very good. Then, in Genesis 2:17, He then warned the first man and woman that if they disobeyed him and sinned, this would lead to their death. The testimony of Romans 5:12 is that since sin entered the world through the one man Adam, death came to all men after him.

If death has no basis in sin (as the theory of evolution says), then what is the role of Jesus Christ as our Redeemer? Romans 5:17 tells us that he came to bring righteousness and life to those who die because they are descendants of the one man Adam.

When those who believe in the theory of evolution reject what the Bible teaches us about the origin of death as the consequence of sin, it's not just a matter of whether to take the first three chapters of Genesis literally. This actually throws into doubt the truthfulness of the rest of God's Word, including what he did for us through Christ as our Mediator. (WG)

Evolution Cannot Account for the Uniformity of Nature

The fact that the universe is orderly and regular makes science possible – this is the “uniformity of nature.” Evolutionists believe in the uniformity of nature, but it is inconsistent with the foundations of the theory of evolution. Those foundations cannot account for the world in which we live. Therefore, evolution and its associated worldviews cannot provide an adequate

answer to the question of why we should believe that the future will reflect the present or the past. If all that exists is only matter (as most evolutionary worldviews claim), there is no basis for the uniformity of nature, and therefore no basis for science.

Appealing to some form of theistic evolution does not help. The Bible teaches that the uniformity of nature has its basis in God and his decrees. The same Bible also teaches that God created the universe in six normal days. It is inconsistent to accept one while denying the other. It is inconsistent to regard Genesis 1 and 2 as mythical or poetic while regarding Genesis 8:22 as literal. Like his secular counterparts, a theistic evolutionist has no credible way to account for the uniformity of nature and the foundations of science. (WB)

Evolution is Incompatible with the Biblical Doctrine of Marriage and Family

According to Scripture (Genesis 2:18-23), God created a wife for Adam and then officiated at the first wedding ceremony. The Bible teaches that marriage and family have their origin with God's creation in Genesis. Evolutionary theory teaches, however, that marriage and family are social conventions that developed among evolving animals. This theory would suggest that family and marriage relationships are not written in stone, and therefore we can expect them to continue to evolve. It is not a significant step from accepting evolutionary dogma to embracing the validity of homosexual relationships, polygamy, or even bestiality. If there is no essential difference between man and the animals, then man may certainly behave like an animal. The Bible teaches one thing and evolution something completely different – this is the antithesis established between the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman. If we are to maintain the Biblical doctrine of marriage and family, we do well to see evolution for what it is: an attack on the truth of God's Word. (WB)

Evolution Falls Outside the Tent of the Reformed Confessions

One of the great things about the Three Forms of Unity (TFU) is that they provide a big roomy tent under which Reformed confessors can discuss, even argue, theological points. For example, TFU subscribers can either believe there is such a thing as a covenant of works or that there is not, and have the room under the tent to discuss it. TFU subscribers can hold to either the Puritan or the Calvinian view of the application of the fourth commandment and have room to discuss their differences. This, alone, makes the TFU superior to some other Reformed confessions, which insist—to use the aforesaid examples—that one hold to the covenant of works doctrine and the Puritan understanding of the fourth commandment. The TFU get it right. They exclude Roman Catholic, Anabaptist and Arminian heresies and errors, but do not push fellow Reformed confessors out into the cold and rain. But what about “theistic evolution”? Can that discussion take place under the big tent?

Someone who holds to a teaching of evolution, “theistic” or other, has brought the discussion outside the tent. By way of our confessions, we say that we believe scripture to teach that Adam was a direct creation of God; we reject that Adam had human and/or animal ancestors.

One example from each confession should suffice to demonstrate the truth of this:

- Article 14 of the Belgic Confession says, “...God created man of dust from the ground and He made and formed him after His own image and likeness....”
- Lord's Day 3, referring to “our first parents, Adam and Eve,” says that “God created man good and in His image.”
- Canons of Dort, III/IV, I says, “In the beginning man was created in the image of God.”

Whether or not we have animal ancestry is not an intramural discussion. (GVP)