Part 1: The World of Prehistory
Part 2: Has Earth Already Had an "End Time"? Cataclysm of the Great Flood
Part 3: Transition from One Environment to Another
Part 4: How Well Does Evolution Theory Agree with Scientific Principles and Discoveries?
Part 5: How Old Is the Natural World?
Part 6: Conclusion

Part 4: HOW WELL DOES EVOLUTION THEORY AGREE WITH SCIENTIFIC PRINCIPLES AND DISCOVERY?

4-A: Introduction
4-B: Complexity of the Natural World – Evidence of Supernatural Designer
4-C: Laws of Science
4-D: The Marvel of DNA (Deoxyribonucleic Acid) Structures
4-E: Monkey-to-Man Evolution? Missing Evidence of Missing Links
4-F: Micro Versus Macro Evolution
4-G: The Problem with Darwinism
4-H: In Summary, What Does Science Tell Us about Evolution Theory?

*

Or, to re-phrase the title-question, we might ask, did the natural world evolve by itself, or was it created?

What we have learned so far – from fossil, geological, and cultural evidence – presents a version about the origins of the natural world that may be different to what you have heard before. As outlined in previous posts, mankind has a fascinating and marvelous ancient heritage. But unfortunately, it has lain buried under misguided concepts about our past history.

Those concepts were thought to be modern and progressive at one time, but now a more thorough examination of the scientific evidence has revealed many of them to be somewhat misleading and outdated. Let us

continue then the process of re-orienting our thinking. Let's aim to get a more accurate understanding of the science behind these issues as we continue the search to retrieve our lost, ancient heritage.

The following posts will examine evolution theory in the light of the science of genetics, DNA discoveries, fossil evidence, and dating of the Earth's age.

Every scientist knows that, before pronouncing a theory or hypothesis as fact or as a "law", he or she must prove its truth by using the experimental method. Until one has tested a theory exhaustively enough to see that it works in practical reality, only then does it become legitimate; only then can one begin to proclaim it as a new "law of science".

But when it comes to investigating the more distant past history of humankind and the earth, this experimental method is often ignored; scientists tend to skip this normal and established procedure called investigation, experimentation, and testing. Instead of letting the evidence speak for itself, it ends up getting misinterpreted, then forced, pounded, and made to fit into the mold of preconceived ideas.

Along this line, here is a revealing quote from the brother of Charles Darwin, commenting on Charles' recent book *The Origin of Species* :

> **"In fact the *a priori* reasoning [the theory] is so entirely satisfactory to me that if the facts won't fit in, why so much the worse for the facts is my feeling"**
> **[Erasmus Darwin – 23 November, 1859]**

What he meant here was that the theory seemed to him so utterly profound that the facts, even if contrary to evolution, should just mind their own business and take a back seat to the theory. Well, that is a case of putting on the blinders – a poor scientific approach… and poor detective work!

True science is based on

- **accurate observation**

- **thorough investigation**
- **unbiased interpretation**

And if true Science points us to the reality of a supernatural Creator, then that is what we ought to believe and follow.

Unfortunately however, that regrettable attitude towards the study of origins (of ignoring the evidence) has persisted and caused great misunderstanding these days in the collective mind of humankind… to the point now where everyone assumes that evolution theory is the only valid explanation for the origins of the natural world. And because of that universal assumption, any evidence to the contrary is ignored, denied, discredited, and otherwise swept away out of sight under the academic rug.

Proponents of evolution may be very good scientists in their areas of specialization, but when it comes to understanding our distant origins, all scientific sense, even common sense, seems to fly out the window. Likely, this stems from an unwillingness to acknowledge the role of the Creator in forming the natural world, which arches beyond what can be explained by science. Among scientists, the need to explain everything is both a strength and a weakness, it would seem.

So in spite of solid scientific evidence, it still remains a difficult exercise to dismantle the old assumptions and ways of thinking about the origins of the natural world. But let us look at the "solid scientific evidence", at what can help us gain a better updated understanding about this great mystery of our origins… from five different angles:

- **Complexity of life**
- **Laws of Science**
- **DNA discoveries**
- **Absence of missing links**
- **Micro versus macro evolution**

***

Continue to 4B: Complexity of the Natural World