

## **PRIMORDIAL DISAGREEMENT: A CRITIQUE OF EVOLUTIONIST AND CREATIONIST VIEWS ON COSMOLOGY**

**Christian Maduabuchi Umeanwe\***

### ***Abstract***

*The origins of the universe have sparked intense debate between evolutionary and creationist perspectives, reflecting fundamentally disparate views on cosmology. This primordial disagreement revolves around conflicting accounts of the universe's beginnings, with far-reaching implications for understanding of human existence. Proponents of evolutionary cosmology, grounded in scientific inquiry, posit that the universe emerged approximately 13.8 billion years ago through the Big Bang. Cosmic evolution, driven by physical laws and random processes, gave rise to complex structures and life. This perspective is supported by empirical evidence from astronomy, astrophysics, and biology. Creationists, rooted in religious conviction, assert that the universe was created by a divine entity, often citing scriptural accounts (e.g., Genesis). This perspective posits that the universe, life and humanity were intentionally designed and created. Creationist views encompass various forms, including young earth creationism, intelligent design and theistic evolution. The disagreement between evolutionary and creationist views has significant implications for: cosmological understanding, origins of life and humanity, purpose and meaning, science-religion relations and educational curricula. Efforts to reconcile these perspectives include: theistic evolution, intelligent design, multi-faith, dialogue and science-religion integration. This study concludes that primordial disagreement between evolutionary and creationist views on cosmology underscores fundamental tensions between scientific inquiry and religious conviction. Understanding these perspectives and their implications is crucial for fostering informed dialogue, promoting mutual respect, and exploring the complex intersections of science, philosophy, and faith.*

**Keywords:** Primordial, Disagreement, Evolutionist, Creationist, Views, Cosmology.

### **Introduction**

The origins of the universe and life have captivated human imagination since ancient times. Two fundamental perspectives have emerged: evolutionism and creationism. This primordial disagreement has sparked

intense debate, fueling discussions across science, philosophy, and theology. Evolutionists propose that the universe and life arose through natural processes, governed by laws of physics and chemistry. Charles Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection forms the cornerstone of this perspective. Evolutionists contend that cosmic evolution, stellar formation, and biological diversification unfolded over billions of years. Creationists, on the other hand, assert that the universe and life were created by a divine being or supernatural force. This view posits that the complexity and order in the universe cannot be explained by natural processes alone. Creationists often cite biblical accounts or other sacred texts as the foundation for their beliefs.

Science is a particular way of knowing about the world. In science, explanations are limited to those based on observations and experiments that can be substantiated by other scientists. Explanations that cannot be based on empirical evidence are not a part of science. In the quest for understanding, science involves a great deal of careful observation that eventually produces an elaborate written description of the natural world. The theory of evolution is one of these well-established explanations. An enormous amount of scientific investigation since the mid-19th century has converted early ideas about evolution proposed by Darwin and others into a strong and well-supported theory. Today, evolution is an extremely active field of research, with an abundance of new discoveries that are continually increasing our understanding of how evolution occurs.

According to Darwin (1859), evolutionists propose that life originated and diversified through natural processes, primarily through Charles Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection. Key concepts of evolutionary theory include according to the following scholars: Dawkins (1986) informed the concept of gradualism which means species change over time through incremental adaptations. Mayr (1991) also opined natural selection which means favorable traits increase survival and reproductive success. Cracraft and Donoghue (2004) in their opinion of the key concept in evolutionary theory said it is common descent, which means all life shares a common ancestor.

Creationists argue life was divinely created by Almighty God, they cite Genesis 1:1-31. According to Behe (1996), this perspective asserts species were created separately, remaining unchanged. Johnson, (1991) opined that intelligent design and biblical account underpin creationism. The

evolutionist-creationist debate rages on, with two starkly different views on life's origins and diversity. Evolutionists stress natural selection and gradual change, while creationists champion divine creation. Amidst the divide, reconciliation efforts strive to merge scientific and spiritual perspectives, seeking common ground between nature and divine design.

Creationism or Intelligent Design is the belief that life and the universe were created by a supernatural being (an 'Intelligent Designer'), an omnipotent, benevolent God. Evolution, on the other hand, is the process by which different kinds of living organisms developed and diversified from earlier forms during the history of the Earth. Richard Dawkins an Evolutionary Biologist in Dawkins (2009) said, the theory of evolution is not just a scientific theory, but a scientific fact, supported by overwhelming evidence from multiple fields of study. (p. 115). Sequel to that, William Dembski Mathematician and Intelligent Design Proponent in Dembski (1998) said, intelligent design is not just a negative critique of evolution, but a positive case for the detection of design in the natural world. (p. 23). Francis Collins Geneticist and Theistic Evolutionist in Collins (2006) opined, "Evolution is not incompatible with faith. In fact, evolution can be seen as an elegant and beautiful mechanism for creating diversity and complexity in the natural world" (p. 143). Michael Behe, Biochemist and Intelligent Design Proponent in Behe (1996) said, "The complexity and irreducible complexity of biological systems cannot be explained by natural selection alone, and require the intervention of an intelligent designer" (p. 39). Evolution maintains that life on earth evolved from one universal common ancestor about 3.8 billion years ago. Intelligent design a proponent theory to creationism maintains that life and universe created by a supernatural being.

### **Conceptual Clarifications**

Conceptual clarification is the process of defining, analyzing, and distinguishing between related ideas, concepts, or terms to remove ambiguity and confusion, establish clear meanings, identify relationships, distinctions, facilitate understanding and communication. It involves defining key terms, identifying assumptions, distinguishing between similar concepts, recognizing nuances and subtleties. Conceptual clarification helps improve communication, enhance critical thinking, resolve misunderstandings and foster deeper understanding. It applies to various fields, including Religion, philosophy, science, ethics, and

everyday life. Therefore in following are the keywords as contained in the title of the research topic; primordial, disagreement, evolutionist, creationist, views, cosmology.

### **Primordial**

Primordial refers to the earliest or most fundamental aspect of something, often relating to its origin, nature, or essential characteristics. Primordial denotes the initial or primitive state of being, existing from the beginning, or inherent in the nature of something. Scholarly perspectives include; Oxford English Dictionary (2019): Primordial originates from Latin *primordialis*, meaning 'first-born' or 'original'. According to Jung (1968), "The primordial image... represents the collective unconscious" (p. 342). For Eliade (1957), primordial time refers to the mythical era of creation. "The primordial universe" describes the earliest moments after the Big Bang Hawking (2005, p. 14). Neumann (1954) defined primordial man as the symbol of humanity's earliest psychological and cultural stages. Primordial refers to the original, fundamental, or innate condition of existence, characterized by being present from the inception, inherently embedded, or naturally occurring, often describing the earliest stages, essential qualities, or intrinsic properties of something.

### **Disagreement**

Disagreements refer to conflicts or differences in opinion, belief, or perspective between individuals or groups, often resulting from divergent values, interests, or interpretations. Disagreements involve a clash of views, ideas, or understandings, potentially leading to debate, contention, or conflict. Scholarly perspectives include the opinion of the following scholars; according to James (1907): "Disagreements are essential to intellectual progress." (p.45). Heidegger (1959,): "Disagreement... reveals the depth of our understanding." (p.78). According to Kuhn (1962), "Scientific disagreements often reflect paradigmatic differences" (p. 147). Disagreements occur when differing views, ideas, or perspectives collide, sparking debate, tension, or conflict, often requiring resolution through dialogue, compromise, or reconciliation.

## **Evolutionist**

An evolutionist is a scientist, theorist, or advocate who supports the theory of evolution, proposing that species change and diversify over time through natural processes such as mutation, selection, and genetic drift. Scholarly perspectives: Darwin (1859), “Evolutionists consider the species as descended from a common ancestor” (p. 459). Gould (2002) “Evolutionists explain diversity through variation and adaptation” (p. 15). Dawkins (2009), Evolutionists see the universe as governed by laws, not chance” (p. 15). Mayr (1991), “Evolutionists recognize the central role of natural selection” (p. 32). Eldredge (1985): “Evolutionists seek to understand the patterns and processes of life's history”. (p.119). Evolutionists propose that all species share a shared heritage, tracing their lineage back to a single common ancestor, from which diverse life forms have emerged through gradual changes, adaptations, and natural processes over millions of years.

## **Creationist**

A creationist is an individual who believes that the universe, life, and humanity were created by a supernatural being or divine force, often based on religious or scriptural accounts. Scholarly perspectives include the views of the following scholars; according to Morris (1974), “Creationism affirms the divine origin of life and the universe” (p. 12). Ham (2011) said, “Creationists believe God created the world as described in Genesis” (p. 15). Lennox (2011) opined, “Creationism is consistent with scientific evidence and biblical teaching” (p. 20). Numbers (2006), “Creationists reject evolutionary theory, citing divine intervention” (p. 5). Collins (2006) said, “Theistic creationists see God guiding evolutionary processes” (p. 143). Creationism posits that life and the universe originate from a supernatural or divine source, asserting an intentional, purpose-driven creation rather than random or natural processes, often rooted in religious or spiritual beliefs and scripture.

## **Views**

A view is a perspective, opinion, or attitude formed through personal experience, knowledge, or interpretation. Scholarly perspectives on the view are as follow; according to Russell (1926): "A view is a mental construct, a way of organizing experience." (p. 23). In the words of Heidegger (1959), "A view reveals our understanding of the world, things and events." (paraphrased) (p. 147).A view is a personalized framework

that interprets and structures our experiences, shaping our perceptions, understanding, and interpretation of reality.

## **Cosmology**

Cosmology is the scientific study of the origin, evolution, and fate of the universe, encompassing its structure, composition, and governing laws. Scholarly perspectives on the term cosmology are as follow; according to Hawking (2005), "Cosmology seeks to answer the ultimate questions like where did the universe come from, and where is it going?" (p. 12). Greene (2004,) said, "Cosmology explores the universe's grandest scales, from the Big Bang to the expansion of space itself." (p. 15). Cosmology explores the universe's beginnings, transformation, and ultimate destiny through scientific inquiry, examining its origins, development, and future trajectory.

## **The Complexities of Evolutionary Theory**

There are challenges that evolutionary theory is facing that has placed it at the unjustified state and made it unacceptable to creationism proponents. The problems of evolutionary theory can be broadly categorized into several areas, with scholars' views as follow:

### **1. Origin of Life**

Problem of explaining how the first living cells emerged. The origin of life puzzle, explaining the spontaneous generation of primordial cells, bridging non-living matter to life, remains a profound scientific challenge, necessitating interdisciplinary approaches to unravel the complex interplay of chemical, physical, and biological processes." According to Crick (1981), "The origin of life remains one of the greatest unsolved puzzles of modern science. (p.153). Life's genesis remains modern science's enduring enigma, with the transition from non-living matter to life's emergence still shrouded in mystery and sparking intense scientific inquiry."

### **2. Irreducible Complexity**

Evolution's complexity dilemma, the emergence of intricate biological systems, such as eyes, wings, and brains, poses significant explanatory challenges due to their irreducible complexity, necessitating nuanced theories that reconcile gradualism with saltational events and multifaceted selection pressures. Problem of difficulty in explaining complex structures'

evolution. According to Behe (1996), "The complexity of biological systems challenges the gradualists' view of evolution." (p.39). Biological complexity defies gradualistic evolution, as intricate systems and organs resist reduction to incremental adaptations, sparking debates on saltational events and non-linear evolutionary processes.

### **3. Gradualism vs. Punctuated Equilibrium**

The tempo of evolution debate, scientists contest the pace of change, with gradualists advocating steady, continuous transformation and punctualists proposing rapid, episodic events, highlighting tensions between phyletic gradualism and punctuated equilibrium. Problem of debate over the pace of evolutionary change. According to Eldredge (1985), "Punctuated equilibrium challenges the traditional view of gradual evolution." (p.145). Punctuated equilibrium disputes gradual evolution, proposing rapid species transformation and long stability periods, contradicting phyletic gradualism's steady, continuous change."

### **4. Species Concept**

The species boundary problem: Taxonomists struggle to delineate distinct species owing to ambiguous morphological and genetic differences, hybridization, and cryptic diversity, underscoring the need for integrative approaches to clarify species limits. Mayr (1991), "The species concept remains a contentious issue in evolutionary biology." (p.23). The species concept conundrum: Evolutionary biologists grapple with defining and delineating species due to inconsistent criteria, genetic variability, and phenotypic flexibility, highlighting tensions between phylogenetic, biological, and morphological species concepts.

### **5. Evolutionary Mechanisms**

Unraveling evolutionary mechanisms: Researchers struggle to quantify the interplay between natural selection, genetic drift, mutation, and gene flow, complicating our understanding of adaptation, speciation, and evolutionary trajectories, and fueling debates on deterministic versus stochastic forces. Problem of understanding the relative importance of natural selection, genetic drift, and other mechanisms. Gould (2002), "The role of genetic drift in evolution is still debated among scientists."(p.644). Genetic drift's role in evolution sparks debate: Researchers argue over its relative importance, considering neutral and nearly neutral theories, adaptive

explanations, and empirical evidence from population genetics, phylogenomic, and comparative genomics."

## **6. Fossil Record Gaps**

The fossil record's transitional form deficiency sparks controversy: Incomplete evidence for gradual evolution challenges phylogenetic reconstruction, fueling debates on punctuated equilibrium, saltational evolution, and the role of soft-bodied organisms in evolutionary history." Problem of incomplete fossil evidence for transitional forms. According to Patterson (1999), "The fossil record's gaps remain a challenge to evolutionary theory." (p.105). The fossil record's incomplete transitions and missing links challenge evolutionary theory, sparking controversy over gradualism, punctuated equilibrium, and saltational evolution, while phylogenetic inference and molecular evidence provide complementary insights.

## **7. Molecular Clock Discrepancies**

Molecular evolution rate inconsistencies spark debate: Variable mutation rates, heterogeneous substitution patterns, and conflicting phylogenetic signals obstruct precise evolutionary reconstructions, underscoring the need for integrated analyses of molecular, fossil, and morphological data. Problem of inconsistencies in molecular evolution rates. According to Nei (2013), "Molecular clock discrepancies question the neutrality of molecular evolution." (p.287). Molecular clock inconsistencies undermine neutral evolution's assumptions. Heterogeneous rates, selective forces, and functional biases indicate non-neutral processes, prompting reevaluation of molecular evolution's mechanisms, clock calibrations, and phylogenetic reconstructions.

## **8. Developmental Biology**

Unraveling developmental evolution: Researchers face challenges in understanding how developmental processes, gene regulatory networks, and morphogenetic mechanisms evolve, interact, and respond to selection, highlighting tensions between developmental constraint and evolutionary innovation." Problem of understanding how developmental processes evolve. According to Hall (2011), "Evolutionary developmental biology seeks to explain the origins of body plans." (p.12). "Evolutionary

developmental biology (evo-devo) uncovers the evolution of body plans, integrating developmental genetics, comparative embryology, and phylogenetic to understand morphological diversification, developmental constraint, and innovation in animal and plant architectures.

### **9. Evolution of Complex Traits**

Complexity's origins puzzle: Researchers face challenges explaining emergence of complex traits, like sensory organs, appendages, and cognitive systems, fueling debates on gradual evolution, macromutation, and self-organized criticality in biological systems. Problem of explaining the emergence of complex features. According to Futuyma (2013), "Complex traits evolve through multiple genetic and environmental interactions." (p.345). Complex trait evolution: Multifaceted interactions among genetic, environmental, and epigenetic factors, including polygenic inheritance, pleiotropy, and epistasis, underscore the dynamic and non-linear nature of trait development, defying reductionist explanations.

### **10. Co-evolution**

Studying co-evolution which is investigating reciprocal evolutionary interactions between species, including arms races, red queen dynamics, and mutualistic feedback loops, requires integrating ecology, evolutionary biology, and network theory to grasp adaptation, selection, and emergent ecosystem properties. Problem which is studying the evolution of interacting species. According to Thompson (2005), "Co-evolution shapes the evolution of species interactions."(p.17). Co-evolutionary forces reshape species interactions: Mutual adaptive responses between organisms influence trait evolution, community structure, and ecosystem functioning, illustrating the dynamic interplay between species and their environment, and underscoring coevolution's role in shaping biodiversity."

### **The Complexities of Creationism Theory**

According to Numbers (2006), Creationism theory encompasses diverse perspectives, including young-earth, old-earth, and intelligent design, each addressing complexities of origins, evolution, and divine intervention (p.12). Debates surrounding scriptural interpretation, scientific evidence, and philosophical frameworks underscore the multifaceted nature of creationism, challenging simplistic definitions and binary oppositions.

## **Criticisms and Controversies**

The fundamental issue with creationism as claimed by evolutionists is its deficiency in empirical evidence and predictive power. Creationism: Lacks tangible proof, fails to provide testable predictions, relies on unverifiable claims, contradicts scientific observations, ignores natural laws, hinders critical thinking and undermines scientific progress. Empirical evidence and predictive capability are essential for valid scientific theories which is not the method of creationists. According to Dawkins (2006) said that the problem of creationism is, lack of empirical evidence, creationism fails to provide testable prediction. (p.157). According to National Academy of Sciences (2008), inconsistencies with scientific theories, creationism contradicts established scientific theories. (, p. 12). According to Kitcher (1982), creationism is criticized for its, methodological flaws, creationism relies on unscientific methods. Creationism faces further criticism from evolutionists for: methodological flaws, unscientific approaches, lack of empirical rigor, reliance on scripture over data, anecdotal evidence, cherry-picked data, unfalsifiable claims, ignoring peer review, disregarding scientific consensus, inconsistent logic. Evolutionists continued to argue that, creationism's unscientific methods undermine its credibility, distinguishing it from evidence-based scientific theories.

## **Creationism's Impact on Education and Society**

According to National Center for Science Education (2019), "Teaching creationism undermines science education" (p. 12). Also as Numbers (2006) opined, "Creationism influences social and moral values" (p. 145). AAAS (2014) informed that creationism disrupts scientific literacy. According to Forrest and Gross (2004), "Creationism shapes public policy" (p. 102). Shibley (2016), "Creationism impacts environmental attitudes" (p. 67).

## **Reconciliation Attempts between Creationism and Evolutionism**

Some scholars propose reconciliation between evolution and creationism.

### **Theistic Evolution**

The first attempt of some scholars to propose reconciliation between evolutionism and creationism is theistic evolution. Theistic evolution, also known as evolutionary creationism, is a perspective that seeks to reconcile

Christian theology with scientific findings on evolution. It posits that God created the universe and life through the process of evolution. Key tenets are as follow: God is the creator of the universe, evolution is a natural process guided by God, science and faith are complementary, not contradictory and biblical accounts of creation are interpreted symbolically or metaphorically.

There is a list of scholars supporting Theistic Evolution from different fields of human endeavours are as follow; Creationism evolutionists viewed evolution as God's method for creation. Evolution, as scientifically understood, harmonizes with biblical teachings, revealing God's creative process. Scripture and science together illuminate humanity's origin and purpose. Theistic evolution integrates faith and reason, affirming God's sovereignty and the complexity of creation. To this concept, Collins (2006) argues that "evolution is fully compatible with biblical teachings" (p.143) Furthermore, Collins (2006) maintained that, "God's existence is not contradicted by scientific discoveries" (p.201). Scientific advancements affirm, rather than contradict, God's existence. The intricate complexity of the universe, fine-tuned laws, and emergence of life suggest divine design. Theistic evolution reconciles faith and science, revealing God's creative power and wisdom.

Faith and science converge as interconnected paths to truth. Science illuminates God's creation, while faith reveals its purpose. Theistic evolution integrates reason and reverence, demonstrating harmony between scientific inquiry and spiritual insight. According to Falk (2012), theistic evolution contends that "science and faith are not enemies, but complementary ways of understanding" (p. 123). Falk (2012) furthers to contend that "evolution is a natural process" (p.180). Evolution unfolds as a natural, God-ordained process, shaping life's diversity. Scientific evidence and biblical teachings converge, revealing creation's intricate complexity and divine design. Theistic evolution celebrates God's sovereignty and science's discoveries

To this view of scholars on theistic evolution, Wright (2013) opines a sharp counter view in his book, *New Testament perspective on creation* as follow; "the Bible is not a scientific textbook" (p.256). The Bible, a sacred narrative, reveals spiritual truths and God's relationship with humanity. It's not a scientific textbook, but a theological foundation. Science and faith intersect, illuminating creation's wonders and divine purpose Wright (2013) continues to opine that, "God's creation is a story of redemption" (p.300).

According to Demoski (1998); intelligent design, complexity suggests intelligent design" (p.127). In the words of Haught, (2003), in theistic evolution, God guides evolutionary processes" (p.145). Furthermore, Biblical literalism, Morris, (1972), "Creation story is historically accurate" (p.23). God's creation unfolds as a redemptive narrative, weaving together cosmic purpose, human dignity, and salvation. Scripture reveals creation's original intent, tragic fall, and ultimate restoration through Christ, illuminating the divine plan.

According to McGrath (2010) in his research work, 'the science of God: An introduction to scientific theology said that theistic evolution is a scientific theology. Scientific theology integrates scientific inquiry with theological understanding, exploring the intersection of faith and reason. It seeks to harmonize biblical teachings with scientific discoveries, revealing God's nature, creation's complexity, and humanity's purpose. McGrath (2010) argues that "theology and science are interconnected" (p.145) Theology and science are intimately intertwined, each enriching the other. Scientific discoveries illuminate God's creation, while theological insights reveal its purpose and significance. This synergy fosters a deeper understanding of the divine, the universe, and humanity's place within it. McGrath (2010) further to argue that "God's existence is supported by scientific evidence" (p.220). Scientific discoveries affirm God's existence, revealing intricate design, cosmic fine-tuning, and life's emergence. Evidence from physics, biology, and cosmology such as the Big Bang and DNA's complexity point to a divine Creator

According to Polkinghorne (2005), in his research work, 'Science and creation: The search for understanding,' said that theistic evolution is, integration of science and faith. Science and creation converge in a quest for understanding. Theological and scientific perspectives intersect, revealing the intricacies of God's design. Exploring creation's complexity, scholars seek harmony between faith and reason, illuminating the divine plan. Polkinghorne (2005) contends that "science and faith are complementary" (p.87). Polkinghorne (2005) continue to argue that "God's creation is a complex process" (p.150). God's creation unfolds as a multifaceted, intricately woven process, integrating divine design, natural laws, and evolutionary mechanisms, revealing the majestic complexity of the universe.

## **Intelligent Design Evolution**

The second attempt of some scholars to propose reconciliation between evolutionism and creationism is intelligent design evolution. Intelligent Design Evolution: A Synthesis of Science and Faith. Intelligent Design (ID) evolution proposes that life's complexity and diversity result from a combination of natural processes and intelligent guidance. This perspective seeks to integrate scientific evidence with theological insights, bridging the gap between evolutionary theory and religious beliefs. Key principles include the opinions of the following scholars.

1. **Irreducible Complexity:** According to Behe (1996) opinion on irreducible complexity said, "Certain biological systems exhibit complexity that cannot be explained by gradual evolution alone" (p.39). Irreducible complexity proposes that certain biological systems or structures cannot function unless all components are present, challenging gradual evolution. Examples include; blood clotting cascade, bacterial flagellum, eye's lens and retina. These systems require multiple, synchronized parts to operate. Also, Behe (1996) a Biochemist and Intelligent Design Evolution proponent, arguing that "irreducible complexity points to intelligent design." (p.39). Irreducible complexity in biological systems, such as blood clotting and bacterial flagella, suggests intelligent design, as multiple interconnected parts imply purposeful creation

2. **Specified Complexity:** According to Dembski (1998) on specified complexity said, "Life's intricate structures and patterns suggest intelligent design." (p.127). also, Dembski (1998) Life's complex biological systems, precise molecular mechanisms, and interconnected patterns exhibit specified complexity, indicative of intelligent design (p.127). Examples include DNA's coded information, protein folding, and the fine-tuned universe, pointing to purposeful creation and a mastermind behind life's intricate architecture.

3. **Fine-Tuning:** According to Lennox (2011) on fine-tuning said, "The universe's physical constants are precisely calibrated for life's emergence." (p.145). The universe's fundamental physical constants, such as gravity and cosmological constants, are finely tuned to precise values, allowing life to emerge. This cosmic fine-tuning suggests intentional design, as minor variations would render life impossible, pointing to a designer's deliberate

creation. Lennox (2011) highlighted fine-tuning as evidence for intelligent design (p. 145). The universe's fine-tuning, where physical constants like gravity and cosmological constants are precisely calibrated, serves as compelling evidence for intelligent design. This precise balancing act suggests purposeful adjustment, pointing to a mastermind's deliberate creation, rather than random chance or natural necessity.

## **Conclusion**

Through examining the primordial disagreement between evolutionist and creationist perspectives, we gain a deeper appreciation for the complexities of existence and the enduring quest for answers to humanity's most fundamental questions. Navigating the Complexities of Creationism and Evolutionism. The debate on creationism and evolutionism has sparked intense discussion among scholars, scientists, and theologians for centuries. This research work synthesizes the primordial challenges and potential reconciliations between these two worldviews, drawing from prominent scholars' perspectives. Primordial challenges according to scholars include' According Falk (2012) who opine the concept of ontological disagreements which is creationism's supernatural explanation for life's origin conflicts with evolution's naturalistic mechanisms. (p. 123). According to McGrath (2010) opined, teleological divergence which is evolution's emphasis on random mutation and selection contrasts with creationism's purpose-driven design. (p. 145). According to Wright (2013) opined the concept of epistemological tensions which is creationism's reliance on scripture clashes with evolution's empirical evidence. (p. 256). The creationism-evolutionism debate is complex, with deeply entrenched perspectives. However, scholars' efforts to reconcile these views offer promising avenues for understanding. By acknowledging the compatibility of science and faith, embracing integrative approaches, and fostering dialogue, we can navigate the primordial challenges and illuminate the majestic tapestry of creation.

## References

- Behe, M. J. (1996). *Darwin's black box: The biochemical challenge to evolution*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Collins, F. S. (2006). *The language of God: A scientist presents evidence for belief*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Cracraft, J., & Donoghue, M. J. (2004). *Assembling the tree of life*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Crick, F. (1981). *Life itself: Its origin and nature*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Darwin, C. (1859). *On the origin of species*. London, England: John Murray.
- Dawkins, R. (1986). *The blind watchmaker: Why the evidence of evolution reveals a universe without design*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Dawkins, R. (2006). *The God delusion*. London, England: Penguin.
- Dawkins, R. (2009). *The greatest show on earth: The evidence for evolution*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Dembski, W. A. (1998). *The design inference: Eliminating chance through small probabilities*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Dennett, D. C. (1995). *Darwin's dangerous idea: Evolution and the meanings of life*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Eldredge, N. (1985). *Time frames: The rethinking of Darwinian evolution*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Eliade, M. (1957). *The sacred and the profane: The nature of religion*. New York, NY: Harcourt.
- Falk, D. R. (2012). *Coming to peace with science: Bridging the worlds between faith and biology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Forrest, B., & Gross, P. R. (2004). *Creationism's Trojan horse: The Wedge of Intelligent Design*. Oxford University Press.
- Futuyma, D. J. (2013). *Evolution*. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates.
- Gould, S. J. (2002). *The structure of evolutionary theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Greene, B. (2004). *The fabric of the cosmos: Space, time, and the texture of reality*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- Hall, B. K. (2011). *Evolutionary developmental biology*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Ham, K. (2011). *The answers book*. Hebron, KY: Answers in Genesis.
- Haight, J. F. (2003). *Defying creationism: Creationism, intelligent design, and the battle for science*. New York, NY: Chelsea House Publishers.

- Haight, J. F. (2010). *Making sense of evolution: Darwin, God, and the drama of life*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Hawking, S. (2005). *A brief history of time: From the big bang to black holes*. New York, NY: Bantam.
- Heidegger, M. (1959). *An introduction to metaphysics* (R. Manheim, Trans.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- James, W. (1907). *Pragmatism: A new name for some old ways of thinking*. New York, NY: Longmans.
- Jung, C. G. (1968). *Man and his symbols*. New York, NY: Dell.
- Kitcher, P. (1982). *Abusing science: The case against creationism*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lennox, J. C. (2011). *God and Stephen Hawking: Whose design is it anyway?* Oxford, England: Lion Hudson.
- Lennox, J. C. (2011). *God's undertaking: A future historian's perspective*. Oxford, England: Lion Hudson.
- Mayr, E. (1991). *One long argument: Charles Darwin and the genesis of modern evolutionary thought*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mayr, E. (2001). *What evolution is*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- McGrath, A. E. (2010). *The science of God: An introduction to scientific theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing.
- Miller, K. R. (2007). *Finding Darwin's God: A scientist's search for common ground between God and evolution*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Morris, H. (1974). *Scientific creationism*. San Diego, CA: Creation-Life Publishers.
- Morris, H. M. (1972). *The remarkable birth of planet Earth*. Wheaton, IL: Dimension Books.
- National Academy of Sciences. (2008). *Science, evolution, and creationism*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- National Center for Science Education. (2019). *Creationism and public schools*. Oakland, CA: National Center for Science Education.
- Nei, M. (2013). *Mutation-driven evolution*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

- Neumann, E. (1954). The origins and history of consciousness. New York, NY: Princeton University Press.
- Numbers, R. L. (2006). The creationists: From scientific creationism to intelligent design. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Oxford English Dictionary. (2019). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Patterson, C. (1999). Evolution. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Plantinga, A. (2011). Where the conflict really lies: Science, religion, and naturalism. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Polkinghorne, J. (1998). Science and theology: An introduction. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- Polkinghorne, J. (2005). Science and creation: The search for understanding. West Conshohocken, PA: Templeton Foundation Press.
- Prothero, D. R. (2007). Evolution: What the fossils say and why it matters. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Rees, M. (2000). Just six numbers: The deep forces that shape the universe. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Behe, M. J. (1996). Darwin's black box: The biochemical challenge to evolution. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Scott, E. C. (2004). Evolution vs. creationism: An introduction. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Shibley, M. A. (2016). The Creationist Movement and the Teaching of Evolution. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Thompson, J. N. (2005). The coevolving web of life. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Wallace, A. R. (1876). The geographical distribution of animals. London, England: Macmillan and Co.
- Wright, N. T. (2013). The New Testament and the people of God. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

*\*Christian Maduabuchi Umeanwe (PhD) is a Lecturer in Department of Religion and Human Relations, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.*

*E-mail: [cm.umeanwe@unizik.edu.ng](mailto:cm.umeanwe@unizik.edu.ng)*