

Conforming Under Pressure

According to a Gallop Poll conducted in 1991, only 9% of the general population in the United States of America believed the purely evolutionary model.ⁱ Feder's 1986 study at Connecticut State University in the USA showed that 18% of students attending an introductory course believed that God created the universe in six literal days, a view that he considers to be based on pseudoscience.ⁱⁱ



It is typical of evolutionary scientists to regard any alternative scientific approach to the study of origins—other than the evolutionary one—as pseudoscience. Even more amazing, in the light of the [theological barriers to compromise discussed before](#), is the fact that even religious organizations will conduct efforts to convince students to incorporate evolutionary principles into their religious thinking. One such effort was conducted at the University of Cape Town by Professor M. L. Anderson.ⁱⁱⁱ

This study was conducted on Zoology students, and the researchers were pleased to record an increase from 47% to 70% acceptance of evolutionary ideas from their first to their third year of study. Belief in six-day creationism declined from the first to the third year from 13% to 0%. It was concluded that knowledge of evolution brought about this change. Of course no counterarguments against evolution were ever presented.

In the light of this rather one-sided approach, it is not surprising that the students were persuaded to undergo paradigm shifts. Many students concluded that compromise theology was the only way to retain their religious convictions.



The Anderson study particularly singled out students who believe in a six-day Creation as students most likely to lose faith when confronted with lectures on evolution. A further study conducted by Fulljames (1991) on adolescent pupils showed that those who hold to a six-day creation had greater difficulty combining science and religion.^{iv}

The Anderson study consequently points out the absurdity of believing in a six-day creation in the light of the evolutionary evidence and concludes that all pastors should relent from attacking evolution. They should furthermore emphasize, that whilst the Scriptures teach that God is the Creator, it is open on the question of which natural processes He used in Creation. Theistic evolution is thus propagated as the means of retaining students in the faith whilst people believing in a literal Creation are categorized as largely illiterate.

Clearly the battle lines in the conflict between evolutionism and creationism are thus drawn between the six-day Creation view and the naturalistic view; the one advocating total faith in the Word of God and other excluding God.