

## **“Creation Super Highway”**

*presented by Gib Wood; Morse Church; 4/07*

Today we are going to explore Creation from both the scientific and theistic perspectives. Now this whole effort would take many, many weeks but I've cut it down to one simple, easy to use lesson. I call this talk the “Creation Super Highway”. It's kind of a take off on the “Information Super Highway”. I've used this silly metaphor of a super highway for several reasons, one is that I've found that most people, like me, or I should say, like I used to be, are on the “gravel on-ramp” to the creation super highway and don't really know much about this debate and many don't really care.

In Romans, (Romans 1:18-25) Paul said that only the foolish denied Creation and there was no excuse as it is “self-evident”. Now if someone had told me that 5 years ago, I would have dismissed Paul as being foolish. Because, to me, evolution was self-evident – man looks like ape, therefore, man must have evolved from apes. Besides, it was what we were taught in school so it had to be right. It was obvious to me, and only deluded, religious type could possibly believe in creation.

Now most of you here today know that I've seen the errors of my ways, not in spite of science but because of science. The scientific debate between creation and evolution is the reason I'm a Christian today! So, what I'm going to do today is give a brief explanation of each perspective, give the objections to each and then give you my opinion. Lastly, I'm going to explain why this debate is so important. (Show first slide)

As you can see from the chart above, there are four main theories as to how life began. Three of them have to do with a creator/or designer, and one denies the need for a creator. So you have on the right two lanes, Creation Science and Intelligent Design, and on the left lanes, theistic evolution and evolution. I'm going to let you in on a little secret, only one of these, in my opinion, is purely scientifically based and the others are tainted, to some degree, by religion with two manipulating science to fit their religion and one manipulating their religion to fit science. This may give it away but if you notice, the two cars in the right lane are heading in the correct direction, while the cars on the left are going the wrong way.

Ok, let's start with Creation Science. Most Creation Scientists believe in a literal translation of the first 11 chapters of Genesis and that the earth and the universe are approximately 6,000-8,000 years old based on the genealogies contained in the bible. They believe in a literal 6 days of creation. Further, they believe that most of the geological structures can be and are better explained by the worldwide flood that happened at the time of Noah. Now in case you think that people who hold this view are somehow incapable of intelligent thought, you may be surprised to learn that there many, many, highly intelligent, PhD level scientist hold to this argument and they have some very persuasive arguments. Brian's dad, himself a chemical engineer and former president of an oil company, viewed many of their arguments as more rational than those views held by mainstream scientist.

Next we have intelligent design. Many in the scientific community try to lump Intelligent Design into the category of "creation science". But it is distinct for a number of reasons, primarily as it is not an attempt to reconcile the bible to science. Essentially, Intelligent Design is a scientific study to detect design within the natural world, much like anthropologist try to detect human activity from natural activity or forensic scientists try detect a causal activity from random activity.

Further, ID holds that "certain features of the universe and living things are best explained by an intelligent cause rather than an undirected process such as natural selection".

Now let me back up for just a minute... There are three general types of scientists; 1<sup>st</sup> we have naturalists; they hold that everything must have a natural (or material) explanation regardless of the evidence. The vast majority of mainstream scientists today are naturalists. Second, we have Creation scientists, who hold that the Bible is the ultimate authority on Creation, and like naturalists, view science through their worldview. Lastly, we have Socratic scientists (taken from Plato's Socrates) who "follow the evidence where ever it leads" regardless of the implications. This last group is by far the fastest growing segment of the scientific community. And this is the segment that most ID proponents find themselves in.

Now let's move the left hand lanes. First we have theistic evolution, which essentially states the evolution is true but God designed the process.

And lastly, we have evolution, which states the life began by chance and that it evolved over time through random mutations and the process of natural selection. Today, technically, evolution is known as neo-Darwinian Theory or Synthesis due to scientific evidences, which have invalidated several aspects of Darwin's original Theory. For example, today we have the theory of "punctuated equilibrium" that attempts to explain the sudden influxes of life that appeared in the Cambrian era which go against Darwin's view of successive, gradual changes.

Now what are the objections to each one of these theories?

First, with Creation Science it is viewed as being biased. That it tries to manipulate science to fit a predetermined outcome. In addition, it is said to disregard well-established scientific data in order to arrive at its conclusion. Furthermore, many Christians say it harms evangelism because of that very fact. The argument goes that the Gospel is hard enough for non-believers to accept and it makes it even harder if they have to believe an esoteric scientific theory. Their argument goes on to state that you should not debate the age of the earth but emphasize the creation story contained in John 1:1-3: *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The Word was with God in the beginning. All things were created by him, and apart from him not one thing was created that has been created.*

With Intelligent Design, its critics say that it is not science because it is not falsifiable and therefore cannot be validated. And that it is just a new version of creation science but packaged better. That it is thinly veiled religion packaged as science because it implies a creator or heaven forbid, a god. Further, as ruled by a Pennsylvania judge, it is not science because most scientists say it is not science. I call this the "take your ball and go home" school of thought or "post modernism is a live and well in the scientific community".

Theistic Evolution. It's critics point out that it is a contradiction in terms. You cannot have a random process controlled by God. The very fact that God controls it, eliminates randomness and makes it a structured process. Further, they point out that theistic evolutionists like the Theory of Evolution, because they can manipulate their theology to fit science, because if man is evolving, then societies must be evolving and therefore, the gospel has to evolve to fit a changing mankind. Therefore, they can reshape the gospel to their image, instead of God's.

The critics of evolution attack it from several fronts. First they point out the evolution is really two theories instead of one monolithic theory. That it is really made up of microevolution and macroevolution. Microevolution is what Darwin proved and it is a scientific fact that species adapt and change within the species. And that Darwin erred by extrapolating microevolution into macroevolution, by saying that species adapt and change into new species. Further, they point out that in every scientific discipline the evidence for design far outweighs the evidence for evolution, that in fact there is no hard evidence for macroevolution, only soft or visual evidence i.e. man looks like ape, therefore, he must have evolved from apes. Lastly, they point out Darwinian scientists are by definition biased. That by stating that everything must have a natural explanation regardless of where the evidence leads, that they are being arbitrary. That they are setting up these arbitrary limits in order to prop up their own religion or worldview, which is naturalism (or another name for it is Ontological Materialism, which is that all things come from matter and that there is nothing else but matter or material.) Because of this, they give evolution a pass, scientifically, because it is the lynchpin of their belief system.

Ok, from here on out, I am going to give you my take on these differing views for the explanation of life.

First, I tend to agree with the critics of Creation Science. To me, the evidence for a young earth, while interesting is less convincing than evidence for an earth that is several billions years old. Further, I see nothing in the Bible that doesn't harmonize well with an older dating of the earth and universe. To me, the creation story is about who and why, not how. With that being said, what scientists now know about the beginning of the earth and universe line up amazing well with the cosmological events contained in Genesis. Further, the Hebrew word used for "day"-yom - can mean either a specific day as in "Yom Kippur" or an age as in an era. It all depends on the context. So each "age" lines up with the sequence of cosmological events that science now believes as factual. Additionally, the ancient Hebrews were the only ones who had their creation story correct, cosmologically.

I also agree that it makes it harder for non-believers to believe if creation science is used as an evangelical tool. I certainly don't have any qualms about talking about creation but saying the creation happened in 6 days, 6,000 years ago is a definite conversation stopper for most people. Even if I could be convinced that it was a valid argument, I would not mention it when talking to

unbelievers because of the implications and connotations of this argument.

I think you can probably see by now that I am a proponent of Intelligent Design. From my research, it is the only purely scientific discipline of those I've mentioned. Despite what its critics say, it is certainly falsifiable and offers far superior explanations for what we see in nature. For example, the skeletal structure of an antelope looks incredibly similar to that of a whale. Now, the evolutionist will say that it is obvious the antelope evolved from whale due to its similar skeletal structure. While there is absolutely no evidence other than this visual evidence, naturalist will completely disregard the obvious answer because it doesn't fit the prior commitment to naturalism. The answer that best explains this situation is that the designer of the whale and antelope used a common platform. It is a very simple and basic engineering principle that you don't re-engineer something that already works and serves the purpose it was designed for. If you look at a Ford Expedition next to a Ford F-150, do you think Ford completely re-engineered the Expedition? No, it's obvious that Ford used the F150 platform and modified it into the Expedition. 95% of the parts are shared, 5% are different. 95% of the genes of an ape are shared with man, 5% are different. Yet there isn't a evolutionist alive today that would suggest that the F-150 evolved by itself into Expedition, but that very same evolutionist will have you believe that an infinitely more complex machine, man, evolved from an ape despite all the evidence to the contrary. The more and more I study this, the more and more ludicrous their arguments become.

It has become obvious that the only reason Intelligent Design is being dismissed by the current powers-that-be within the scientific community is because it implies a creator. This is the same reason that the Big Bang took almost 40 years to gain acceptance because it implied a creator. But finally, the weight of scientific evidence was so overwhelming that it overcame the bigotry and dogma of naturalism.

As for the Theory of Evolution, its proponents are feeling the heat which is becoming obvious by their increasing hysteria as evidenced by Richard Dawkins, a professor of biology at Oxford, who said, (Slide) *"It is absolutely safe to say that if you meet somebody who claims not to believe in evolution, that person is either ignorant, stupid or insane (or wicked, but I'd rather not consider that)."* Now let's take a look at this comment. First, it is unbelievably arrogant as there are scientists of equal or greater intellectual status than Richard Dawkins who are not Christians that dispute evolution.

But more importantly, Dawkins' quote is completely disingenuous and uses a typical tactic taken by evolutionists. When he says if you don't believe in evolution your ignorant or stupid, he is using microevolution as proof for all of evolution which is the same mistake that Darwin made; although in Darwin's case it was unintentional. I as said earlier, microevolution is a fact but it is also what you would expect from a creator who, as it's now becoming obvious from probability studies, created the universe with the earth in mind. And the earth was created with first the lesser life in mind as infrastructure for higher beings with his ultimate creation being humans. So it is obvious, or should be, that the creatures designed to inhabit the earth would be able to adapt and change to the changing environments of earth, which were created for them. It's all part of God's design. Now that last part is my opinion based on the evidence and is certainly not a strictly scientific view but it is implied by the science.

Dawkins, as well as all leading evolutionists, know very well the problems with macroevolution but obfuscate them, because, as I alluded to earlier, the real reason that the theory of evolution is given a pass from a scientific perspective is because it is the lynchpin of their belief system. If you don't believe me, here is what Richard Lewontin, a well-known zoologist and supporter of evolution, has to say: (slide)

*We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, in spite of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, and in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so-stories, because we have a prior commitment, a commitment to materialism. It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our priori adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counterintuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is an absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door."*

- Richard Lewontin

(The implication is more important than the evidence!)

Now, here is a quote about a critic of evolution who is not a Christian. This quote is taken from

*Darwin's Black Box* a book by Michael Behe, Professor of microbiology at Lehigh. In his book he says the following: 'Lynn Margulis, Distinguished Professor of Biology at the University of Massachusetts... "says that history will ultimately judge neo-Darwinism as a minor 20<sup>th</sup> century religious sect...."' At one of her many talks she asks molecular biologists in the audience to name a single, unambiguous example of the formation of a new species by accumulation of mutations. Her challenge goes unmet.'

Just in case this is not enough for you, there is a list of 700 (and growing) ph.d. level scientists who are part of the "Dissent from Darwin" who have signed a statement that reads: (slide)

*"We are skeptical of claims for the ability of random mutation and natural selection to account for the complexity of life. Careful examination of the evidence for Darwinian theory should be encouraged."*

These scientists hale from the likes of Oxford, Yale, Princeton, Stanford, MIT, UC Berkley, UCLA and others. And many are leaders in their fields.

Isn't it ironic that Kansas is viewed by the national press and the establishment scientific community, as an educational backwater because the State School Board wants to simply "allow an examination" of the Theory of Evolution. The truth is that Kansas is on the cutting edge of education. Twenty to thirty years from now (hopefully sooner), Darwinism will be taught in the history books. Yet these modern day "flat earthers" are indoctrinating our children into the religion of materialism.

And that, my friends, leads me to Theistic Evolution.

Theistic Evolution is and always has been a complete cop-out.

From the very start it was a way of conforming to the intellectual world. It started in the late 1800's and the early 1900's when theologians in the great Christian universities first in Europe and then in America, succumbed to their secular intellectual peers and accepted evolution but said that God did it.

As its critics point out, it is an oxymoron; something cannot be random if guided by God. Yet today most will say that initial creative act was done by God, but, despite the evidence against macroevolution, that we evolved by chance but at a point when we “were ready” God infused us with a soul and that we continue to evolve today. Now most lay people and theologians have not study the evidence for evolution nor have not thought through the implications of aliening themselves with what I consider the biggest false teaching that has ever been perpetrated on mankind.

From the start, the sole purpose of evolution was to lead people away from God. During Darwin’s time, the Age of Enlightenment, the western world was coming out of a repressive time in the church, and naturalist were looking for an explanation of life apart from God so as to free themselves from the Church and usher in a new age of science. This was about the time that science was redefined to accepting only naturalistic explanations. Prior to this, it did not have this arbitrary limitation.

Now, the implications of this are very profound. If there is no God then there is no absolute moral authority and no objective truth. Some of you will recognize this as the precursor of Post Modern thinking. But the implications are much larger. Most of the evils perpetrated on the world, since the time of Darwin’s Theory, have their roots or are enabled or perpetuated by the theory of evolution. In Hitler’s book, Mein Kampf, he lays the groundwork for genocide when says: (slide)

*“If nature does not wish that weaker individuals should mate with the stronger, she wishes even less that a superior race should intermingle with an inferior one; because in such cases all her efforts, throughout hundreds of thousands of years, to establish an evolutionary higher stage of being, may thus be rendered futile”.*

Hitler explains it very well, that the logical outgrowth of evolution is racism and genocide.

In case you think Hitler was a lone case, the modern day abortion movement was started by Margaret Sanger, a staunch evolutionist who wrote concerning the immigrants and the poor as; *‘human weeds’, ‘reckless breeders’, ‘spawning human beings who never should have been born’*. And she said this about blacks; *“We do not want the word to go out that we want to exterminate the Negro population, if it ever occurs to their more rebellious members.”* She, along with

Hitler, was a proponent and leader in the eugenics movement in which she exhorted Americans to “restrict the propagation of those physically, mentally and socially inadequate” in order to breed a better class of humans.

Oh, by the way, she was also the founder of Planned Parenthood.

In case you think these two are aberrations, let me ask you what is the greatest cause of human suffering and death in the world aside from nature? Now don't answer that, let me. The secular world will tell you its religion. As our friend Richard Dawkins said, *“I think a case can be made that faith is one of the world's great evils, comparable to the smallpox virus but harder to eradicate”*. People like Dawkins will always trot out the Crusades and the Inquisition in trying show the evils of religion but fail to recognize that secular regimes have murdered more people in the twentieth century than all “so-called” religious atrocities in the last 6,000 years combined. They are a drop in the bucket compared to Pol Pot alone who killed 2 million of his citizens in the killing fields of Cambodia. But it doesn't stop there...Stalin killed 30 million, and Mao 65 million of his fellow Chinese! And what do they have in common? All were leaders of secular regimes and atheist. This doesn't even include Hitler, as an atheist, killed 6 million Jews. All of them used The Theory of evolution to rationalize their secularism or atheism.

At this point I would like to ask your forgiveness. As an atheist for the first 40 years of my life, I would like to apologize to you for being a part of this. I hope you'll accept my apology.

So, now I ask myself, why in the world would Christians align themselves with evolution?!

Well, as I mentioned earlier, most (like I used to be) haven't objectively studied the evidence and the implications of evolution. And this is the vast majority of mainline Christians.

Secondly, some have and still will align themselves with evolution because it fits their religious worldview. As I said earlier, if evolution is true, then man must be evolving and therefore, religion must evolve to better serve a changing mankind. There is a group of so-called theologians known as the Jesus Seminar. These are ultraliberal theologians who deny the miracles and the resurrection of Jesus, and are all theistic evolutionists. In what sense they are Christians, I can't fully grasp, but these are the folks you'll always see trotted out on national TV, the likes John

Dominic Crossan and my favorite, Bishop John Shelby Spong, a former zoology professor and now an Episcopalian bishop who wrote the book, “Why Christianity must change or die”. Does anyone see the irony in this? The once great Episcopalian denomination is now on the brink of extinction because of the very policies written about by Bishop Spong. For this group, evolution allows them the freedom to reshape God, the Bible and Jesus in their image and not like their “less educated” brethren who believe they were created in the image of God.

There is one last group that can fall into both camps above. Some Christians align themselves with evolution in order to distance themselves from their more fundamental brothers and sisters who believe in Creation Science. Essentially, they are embarrassed by this group and see them as their crazy uncle that they would prefer to commit than to deal with. As for me, while I might not agree with creation science, I nonetheless would never question their commitment to God, Jesus and the truth of the Gospels. And to align yourself with false teaching just to feel good about your intellect just isn't right. Didn't Jesus say, *“If you're embarrassed of Me, I'll be embarrassed of you?”* And wasn't it God who said through the prophet Isaiah, *“Woe to those who call evil, good and good, evil!”*

Ok, let's rap this up.

Here's why this debate is so important.

First, since the advent of evolution and theistic evolution, the church has steadily declined to the point where it is almost non-existent in Europe the birthplace of evolution and theistic evolution. The reason for this is that evolution is taught as a more rational explanation for life than God, that you don't have to have faith in anything but nature, which is around you all day. Theistic evolution, while an attempt to co-opt evolution and the intellectual debate, only fosters doubt and doesn't alleviate it. Here again, evolution appears to be a more rational explanation and theistic evolution as a gimmick designed to dupe the unsuspecting.

Secondly, your children are being indoctrinated into a secular worldview under the guise of intellectual integrity. The Theory of Evolution is being taught as a fact, a fact that is not lost on your kids. Your kids know the implications. That's why I turned from God and most the people I know turned from God because religion was irrelevant to them because it was viewed as a myth

and a crutch for the weak.

Lastly, most the people who don't believe in God do not believe in creation. It is the single most important aspect of faith, more important than the Bible and more important than Jesus. If someone doesn't believe in creation, it is impossible to believe in the saving grace of Jesus! *"In the beginning God created the heavens and earth!"*

Let me give you another example of this other than myself. Antony Flew is one the preeminent atheist of the last ½ century. He has written more books on atheism than almost any other writer on the topic. But recently, he made an announcement that stunned the atheist community. He announced that he concluded that some sort of intelligence must have created the universe. In talking about biologists' investigation of DNA, he said this investigation *"has shown, by the almost unbelievable complexity of the arrangements which are needed to produce [life], that intelligence must have been involved. Has science discovered God?"* Now, he is certainly not a Christian, yet, but he has started his journey because of science not in spite of it. This illustrates the importance of this issue in terms of evangelism and leading people to the truth of Creation, God and ultimately the saving grace of Christ Jesus.

Now you can do with this teaching as you see fit. I'm not going to tell you have to go out and read books and study. But you have to decide for yourself if this is as important as I think it is and if you do decide that and want some suggestions, Bryan will be sending out an email with links to a bibliography. For those of you who think I'm full of it, I encourage you to prove me wrong, please, please, please. Because I know, if you have an open mind, where it will lead.

Let me finish with a quote from Paul that explains that this is not a new issue but one that must be constantly confronted and explains why the world is the way it is. In Romans 1-25 he says, *"They exchanged the Truth of God for a lie and worshiped and served created things rather than the Creator..... Amen"*.