

**Alderwood Community Church**  
**February 12, 2012**

**Creation or Evolution? (Part One)**  
 Genesis 1:1; 1 Peter 3:15

**Intro:** Creation or Evolution that is the question! Volumes of books have been written on the subject and I have read parts of many of them the last several weeks. Because of the complexity of the issues, and the ramifications of one's view, emotions tend to run very high, combined these have contributed to many heated, sarcastic and disrespectful debates between Christians and Evolutionists and even between Christians.

I know there are some of my brothers and sisters here at Alderwood who come from a science background, and some who work in scientific fields and even teach science in school who wrestle with the integration of a number of scientific theories and their faith.

I know there are Jesus loving, Bible believing Christians who believe that God created the heavens and the earth and hold to a very old earth of millions and perhaps billions of years old. (And, by the way, in two weeks we will study various views Christians take to support their view on the age of the earth.)

I know there are a large number of believers who believe that God created the earth in 6- literal days and that this world is young (only thousands of year old). I personally, along with Pastor Fred and Tim hold to a 6-day literal creation and a young earth.

But...Let me be crystal clear, one's view of the date of creation should not be the litmus test of fellowship. It is not the litmus test to attend or to become a member or to be in leadership at Alderwood Community Church... I want us to step back and give careful consideration to the subject of creation.

My goal for my message this morning is threefold: (1) to dismantle false notions. (2) to challenge you to diligently pursue a greater knowledge of the Christian faith in general and of Creation in particular. (3) to give you greater confidence in order to stimulate healthy and respectful dialog on this subject.

**Big Idea:** God's Word instructs us to know what we believe and why we believe it!

**Read Text:** *"But in your hearts set apart Christ as Lord. Always be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have. But do this with gentleness and respect..." 1 Peter 3:15*

According to the Scriptures, creation (the heavens and the earth and everything in them) is a gift from a loving Creator God. From the bodies we inhabit, the air we breathe, the sun we bask in, the food we eat, the flowers we pick, the water we drink, the ground we walk upon, and the pets we love, to the pleasures we enjoy and destinations we visit on vacation, life is filled with good gifts for us to steward and enjoy.

## Why do we believe this?

1. We believe the Bible is the inerrant Word of God. (No mistakes)
2. The Bible clearly teaches us that God created all the physical universe for man's good and God's own glory. (Gen. 1, James 1:17, Col. 1:16-17)

God created the universe out of *nothing*. He spoke it into existence by His Word. In fact, one of the unique features of the creation account in Genesis is a repeated stress on divine creation by fiat—meaning that a simple decree from God brought the created thing into being. “*And God said, ‘Let there be...and there was...’*” (Light, land, water, vegetation, Sun, moon and stars, living creatures and man)

Our church's article of faith states our view of Creation: Man was directly and instantly created by God at the time of Creation. Man was created in God's image (Genesis 1:26-27; Colossians 1:16; James 3:9)

As Pastor Fred said two weeks ago, Genesis is a historical narrative and is to be read in its normal and literal sense. Adam and Eve are treated throughout Scripture as real people and the worldwide flood during the days of Noah was an historical event of God's judgment on the earth.

3. We accept this by faith.

*“By faith we understand that the universe was formed at God's command, so that what is seen was not made out of what was visible.”* Hebrews 11:3

4. We believe that every part of the physical universe that we live in has the ‘fingerprint of God’ giving abundant evidence that God is the intelligent designer and creator of all.

*“For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities – his eternal power and divine nature – have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse.”* Romans 1:20

### A. Every field of science points to God as creator.

- (1) The Evidence of Cosmology
  - (a) Whatever begins to exist has a cause.
  - (b) The universe had a beginning – virtually all cosmologists now agree that the universe began in the Big Bang at some point in the past.
  - (c) Therefore, the universe has a cause.
  - (d) British physicist Paul Davies, though not a professing Christian, says the big bang is ‘*the one place in the universe where there is room, even for the most hard-nosed materialist to admit God.*’

(2) The Evidence of Physics

One of the most striking discoveries of modern science has been that the laws and constants of physics unexpectedly conspire in an extraordinary way to make the universe habitable for life.

(3) The Evidence of Astronomy

*“If the universe has not been made with the most exacting precision we could never have come into existence.”* Said Harvard-educated astrophysicist John A. O’Keef of NASA. *“It is my view that these circumstances indicate the universe was created for man to live in.”*

(4) The Evidence of Biochemistry

Darwin said, *“If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down.”* Biochemist Michael Behe has demonstrated exactly that through his description of “irreducibly complex” molecular machines...”*My conclusion*”, said Behe, *“can be summed up in a single word: design. I say that based on science. I believe that irreducibly complex systems are strong evidence of a purposeful, intentional design by an intelligent agent.”* Behe’s argument has proven impervious to challenges by skeptics.

(5) The Evidence of Biological Information

The six-feet of DNA coiled inside every one of our body’s one hundred trillion cells contains a four-letter chemical alphabet that spells out precise assembly instructions for all the proteins from which our bodies are made. Cambridge-educated Stephen Meyer demonstrated that *“no hypothesis has come close to explaining how information got into biological matter by naturalistic means.”*

(6) The Evidence of Consciousness

Many scientists are concluding that the laws of chemistry and physics cannot explain our experience of consciousness. Professor J.P. Moreland states, *“You can’t get something from nothing.”* *If the universe began with dead matter having no consciousness, ‘how, then, do you get something totally different – consciousness, living, thinking, feeling, believing creatures – from materials that don’t have that?’* But if everything started with the mind of God, he said, *‘we don’t have a problem with explaining the origin of the mind.’* Darwinist philosopher Michael Ruse candidly conceded that *‘no one, certainly not the Darwinian as such, seems to have any answer’* to the consciousness issue.

(Strobel, Lee 2004 *The Case For The Creator* pgs. 279-283)

## **B. There is no conflict between Christianity and science.**

*“A little science estranges a man from God. A lot of science brings him back.”* Francis Bacon

Tragically, there has been much misreporting about the historical relationship between Christianity and science. Thus, I want to refute some powerful yet untrue myths that have caused some to wrongly see Christianity as suppressing the truth while science pursues it.

The first myth is that, prior to Christopher Columbus's first voyage; people thought the world was flat. The truth is that, more than eight hundred years before Columbus's voyage, Bede the church historian taught that the earth was round, as did Thomas Aquinas. Furthermore, Sacrobosco's book *De Sphaera*, written around 1231, was the standard manual for elementary astronomy until the Renaissance. That work described a spherical earth some two centuries before Columbus.

The second myth is that when Copernicus wrote that the earth revolved around the sun, his conclusions were a revolutionary, and previously untaught, concept. The truth is that Copernicus was taught the essential fundamentals leading to his model by his Scholastic professors, that is, Christian scholars who developed the model gradually over the previous two centuries.

The third myth is that the "scientific revolution" of the seventeenth century invented science as we know it because Christianity had lost the power to prevent it. The truth is that three hundred years before Newton, a Scholastic cleric named Jean Buridan anticipated Newton's first law of motion, that a body in motion will stay in motion unless otherwise impeded. It was Buridan, not an Enlightenment luminary, who first proposed that the earth turns on its axis. Furthermore, science flourished only in Europe, where the worldview was shaped by Christianity. Many civilizations had alchemy, yet only Christian-influenced Europe developed chemistry. Likewise, astrology was practiced everywhere, but only in Europe did it become astronomy. (Driscoll, M., & Breshears, G. (2010). *Doctrine: What Christians should believe*)

Christians should not, however, in any way abandon the sciences; instead, they should pursue them with great vigor and faith to learn more about God through what he has made as an act of worship to him.

### **C. There is a conflict between Christianity and atheistic naturalism.**

Theism is the belief that there is a transcendent God who created the universe, naturalism is the belief that natural causes alone are sufficient to explain everything that exists.

These two major systems are utterly opposed, and if we are going to defend the truth effectively, we must grasp their full implications. Naturalism is the idea that nature is all that exists, that life arose from a chance collision of atoms, evolving eventually into human life as we know it today. By contrast, Christianity teaches that there is a transcendent God who existed before the world existed and who is the ultimate origin of everything else. The universe is dependent at every moment on his providential governance and care."

Naturalistic scientists try to give the impression that they are fair-minded and objective, implying that religious people are subjective and biased in favor of their personal beliefs. But this is a ruse, for naturalism is as much a philosophy, a worldview, a personal belief system as any religion is.

Naturalism begins with the premises that cannot be tested empirically such as the assumption that nature is ‘*all that is or ever was or ever will be.*’ To use a line from the late Carl Sagan’s popular science program Cosmos. This is not a scientific statement, for there is no conceivable way it could be tested. It is a philosophy.

The Christian must be ready to separate genuine science from philosophy. Evolution, as it is typically presented in textbooks and museums, confuses the two, presenting as ‘science’ what is actually naturalistic philosophy. Many secular scientists insist that only naturalistic explanations qualify as science.

But why should we let secularists make the definitions? Let’s be clear on the distinction between empirical science and philosophy, and then let’s answer science with science and philosophy with philosophy.

The moment a Christian questions evolution, he or she is labeled a backwoods Bible-Thumper, an ignorant reactionary trying to halt the progress of science. Our task is to shatter that stereotype. We must convince people that the debate is not about the Bible versus science. The debate is about pursuing an unbiased examination of the scientific facts wherever they may lead. We must challenge the assumption that science by definition means naturalistic philosophy.

The real battle is worldview against worldview, religion against religion. And unless one is converted to the other’s religion, a Theist and a Naturalist will never see eye to eye! We have to expect this.

We can be confident! Creationists are not backwoods Bible thumpers, but the more I have been studying I am so pleased to see how many brilliant scientists who specialize in all of the sciences, upon whose research and shoulders we can stand have made significant discoveries and observations that point to our intelligent Creator, God Almighty.

Let me restate our key verse again:

*“But in your hearts set apart Christ as Lord. Always be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have. But do this with gentleness and respect...” 1 Peter 3:15*

### **What is involved in being prepared to give an answer?**

#### **1. Know what you believe.**

Chuck Colson in his book, *How Now Shall We live?* states that “*If Christians are going to carry this life-giving message to the world, we must first understand it and live it ourselves. We must understand that God’s revelation is the source of all truth, a comprehensive framework for all of reality.*”

*Our choices are shaped by what we believe is real and true, right and wrong, good and beautiful. Our choices are shaped by our worldview... A person's worldview is intensely practical.*

*Every worldview can be analyzed by the way it answers three basic questions: Where did we come from, and who are we (creation)? What has gone wrong with the world (fall)? And what can we do to fix it (redemption)?" (pgs. xi – 21)*

Our view of creation is the necessary starting point for our entire world-view. It is so vital an issue that Francis Schaeffer once remarked that if he had only an hour to spend with an unbeliever, he would spend the first 55 minutes talking about creation and what it means for humanity to bear the image of God—and then he would use the last 5 minutes to explain the way of salvation.

2. **Know why you believe it.** (Four things to consider in order to firmly know what and why we believe.)
  - A. **Examine the evidence**
  - B. **Think it through**
  - C. **Consider the implications of your view**
  - D. **Communicate your position with confidence, grace, gentleness and respect.**

(1) The Scriptures

*"Do your best to present yourself to God as one approved, a workman who does not need to be ashamed and who correctly handles the word of truth." 2 Tim 2:15*

*(How to read the Bible for all its worth – by Gordon Fee and Douglas Stuart)*

(2) Creation (See Bibliography: *The Battle For The Beginning* – John MacArthur, *The New Answers Book* – Ken Ham)

(3) Evolution (The Scientific Case Against Evolution – Henry Morris)

Dr. Henry Morris of the Institute for Creation Research wrote an article entitled "The Scientific Case Against Evolution" and states, "Belief in evolution is a remarkable phenomenon. It is a belief passionately defended by the scientific establishment, despite the lack of any observable scientific evidence for macroevolution (that is, evolution from one distinct kind of organism into another). This odd situation is briefly documented here by citing recent statements from leading evolutionists admitting their lack of proof. These statements inadvertently show that evolution on any significant scale does not occur at present, and never happened in the past, and could never happen at all.

## **1. Evolution Is Not Happening Now**

First of all, the lack of a case for evolution is clear from the fact that no one has ever seen it happen. If it were a real process, evolution should still be occurring, and there should be many "transitional" forms that we could observe. What we see instead, of course, is an array of distinct

"kinds" of plants and animals with many varieties within each kind, but with very clear and -- apparently -- unbridgeable gaps between the kinds. That is, for example, there are many varieties of dogs and many varieties of cats, but no "dats" or "cogs." Such variation is often called microevolution, and these minor horizontal (or downward) changes occur fairly often, but such changes are not true "vertical" evolution.

Evolutionary geneticists have often experimented on fruit flies and other rapidly reproducing species to induce mutational changes hoping they would lead to new and better species, but these have all failed to accomplish their goal. No truly new species has ever been produced, let alone a new "basic kind."

A current leading evolutionist, Jeffrey Schwartz, professor of anthropology at the University of Pittsburgh, has recently acknowledged that:

*. . . it was and still is the case that, with the exception of Dobzhansky's claim about a new species of fruit fly, the formation of a new species, by any mechanism, has never been observed.<sup>1</sup>*  
One can never actually see evolution in action.

## **2. Evolution Never Happened in the Past**

Evolutionists commonly answer the above criticism by claiming that evolution goes too slowly for us to see it happening today. They used to claim that the real evidence for evolution was in the fossil record of the past, but the fact is that the billions of known fossils do not include a single unequivocal transitional form with transitional structures in the process of evolving.

Given that evolution, according to Darwin, was in a continual state of motion . . . it followed logically that the fossil record should be rife with examples of transitional forms leading from the less to the more evolved.<sup>3</sup>

Even those who believe in rapid evolution recognize that a considerable number of generations would be required for one distinct "kind" to evolve into another more complex kind. There ought, therefore, to be a considerable number of true transitional structures preserved in the fossils -- after all, there are billions of non-transitional structures there! But (with the exception of a few very doubtful creatures such as the controversial feathered dinosaurs and the alleged walking whales), they are not there.

The entire history of evolution from the evolution of life from non-life to the evolution of vertebrates from invertebrates to the evolution of man from the ape is strikingly devoid of intermediates: the links are all missing in the fossil record, just as they are in the present world.

With respect to the origin of life, a leading researcher in this field, Leslie Orgel, after noting that neither proteins nor nucleic acids could have arisen without the other, concludes:

*And so, at first glance, one might have to conclude that life could never, in fact, have originated by chemical means.<sup>5</sup>*

Being committed to total evolution as he is, Dr. Orgel cannot accept any such conclusion as that. Therefore, he speculates that RNA may have come first, but then he still has to admit that:

*The precise events giving rise to the RNA world remain unclear. . . . investigators have proposed many hypotheses, but evidence in favor of each of them is fragmentary at best.*<sup>6</sup>

Translation: "There is no known way by which life could have arisen naturalistically."

Other gaps are abundant, with no real transitional series anywhere. A very bitter opponent of creation science, paleontologist, Niles Eldredge, has acknowledged that *there is little, if any, evidence of evolutionary transitions in the fossil record. Instead, things remain the same!*

Even with DNA sequence data, we have no direct access to the processes of evolution, so objective reconstruction of the vanished past can be achieved only by creative imagination.<sup>14</sup>

Since there is no real scientific evidence that evolution is occurring at present or ever occurred in the past, it is reasonable to conclude that evolution is not a fact of science, as many claim. In fact, it is not even science at all, but an arbitrary system built upon faith in universal naturalism.

Creationists would obviously predict ubiquitous gaps between created kinds, though with many varieties capable of arising within each kind, in order to enable each basic kind to cope with changing environments without becoming extinct. Creationists also would anticipate that any "vertical changes" in organized complexity would be downward, since the Creator (by definition) would create things correctly to begin with. Thus, arguments and evidences against evolution are, at the same time, positive evidences for creation.

### **Evolution is a religion:**

A professor in the Department of Biology at Kansas State University says: *Even if all the data point to an intelligent designer, such a hypothesis is excluded from science because it is not naturalistic.*<sup>24</sup>

It is well known by almost everyone in the scientific world today that such influential evolutionists as Stephen Jay Gould and Edward Wilson of Harvard, Richard Dawkins of England, William Provine of Cornell, and numerous other evolutionary spokesmen are dogmatic atheists. Eminent scientific philosopher and ardent Darwinian atheist Michael Ruse has even acknowledged that evolution is their religion!

Evolution is promoted by its practitioners as more than mere science. Evolution is promulgated as an ideology, a secular religion -- a full-fledged alternative to Christianity, with meaning and morality . . . . Evolution is a religion. This was true of evolution in the beginning, and it is true of evolution still today.<sup>25</sup> (*The Scientific Case Against Evolution* – Henry Morris)

### **Carefully Consider the implications of what you believe:**

Outspoken Evolutionist Carl Sagan's religion of the cosmos was that he was actively committed to the cause of animal rights. And quite logically so. For if humans evolved from the beasts, there can be no intrinsic difference between them. It would be just as cruel and immoral to kill a cow as to murder a person. As a result, he was adamantly opposed to using animals for medical research. For if animals have the same value as humans, how can we justify expending their lives to save humans?

But on this issue, Sagan bumped up against reality in a very painful way. In 1994, he discovered that he had myelodysplasia, a rare blood disease. With possibly just months to live, he was told that his only chance for survival was an experimental bone-marrow transplant. But there was one catch: The procedure that might save his life had been developed by research on animals – the kind of research Sagan passionately opposed.

Sagan faced an excruciatingly dilemma: Should he remain true to his naturalistic philosophy and reject the marrow graft as something acquired by immoral means? Or should he agree to undergo the medical treatment in hope of saving his life, though it meant acting in contradiction to his moral convictions?

Sagan didn't take long to reach a decision: He underwent three bone-marrow treatments, which did extend his life for a time (though he ultimately succumbed to the disease and died in 1996). At the time Sagan wrote the Parade article, he was still, in his words “very conflicted” over the choice he had made. He recognized clearly that his decision to accept the treatment was a practical denial of his naturalistic worldview. But when he came up against reality, he abandoned his naturalistic theories of life. (Chuck Colson, *How Now Shall I Live*)

#### Resources for Creationism:

1. *The Scientific Case Against Evolution* by Henry M. Morris (Article)  
[http://www.icr.org/home/resources/resources\\_tracts\\_scientificcaseagainstevolution/](http://www.icr.org/home/resources/resources_tracts_scientificcaseagainstevolution/)
2. *Exploring The Evidence for Creation* by Henry M. Morris III (Book)  
[www.ICR.org](http://www.ICR.org) (Excellent website with hundreds of articles from brilliant Christian Creation Scientists.)
3. *The New Answers Book* by Ken Ham (Book)  
[www.answersingenesis.org](http://www.answersingenesis.org) (Another excellent website from a Creation Science view)
4. *The Battle For The Beginning* by Pastor John MacArthur (Book)
5. *The Case For The Creator* by Lee Strobel (Book)  
(An investigative report, Strobel was a reporter for the Chicago Tribune)

#### Resource for Christianity:

1. *Know What You Believe* by Paul E. Little
2. *Know Why You Believe* by Paul E. Little
3. *The Reason For God* by Tim Keller
4. *How To Read The Bible For All It's Worth* by Gordon D. Fee and Douglas K. Stuart