

## **Creation Vs. Evolution: Introduction- What is at Stake?**

Scripture: Genesis 1

### **Introduction:**

Evolution, why even address this issue? Is it really relevant for our church, since we know that evolution is filled with utter nonsense, which ultimately is designed to deny the existence of God, let alone the Gospel of grace in Christ? Let me begin by giving you at least three main reasons for why I believe we ought to work through this topic:

1) Evolution is the scientific foundation for most public/secular schools (including colleges of course), and it contains the worldview within which many people, especially the younger generations, are beginning to think and live. Creationists are viewed as unscientific fanatics by most, in the realm of scholastics. We must be ready to stand up against the growing tide, especially for the sake of our children, who, as they grow older, and begin to think more critically, will not be as easily persuaded by simple arguments such as, "Well, evolutionists believe that we came from monkeys...etc." Brethren, there is a lot more to evolution than that. We must understand the terms. We must understand what is indeed scientific and not, and be able to explain the truly scientific, from a biblical standpoint. We must expose the lies and all that evolutionists have come to embrace as scientific fact, which really is nothing more than guess work and biased interpretations of things that take us back to times and places that no one has access to anymore. We must seek to understand the presuppositions and the so-called "givens" (uniformitarianism, naturalism, the fusing together of observational Science and historical Science...etc), which lie at the very foundation of evolutionary thinking and the process by which they develop their hypotheses.

2) Evolutionists make use of just enough truth to convince people to swallow the entire system. Indeed, they deal with the same observational data, which creationists deal with, but if we are unprepared, we can easily be swept into their interpretation and processing of that data, simply because they seem logical, and their description of the facts themselves are accurate at many points. One can point out a lot of observational facts, and yet, connect those facts together

and draw conclusions about those facts, which are grossly inaccurate. But, if we are not prepared; if we are not "Bereans" in this sense, we will be incapable of defending what we know to be true, in light of the given and interpreted facts.

3) Many *Christian* scholars have already compromised, attempting to somehow bridge evolution and creation together. This is where we get the term "Theistic evolution," which embraces the teaching that God is indeed the Creator, but He created through the use of evolutionary means. And so, such scholars would deny, for example, a literal interpretation of Genesis 1, saying that the days of the week listed, are *not literal* days, and can represent even millions of years, allowing for an old earth, and evolutionary processes to take place in the formation of animals and mankind...etc. In fact, among many scholarly Christians, it is almost foolish or unintelligent to embrace the notion of a young (6000-8000) year old earth.

Why is this important? Well, for many reasons, one of which would include the fact that death would have existed before the fall of man had taken place. But most of all, it would bring the integrity of the Scriptures into question. If we deny the literal days of Genesis 1, and declare the first few chapters to be poetic or allegorical, what do we do with Adam and Eve, Noah's flood, the Tower of Babel, and many other of the historical events, given in Scripture? What happens, when it is left up to fallible man, to begin tampering with God's history, determining what might be allegorical or not? Many (though not all), who have begun to deny the literal interpretation of Genesis 1, have also denied the historicity of Adam and Eve, which would also bring into question our Lord's teachings and the Apostle Paul, who spoke of Adam and Eve as our historical first parents. Others have denied the historicity of the fall, saying that it is just illogical to presume that Eve was tempted by a serpent. The universal flood of Noah's day, and even the miracles of Christ have come into question as well. You see, the enemy is glad to chip away at the foundation, because he knows that over time, the whole building of Scripture will collapse. If he can bring the integrity, authenticity, sufficiency and inerrancy of Scripture into question, then he has done a fine job of eroding the Christian faith. The Scriptures stand together, and one loosened wall, will ultimately bring down the whole building.

And so, brethren, we have to be ready and prepared, lest we be swept away with so-called scholarship and critical thinking. We must know the facts, and what is at stake, and we must be prepared to go to the mat, without compromise, when addressing the integrity of Scripture.

People such as Bruce Waltke, DA Carson, Tim Keller, Tremper Longman III, John Piper and many, many others, have already begun to waver in these areas.

Brethren, the short form is this: While we may ultimately survive the onslaught of such compromise, our children may not, and our children's children will certainly not. We must protect the truth for our own generation, indeed, but also, and especially for future generations. *Many* Christian colleges have already compromised in these areas.

## **I. Evolution is *not* an Observable Science**

When we think of the term "evolution," as Christians, negative thoughts and feelings tend to immediately arise. Now, we must understand, of course, that the word "evolution," in and of itself, is not evil. The idea of evolution, in its most basic, definitional sense, simply implies "change" of some sort. And so, the term can be used in a pure sense, but unfortunately, because of what has become known as the system of "evolution," we have to cautiously detract from using the term in any positive sense.

What we mean by "evolution" then; or the system with which the term has become directly associated, is the idea that all of life on earth has come from a common ancestor (a hypothetical, single-celled organism of some sort). Through some form of process of modification and change, every living thing has evolved into the complex living forms we see today. Dogs, cats, iguanas, kangaroos, apes, eagles, pigeons, alligators, elephants, whales, cat fish, dinosaurs, ants...etc, have all ultimately come from the same single-celled ancestor.

Now, we must also understand that evolution, in this sense, is not to be equated with observational "Science," although sadly, such an assumption is often made in the world that surrounds us (in our school text books, museums, Science programs and magazines, scholarly lingo...etc). Rather, evolution is *one interpretation* of observable Science. You see, for Science to be Science, it must be observable today, able to be tested, repeated and falsifiable. And evolutionists, of course, are not capable of doing this. And this, therefore, takes us to two critical definitions, which will help us properly identify and classify the theory of evolution.

1) Observational Science- Observational Science is "a systematic approach to understanding that uses observable, testable, repeatable, and falsifiable experimentation to understand how nature commonly behaves" (*Evolution Exposed: Biology*, Patterson, Pg.24)

In other words, we can study general patterns and/or codes, given us in nature, which can lead us to draw general conclusions about the thing we are studying. Through observational Science, we can understand such things as how DNA molecules code for proteins..etc. Observational Science is what enables us to advance technologically, giving us the ability to develop new products, cures for diseases...etc, based upon the natural laws that are discovered by various studies, trial and error...etc.

And the true genius involved in observational Science, which of course the atheist would deny, is that God has created this wonderful creation in an orderly fashion, providing us with observable natural laws, which we can use for further advancement in many areas of living. God "coded" creation, as it were. He gave us natural laws that work consistently, so we could grow in our understanding of His creation, and so that we could develop ways to utilize it, especially in the advancement of technology (flying, submarines, picture taking, computers...etc).

Sadly, evolutionists see these laws as laws unto themselves, with no necessary Creator or Designer behind them. And they attempt to search for truth by means of them, under the assumption that a Designer does not exist. We will get back to this in a moment, but for now, it is important that we understand that Observational Science deals with that which can be tested, repeated and observed happening in the present. When you deal with the question of origins, therefore, it is impossible to prove origin on the basis of observational Science, because no one, with the exception of God, of course, was there to observe the origin of all things, first hand. Now this is important, because often times, evolutionists will claim that evolution is a Scientific fact, which has been proven, when in reality, it has not been proven at all, nor could it be, because no one can go back and actually observe the millions of years, which have brought molecules to man.

Rather, what evolutionists do, is attempt to interpret various evidences located throughout our world; deposited pieces of history, as it were (such as fossils, various rock layers, star light distances...etc), and other observable present day patterns (such as rock decay, radioactive

isotopes...etc) as a means of drawing conclusions about the past. So, they take factual data, and use it as a means of drawing conclusions about unobservable events of the past, which takes us to our second critical definition.

2) Historical Science- Historical Science is to interpret evidence from past events based on a presupposed philosophical point of view. [This will all make sense as we move on]

Evolution is an historical Science. In fact, creationism is an historical Science as well. Both deal with the same data; the same deposited evidences given us from the past. But they both deal with it, within the realm of two different presuppositional systems. Creationists look at the same exact data that evolutionists look at. Creationists do not deny the facts. They just interpret them differently (in fact, we have the advantage, because there was One who was there to observe what really happened--Gen. 1:1). Evolutionists, however, begin with various presuppositions as well. But it is important to note, as we prepare to consider some of the presuppositions of evolution that evolution is not an observable Science. It is an historical Science. From the standpoint of man, evolution is no more of an observable Science than creationism. Now, let us consider a few of the key presuppositions, which under-gird the theory of evolution. And brethren, this is absolutely critical, because these are governing assumptions, which evolutionists carry with them to the field, when seeking to use the data that exists. These are basic, inviolable givens, which are on the table from the moment they begin any study. They remain unchanged, and when any changes have to be made to evolutionary theory (which has changed much since Darwin), these presuppositions remain tightly in tact. They are undeniable facts, right from the outset for evolutionists.

## **II. Evolutionist Presuppositions: (Matters of Faith)**

1) Naturalism: "A belief denying that an event or object has a supernatural significance; specifically, the doctrine that scientific laws are adequate to account for all phenomena" (Patterson, pg. 243).

And so, as a very basic and firm principle, evolutionists presuppose that everything has a natural explanation. In other words, the possibility that anything in our world has a supernatural

explanation, be it, with regard to origins or processes of change...etc, is simply a non-option. In a very real sense, you can say that God, Himself, is a non-option. This is a very basic presupposition, held by evolutionists. And so, when studying anything, that study of anything must be contained within the realm of natural explanations and reasoning. Any evidence that cries out, "supernatural design," or "supernatural intervention...etc," is just not acceptable. [Hence, 6 *literal* days of creation *cannot* even be considered an option]

2) Materialism: "A belief claiming that physical matter is the only or fundamental reality and that all organisms, processes, and phenomena can be explained as manifestations or interactions of matter (Patterson, Pg. 242).

Again, everything is bound to the natural order. The whole notion that God created "ex-nihilo" (or "out of nothing") is just not acceptable Science to the evolutionist. From the Creationist standpoint, we would say that evolutionists borrow from the very order of God's design; they borrow from the very things that ought to lead us to God, only to ignore the God who designed everything (including the order). They study and embrace the logic in creation, only to deny the rational mind that gave us this logic. In fact, the logical patterns, signs and elements, which give us our natural laws, ought to be one of the greatest evidences for the existence and power of our Creator, but man is desperately lost, and corrupt, and dead in sin, leading him to suppress the obvious and to embrace the lie.

3) Uniformitarianism: "The doctrine that present-day processes acting at similar rates as observed today account for the change evident in the geologic record" (Patterson, Pg. 246).

Evolutionists assume that when measuring the rate of change in a variety of the earth's elements, such as measuring rate of decay, one can assume the same rate of change has always been in play, and thereby discover the age of those elements (and the earth as a whole for that matter). Uniformitarianism assumes universal laws of change.

The problem with this is that it does not take into account the potential (even) for a supernatural creation. No one was there at the beginning to measure the beginning point of anything or if the processes of change in the geologic record remained the same all throughout history. This is especially important, when considering the effects on change processes brought about by catastrophe, such as a global, world-wide flood. The earth has changed in very

significant ways after the fall, and especially after the flood. Yet, these changes are not even considered; they are blindly passed over by evolutionists. We will, in fact, see, through observational Science, how recent localized catastrophes have affected change processes, right before our very eyes, confirming this to be a very relevant factor, when studying origins and the evident changes in our geologic record.

## **Conclusion**

All in all, evolution assumes from the outset that God is not in the equation, and this is a huge problem. The option of "God" is a non-option to evolutionists. [no miracles either]

Evolution is ultimately a consequence of all that we are told in Romans 1; a hardening of hearts, on account of our gross idolatry, and our willful suppression of the truth of God, which is actually wired right in us. [see also Patterson, Pg. 22]

Amen!!!