

Appendix V — The Theory of Evolution

Many would like to see the creation vs. evolution debate as a conflict between religion and science, superstition and empirical fact. This presents a false antithesis. Christians are not opposed to science. They just do not place their faith in subjection to science. For example, although it cannot be scientifically proven that God exists, the Christian accepts God's existence not as theory, but as fact.

In addition to this, even some non-Christians believe evolution must be questioned as sound science. In fact, some have referred to the theory of evolution as "scientism." Scientism is a belief system that is based on limited findings from limited scientific inquiry. It is, in essence, a system of faith.

The comparison of the Biblical account of creation vs. scientism / evolution is summed up in this chart.

BELIEF	BIBLE / CREATIONISM	SCIENTISM / EVOLUTION
Time of creation	six 24-hour days	billions of years
Method of creation	God's Word and decree	chance
The existence of man	a special creation of God	an advanced animal
Man's purpose	to serve and honor God	to survive, serve self
Man's responsibility	to thank and obey God	none — but to please self

The Assumptions of Scientism

Scientism rests primarily on two main assumptions in its effort to explain the origin and maintenance of the universe:

1) *The unproven and unprovable theory that things are as they are because they have come through a long process.* It is inconceivable to the evolutionist that complex organisms (such as man) of today were not originally one-celled. He will also assert that these organisms originated from inorganic matter.

2) *Uniformitarianism.* This theory states that rates of change which are observable today and which can be calculated have always been the same in the past.

An example of how these two theories would be utilized could be the calculation of the erosion rate of a mountain. Suppose a mountain erodes at the rate of one inch per century, and it appears to have eroded 1,000 inches. According to the two theories above, the mountain *must* be 100,000 years old. However, the argument is based on the assumptions that 1) the process of the mountain's deterioration must have taken time, and 2) that the process of the mountain's deterioration must have been uniform and constant. Both theories are completely unprovable. If some unknown factor in the past had either sped up or retarded erosion, then there would be no way to determine the age of the mountain.

Another example of the way those two assumptions are used would be the "measuring tests" that have been developed to support the "great age theory" of the universe, such as carbon-14 dating, potassium-argon dating, and the uranium 235-lead tests. These tests all work on basically the same principle: that certain materials under certain conditions tend to decay and change into other materials. For example, potassium deteriorates into argon at a constant rate. If a given deposit of potassium and argon is found, the ratio of the two amounts found should indicate how long the process has taken place in that particular deposit. In most cases these processes have been measured in the hundreds of millions of years, if not billions.

The fallacy of the entire procedure becomes obvious when a few factors are given special attention. First, it must be proved that the original deposit was pure potassium with no lead whatsoever — or at least the original ratio must be known. Obviously neither of these factors can be known since no scientist was there to record the information. Second, the uniformitarian is assuming that there has been no "leakage" of the deposit — that no lead has percolated into the deposit or that no potassium has leaked out. Unless this can be firmly demonstrated, the procedure cannot claim to be truly scientific. If the potassium-argon ratio has been quickly formulated as it now exists, what appears to be millions of years old might be only thousands. In short, a great deal of assumption lies at the foundation of these dating methods.

What is the Reason or Motive for Scientism & Evolution?

Apart from Scripture, scientism simply has no alternatives to choose from concerning the origin of the

universe. If you reject the premise of a Creator God, as described in Genesis, what other options do you have? The assumptions of evolution are made simply because the universe *must* be old to account for its existence if there is no Creator God. There is no other explanation. You can see, therefore, that evolution is more than a mere set of propositions and statements. It is a total world and life view. In essence, it is a religion requiring as much faith as creation. The creationist says, "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth..." (Genesis 1:1). The evolutionist says, "In the beginning a mass of hydrogen exploded..." Neither are provable. Both are based on faith.

Why is this faith in evolution preferred by so many over faith in what Scripture tells us is true? Because the conflict between the Bible and scientism is not limited to explanations of the universe's origin. If the evolutionist's theory was true, then there never were two human beings who began the human race, since man emerged gradually from animal ancestry. Then there was obviously no disobedience in the Garden of Eden, no sin as defined by the Bible. What the Scriptures call "sin" would really be no more than a remnant of our bestial nature — times when we don't act as evolved as we are. And if there is no sin, then there is no need for a Savior. Mankind is not sinful by nature, but is getting better and better as they evolve. Christ's work was unnecessary. He is only a martyr, not a Redeemer. The doctrine of salvation by grace through the work of Christ *cannot* be harmonized to evolution. More than that, the whole of Scriptures state their agreement to Genesis. Christ himself referred to the creation account as historical fact. Therefore, the Scripture must be nothing but superstitious ranting if evolution is accepted as fact.

The conflict comes down to this. There are two faiths — creationism and evolutionism — and they cannot be reconciled. In the end, choices must be made. Either there is a God or there is not. Either the human race is composed of creatures who are subject to their Creator or they are sophisticated animals who are subject only to themselves. Either we are sinners in need of a Savior or we are only occasional beasts who simply need more evolutionary improvement to survive. Either Genesis is God's Word or it is myth. Either Jesus Christ is a trustworthy Lord or he is a simpleton, or lunatic.

What about Compromise?

In the last decades an attempt has been made to combine the evolution and creation under the label of *theistic evolution*. The theistic evolutionist claims a belief in God's creation of the universe, but he claims that God did so by guiding evolution over the course of billions of years. This contradicts the Genesis account of creation which establishes a rhythm of the 24 hour period — "and there was evening, and there was morning — the first day" (Gen. 1:5). Trying to combine evolution and creationism is perhaps the ultimate in superstition. It claims a belief in a God, yet it categorically rejects God's Word.

Does Creationism Rest on a Solid Foundation?

Biblical creationism is a faith that rests solely on the Biblical account. In the final analysis we must conclude that if we are to know anything about creation — its date, process, order, or duration — then the Creator must tell us. The writer to the Hebrews explains it best. *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).*

This does not mean that creationism is incompatible with science, or that it rejects science. But as stated earlier, the Christian places his faith in science in subjection to his faith in God's Word, not vice-versa. For example, while the Christian may accept that potassium or uranium decay at a certain, measurable rate, that is not in conflict with their faith. A logical assumption, made in faith, is that *God created the original deposit of uranium containing lead*. Therefore if you measured the lead / uranium ratio assuming that the deposit was, at one time, pure uranium, your estimation of the age of the deposit would be immensely greater than the true age. This assumption embraces the wonders of science without abusing the wonders of God's Word.

The Christian embraces the teachings of science, for in them the Christian sees the beauty and order of God's creation. But the Christian also ultimately understands that God is not bound to the laws of science. He called the universe into existence by his Word. He formed everything out of nothing at all. That is scientifically impossible, but it is nothing to our God!