

Evolution, Science and the Bible - Part I

Genesis 1:1-10

I. Microevolution and the age of the earth.

A. Examples of microevolution or variation within a species today. *Bacteria naturally develop resistance to antibiotics, and insect pests become resistant to insecticides, because of the survival of mutant forms possessing the advantage of resistance. The DNA in the bacteria and insects include a wide enough range so that a favorable change in a hostile climate will be reproduced, and produce a whole population with that attribute. This is microevolution because a new species is not created but only a change within a current species.

B. The age of the earth. The idea that the earth is old is undisputed in the scientific community except by people of faith who interpret the Bible to say that the earth is only 6,000 years old.

1. Cuvier – Father of paleontology observed catastrophes in the fossil record leading to extinctions of animals no longer on the earth.

2. The light from the farthest star in the Milky Way galaxy takes 60,000 years to get to earth. Some star's light in far away galaxies take 100 million years to shine on the earth.

3. The United States Department of the Interior Branch of Isotope Geology gives the five main reasons that science believes the earth is old based on the radiometric dating of minerals in rocks. *Young earth creation scientists have fought a courageous fight for the Bible – and if they are right the rest of the scientific community is just wrong.

C. Evolutionists claim that macroevolution (one species evolving out of another) is microevolution over a very long time and are very dogmatic about it. *Expelled

II. Three reasons why macroevolution is not science but faith in naturalism.

A. The fossils say “no.” In 1859 Darwin proposed a theory even though he knew that it was contradictory to the fossil record. “Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this perhaps, is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be argued against my theory.” (280) His solution was two fold: Fossils are rare to start with; we haven't dug into the fossil record enough – it will reveal links as we dig more.

1. Archeopteryx, found in 1861, led to an embracing of his theory. It is an interesting species with a combination of reptile and bird traits but it is

fully formed, not in transition, much like the duckbilled platypus today.
*Not links but chains are necessary. Before there could be one beaver there would need to be 10,000 transitional beavers that were not fully formed.

2. Stephen Jay Gould – 2001 named by the Library of Congress as one of 83 living legends, professor of geology at Harvard and the leading voice for evolution for 40 years until his death in 2002. After 140 years of searching the fossil record he maintains that two things are mainly observed:

- i. Sudden appearance - species appear all at once, and are fully formed.
- ii Stasis - species exhibit no directional change but stay the same once they appear until they disappear from the fossil record.

He says that the lack of fossils showing a progression of evolution is “the most puzzling fact of the fossil record.” He wrote that “the extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record is the trade secret of paleontology.” *Niles Eldredge his associate agrees with Gould by stating further: “We paleontologists have said that the history of life supposes the story of gradual adaptive change, all the while really knowing that it does not.”

3. 1972 Gould and Eldredge proposed a new theory: “Punctuated Equilibrium” to accommodate the fossil record. Redefined in his last book “The Structure of Evolutionary Theory” (2002 Harvard Press)
*There are over 60 million fossils in the British Museum of Natural History and not one of them is portrayed as a true transitional fossil.
*My experience with science teachers: “we trust the experts.” Educated people on the street believe there are fossils that prove gradual natural selection. *The emperor with no clothes.

4. Today, punctuated equilibrium is out and natural selection through micro-mutations is in. “There was and is general agreement that they (Gould and Eldredge) were right to point out that the fossil record does show long periods of non-change, followed by rapid-instantaneous change in the record-change from one form to another.” (Darwin and its Discontents, Michael Ruse: Cambridge, University Press, 2006, pg 157)
But he ends the chapter this way: “There is no call for theory change yet, nor is there any prospect of such change in the near future.” (pg 165)
Believe it if you want to but don’t call it science.

B. Macroevolution breaks two scientific laws:

1. The law of biogenesis - 130 years ago people thought that life came from non-life. A rotting carcass would produce gnats over time; but Louis Pasteur, the father of modern biology proved through experiments that this was impossible. Life only comes from life. This law, which has never been broken yet, must be contradicted if spontaneous generation is true. *Fred Hoyle, famous astronomer and mathematician, to his evolutionist colleagues, "Let's be intellectually honest. The probability of life rising by chance is the same as the probability of rolling six on a dice five million times in a row." *Panspermia

2. The second law of thermodynamics. In an isolated system (which the first law establishes) the natural course of things is to degenerate. Entropy - things left to themselves move toward greater chaos. *Kathy Lee Gifford interviewing Carl Sagan. "All you need to overcome that is enough time, and eventually anything is possible." If you want to believe it, go ahead, but don't make everyone think its science.

C. The unbelievability of sexual selection.

"The amazing complex, radically different, yet complimentary reproductive systems of the male and female must have completely and independently evolved at each stage at about the same time and place. Just a slight incompleteness in only one of the two would make both reproductive systems useless, and the organism would become extinct." *George at the Museum of Geology. Faith, not science.

III. Does the Bible allow for an old earth?

*Using Yom as an age of millions of years doesn't work for three reasons:

1. God made each "after its kind".
2. Romans 5 says that death entered through Adam and Eve's sin. Evolution would be creating through death and the curse would be pre-Adam.
3. "Yom" with "Evening and morning" points to a 24 hour period.

Gap Theory is a better fit.

A. Heaven and earth were here before the seven days. When I first became a believer and started taking the Bible as the word of God I was struck by the fact that heaven and earth were already created when God started speaking on the first day. The Spirit was brooding over the waters that covered the earth before God

said anything. It appeared to me that our first “morning and evening” were not heaven and earth’s first morning and evening.

B. Satan was already here. The Bible seems pretty straight forward until Genesis 3:1. In the beginning God created everything and He had called everything very good, and then something entirely unexpected happens: In this world that God had made “very good” we find an unaccounted for evil presence. We have no explanation for his existence, he is just there speaking through a serpent. When we go to the New Testament we see Jesus dealing regularly with Satan and his demons, but we are still given no explanation of his origin except that he was “a murderer from the beginning.” (John 8:44) To believe that he was a murderer from his beginning is to believe that God created him evil, which would make God the author of evil which is impossible.

So Jesus can only mean that he was a murderer from our beginning. He was already evil when God made Adam and Eve, and thus, was already on the earth in Genesis 3 when he dialogued with Eve. Yet we have scriptural evidence that he was on earth as Lucifer, perfect in all his ways, an anointed cherub, before he fell. (Isaiah 14:12-14; Ezekiel 28:12-17) Jesus referred to him as the “prince of this world” (John 14:30). Was that title given for deceiving Adam or was it his former office? The only clue we have before Genesis 3 about a fall is in Genesis 1:2 where it states that after God created the earth, it “was” void and without form. The word “was” is the Hebrew word “hayah” and is translated “became” in 67 other places. Did God originally create the world “void and without form” or did it become that way after Lucifer’s fall?

C. The Hebrew scholars who translated the New International Version put an asterisk next to “was” in Genesis 1:2. If you go to the bottom of the page you will see this note: “or possibly became.” The greatest Hebrew Christian scholars from every denomination felt like “hayah” could be translated either way. I believe that the correct translation, given the context, should be “became”. “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth and the earth became void and without form.”

D. The Hebrew words for “void and without form” are “tohu va bohu.” These two words are used together in only two other places. Once in Isaiah 34:8-10, where God is describing a devastating judgment that is coming on Edom; and once in Jeremiah 4:22-23 where He is describing desolating judgment that will come on Israelites who have been in rebellion. Two of the uses describe certain and complete judgment, is it possible that its third use in Genesis 1:2 is describing the same?

E. In verses 9-10 when God gathers the waters together and dry land appears, He calls the dry land “earth”. God’s own definition of earth is “dry land,” not land that’s covered with water. Doesn’t it make sense that the “earth” He created in

verse one was dry land? And that it must have been flooded with water at a later time?

F. Bara, translated “create”, is the Hebrew word for creating something out of nothing, and is only used three times in Genesis 1. Asah translated “made” is the Hebrew word for “doing” and whenever translated “made” means to make something out of preexisting materials. When God “makes” the atmosphere he doesn’t create anything but moves existing stuff around. When He “makes” the sea and the dry land He doesn’t create anything either.

G. The same is true of the stars, sun, and moon in verse 16. Job 38:4-9 “Where were you when I laid the foundation of the earth? Tell Me if you have understanding... when I made a cloud its garment and thick darkness its swaddling band ...”

a. Darkness is only on the face of the earth in verse two.

b. The sun was there from verse one or how could have there been morning and evening on the first day?

c. Asah – can also be translated “bring forth.” God brought forth the sun and the moon and the stars on day four by completely removing the cloud cover. Gorman Gray “Then God brought forth two great lights, the greater light to illumine the day and lesser light to illumine the night...” *Asah is most frequently translated “do” but is translated 74 different ways in the KJV. Because the stars were already created in verse one, the pluperfect “had made” is proper in both verse 16 as well as verse 31. Bible translator, Robert Heim: “The context would support a pluperfect reading of asah in verse 16. Hence we could keep the English verb ‘make’ for asah, and translate that God had made the sun, moon, and stars (in the past), and that He presented them in the earth’s sky on the 4th day.” (The Age of the Universe; Morning Star Publications; 2005; pg 183)

What does this mean? I don’t think we know very much about the original creation and we’re over reaching when we try to explain everything, just as I believe scientists are over reaching when they try to explain everything through macro-evolution.