

## Is Evolution Compatible With The Bible and Christianity?



[Recommended Reading: Tim Keller, *The Reason For God* / the movie *EXPELLED* . . . ] These days, it's common to believe there's a war going on between science and religion, specifically the Judeo-Christian religion. And the religious folk are losing the war (some think the war is over, and the religious folk already lost). One of the reasons for this perception is that media needs to report news events (like the Texas Textbook controversy) as stories with **protagonists and antagonists**. In fact, that's how ALL media work: Movies, Novels, Short stories, news stories = protagonist / antagonist. Eg a movie like (Ferris Buhler's Day Off) Ben Stein's 2008 film *Expelled: No Evidence Allowed*. [Read the Amazon.com reviews, 528 \*\*\*\*\* / 250 \* and the

comments. . . ] Depending on your point of view, Ben Stein was either the PROtagonist or ANtagonist of the film. What we need is to do is to simply set forth where the points of disagreement between scientific evolution and the Judeo-Christian perspective are and having done that, we will arrive at an answer to the question "**Can I embrace both evolution and Biblical Christianity**"?

Let me be clear about this: Since I've heard MY perspective misrepresented & ridiculed by evolutionists, I've tried to apply the "Golden Rule" to evolutionists and represent them as fairly as I can. Also, tried to be simple w/o being simplistic.

### First, some definitions:

- **The SIMPLE USE of the word "evolution":** *The word simply means "CHANGE OVER TIME" and in that usage, there's no incompatibility between evolution and what the Bible says. [The evolution of Dance on YouTube (with Judson LAIP-ly), the evolution of the cell-phone (early ones looked like walke-talkies), the changes you go through physically (Carol and me picture, "Who's the man . . . ?"), the personal evolution of thought in your life regarding some political issue, the evolution of television, the evolution of Miley Cyrus from "Hannah Montana" to whatever in the world it is she's all about now. Some change for the better (Apostle Paul), some for the worse (Demas)].*

The Bible talks about **2 Cor. 3:8** *And we all, who with unveiled faces contemplate<sup>[a]</sup> the Lord's glory, are being transformed into his image with ever-increasing glory, which comes from the Lord, who is the Spirit. Psalm 102:25-27* *In the beginning you laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of your hands.<sup>26</sup> They will perish, but you remain; they will all wear out like a garment. Like clothing you will change them and they will be discarded.<sup>27</sup> But you remain the same, and your years will never end.* = a poetic way of stating the 2<sup>nd</sup> Law of Thermodynamics = heat naturally flows from hotter to colder . . . things are wearing down!! Like me.

- **The SCIENTIFIC USE of the word "evolution":** *Evolutionary Science is a \***NATURALISTIC** perspective on the ORIGIN and DYNAMIC of everything we see around us.* In evolution, a PROCESS is POSTULATED that over time, matter and energy become simple living things that

become more complex, gradually, over long periods of time, through a process called NATURAL SELECTION. Ultimately, over a period of some 2,100 million years ago or longer, mankind or *homo sapiens* emerged from pre-existing organisms.

**\*NATURALISTIC comes from NATURALISM which is a belief system in which nature is ultimate because it can be experienced by the 5 senses; and anything BEYOND nature (or SUPERNATURAL) does not exist, except in one's imagination.** It is a worldview that either leaves God completely out of the picture or perhaps tacks him on as an add-on, like theistic evolutionists do. Usually stated something like this, "God started the process and nature took care of the rest."

The naturalistic formula for what exists was best stated by the late Francis Schaeffer:

### **THE IMPERSONAL + TIME + CHANCE = THE UNIVERSE AND ALL IT CONTAINS**

So, we will be considering if the scientific use of "evolution" is compatible with the Bible and Christianity. To do that we will ask **4 QUESTIONS**. As the questions progress, the evolutionist has more difficulty answering the questions...

#### **1. How did what EXISTS right now come to be?**

When it comes to pressing the question of origins, Naturalistic, Scientific evolution boils down to 3 foundational assertions upon which evolution is built:

- Either **SOMETHING** came from **NOTHING**, or the material universe has always **EXISTED**.
- Organic **LIFE** came from inorganic **NON-LIFE**. = "Spontaneous Generation"
- From **PRIMAL SIMPLE** forms came **COMPLEX** forms with new **SPECIES** arising from old ones.

QUESTION: Is this "Observational Science" or "Historical Science"? There is a BIG difference between the two!

**"OBSERVATIONAL Science" can be observed, measured, verified (by senses), and can be duplicated in a laboratory.**

**"HISTORICAL Science" is about the PAST, was not observed, measured, or verified, nor can it be duplicated in a laboratory.**

What scientists refer to as "evolution" properly understood is **HISTORICAL SCIENCE** and must be taken by **FAITH**, same as what the **BIBLE** says about the origin of all there is. (*cf Hebrews 11:3*)

**Hebrews 11:3, 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.** No one has ever seen in a lab or anywhere else something come from nothing, no one has ever seen anything that did not come from something else. Every effect has a cause. [WE are “effects” that had a “cause” . . . As a house implies a builder, and a garment a weaver, and a door a carpenter, so does the existence of the universe imply a creator.] No one has ever observed life coming from non-life, and no one has seen ANY transitional species of anything. It's all about 2 accounts of history, one Bible-based and theistic; the other based in naturalistic history with God left out of the picture. BOTH ARE FAITH-BASED BELIEFS! But here's the kicker: You WON'T hear most evolutionists speak of themselves as “Historical Scientists”!

## 2. Who Is Being Intellectually HONEST?

Even from a non-Christian perspective, bearing false witness is frowned upon (**Exodus 20:16**). Deception is wrong. The Bible makes Truth-claims for itself and when properly interpreted does not contradict itself (later on that), **John 17:17**. Everything is “in the open,” so to speak [Incarnation was measurable, height, weight, skin color, pictures, voice recordings of Jesus . . . = a theological reason why they are not, **1 John 1:1-4, That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked at and our hands have touched—this we proclaim concerning the Word of life.** <sup>2</sup> *The life appeared; we have seen it and testify to it, and we proclaim to you the eternal life, which was with the Father and has appeared to us.* <sup>3</sup> *We proclaim to you what we have seen and heard, so that you also may have fellowship with us. And our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son, Jesus [Christ](#).* <sup>4</sup> *We write this to make our<sup>a</sup> joy complete.* ]; as the Bible consistently speaks against deception.

The Big Deception in evolution as presented to us seems to boil down to the difference between MICRO-evolution and MACRO-evolution. The former agrees with the Biblical record, the later does not.

MICRO-evolution refers to an array of distinct KINDS of plants and animals with many varieties WITHIN each kind of plant or animal. But there are unbridgeable GAPS between the kinds. [For example, there are many varieties and shapes and sizes of DOGS and many varieties of CATS, but there are no “dats” or “cogs”.] There's nothing UNBLIBLICAL about MICRO-evolution. “. . . after their kinds . . . “ **Genesis 1:11, 21. 24-25; 1 Corinthians 15:39,** <sup>35</sup> *But someone will ask, “How are the dead raised? With what kind of body will they come?”* <sup>36</sup> *How foolish! What you sow does not come to life unless it dies.* <sup>37</sup> *When you sow, you do not plant the body that will be, but just a seed, perhaps of wheat or of something else.* <sup>38</sup> *But God gives it a body as he has determined, and to each kind of seed he gives its own body.* <sup>39</sup> *Not all flesh is the same: People have one kind of flesh, animals have another, [birds](#) another and fish another.* <sup>40</sup> *There are also heavenly bodies and there are earthly bodies; but the splendor of the heavenly bodies is one kind, and the splendor of the earthly bodies is another.* <sup>41</sup> *The sun has one kind of splendor, the moon another and the stars another; and star differs from star in splendor.*

- **MACRO-evolution refers to a plant or animal evolving into a completely different KIND of plant or animal.** There is no evidence anywhere on earth of this happening. Finches stay finches. Toads stay toads. For this to happen, the evolving animal would have to produce offspring with new additional genetic information, and that has *never* been observed. In all the testing done in all the laboratories and zoos by scientists worldwide, there has never been one example of even one animal giving birth to an offspring with new, additional genetic information. There are no clearly transitional species, and no authentic transitional fossils.

QUESTION 99 (from *Evolution: A Fairy Tale For Grownups* by Ray Comfort) WHO said this? “The extreme RAIORITY of transitional forms persists as the trade secret paleontology. The evolutionary trees that adorn our textbooks have hard data only @ the tips and nodes of their branches; the rest is INFERENCE, however reasonable, and NOT the EVIDENCE of fossils.” – noted evolutionary scientist Stephen J. Gould

NO direct EVIDENCE of transitions! Ernst Mayr of University of Harvard, “What one actually finds when observing the fossil record is nothing BUT discontinuities; ALL species are SEPERATED from each other by bridgeless GAPS; INTERMEDIATES BETWEEN species. And the HIGHER on the evolutionary chain you go, the MORE SERIOUS the problem becomes. “ -- quote from famous EVOLUTIONIST Stephen J. Gould.

### 3. What about a consistent basis for ETHICS?

Here’s where evolutionistic thinking (and the naturalism it is based on) gets bogged down in a major way. No one can get around making ethical statements about what’s right and what’s wrong. But the question is, can evolution dictate any ethic at all?? Take away mankind as the image of God with God-given morality hard-wired into us, and merely a physical being, then what is MORALITY and how are MORAL judgments made?

- **Can we say that some action [genocide, bombing of WTC on 9/11] is WRONG, or is it simply a RESULT of NEUROCHEMISTRY hardwired into us?** And WHO is to say WHOSE neurochemical wiring is the morally SUPERIOR one? [Assad . . . / 9-11 terrorists . . . maybe it’s just the way their brain is wired . . . who are WE to stand in judgment??? Morality becomes simply a matter of neural chemical exchanges in the brain, which were ULTIMATELY the result of some cosmic accident! ]
- **In naturalistic ethics (which is part of the evolutionary “package”) if consistently applied, there is no ABLOSUTE right and wrong because there is no TRANSCENDENT Standard.** It’s all about how YOUR brain works. [Tim Keller in *The Reason For God*, “If there is no God, there’s no way to say any one action is MORAL and another action IMMORAL, but only ‘I LIKE THIS’. If THAT’s the case, WHO gets the right to put their subjective, arbitrary, neurochemically-determined moral FEELINGS into LAW?

You may say, "The MAJORITY has the right to make the law," but do you mean then that the MAJORITY has the right to VOTE to EXTERMINATE the MINORITY? NO that is WRONG? WRONG according to WHOM?] [American author Annie Dillard, creek by mountains of VA, nature is ruled by one central principle: VIOLENCE by the STRONG against the weak . . . SURVIVAL of the FITTEST!]

- **Consistently applied, evolutionary thought leads to AUTONOMOUS ethics (*Genesis 3:5; Judges 21:25*)** where, "each man did whatever their brain was hardwired by "nature" to do . . . .)

#### 4. Does evolution undermine the GOSPEL?

The Gospel is about God's grace in Christ, the God-man Who was perfect, lived a perfect life, and died a redemptive death to save His people from their sin, and ultimately undo the effects of the Fall. Now, think this through as an evolutionist.

- **About GOD's grace** = It's hard to get to GRACE from a scientific perspective of "survival of the fittest," Plus, since it's GOD'S grace and GOD is ruled out in the naturalistic worldview of evolution, grace doesn't really exist.
- **About the GOD-man (*John 1:14*)** = In the incarnation, the visible and invisible are united in a PERSON, the transcendent God became the intimate God-man. The Invisible heaven and visible earth interlock in this God-man Jesus. Naturalistic Evolution will not allow for this, because transcendence is ruled out.
- **What perfection entails and why it's needed** = It means Jesus was morally perfect and never wrong or mistaken. Jesus' statement about marriage in *Matthew 19:4-6* references *Genesis 1-2* as history, not mythology. Was Jesus mistaken? Or UNINFORMED? Or WRONG? Are Jesus words misleading? If so, we do NOT have a perfect, sinless savior who when we have faith in Him gives us his perfect record (which we need to be acceptable to God & accepted into Heaven). [C. S. Lewis in *Mere Christianity*, "LIAR, LUNATIC, or LORD!"]
- **About sin (cf ethics discussion above, WHAT sin) (*Matthew 1:21*)** But if evolution is true, the whole idea of "sin" (which is based on morals) is simply a construct of chemical reactions happening in our brains
- **About the Fall.** What Fall? The connection of the HISTORICAL RECORD of the HISTORICAL ADAM and the HISTORICAL CHRIST . . . Paul believed in a historical Adam (*Rom. 5:12-21; 1 Cor. 15:21-22, 45-49*). Without a common descent we lose any firm basis for believing that all people regardless of race or ethnicity have the same nature, the same inherent dignity, the same image of God, the same sin problem, and that despite our divisions we are all part of the same family coming from the same parents.

Without a historical Adam, Paul's doctrine of original sin and guilt does not hold together. Without a historical Adam, Paul's doctrine of Christ as the second Adam does not hold together.

Christians may disagree on the age of the earth, but whether Adam AS REVEALED IN SCRIPTURE ever existed is a GOSPEL issue. Tim Keller is right:

"[Paul] most definitely wanted to teach us that Adam and Eve were real historical figures. When you refuse to take a biblical author literally when he clearly wants you to do so, you have moved away from the traditional understanding of the biblical authority. . . .If Adam doesn't exist, Paul's whole argument—that both sin and grace work 'covenantally'—falls apart. If you don't believe what Paul (under inspiration) wrote about Adam, you are denying the core of Paul's teaching of the Gospel." (*Christianity Today* June 2011)

### **CONCLUSION: To BE or NOT be BAZINGAED!**

= a word used by a Character in a *sitcom* ...a character by the name of *Sheldon Cooper*. It means, "I fooled you!" In the creation-evolution debate, you must eventually ask the question @ every level, "WHO'S being BAZINGAED?"

***Kata the Bible, In Psalm 14:1, "The FOOL (not a stupid person, but a person who is morally deficient) says in his heart there is no God."***

***@ the end of the day, there are 2 starting places: Genesis 1:1 & Psalm 14:1***