

Christ Confronts Evolution

Rich Nathan

January 23-24, 1999

Christ Confronts the Culture Series

Genesis 1

I have been doing a series titled “Christ Confronts the Culture” in which I am attempting to tackle a number of the issues that shapes our culture’s thinking – issues like abortion, pluralism, materialism, and our culture’s obsession with sex and sexuality. Now today I want to talk about evolution and the evolutionary theory of the origin of the universe and the origin of life. The great difficulty in talking about evolution in public school, in a biology class, in a college classroom, or before a school board that is evaluating textbooks and curriculum is that almost inevitably to even raise a question or critique on evolution is to be immediately branded as an “ignorant religious fanatic.” If any of you were to get up in a classroom and wonder out loud whether God created the universe over against the opening pages of every one of your science textbook explanations for the origin of the universe; if you raise your hand and say, “But aren’t there a lot of problems with evolution?” or if you as a parent were to go into your child’s school and speak to the principal about the reasonableness of teaching children evolution without teaching an alternative theory, you will be immediately classified as an “ignorant fundamentalist” who simply cannot accept the assured findings of modern science when they conflict with your superstitious, prejudice, religious viewpoints.

If you want to assure yourself of being marginalized, just raise the question in academic circles about the truthfulness of the evolutionary explanation of the origin of life or the origin of the universe. You will be compared to those who still believe in a flat earth. Someone may raise the issue of Galileo and how he was persecuted by the church as well.

Most likely, at some point, a person is going to pull out the play and the movie “Inherit the Wind.” In most schools today, students are exposed to the movie “Inherit the Wind” which starred Spencer Tracey, Gene Kelly and Frederick March – a 1960 movie. The movie and the play were a fictionalized treatment of the Scopes’ Monkey Trial that took place in 1925.

Now, what happened actually in the Scopes’ trial is that the Tennessee legislature had funded a new science education program and to reassure the public that science wouldn’t be used to discredit religion, they included a symbolic measure forbidding the teaching of evolution. The governor signed the bill into law, but he realized that any prosecution of the teaching of evolution would be an embarrassment. He was assured that there would never be a prosecution.

The American Civil Liberties Union wanted a test case, however, and they advertised for a teacher who would be willing to be a main defendant in a staged prosecution. So there was a volunteer defendant – John Scopes. He was actually a gym teacher. He taught biology briefly and he let it be known all over town that he was going to teach evolution. The town of Dayton, Tennessee thought it would be good

publicity for their town and would actually boost local business and give some free advertisement for the town if they prosecuted John Scopes.

Well, local prosecutors decided that they were going to prosecute Scopes and the trial became a media circus when William Jennings Bryant, a presidential candidate I think 3 or 4 times, volunteered to offer his services for the prosecution. The reason he decided to do that was because William Jennings Bryant was opposed to Darwinism. Now, he wasn't opposed to Darwinism because he was an ultra-conservative biblical liturgist. Actually, Williams Jennings Bryant didn't believe in a young earth. He was what, in today's terms, would be called a progressive, or liberal, politically. He was upset with Darwinism because of the way it was used by big business to crush smaller businesses and to crush family farms. Big business in the United States at that time said, "Hey, its just survival of the fittest. And if we roll over smaller businesses or family farms, if we structure pricing, or if we conspire to fix prices, that is just survival of the fittest." And so William Jennings Bryant attacked Darwinian evolution because of his political concerns that it was being used to hurt people – particularly small businesses and small farmers.

Well Clarence Darrow volunteered to defend John Scopes. Like Bryant, Darrow was a friend of labor unions and an opponent of unrestrained capitalism, but he was a materialist. He believed that schools should throw the Bible out.

Objective observers of the trial said that it was a pretty even match between Bryan and Darrow. Darrow did, at one point, make a fool out of Williams Jennings Bryan when he got Bryan to volunteer as an expert on creation and Bryan allowed himself to be cross-examined by Clarence Darrow. But Bryan seemed to bounce back from that setback and was generally pretty optimistic and buoyant through the trial.

The trial was very negatively covered by a news reported named H. L. Menchen who called the Tennessee residents "peasants, yokels, morons, hillbillies, babbits" in his dispatches to the NY Times and in the Baltimore Sun. In the movie, *Inherit the Wind*, the townspeople were portrayed as even more ignorant singing "Give me that Old Time Religion" every time they couldn't answer Clarence Darrows rational, thoughtful arguments. When William Jennings Bryan died in his sleep as a result of a diabetic attack five days after the trial, Menchan gleefully reported, "We killed the SOB."

As it turned out, Darrow did concede defeat. It was obvious that Scopes had deliberately violated the law. And before any wonderful closing arguments were made, he admitted his client's guilt. A small fine was levied on the defendant. But the coverage of the trial sewed in the public mind a perspective of ignorant religious people trying to stop the progress of science. This popularized view of ignorant religious people opposing science was reinforced by the play "Inherit the Wind."

Contrary to the media portrayal, any questioning of Darwinian evolution is a Neanderthal throwback to the Dark Age and the oppression of scientific inquiry, another Bible versus science problem. The questions regarding evolution are arising from the scientific community itself.

I don't mean, by any means, to suggest that a large percentage of scientists are questioning it, or that the stranglehold over academia or the media has been broken. But I would suggest that there is more and more critical writing and thinking out there designed to give any fair minded person great pause before they dismiss the creation account out of hand and buy into the naturalistic Darwinian evolutionary account for the

formation of the universe and the creation of life in all of its varieties. Today, my message is going to be called Christ Confronts Evolution. Let's pray.

If you have a Bible, I would like you to open it to the first chapter of the entire Bible, Genesis 1, where we read, "In the beginning, God created the heavens and earth. Now the earth was formless and empty, darkness was over the surface of the deep, and the Spirit of God was hovering over the waters. And God said, 'Let there be light' and there was light. God saw that the light was good and he separated the light from the darkness. God called the light 'day' and the darkness he called 'night' and there was evening and there was morning the first day."

Now, I must immediately deal with one particular view of the Genesis text, especially if I am going to critique neo-Darwinian theory. And the view that I need to immediately deal with is that proposed by so-called creation scientists, folks like Henry Morris and the like. From the 1960's to the 1980's the only people who were calling in to question neo-Darwinian evolutionary theory were folks who called themselves creation researchers or creation scientists. These brave souls raised some of the early arguments against Darwinian orthodoxy, but they did so from a particular perspective, a perspective of belief in a young earth – what has become known as the young earth theory. These creation scientists believed that the earth is no more than 10 or perhaps on the outside 20 thousand years old. And their particular viewpoints are the ones caricatured and opposed by teachers of evolution. Often it is assumed that if you critique evolution you must hold to a young earth viewpoint. Moreover, many Christians having been exposed to creation science research through their many books and videos believe that the only options available to them is to believe in a young earth and that is the way to be faithful to the texts of the scripture. Or on the other hand, to throw out Gen 1 and simply buy into either Darwinian evolution or some sort of theistic evolution that God made the world, but he did so by way of evolution.

I would like to suggest to you right from the outset that one can hold onto an orthodox reading of Genesis 1, strongly critique Darwinian evolution, and yet not hold to a young earth, but believe that the earth is many millions, or indeed many billions of years old. The only position to the orthodox Christian is not young earth, 10,000 years old, and six literal days of creation or throwing your Bible into the fire. There is another alternative. Belief in an old earth and universe perhaps billions of years old but believing in Creation not evolution as the way the universe and life came to be.

You say, "Rich, why would you call into question what the creation scientists, these young earth theorists, have come up with?"

I don't have the time to fully develop these ideas but among the issues one could include are

1. The formation of coral reefs – which would take infinitely longer than 10,000 years and would not have resulted from a catastrophe like the flood.
2. The flexible use of the word Day in the Old Testament and in Genesis – it is not necessarily a 24-hour period and could not have been a 24-hour period on the first 3 days since the sun was not created until the 4th day.
3. The radio metric dating of moon rocks and meteors back to 4.5 billion years which would not have been affected by the flood

The point that I am making is that it is not necessary to hold to a young earth to critique the Darwinian explanation for the existence of life or to hold to a Genesis

account for creation. I go into all of that simply because often times the straw man of the young earth is raised to attack legitimate arguments against evolution.

Well, what does the Bible teach? The Bible teaches first of all that the universe has a beginning. We read in the opening words of Gen. 1, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." There would clearly be a conflict with science if science discovered that there was no beginning to the heavens and the earth. And by the heavens and the earth, that is a Hebraic expression to refer to the totality of existence, that which we might call the cosmos. The Bible is clearly teaching that the universe has a beginning point. And again, there would be a conflict between the Genesis account and science if we discovered that the universe was eternal.

Some scientists have alleged this. Carl Sagan said that "the universe is all that there ever was or is or will be." He believed in an eternal universe. Some theories of the origin of the universe suggest that matter is eternal, that the universe had no beginning point. But most scientists today believe that the clear findings of science are in agreement with these first words of Genesis. Most scientists today say that all that we know about physics requires there to be a beginning point.

Albert Einstein, the great physicist, discovered the universe had a beginning point at the start of the 20th Century. In his General Theory of Relativity Einstein discovered that the universe was simultaneously expanding and decelerating. The only physical phenomena in which expansion and deceleration occur at the same is an explosion. But he postulated that if the universe is the aftermath of an explosion, then sometime in the past it had to have a beginning. There had to be a moment at which the explosion began. And if it had a beginning, then we Christians would say through the principle of cause and effect that the beginning implies the existence of a beginner.

An astronomer, William Hubbel, for whom the space telescope was named, proved that the galaxies are expanding away from one another in the manner exactly predicted by Einstein's formulation of general relativity. And while Einstein's worldview was certainly not a Christian worldview, he certainly accepted the notion that the universe had to have a beginning and that the order of the universe required a superior reasoning power.

Other natural physicists like Stephen Hawking and Roger Penrose, extended the equation of general relativity to include space and time. Without even attempting to explain their complex theories, these astrophysicists in the 1970's have proven that even time had a beginning. And scientists through space probes have upon 12 separate occasions accumulated evidence to show that the universe had a beginning point. They would conclude that the beginning point was somewhere between 17-20 billion years ago.

But however long the length of time was, the Genesis account is scientifically validated today so much so that Robit Jastrow, the former director of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies in his book called "God and the Astronomers" said, "Science has proven the universe exploded into being at a certain moment." If you are looking for theories that are in accordance with the Genesis account, one might look at the big bang theory. If you are looking for theories that are opposed both to the Genesis account and to Einstein, one might look at the steady state theory for the universe's existence.

Now the second thing that we read from this Genesis account is that God created everything. It says, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." The universe and all that it contains, visible and invisible, was made at a point in time by one person, God. The Bible continually asserts that over and over again. In John 1:3 we read, "All things were made through him and without him not anything was made that has been made." Paul is very explicit when he says about Christ, "For in him, all things were created, all things were created in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible." Rev. 4:11 underlines this when the 24 elders around the throne say, "You are worthy, our Lord and God, to receive glory and honor and power for you created all things and by your will they existed and were created."

What does this mean? It means that in contrast to a view that the universe is eternal, or that matter or energy is eternal, matter and energy had a beginning as did time itself. Gen. 1:1 clearly teaches creation ex nihillum – creation out of nothing. Now this stands over against a number of explanations for the origin of the universe. For example, the philosopher Plato suggested the world was formed out of some sort of primal matter, that there was some stuff here that was worked on by the creator. In Babylonian mythology the God Marduk fights against Tiamat, the monster of chaos; slays this monster and the world is created out of the fragments of its carcass.

But the biblical picture is a picture of from nothingness comes existence. The account in Genesis 1 is also at odd with Pantheism as seen in Eastern religions. Pantheism teaches that there is a distinction between God and the creation, but creation is all a part of God, just a particularized expression of God. So Shirley McClain can run around saying, "I am God and you are God, the only thing is we don't realize it." Pantheism – the view that all is God, over against this the Bible asserts that there is a personal infinite God who made the universe, but the universe is not itself God, it is distinct from God.

There is a great picture of this distinction between God and his creation in the painting that Michelangelo did on the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel. On one side of the ceiling as Michelangelo tries to portray the creation of Adam, he has a picture of God with God's finger stretched out towards Adam. On the other side of the ceiling, he has Adam with his hand stretched out towards God. But there is a little gap between the finger of God and the hand of Adam. God's essence doesn't ooze into Adam. Adam is not a part of God. He is not the creator in some sense. God's distinctiveness remains as creator. There is no cosmic oozing. There is no emanations. God created the universe the way an artist might paint a picture. The picture was conceived in the artist's mind and the artist put it on the canvas, but the painting is not the artist and the artist is not the painting. The only difference is that God also created the stuff from which the canvas was made and the oils and the brushes were made. There is no analogy to that that we humans have. We never create out of nothing. And we manufacture, make, shape and form. It is interesting by the way that the word "create" the Hebrew word "bara" is used only of God and never of people because none of us creates out of nothing.

God not only created the universe, but we read in Gen. 1 that there is an orderliness to God's creation. Out of the original darkness, God brings light. Perhaps this is speaking of the original big bang, this stupendous explosion that occurred at the beginning that scientists have calculated must have involved trillions of degrees of heat,

billions of times hotter than any nuclear explosion. One astrophysicist said the dazzling brilliance of the radiation in this dense, hot universe must have been beyond description. And immediately following this enormous flash of light and energy, all that constitutes the universe was ejected in every direction. Perhaps the light was that original cosmic explosion by God.

But there is an orderliness to the creation. The light is separated from the darkness. The waters are separated from the land. The animals and plants are created according to their kinds. This is not just a random throwing together of things. This is not like one of those modern art paintings where water balloons are filled with paint and then someone throws them against a canvas.

And it is this orderliness, this rationality, in the creation that forms the foundation for modern science. If the universe didn't have a certain logic to it, a certain order, not only in the physical world, but in the biological world – the world of plants and animals, then it wouldn't be worth studying. All of our studies would lead to nothing. The reason why science can exist is because the universe has a logic to it, an order. As Einstein once observed, God didn't play dice, he didn't play craps with the universe.

Most of the founders of modern science were orthodox Christians who saw this orderliness to it and sought to understand what God was doing. Men like Isaac Newton, Johannes Kepler, Blaise Pascal, Robert Boyle, Michael Faraday, James Clerk Maxwell, even Galileo, who was persecuted by the church was an orthodox Christian. The universe is wonderful in its orderliness.

And the order that we see in Gen. 1 and the statement that God created the heavens and the earth suggests an intelligent designer and ultimately a purpose in all that exists. You see, there are really only one of two possibilities – either the universe had a designer namely God, who had something in mind, a purpose for designing the world, or the universe has no designer and is simply the result of matter and energy as they interact over time. That the universe began with no purpose in mind and will end with no purpose in mind. A universe began with no purpose in mind and ends with no purpose in mind that means that we human beings are here just by some accident, but some cosmic joke as Bertrand Russell said, “we are a sideshow, footnote in the story of the universe a curious accident in a backwater called earth.” And that means that there is no ultimate significance to our lives. Indeed, it is just our own arrogance, a twist of our own makeup that we just try to project out some purpose and meaning where there is none.

Many, many people living on the earth today without a view of the creator are living without a sense of purpose and meaning. And is it any wonder that living without a sense of purpose, meaning, without a sense that God created this world and everything in it including you, is it any wonder that in the wealthiest nation that has ever existed that when millions have a philosophy of life that there is no ultimate purpose that we would suffer the highest rates of depression in world history. Is it any wonder that millions of people around the world commit suicide every year and deliberately end their own lives because existence is so painful without purpose, without meaning? Is it any wonder that millions try to dull the sense of purposelessness and meaninglessness through drug addiction, alcoholism, substance abuse, and eating disorders.

The naturalistic scientific enterprise that has removed God as creator and preserver of the universe, the one who ordered things and has a purpose, this naturalistic

scientific enterprise has bequeathed to us despair and depression and addiction. For without a view of the creator, without being grounded in Genesis 1 you cannot live a meaning-filled, purpose-filled life. Do you feel depressed? Hopeless? Do you feel like there is an absence of purpose and meaning in life? How strongly do you believe that God created the whole world and specially created you?

Why did God create? Why is there anything rather than nothing?

God created so that his name would be praised and blessed. Psalm 148 says, "Praise him sun and moon, praise him all you shining stars, praise him you highest heavens and waters beneath the heavens, let them praise the name of the Lord for he commanded and they were created."

Psalm 104 says, "O Lord my God, you are very great; you are clothed with splendor and majesty. You wrap yourself with light as with a garment; You have stretched out the heavens like a tent...You set the earth on its foundation so that it would never be shaken. You covered the waters with the deep as with a garment. The waters stood above the mountains. At your rebuke they fled...O Lord, how manifold are your works? In wisdom have you made them all."

God created the world and everything in it so that he would be praised. He created the world and everything in it so that we would stand back and marvel at his power and wisdom.

Psalm 145:5 says, "On the glorious splendor of your majesty and on your wondrous works I will meditate."

There are few people in the world today who have marveled more at the wonders of creation than a woman named Annie Dillard. She wrote a marvelous book called "Pilgrim at Tinker Creek," which won a Pulitzer Prize. It is written in the forms of meditations on various creatures that Annie Dillard comes upon in her little world. Here is what she says,

"You are God. You want to make a forest, something to hold the soil, lock up solar energy, and give off oxygen. Wouldn't it simpler just to rough in a slab of chemicals, a green acre of goo?" Just think about what it would take to make a tree, Annie Dillard says, you are a man, a retired railroad worker who makes replicas as a hobby. You decide to make a replica of one tree, an exact replica. The long leaf pine your great-grandfather planted, just a replica. It doesn't even have to work. It doesn't have to absorb light or use chlorophyll to manufacture nutrients for the tree, you just want to make something that looks like a tree. How long do you think it would take you to make an exact replica of a pine tree? How good is your glue?

For one thing you have to dig a hole and stick your replica trunk in the ground half way to China if you want the thing to stand up because you have to work fairly big. If you replica is too small you will be unable to handle the slender, three-sided needles, fix them in clusters of three fascicles and attach those laden fascicles to flexible twigs. The twigs themselves must be covered by many silvery, white-fringed long spreading scales. Are your pinecones scales thin, flat, rounded at the apex, the exposed portions (close cone) reddish brown, often wrinkled, armed on the back with a small reflected prickles which curves toward the base of the scale? When you loose the last cup of wiring trussing the limbs to the trunk, the whole tree would probably collapse like an umbrella.

You want to marvel at creation, think about how long it would take you or an Army of people to build one exact replica of a pine tree. And it is not just a matter of marveling,

but the purpose of creation is to provide men and women with some humility. In the presence of the great creative activities of God, do we not just want to bow in humility and say, "O Lord, you are very great." As John Piper once said, "The way to build up your self-esteem is not to stand next to something really, really big. A person doesn't stand next to the Grand Canyon and marvel at their own greatness. A person stands next to the Grand Canyon and feels a sense of their own smallness, their own littleness. Very big things humble us. And as we look at the stars and the scope of the universe, as we consider the millions of galaxies, we proud modern men and women are humbled.

We read that God created the animals according to their kinds, v. 21. "So God created the great creatures of the sea and every living and moving thing with which the water teemed, according to their kinds; and every winged bird according to its kind. God saw that it was good."

V. 24, "Let the land produce living creatures according to their kinds. Livestock creatures that moved along the ground and wild animals each according to its kind and it was so. God made the wild animals according to their kind, the livestock according to their kind, and all the wild creatures that move along the ground according to their kind. And God saw that it was good."

One of the foundations of the theory of evolution according to Darwin was the absence of fixity, fixedness, in various species. Darwin said that whether we are talking about species or families or orders, or phyla, these things are fluid and changeable over time. Darwin also believed that all of the animals, as well as every other living organism has a common ancestor – a single microscopic ancestor. From a bacterial cell, for example, over billions of years was crafted such wonders as trees and flowers, ants, birds and humans.

And then Darwin said that the mechanism by which this single cell organism produced all of the varieties of creatures that we see today is two fold: one variation is what scientists call today mutations and natural selection. What has on occasion been called the survival of the fittest.

Now the Bible directly contradicts Darwinian theory. The Bible seems to suggest not these changeable animals that mutate from one species to another over time. The Bible says that the animals were created according to their kinds. It is unclear what the Bible meant by kinds, every word has some degree of flexibility in it, it is probably not as narrow as species. We don't know how broad it goes. It could extend out to families and orders. But there are limits. And the Bible clearly doesn't suggest that all of life had a common ancestor, a single cell bacteria. It said that God created the various kinds of animals fully formed. He creates the livestock fully formed. He creates the birds fully formed. He creates the snakes fully formed. The only common source is God.

The Bible also doesn't say that all the variation is a result of random mutation. It says the variation is due to the thoughtful, planned activity of God.

Now here we have a confrontation. There really is no room for accommodation on the point of Darwinian evolution, there is a clear collision of explanations – God created; or it came about by random mutations. And it will do no good to talk about theistic evolution, God created, but he did so through the mechanism of evolution. Genesis 1 couldn't be plainer – not everything descending from one bacteria over time, but special

creations of the various kinds; some degree of limitness and fixedness to the species – Genesis 1 doesn't say that God created millions of random mutations, none of which were very good in the way that he intended. None of which were really the kinds of plants or animals he wanted to have on the earth. Try to square Genesis 1 with any kind of evolutionary view would require God to have said, "Let the earth bring forth living creatures according to their kinds" and after 387,492,871 attempts God finally made a mouse that worked and that pleased him.

And the moment you start talking about intelligent design anyway, you have completely shot through Darwinian evolution anyway which is based on random mutation. There is a conflict.

Now, how do we resolve the conflict. The resolution of the conflict is not only for Christians to say, "Well, we just close our eyes to the scientific evidence and sing another chorus of "Give me that old time religion." Christians do bow before the Word of God, but we also expect the world around us to actually support and be congruent with what the Bible says because the Bible is describing reality as it is, not as we wish it to be. The Bible is not calling for people to stick their heads in the sand or unscrew their heads. The Bible speaks truthfully. The author of the scripture is the creator of the universe. What we find in the universe ought to be in accordance with what we find in the Bible.

And friends, it is. The scientific evidence is not on the side of Darwinian evolution. It is on the side of the Gen. 1 creation account. Listen to me. Darwin said in his day in the 1850's that the fossil record would eventually disclose millions and millions of transitional life forms. Listen, if all of life came from a single bacteria and then evolved to all the complex species that exist in the world today, the fossil record that Darwin predicted should reveal millions and millions of transitional forms – intermediary life forms going up the evolutionary chain toward evermore complex creatures. Darwin said, in fact, that if a fossil record did not eventually disclose these intermediary forms, these transitional forms, then his theory would collapse.

Do you know that we have over 130 million fossils and Stephen Gould from Harvard University said that the two characteristics of the fossil records are entirely inconsistent with the idea of gradual Darwinian change over the generations. Stephen Gould who rejects the idea of the creator, who is still an evolutionist, said what the fossil record reveals entirely is #1 stasis that species exhibit no directional change during their time on earth. They appear in the fossil record looking pretty much the same as when they disappear. In other words, a species appears in the fossil records at a 100 million BC exactly as it disappears from the fossil records at 50 million BC.

The second thing that the fossil records show is not only stasis, no change, but sudden appearance. In a local area a species doesn't arrive gradually by a steady transformation of its ancestors, it appears all at once, full formed. What you see in the fossil record is sudden appearance of a fully formed reptile, not a gradual transition into reptilian form. It is the sudden appearance of birds, not an animal with part of a wing and then another part of a wing. Just like the Genesis accounts suggests, creation according to their kinds and fully formed animals when they were created.

You say, "Rich, what about all the drawings that we see on the walls of the Natural History Museums? All these paintings of these intermediary forms?"

They are precisely that – paintings. Like the medieval painting of angels or cherubim, it's all just our imagination. The fossil record does not depict transitional life forms.

“But,” you say, “what about my science book which had the evolution of the horse and it had a little tiny horse called “eohippus” and then getting bigger and bigger into the modern horse.”

Do you remember that little transitional thing in your science books? What your science textbooks didn't tell you is that there is nothing like that straight line of descent in the fossil records. In fact, those intermediary skeletons actually appear earlier in time than the ancestor horses. You start off, in other words, with one of these creatures at about 40 million BC and this so-called descendant actually appears in the fossil record at 50 million BC. And then another one of these creatures appears at 20 million BC and then another appears as a later descendant appeared earlier in time in the fossil records at 30 million BC. The fossil record just bounces all over the place.

I haven't had the time to critique paleontology. The evidence suggests, according to Philip Johnson in *Darwin on Trial*, that paleontologists see in these various bones what they want to see. It is not the bones that are forcing conclusion, it is the paleontologists that are looking at the bones very much the way someone would look at a Rorschach Inkblot Test. They see the projection of their own minds. Most of the bones are nothing other than various kinds of primate species, different apes, others are simply men.

Not only does the fossil record not support Darwinism, but it is statistically virtually impossible to form even a simple protein out of the so-called prebiotic soup that was said to exist at the beginning of time. Listen, a protein is an unimaginably complex string of amino acids. A lot of people imagine that at the beginning the earth had all these chemicals swishing around in this big pond that was being bombarded by gamma rays and by radiation and lightening bolts. And with all of this energy interacting with these chemicals over billions of years, suddenly a protein arose.

One mathematician calculated that the likelihood that chemicals could randomly arrange themselves into a protein molecule would be about 1 out of 10 to the 65th power given even 10 billion years. 1 out of 10 to the 65th power. That is 10 with 65 zeros after it.

Do you know how small a probability that is? I mean if you filled the state of Texas with silver dollars one foot deep and just marked one of those silver dollars with a red dot and threw it somewhere in the pile and then blindfolded a person and said, “Walk over the length and breadth of Texas, reach down your hand and find the silver dollar with the red dot, his chances of finding the silver dollar with the red dot would be trillions of times greater than the chance of chemicals randomly arranging themselves into proteins. The formation of a protein, much less a cell, which is so much more complicated just could not happen by random design. Fred Hoyle, a famous scientist said, “it is more likely that a Boeing 747 would be created by a tornado sweeping through a junkyard than a protein particle would form from chemicals randomly combining in a pond.”

Evolutionists would say, “But amazingly it did happen, so it could happen.”

Listen, if a person were sentenced to death by a firing squad of a 1000 sharpshooters and the sharpshooters stood 20 feet away from that person with high-powered rifles aimed at the criminal's chest. And at a given signal they all fired at his

chest, but amazingly, the man didn't fall dead, one possibility would be that chance, that luck saved the man's life. He might say with the evolutionists, "I guess an even against all the odds really can occur. I guess you can really pluck up the one silver dollar with the red dot from the whole state of Texas. Maybe a 747 could come into being from a tornado blowing through a junk yard. Maybe chemicals could form themselves into great amino acids and change into what we call proteins."

Or, more plausibly, more reasonably, the still living man might say, "Perhaps there is an alternate explanation to my continued life. Perhaps the reason why I am still alive is because the men were firing blanks, or they purposed to miss."

What we see is the best explanation for intelligent design by an intelligent designer. What Darwinian evolutionists cannot explain is the sudden appearance of organisms in the fossil record from nothing and the sudden functioning of organs within those organisms from nothing. So they create more and more complicated theories to explain the fossil record.

Do you know what is going on in modern biology today? It is reminiscent of astronomy before Copernicus. Before Copernicus astronomers said that the earth was the center of the universe and the sun revolved around the earth. Astronomers came up with ever more complicated theories to explain the movement of the heavenly bodies. And they were pretty good in their predictions. They could trace where certain planets ought to be, but there were these different anomalies. The planets didn't show up where they should be, so they had another hypothesis of why a planet showed up in a certain place. And other theory about why the sun showed up in a certain place. And why the stars moved the way they did. And the whole theory became more and more complicated until it all collapsed under the weight of all these alternative hypotheses and Copernicus came up with a new and much simpler view that instead of the earth being the center, the sun was the center and the earth revolved around the sun.

What is going on in modern evolutionary theory is more and more alternative hypotheses designed to bolster this one false hypothesis that life evolved over time from a single ancestor; that all the diversity is a result of random mutations plus time and chance; that species change radically over time into new and different species passing through thousands or millions of intermediate, transitional forms on the way. .

You say, "Why are biologists working so hard to stifle the mountain of contradictory evidence to evolution? Why work so hard? Why after a hundred million fossils will people not simply say, "This theory is false, it doesn't work?" Why when we are talking about astronomical odds against the formation of even a simple protein, much less the complexity of a cell or the human eye or liver, would we say, "Well, it still must have happened by chance." Why work so hard to preserve something so foolish?"

Because the alternative to Darwinian evolution is too horrible for many people to imagine. The alternative to Darwinian evolution and a universe that is simply the product of randomness and chance and natural forces is the existence of God and special creation. And the moment we start opening the door to the possibility that a God exists who created animals according to their kinds, and created men and women in his image by a special act of creation, you know what you have then? You have the possibility of accountability before that God. The possibility of judgment and the potential existence of absolute standards of right and wrong.

Do you know why folks hold onto evolution so strongly? Because the alternative is unthinkable.

Friends, all of the scientific evidence is on the side of the Genesis 1 account. There is a beginning to the universe. There is design. The fossil records suggest species arising suddenly without transitional forms. Life is simply too complicated to have arisen randomly. There is a creator over us who does hold us accountable and before whom we will have to answer.

But because there is a creator over us, life has meaning and purpose. And human beings are worth something. We are not simple accidents to be tossed aside when weak, sick or old. But we are precious because we are specially designed and created in the image of God.

Let's pray.