

We're been in a series entitled, *Call Me Crazy* – talking about why I believe in the Bible and in God's existence. Today, we're going to look at why I believe in Creation.

As we begin our study, I want to remind you that while I'm not an expert in the field of science will see today that there's great credible evidence through science to support the truth of God and creation. In fact, I believe science provides far more proof for creation than it does for evolution.

Contrary to what some believe, I believe most of the modern findings of contemporary science establish the reality that science and faith are not at war – but that science, when performed correctly, points powerfully toward the existence of God and His creative genius as described in the Bible.

As you'd imagine, there are many who'd disagree w/ me. Once such person is prominent Darwinian evolutionist William Provine of Cornell University who offers (5) inescapable conclusions if Darwin's claims are true.

1. There's no evidence for God
2. There's no life after death
3. There's no absolute foundation for right/wrong
4. There's no ultimate meaning for life
5. People don't really have free will
- 6.

The issue for Dr. Provine is that recent scientific/astrological findings have so discredited Darwin's theory that leading scientists are jumping ship to believe in an intelligent designer.

Needless to say, paleontologically speaking, such a result has led to a *bone of contention*.

I A Fundamental AXIOM

To begin w/ there are a few fundamental ideas that must be understood to appreciate the uniqueness of the debate.

Science is an attempt to interpret the facts of nature to understand our origin and way of life

Theology is an attempt to interpret the reality of God through the words of the Bible

Since the Bible claims God created the universe and gave us the Bible as revelation to know who He is; then if the Bible is God's Word, it shouldn't be in contradiction to God's creation.

Any conflict b/w science and the Bible either must be attributed to man's misunderstanding/misinterpretation of either the Bible, or science – or both Bible and science.

Did God make man or did man make up God? Was man created in God's image or is God in the imagination of man? Is man just a clever creature who somehow, some way, accidentally and spontaneously emerged from prehistoric ooze, or is life a result of Divine design?

When all the theories are boiled down to the basics, we have but (2) options for belief regarding our existence – either God created or we have evolved from nothing. **Genesis 1**

In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. The earth was formless and void, and darkness was over the surface of the deep, and the Spirit of God was moving over the surface of the waters. Then God said, "Let there be light"; and there was light. God saw that the light was good; and God separated the light from darkness. God called the light day, and the darkness He called night. And there was evening and there was morning, one day. Then God said, "Let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters, and let it separate the waters from the waters." God made the expanse and separated the waters which were below the expanse from the waters which were above the expanse; and it was so. God called the expanse heaven. And there was evening and there was morning, a 2nd day. Then God said, "Let the waters below the heavens be gathered into one place, and let the dry land appear"; and it was so. God called the dry land earth, and the gathering of the waters He called seas; and God saw that it was good. Then God said, "Let the earth sprout vegetation, plants yielding seed, and fruit trees on the earth bearing fruit after their kind w/ seed in them"; and it was so. The earth brought forth vegetation, plants yielding seed after their kind, and trees bearing fruit w/ seed in them, after their kind; and God saw that it was good. There was evening and there was morning, a 3rd day. Then God said, "Let there be lights in the expanse of the heavens to separate the day from the night, and let them be for signs and for seasons and for days and years; and let them be for lights in the expanse of the heavens to give light on the earth"; and it was so. God made the two great lights, the greater light to govern the day, and the lesser light to govern the night; He made the stars also. God placed them in the expanse of the heavens to give light on the earth, and to govern the day and the night, and to separate the light from the darkness; and God saw that it was good. There was evening and there was morning, a 4th day. Then God said, "Let the waters teem w/ swarms of living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth in the open expanse of the heavens." God created the great sea monsters and every living creature that moves, w/ which the waters swarmed after their kind and every winged bird after its kind; and God saw that it was good. God blessed them, saying, "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let birds multiply on the earth." There was evening and there was morning, a 5th day. Then God said, "Let the earth bring forth living creatures after their kind: cattle and creeping things and beasts of the earth after their kind"; and it was so. God made the beasts of the earth after their kind, and the cattle after their kind, and everything that creeps on the ground after its kind; and God saw that it was good. Then God said, "Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness; and let them rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over the cattle and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth." God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them. God blessed them; and God

said to them, “Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue it; and rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over every living thing that moves on the earth.” Then God said, “Behold, I have given you every plant yielding seed that is on the surface of all the earth, and every tree which has fruit yielding seed; it shall be food for you; and to every beast of the earth and to every bird of the sky and to everything that moves on the earth which has life, I have given every green plant for food”; and it was so. God saw all that He had made, and behold, it was very good. And there was evening and there was morning, the 6th day.

What we have here is the basic idea of creation. ***In the beginning God created*** – that is, an intelligent, capable designer spoke life into existence w/ the intent of giving life meaning and purpose. This is the exact opposite reality of what evolution proposes.

Now if we were being honest, **Genesis 1** is a simplistic way of how life began – **WHY?** I think it is b/c the intent of Genesis 1 isn't to give us a detailed accounting of how God created but to give us an appreciation for the God who created. **Meaning Genesis 1 is more about God than it is about creation.** This doesn't mean Genesis 1 is ambivalent and irrelevant on the topic of creation, but that it was never intended to be conclusive, concise, literal description either.

As a result, whether you hold to a young earth or old earth theory – no one can know w/ certainty how this all came to be. And b/c the Bible is about God and His plan of redemption, to get caught in the weeds of **2 of the 1189 chapters** would be in my estimation a grave mistake.

B/c of this and b/c of mankind's thirst to understand and explain everything, man has come up w/ all kinds of theories to explain how we got our universe – and the most commonly accepted theory today is the theory of evolution.

When I speak of the big idea of evolution – I am speaking of the amoeba to man theory of macro-evolution.

This theory was adequately described in a Time Magazine article in 1993 entitled ***How Life Began – New Discoveries Provide Surprising Answers to Age Old Questions***. The article described how scientists believe how life on earth began some 4.5 bil. yrs. ago when the earth/moon were formed. Now scientists have no idea how this happened, but assume that somehow something happened to form our earth/moon. Once formed, the article talked about how the earth/moon were bombarded by meteors likely destroying any semblance of life several times before life finally got a grip in the form of simple, single cell creatures. These single celled creatures began to show up some 2 bil. yrs. ago and began to evolve ultimately becoming vertebrates that evolved to become amphibians, then reptiles, to birds, to mammals and eventually homo sapiens. And that is the basic theory of macroevolution.

Chances are if you've been through the educational system you've been taught this theory as fact in some form or another and more often than not this theory was credited to a man named **Charles Darwin**. But the theory of evolution has been around much longer than Darwin.

A selection-ist theory can be traced as far back as 550 BC to a man named Alexander of Miletus who taught that life was generated from slime that grew in pools of stagnant water.

Apparently, one day Alexander came upon a stagnant, stinking pool of water that caught his attention. Over the next few days as he passed by he noticed the presence of tiny creatures in the ooze wiggling around. As he observed these creatures over the next few days, he noticed they grew wings, floated to the surface, and flew away. We now these creatures – mosquitos! But he decided that's how life began!

Point – the idea of evolution has been around for a long time. Why? B/c people just don't want to accept the idea that there's a God who put it together. B/c if there's a God who put it together than maybe we're accountable to Him – and since mankind wants his freedom – and evolution gives man the scientific justification to be FREE! He buys it!

Problem is this theory is being peddled as fact in our schools and universities and the results are proving to be catastrophic on the well-being of man. For decades we've been taught that nothing plus time plus chance changes amoebas to astronauts, molecules to monkeys, and then monkeys to man. **It is like a fairytale for adults that we're being taught time plus chance can turn frogs into princes.** A. Rogers

III Five Reasonable REASONS to Reject Evolution

As I have studied the subject, I've come to the conclusion, like many others, that the evidence for creation far outweighs the evidence for evolution – including a growing list of brilliant scientist.

A The VIEWS of Great Scientist

In fact, one of the simple basic reasons I reject evolution as fact is b/c leading scientist are rejecting evolution – and it's not b/c they're believers in God but b/c of the lack of evidence for evolution – it's weird science.

Listen to Dr. Newton Tahmisian, a physiologist for the Atomic Energy Commission said, *“Scientists who go about teaching that evolution is a fact of life are great conmen, and the story they're telling may be the greatest hoax ever. In explaining evolution, we don't have one iota of fact.”*

Swedish embryologist, Dr. Søren Løvtrup, said: *“I believe one day, the Darwinian myth will be ranked the greatest deceit in the history of science. When this happens, many people will pose the question, ‘How did this ever happen?’”*

Many of the greatest scientists who've ever lived were **creationists** – Michael Faraday, Lord Kelvin, Joseph Lister, Louis Pasteur, Isaac Newton, Johannes Kepler, Sir William Ramsey, Lord Francis Bacon, Samuel Morris, and more.

I don't have time to go into all the wacky science involved in trying to support the theory of evolution so I'm going to hit the highlights on a few of the more prominent ideas in my estimation. One of them I mentioned last week – like the failure of science to live w/in the laws of thermodynamics.

B The VIOLATION of Scientific Method

For something to be scientific it must be based on the **Scientific Method**. The Scientific Method is the means by which all science revolves.

The Scientific Method has (4) ingredients: (1) **Observation**. You've got to observe things to have the scientific method occur. (2) **Hypothesis**. Based on what has been observed a theory can be formed. (3) **Testable**. Can the hypothesis be replicated in a controlled environment? (4) **Repeatable**. Can the test of the hypothesis be repeated successfully?

Let's take the Scientific Method and apply it to the idea of evolution. (1) Has anybody ever observed evolution? NO. **Immediately we're in the realm of speculation, not science – b/c to be science** – it has to be observable.

(2) Can a hypothesis be formed? Yes. Only it begins w/ imagination rather than observation.

(3) Can the speculative hypothesis be tested? Not really – especially when it comes to macroevolution. You can't test the hypothesis of amoeba to man w/out monkeying w/ the test. Someone has to make somethings up. Let me explain.

If I offer a simple math problem ($1 + x + 4 = 8$) What is (x)? $x = 3$. In evolution, b/c there's no true observation, an extra variable must be added requiring a human element that monkey's w/ the test – so our equation changes to ($1 + x + y = 8$). To figure (x) someone have to guess (y).

So if it can't be tested, then (4) it can't be repeated – so 3 of 4 ingredients of Scientific Method have been violated. What does this mean? It means that evolution isn't science; it is a religion or philosophy requiring lots and lots of faith.

B The RE-IMAGINING of the Origin of Life

How did life occur? If you believe the Bible, then you believe God authored life. *In the beginning God created...* But the idea of evolution offers a smorgasbord of options – all of which will leave you w/ a bitter taste of dissatisfaction.

One theory of evolution (as late as 3/15) is that some germ of life from some distant place in space hijacked a meteor, and was carried to Earth and after surviving an impact that destroyed everything on the Earth except the earth itself – survived long enough to be the catalyst to spark life once life came around again – and that's how life originated on Earth. Which begs the question – How did life originate somewhere out yonder in space?

How did life on Earth start? Did it emerge from the primordial ooze as is popularly believed, or did it land here from a comet or some other celestial body? A new study in the journal *Nature Chemistry* provides strong evidence the ingredients necessary to concoct the first life forms did indeed exist on earth. The scientists say they used hydrogen sulfide, hydrogen cyanide and ultraviolet light – (3) basic elements that were available pre-life as we know it – to create the building blocks of compounds that eventually led to the genetic material all life on earth holds in common, DNA. The process also likely got some extraterrestrial help. They speculate that meteorites might have reacted w/ nitrogen in the atmosphere to create hydrogen cyanide, and that in water, that chemical could've interacted w/ both hydrogen sulfide and the sun's UV light to generate life. *Time Magazine* in 3/15

Another theory is called *spontaneous generation*. Basically, there was nothing that somehow found something that spontaneously combusted to generate life.

Dr. George Wall, Professor Emeritus of Biology at Harvard, Nobel Prize in Biology, wrote in *Scientific American* on the origin of life: “*There are only two possibilities as to how life arose: One is spontaneous generation arising to evolution. The other is a supernatural creative act of God. There's no 3rd possibility.*” He continues, “*Spontaneous generation, that life arose from nonliving matter, was scientifically disproved 120 yrs. ago by Louis Pasteur and others. That leaves us w/ only one possible conclusion: that life arose as a supernatural creative act of God.*” Sounds good? But listen to what he said next: “*I will not accept that..., I can't accept that philosophically, b/c I don't want to believe in God.*”

C Fixity of the SPECIES – Macro vs Micro

Another hurdle for evolution is transmutation across species. Can cells trans-mutate into something entirely different? No.

Now no one in religion or science disputes *microevolution* – that is, that there is development and adaption w/in a species. But this isn't the premise of the basic theory of evolution. *Macroevolution*, or the theory that life crosses species – meaning that reproduction doesn't always come kind after kind. There has to be a transmutation b/w species that produces a protozoa (single cell organism) that can trans-mutate from one species to the next. **Problem is there's no proven scientific evidence to support this conjecture.**

What does the Bible say about the species? Genesis 1:11–12

And God said, “Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth,” and it was so. And the earth brought forth grass and herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, after his kind: and God saw that it was good.

after his kind – mutation w/in species

If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down.

Charles Darwin

Can I take you on a little journey into the basic factory of life? In recent years, scientist have mapped and documented the entire human genome (the chemical instructions inside every cell that contain the blueprints of life) – and it all begins w/ a single simple cell – **only a cell is not simple.**

I'd like for you to listen to a description of a simple cell by Michael Denton, *Evolution a Theory in Crisis*. He writes, “*Perhaps in no other era of modern biology is the challenge poised by extreme complexity and ingenuity of the biological adaptations more apparent than in the fascinating new molecular world of the cell.*”

Denton continues – “*If we could magnify a cell what we'd see is an object of unparalleled complexity and adaptive design. On the surface of the cell we'd see millions of openings like the portholes of a vast space ship opening and closing and allowing a constant stream of materials to flow in and out. And if we were to enter one of those openings we'd find ourselves in a world of supreme technology and bewildering complexity.*”

Picture a cell in your mind. If that's difficult to imagine, then imagine this room is a factory. And inside our factory we are going to build something – so we need machinery. The cell is the factory; and the machines inside the factory are **cell protein molecules**.

Protein molecules are so small they have to be multiplied several million times before they're visible. They're made up of several 1000 atoms folded into this complex arrangements of a chainlike deal that look like spaghetti. The avg. cell has **445 parts but can be higher.**

So picture our factory (cell). Inside our factory are machines (protein molecules). But there's a problem. In order for the machines (proteins) inside our factory (cell) to work, they have to be put together just right.

It'd be as if we went to a GM Plant and found the plant manager had put all the parts to Corvette in a box in the corner. Problem – it's not put together – but if you can put it together – you can have it. So you walk over to see 1000's of parts and wires along w/ a can of paint. If you're like me, you wouldn't know where to begin. You might get some of it right, but you wouldn't be able to get it all right. That's the problem w/ our cell factory. It has the machinery but all the parts are in boxes and the cell doesn't have the ability to put together the machinery.

These machine parts are called **amino acids**. And scientist estimate there are some **445 amino acids for every one protein molecule**. Now the amazing thing about a cell is that it only works if all the amino acids string together in exactly the right sequence. Amino acids are like a key that fits into the ignition of the protein to make it work.

But the key has to be sequenced correctly to fit – b/c if you confuse even one of them, it won't work. Here's the challenge – the number of options/combinations on amino acids outnumber the entire number of atoms in existence. So to get this sequencing correct, we need instructions. These instructions are located inside the cell in DNA. DNA contains the blueprint for the cell.

Every DNA molecule has some 4 bil. bits of information that is paired together in what looks like a spiral ladder. This DNA floats around inside the cell waiting to provide instruction to precisely align and sequence the amino acids to unlock the proteins to generate the cell.

So picture our factory (cell). Inside our factory are machines (protein molecules). And beside our machines are boxes of parts (amino acids) and the instructions (DNA) to sequence these parts to make our machines to work so that our factory can produce – are in an office inside the factory.

But there is a problem inside our cell – cellular protein molecules and amino acids can't communicate w/ DNA b/c they speak different languages.

So we have a factory (cell) w/ machinery (protein molecules) w/ boxes of parts (amino acids) and blueprints (DNA) in the office, but no one can get in the office to collect them to translate them. We need a communications dept. – RNA

RNA is the communications director inside the cell. RNA goes to the DNA and makes a photocopy of the sequence instructions. And since RNA is bilingual, it can talk DNA and amino acid, it floats over to this box of 400 amino acids and says – “Ok, you go there, you get here, you go there,” putting together all of the amino acids in a perfect string to unlock the protein molecule so that the cell is now ready to start producing something. And this is for one protein. Just one! And the simplest cell has a minimum of 239 cells.

Let's discuss this DNA/RNA process of copying/translating – 4 bil. bits of information. Let's assume you wanted to pass on 4 bil. bits of info to someone so you hire a secretary. This assistant would have to type 6,000 words a minute over 40 hours to make that one copy. Furthermore, DNA to RNA is so accurate our secretary couldn't make one mistake in the process. Anybody know a secretary w/ that kind of skill?

So picture our factory (cell). Inside our factory are machines (protein molecules). And beside our machines are boxes of parts (amino acids) and the instructions (DNA) to sequence these parts to make our machines to work so that our factory can produce – are in an office inside the factory. So our translator (RNA) goes and retrieves the instructions (DNA) and delivers them to the parts (amino acids) and gets them perfectly sequenced so they can allow the machines (protein molecules) to work so that our factory (cell) produces.

If you think this happened as a result of random chance then you have more faith than I have. To think that some primeval cell in bubbly goop on a prehistoric Earth that no one knows how it got here could produce such complexity – I'd say that's a lot farfetched. How farfetched?

Well, since I've already blown your mind, let me pile on a little more. Let's take the simplest living cell. This cell would need 239 proteins. That's so simple there isn't even one in existence. Each protein w/in that cell would need on the avg. 445 amino acids. All lined up in a perfect roll to work. That's what we need to get one spark of life.

To illustrate how difficult this is, I have (10) pennies in my hand, I've numbered them 1 to 10 and I've put them in my pocket. (shake up). This illustrates one protein, not 239. It illustrates 10 amino acids not 445. Now I'm going to reach in and pull out the 1st penny, the odds of me pulling out penny #1 is 1 in 10. If I put the penny back in my pocket and shake it up and pull out two pennies – my odds of pulling out #1 and #2 is 1 in a 100. I put them back in my pocket and mix them up again and pull 3 pennies this time my odds of pulling #1-3 are – 1 in 1000. To pull #1-10 in sequence is 1 in 10,000,000. And we're not talking about 239 proteins w/ 445 amino acids each, but one protein w/ 10 amino acids.

Now I want to take you to the next step. Take your one protein, w/ just an avg. chain of 445 amino acids. And according to the rules of *Random Selection* – the odds of those amino acids forming themselves in a perfect line is 1 in 10^{331} . Furthermore, the time required to get it right based on *Random Selection* is 10^{243} billion years. That's a long time.

That's why I'm here to tell you that evolution isn't science but a religion requiring more faith than to believe in God.

One more illustration. Let's talk about one cell – w/ the 239 proteins – and inside each protein are just 20 amino acids. According to scientists, the mathematical odds of arranging them and getting it right are 1 in $10^{137,915}$. This is why nearly every molecular biologist has a problem w/ evolution. They know it couldn't have happened. Life can't get organized and spring into existence – it's too complex.

One person explained it well. The odds are better for a tornado to blow through a junkyard and leave in its wake a fully functioning 747 than it is for the evolutionary process to have occurred. **We are not here by chance!**

Be careful what you believe about evolution and it's pseudo-science b/c somebody just might be trying to make a monkey out of you.

RESOURCES:

Books

A Matter of Days – Hugh Ross

A Case for the Creator – Lee Strobel

Why I Believe – D. James Kennedy

Articles

Time – *How Life Began* – Oct. 1993

Time – *Some Support for the Primordial Ooze* – Mar. 2015

Websites

www.oneminuteapologist.com

www.time.com/3753366/life-began-earth-evidence

www.illustramedia.org

www.creation.com

www.answersingenesis.org

Sermons

Randy Croft – *Evolution vs Creation: The Great Debate*

David T. Moore – *Evolution as Religion*

Tommy Nelson – *Sermon on Genesis 1* – Denton Bible

Adrian Rogers – *Why I Reject Evolution*

Lee Strobel – *The Case for the Creator*