

## E. The relationship between Scripture and the findings of modern science. (273)

- 1) Francis Schaeffer, *No Final Conflict* (1975): When all the facts are rightly understood, there will be “no final conflict” between Scripture and natural science. (274)
  - a) Schaeffer thought there was room for disagreement among Christians who believe in the total truthfulness of Scripture:
    - i) There is a possibility that God created a “grown-up” universe.
    - ii) There is a possibility of a break between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 or between 1:2 and 1:3.
    - iii) There is a possibility of a long day in Genesis 1.
    - iv) There is a possibility that the flood affected the geological data.
    - v) The use of the word “kinds” in Genesis 1 may be quite broad.
    - vi) There is a possibility of the death of animals before the fall.
    - vii) Where the Hebrew word  $\kappa \tau \grave{\alpha}$  is not used there is the possibility of sequence from previously existing things.
  - b) We should not fear to investigate scientifically the facts of the created world but should do so eagerly and with complete honesty, confident that when facts are rightly understood, they will always turn out to be consistent with God’s inerrant words in Scripture.
  - c) Objection: The Bible is only for teaching religious and ethical truth, not scientific truths.  
Answer: The whole Bible is the words of God, and he can speak to us about whatever he wants.
- 2) Some theories about creation seem clearly inconsistent with the teachings of Scripture. (275)
  - a) **Secular theories** (275): any theory of the origin of the universe that does not see an infinite God as responsible for creating the universe by intelligent design (e.g., “big bang” in secular form without God, or when Darwinian evolution is thought of in a totally materialistic sense).
  - b) **Theistic evolution** (275): The theory that God guided the process of evolution proposed by Darwin, though God created matter in the beginning, created life in its simplest form, and created man.  
Objections:
    - i) The randomness of evolutionary theory is incompatible with Scriptural teaching on the purposefulness of God’s work (Gen 1:24)
      - (a) The driving force of all evolutionary themes is *randomness*. (276) (Gen 1:21, 25)
      - (b) If God intervened in the evolutionary process, guiding it at points, we no longer have evolution at all (no longer random mutation).
    - ii) God’s creative word brings immediate response. (277) (Psa 33:6, 33:9; Gen. 1:11)
    - iii) God made plants and animals to reproduce “according to their kinds” (Gen. 1:11, 24), suggesting that God created many different types of plants and animals. (277)
    - iv) God’s role is present and active in creating or forming every living thing, a fact hard to reconcile with the kind of oversight of evolution proposed by theistic evolution. (277) (Psa 139:13, Exo 4:11, Mat 6:30, Psa 104:21)
    - v) The special creation of Adam, and Eve from him (Gen. 1-2). (278)
      - (a) Adam and Eve possessed highly developed linguistic, moral, and spiritual abilities from the moment they were created.
      - (b) The New Testament clearly understands Adam and Eve to be historical figures (cf. Luke 3:38, Acts 17:26, 1Cor. 11:8-9, 2Cor 11:3; 1 Tim. 2:13-14).
    - vi) There are many scientific problems with evolutionary theories. (279)
      - (a) Those who claim to be forced to believe in evolution because the “scientific facts” leave no other option have simply not considered the data on the other side.
      - (b) Since the Scriptural record argues convincingly against it, it does not seem to be a valid theory for a Christian to adopt.
      - (c) According to Louis Berkhof “theistic evolution is really a child of embarrassment, which calls God in at periodic intervals to help nature over the chasms that yawn at her feet. It is neither the biblical doctrine of creation, nor a consistent theory of evolution.” (Louis Berkhof, ST pp. 139-140).
  - c) Notes on the Darwinian theory of evolution (279). What do we mean by “evolution”?
 

**Micro-Evolution**—small development within one species (e.g., development of immunities, colors and varieties of roses, taller humans, etc.)

**Macro-Evolution**—“nonliving substance gave rise to the first living material, which subsequently reproduced and diversified to produce all extinct and extant organisms” (Wayne Frair and Percival Davis, *A Case for Creation* [Norcross, Ga.: CRS Books, 1983], p. 25).

    - i) Current challenges to evolution (280)
 

Darwinian Evolution—life began when a mix of chemicals present on earth spontaneously produced a very simple, probably one-celled, life form. This living cell reproduced itself, and eventually there were

some mutations or differences in the new cells produced, leading to the development of more complex life forms. A hostile environment meant many would die, but those best suited to their environment survived (natural selection).

Phillip E. Johnson in *Darwin on Trial*:

- (a) The amount of variation produced in 100 years of research is extremely limited (dogs are still dogs, fruit flies are still fruit flies, etc.) (280)
- (b) Almost any characteristic of any living animal can be said to give it some "advantage" in surviving (with imagination). Therefore what "natural selection" really means is that the animals that survive are those that survive. (A tautology, but not a persuasive argument to support a theory). In practice, those that "survive" through generations are those that have the greatest number of offspring. This proves nothing about mutations. (280)
- (c) Vast and complex mutations required to produce complex organs (e.g., an eye or bird's wing) could not have occurred in tiny mutations accumulating over thousands of generations, because the individual parts of the organ are useless (give no "advantage") unless the entire organ is functioning. (281)
  - (i) The mathematical probability of such random mutations happening in one random mutation is effectively zero.
  - (ii) Darwinists are left saying that it must have happened because it happened.
  - (iii) E.g., the Bombardier Beetle.
- (d) The fossil record does not reflect intermediate species, not in Darwin's day nor in 130 years of subsequent intensive archeological activity. (282)  
(Again, it comes to "It must have happened because it did happen" for Darwinists.)
- (e) Molecular structures do show relationships, but Darwinists assume that relationships imply common ancestry, a claim certainly not proven. (In fact, common elements seem better explained by a common designer.) (283)
- (f) Evolution cannot explain how any life could have begun from a random mixing of chemicals. (284)
  - (i) Johnson: "That a living organism emerged by chance from a pre-biotic soup is about as likely as that a 'tornado sweeping through a junkyard might assemble a Boeing 747 from the materials therein.' Chance assembly is just a naturalistic way of saying 'miracle.'" (Johnson, p. 40, quoting Fred Hoyle.)
  - (ii) In billions of years and thousands of miles in distance, even with generous masses of proteins covering the earth, the statistical possibility of enzymes being formed and identical enzymes finding each other so new copies could be produced is 10 to the 340,000,000<sup>th</sup> power—that is, one chance in 10 with 340 million zeros after it! (281)
  - (iii) Darwinian evolution is *not* an established fact.
  - (iv) Life created in a test tube also would not prove evolution, just that life takes intelligent design to create!
  - (v) The uncertainty of evolution has created many novel positions (e.g., Francis Crick, Nobel Prize winner for discovering the structure of DNA molecules, offered the "Directed Panspermia" theory: life may have been sent here by a spaceship from a distant planet!).
- ii) The Destructive influences of evolutionary theory in modern thought (286)
  - (a) If man is the product of random occurrences in the universe, no real significance for human life
  - (b) With no creator, there is no Judge to hold us morally accountable.
  - (c) If natural selection brings improvement in life forms, should we hinder this process by caring for those who are weak or less able to defend themselves?  
(why not war to destroy those who are inferior? Marx, Nietzsche, Hitler use this kind of argument)
  - (d) If humans evolve for the better, the wisdom of earlier generations (particularly religious beliefs) is not likely as valuable as modern thought, negatively impacting the trustworthiness of Scripture.
  - (e) If we are just a higher form of animal, then we should not kill animals (for food, for leather) or use them in scientific/ medical research  
→ radical animal rights groups

To order tapes or CD's e-mail Trent Poling [ctpoling@msn.com](mailto:ctpoling@msn.com) or talk to Trent in the sound booth before or after class. Trent also has electronic copies of these outlines starting in about June, 2005, and the outlines are posted on the web site [www.christianessentialsbc.com](http://www.christianessentialsbc.com)

