### **BBLICAL CREATION TRUTH** V/S THEISTIC *HESICENALIA* EVOLUTION

Theistic Evolutionists are in no way faring better. They are equally guilty of their failure to 'rightly divide the Word of Truth' and take into account all the scriptural accounts relating to creation. Instead, they have freely chosen to 'smuggle into Scripture' evolutionary concepts. They aim to explain how God supposedly brought into existence the complex universe and the rich variety of species on earth with the help of evolutionary concepts. At the same time, they tell us they are not '100 per cent sure' of what they are saying! And, as is the case with atheistic evolutionists, their vague hypothetical conclusions tend to 'mutate' in course of time and 'evolve' into ever new 'speculations'; or else, the same remain 'fossilized'.

In the 'Creation Terminology' there is not even the slightest indication of any form of evolutionary process as having been created and used by God. There is absolutely nothing in the Scriptures to indicate that God brought the complex universe and life into existence in the course of billions of years. Evolution is totally an absurd idea that has been 'smuggled' into the Scriptures based on a false interpretation of 'scientific speculations'. We need to have concrete scientific facts to be accepted as biblically supported truth and not any 'evolving and constantly mutating evolutionary guesses'.

The Bible nowhere states that God created some form of evolutionary process and that the heavens or the universe, the earth and all things therein that Man was directly fashioned and created by God as a perfect and highly intelligent being with the ability to rule over God's creation. Men as we know them today are not the product of lower forms of life resulting from evolution through '*natural selection*' and or '*survival of the fittest*'.

Anyway, as far as the Scriptures are concerned God is not a "*Macro-Evolutionist*" and need never ever be considered as such. He is the CREATOR GOD who creates by *FIAT*, miraculously, almost always in an *instant*. As such, *theistic evolutionists* are guilty of *adding* to God's Word by subscribing to atheistic evolutionary concepts which are only guesses popping out of the heads of biblically illiterate evolutionists.

Nothing has been biblically demonstrated to prove concretely that God brought into existence <u>matter</u> and <u>life</u> forms by creating and using some form of 'evolutionary processes' as falsely assumed by theistic evolutionists. It has been simply and naively assumed as such, as a result of constant exposure to false unscientific speculations (or "oppositions of science falsely so-called", 1 Timothy 6:20) of atheistic scientists and evolutionists.

Instead of allowing the Scriptures to guide them to properly interpret the facts in the "Book of Science and Natural Revelation", the so-called theistic evolutionists have <u>deified</u> the atheistic theories of cosmic and biological evolution. Next, they have naively consecrated unscientific speculations and unbiblical conclusions to sound theistic. However, they blindly believe evolutionary lies and pseudo-scientific speculations.

No wonder, reflecting on such a deplorable thinking in the Church, "In his essay "Lights of the Church and Science," Huxley stated, 'I am fairly at a loss to comprehend how anyone, for a moment, can doubt that Christian theology must stand or fall with the historical trustworthiness of the Jewish Scriptures. The very conception of the Messiah, or Christ, is inextricably interwoven with Jewish history; the identification of Jesus of Nazareth with that Messiah rests upon the interpretation of the passages of the Hebrew Scriptures which have no evidential value unless they possess the historical character assigned to them. If the covenant with Abraham was not made; --if the 'ten words' were not written by God's hand on the stone tables; if Abraham is more or less a mythical hero; the Story of the Deluge a fiction; that of the Fall a legend; and that of the Creation the dream of a seer; if all these definite and detailed narratives of apparently real events have no more value as history than have the stories of the regal period of Rome-what is to be said about the Messianic doctrine, which is so much less clearly enunciated. And what about the authority of the writers of the books of the New Testament, who, on this theory, have not merely accepted flimsy fictions for solid truths, but have built the very foundations of Christian dogma upon legendary quick sands?"<sup>1</sup>

Galileo did actually prove by presenting concrete scientific data to support his conclusions. However, his were found to be in disagreement with the traditional unbiblical church belief prevailing at the time. Nevertheless, Galileo's findings were certainly in tune with the biblical revelation. But, unlike Galileo, the so-called *theistic evolutionists* are still guessing. Instead of <u>using</u> the Scriptures to assess their <u>speculations</u> borrowed from the atheistic theory of evolution, they use evolutionary concepts to substantiate Scriptures. They then boast about evolutionary concepts of which they can never actually be 100 per cent sure. After all, 'no man can really find out' all about God's work. It is unimaginable how any one believing in a Creator God who creates by <u>fiat</u> could at the same time think of God as creating and using false evolutionary processes of chance contrary to His character.

At a time when the Bible speaks so clearly of a creation that has been brought into existence by *fiat*, it is unimaginable how the so-called *theistic evolutionists* should succumb into being deceived by the so-called scientific evidence in support of evolution which is not an *operational* science. The so-called evidence doesn't prove evolution theory and there is no proof of any *complex* species of life evolving from *simple* life forms.

At the same time, *theistic evolutionists* are *doubly* guilty of *taking* away from the Word of God what is actually there. This they do by falsely assuming the biblical creation accounts are written by using some kind of *literary devices*. They boldly teach Christians that the creation accounts in Genesis 1 need not be taken *literally*. And this they do in order to accommodate their unfounded '*scientific speculations*' in the Scriptures and thereby make the Scriptures conform to their speculations.

Ken Ham fittingly comments about the ills of such a compromise: "In many nations, the Word of God was once widely respected and taken seriously. But once the door of compromise is unlocked, once Christian leaders concede that we shouldn't interpret the Bible as written in Genesis, why should the world take heed of God's Word in any area? Because the church has told the world that one can use man's interpretation of the world, such as billions of years, to reinterpret the Bible, this Book is seen as an outdated, scientifically incorrect holy book not intended to be believed as written. As each subsequent generation has pushed this door of compromise open farther and farther, they are increasingly not accepting the morality or salvation of the Bible either. After all, if the history in Genesis is not correct, how can one be sure the rest is correct? Jesus said, "If I have told you earthly things, and you do not believe, how you will believe if I tell you of heavenly things? (John 3:12)"<sup>2</sup>

*Theistic evolutionists*, instead of blindly 'idolizing' and praising an "<u>Unknown God of Evolution</u>", will do better to answer the series of *rhetorical* questions God asked Job (Job 38:1 to 41:34).

In fact, God confronted Job so as "to emphasize the distance between man and his Creator as well as creation and, therefore, man's inability to understand even if God explained it all to man". Theistic evolutionists darken both natural and biblical revelation with their vague unfounded 'smuggled' speculations. Instead of interpreting the creation accounts in Genesis literally, they proclaim God as a <u>Creator of Evolution</u>. And then, they want everyone to 'gasp', "How Great Thou Art?" for supposedly creating 'MAN' after the Image of some 'Common Unknown Ancestor'. As such, to them, man is not to be any more conceived as a direct product of God's handiwork after His own image and likeness. Theistic Evolutionists firmly believe man to be a descendant of some anthropoid common ancestor.

1: Quoted by Ken Ham in 'Couldn't God Have Used Evolution? August 22, 2007.

#### THE UNKNOWN GOD OF EVOLUTION "THE UNKNOWN GOD OF EVOLUTION"

Since creation has a *beginning*, it had to be created by a Supreme Intelligent Agency, even God Almighty, by *fiat*. Therefore, we can with full confidence and conviction affirm that, "*Through <u>faith</u> we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear*" (Hebrews11:3). That is, "<u>God</u> *created everything out of nothing simply by the power of His Word*"<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, instead of *blindly* accepting "*unscientific speculation*" to inform us as to "*how the universe came into being or how the process of creation has unfolded throughout the history of the earth*" which is known to contradict revelation, one will do well to intelligently believe in what God

says in His WORD that remains undisputed; that the 'worlds' (and not 'big bang' or any 'soup of hydrogen atoms') were "framed " by the Word of God; and not "evolved", or that "new species were continually created by fiat over the course of billions and billions of years". Evolution, as a process, is in sharp contrast to direct creation during which, as the Bible authoritatively says, the 'worlds' were actually 'framed', and not evolved.

"<u>Framed</u>" translated from the Greek word "<u>katartizo</u>" actually means "<u>finished</u>", "completed" or "<u>disposed of</u> perhaps with great wisdom and propriety"; as such, to entertain any thought of any evolutionary process for physical things and life to develop by blind chance in the course of time is to indulge in contradictions. By the way, '<u>katartizo</u>' in Greek, meaning 'framed' or 'completed' or 'disposed of' and the Hebrew '<u>suwn</u> or <u>siym</u>' of Job 37:15 has similar meanings, implying an already completed work.

"Of course, we do not <u>pretend</u> to inquire HOW all these things were made, for in doing so we should be committing the folly of those who, "<u>professing</u> themselves to be <u>wise</u> – became <u>fools</u>" by prying into things they never could know. For where, we might ask, is the philosopher who could fully describe the growth of even a daisy? Enough for us to know that the infinite and omnipotent God '<u>spoke</u> and it was <u>done</u>; He <u>commanded</u> and it <u>stood fast</u>" <sup>2</sup> Yes, God commanded; and the entire creation "STOOD FAST" (Psalms 33:9) and <u>not</u> developed or evolved in the course of billions of years through evolutionary process from a 'soup of hydrogen atoms'!

Proponents of "*abiogenesis*" state that primitive unicellular life forms have evolved from non-living matter in the course of billions of years; and that, from these, complex life forms evolved in the <u>course of more billions of</u> <u>years</u>. One is left to wonder how the guesses of billions of years are arrived at to explain the unexplainable past events. Of course, theistic evolutionists know very well that primitive life did not evolve but directly created. Their problem is to guess as to how primitive life forms further evolved into higher forms resulting in the human brain. At the most, they may speculate that the "development of species over vast periods of time tells us that God either created some form of evolutionary process in the beginning or continually created new species by fiat over billions of years".

However, Nobel Laureate, Professor George Wald scoffs at the *absurdity* of such a possibility. He states: "<u>Time</u> is in fact the <u>hero</u> of the plot. The time with which we have to deal is of the order of <u>two billion years</u>.

What we regard as impossible on the basis of human experience is meaningless here. <u>Given so much time</u>, the '<u>impossible</u>' becomes <u>possible</u>, the possible <u>probable</u>, and the probable <u>virtually certain</u>. One has to wait: <u>time</u> itself <u>performs</u> the <u>miracles</u>"<sup>3</sup> Anyway, the lengthy process of evolution does contradict the reality that God is the Creator who creates by fiat. Either we believe that the 'worlds' were 'framed' and 'completed' or else firmly hold on to evolutionary lies with dogged determination.

"CREATION by *fiat*" and the process of "EVOLUTION *in the course of* <u>billions of years</u>" are definitely *antithetical* terms; and the tension of their antithetical meanings can never be compatibly embodied; rather, they are terms in sharp contrast, opposed to each other; '*creation*' being one of established biblical FACT of a <u>completed</u> or <u>finished work</u> (Genesis 2:1) which God looked at and said "*very good*" (Genesis 1:31) and '*evolution*' being a mere THEORY developed by human minds to explain "*the existence of a well-ordered physical creation and life forms without a Creator*"!

1: Creation and Evolution? op. cit. p. 8.

2: John A. Savage, The Scroll of Time, Kingston Bible Trust, U. K., 2004 Reprint, p. 7.

3: George Wald, "The Origin of Life", *Scientific American*, May 1954, 46; quoted by John MacArthur, *op. cit.* p. 40.

4: Henry Morris, *Old-Earth Creationism*, www.icr.org.

## HOW DID MATTER AND LIFE REALLY BEGIN?

Theistic Scientists and Evolutionists state that God brought the *complex* creation into existence, *not as described in* <u>Genesis 1:1</u>; but that He brought it into being by a simple '*creative act*', to begin with, in one "*big bang*". "<u>Not all believe this</u>, but let's say for argument's sake that this <u>is</u> when and <u>how</u> the universe got started".<sup>1</sup>, by treating Genesis 1 account as being penned by Moses by using "the standard <u>style</u> and <u>genre</u> of creation epics at the time"<sup>2</sup> and that, as such, it need not be taken literally.

Next, "At the moment of the 'Big Bang' and for some considerable time afterwards, galaxies, stars and planets did not exist. The universe started over billions of years to a kind of soup of hydrogen atoms, and then expanded over more billions of years during which galaxies, stars, planets and other elements of the universe came into existence. Thus the universe became what it is today through gradual development, <u>the natural consequences of God's original creative act</u>. <u>Perhaps God also did</u> <u>something like that with life on earth</u>. The point is that a process like evolution need not contradict the reality that God is Creator"<sup>3</sup>! But it does contradict the reality that God is a Creator who creates instantly by fiat.

Theistic evolutionists state that there is evidence "to show life on earth is billions of years old"<sup>4</sup> and that "breakthroughs in scientific disciplines such as molecular biology have refined the theory of evolution by natural selection"<sup>4</sup>. They are therefore somehow convinced that "evolution is the most likely explanation for the development of species"<sup>6</sup>. Biological evolution, therefore, need not contradict that God is the Creator of life. Biological evolution states that "all living things are developed from a few simple forms of life through a series of physical changes. That, the first mammal developed from a type of reptile, and ultimately all forms is traced back to a simple, perhaps single-celled, organism"<sup>7</sup>.

Are Christians to believe that God has <u>created</u> 'evolution'? Did God bring into existence the rich variety of species on earth such as the mammals, including Homo sapiens, by 'natural selection'? Did God next take the Homo sapiens and breathed into his nostrils the "breath of life", who then became "a Living Soul with a Human Spirit" and named as Adam?

<u>How about Eve</u>? Did she also evolve from some simple life form? Or was there some other mechanism of which theistic evolutionists are not as yet aware of? Or is the Genesis account of the creation of Adam and Eve a 'myth'? We may then 'blasphemously' state next that the sinless human Christ "descended", not from a distinctly and deliberately created Adam (Genesis 5:1b-2; Luke 3:23-38) but from some Homo sapiens whose 'genealogy' may be traced back to some "single-celled organism" which may be 'metaphorically' termed as a "thing". Accordingly, Adam of the 'creation epic' need not be literally called the "Son" of God (Luke 3:38).

However, *direct creation* and not *evolution*, is the product of an Intelligent Mind. Unlike evolution that depends on *'chance'* or *external* 

factors for the development of life, *direct creation* involves pre-programmed *planning*, *designing* and *execution*. That, that which is designed and made, is always the end product of an intelligent thoughtful process; the product had to be first conceived before it was ever made. In other words, *intelligent design* originates in a mind capable of *thinking*, *conceiving*, *planning* and *executing* what it conceives and plans and *bring it to fruition*, accordingly.

And that, without *waiting*, with fingers crossed, for some lengthy *evolutionary process* to develop by *chance* things thought of and planned to *automatically happen*; or to *evolve* on their own in the course of *billions of years*. God has not used any evolutionary process in the *creation* of life or matter; and there are enough 'gaps' in the evolutionary theory to be filled up so as for the theistic evolutionists to be 100 per cent sure and be fully convinced. Nevertheless, <u>as long as</u> evolutionists are **not** 100 per cent sure, Christians are free to argue that "The evolution theory is not only absurd – its so-called proofs are so contradictory that they cause increasing doubt...;

But then, some are convinced that "The development of species over vast periods of time tells us that God <u>either</u> created some form of evolutionary process in the beginning <u>or</u> continually created new species by fiat over billions of years. In either case, creation was no cosmic accident"<sup>8</sup>!

Embarrassingly, it is still "*Either* and *Or*"; guesses, nevertheless; the *fact* is that it simply doesn't lie "*in the <u>power</u> of man's finite mind to conceive creation; it is a thought which can only be entertained by <u>faith</u>"<sup>9</sup>.* 

1: Evolution and Creation, op. cit. p.7

2: *ibidem*, p.7 3: *ibidem*, p.7. 4: *ibidem*, p.7 5: *ibidem*, p.7 6: *ibidem*, p.7

7: World Book Dictionary

8: Evolution and Creation, op. cit., p.

9: C. A. Coates, op. cit. p. 1.

## **IS IT A PLANNED INSTANT CREATION?**

#### **IS IT A PLANNED INSTANT CREATION?**

#### Or is it a Greation by Ital Over Billions of Years? Or, Is It a 'Creation by Fiat over Billions of Years'?

"Hearken unto this, Stand still, and consider the wondrous works of God. Dost thou know <u>when</u> God disposed them? The wondrous works of Him which is PERFECT in knowledge? (Job 37:14-15).

To think of the OMNIPOTENT Creator God as *depending* upon an evolutionary process is biblically untenable if not an insult to His Sovereign Person who speaks and brings into existence *instantly* by *fiat*; that is, in an *authoritative* order or command!

God boldly reiterates: "I have made the earth and <u>created man</u> upon it: I, even my hands, have stretched out the heavens, and all their host have I <u>commanded</u>" (Isaiah 45:12) and it "**stood fast**" (Psalms 33:9); that is, it came into existence, <u>instantly</u>.

There is no biblical evidence to tell us "that God <u>either</u> created some form of evolutionary process in the beginning <u>or</u> continually created new species by <u>fiat</u> over <u>billions</u> of <u>years</u>" (Creation and Evolution?, op. cit. p. 6). It is blindly assumed as such to make the Theory of Evolution acceptable to the Bible believing Christian community. But God opposes such ideation!

"Who is this that darkens counsel by words without knowledge? Where were thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? Declare, if thou hast understanding. Who hath laid the measures thereof, if thou knowest? Or who hath stretched the line upon it? Whereupon are the foundations **thereof** fastened? Or who laid the cornerstone thereof; when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy? (Job 38:2-7).

If the universe has been created through some evolutionary process and is still in the process of "*being*", then we may presume that "*the sons of* <u>God shouted for joy</u>" at a simple creative act such as '*big bang*' further evolving into a kind of soup of hydrogen atoms. And they must have continued rejoicing as they saw the universe and life forms evolving in the course of some billions of years. And, who knows, they must be still rejoicing to watch the universe and man still in the process '*being*' and '*becoming*'. Or, else, they must be now *wondering* as to what next is going to evolve and develop in the next billions of years.

It is very clear that the Sons of God or angelic host witnessed a fully developed creation brought into existence by *fiat*. However, the unbelieving theistic evolutionists find it difficult to accept by *faith* the biblical truth of an *instant* creation by *fiat*. Instead, they assume that God must have created and used some evolutionary process or 'a creation by *fiat*', not *instantly*, but *over billions of years*. From where the "*billions of years*" is deriving its credibility is unknown, so as for anyone to presume it is a reliable scientific fact. If there was really any evolution or '*creation by fiat through billions of years*', then that must have been the case during the unknown period prior to the earth's destruction as briefly described in Genesis 1:2.

Convinced that *matter* and *life* have evolved into the complex forms we find it today, theistic evolutionists are frantically seeking an answer "to the question of the <u>manner</u> of the <u>creative process</u> or how long the creative process took – or whether it is continuing even today"<sup>1</sup>

As a matter of fact, physical creation is destined to deteriorate and decay in the course of time instead of 'evolving further' (Romans 8:28-29). This fact, no one familiar with the second law of thermodynamics, will ever deny. "There is evidence now that the whole world and all in it are degenerating and moving toward some climax..., instead of evolving upward into higher and better forms"<sup>2</sup>

Notwithstanding unproved assumptions of evolutionary theories of *life* and *matter* developing or evolving into a better form, "the tendency for decay has been recognized as one of the basic laws of nature. First codified in science, and dubbed as the second law of thermodynamics, it has now been recognized in every system of thought including genetics. This tendency has received the name 'time's arrow' always pointing downhill"<sup>3</sup>.

Accordingly, "One of the very strongest arguments against evolution has always been the tendency for every system, living or dead, individual or societal, moral or mundane, to wear out, deteriorate, or die. As is common to all experience, nothing, absolutely nothing, gets better on its own"<sup>4</sup> As such, instead of wondering and speculating as to whether the supposedly created evolution process is '*continuing even today*', we will do well to ponder and accept God's revealed truth that "*The heavens and the earth which are <u>now</u>, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men*" (2 Peter 3:7).

1: Creation and Evolution? op. cit. p.7.

2: Finis J. Dake, op. cit. p.83.

3: John D. Morris, Are Things Getting Better or Are They Running Down? www.icr.org.

# THEISTIC EVOLUTION!

#### **IS IT A FITTING RESPONSE TO EVOLUTIONISM?**

Did God really first create some form of primitive *matter* and *life* endowed with the *potential* of evolving into *complex forms* in the course of billions of years? Did man, accordingly, evolve from some lower form of life or was he created just the way the God of the Bible says He did?

Theistic Evolutionists "accept the findings of science and see no <u>contradiction</u> between the <u>theory of evolution</u> and a <u>proper understanding</u> of the <u>biblical account</u> in <u>Genesis 1</u>"<sup>1</sup>. They state that "revelation of the Bible <u>in no way</u> rules out the possibility of life forms <u>evolving</u> through <u>time</u>"<sup>2</sup>. Their '<u>self-convincing</u>' argument is that "if the <u>facts</u> show that evolution is the most likely explanation for the development of species, they must come to terms with it"<sup>3</sup>. However, there is neither scriptural nor scientific evidence to account for 'the possibility of life forms evolving through time'; nor are there any scientific facts 'to show that evolution is the most likely explanation for the development of species of the most likely explanation for the terms with it to show that evolution is the most likely explanation for the terms with it to show that evolution is the most likely explanation for the terms with it to show that evolution is the most likely explanation for the terms with it to show that evolution is the most likely explanation for the terms with it to show that evolution is the most likely explanation for the development of species', nor are there any scientific facts 'to show that evolution is the most likely explanation for the development of species', including the so-called homo sapiens or man.

Next, in his '*Editorial*' intelligently captioned "In Search of the God of the Gasps"<sup>4</sup>, John Halford confidently confronts the skeptics, saying:

"Like it or not, the evidence is <u>mounting</u> that evolution through natural selection is the way life develops" <sup>5</sup> and that, after all, "it does now look as if Charles Darwin did not get it all wrong" <sup>6</sup>. However, there is no concrete scientific evidence to prove that 'evolution through natural selection is the way life develops'. Neither John Halford did justice to his contention by providing the necessary evidence to prove that "evolution through natural selection is the selection is the way life develops".

Next, according to him, "What the world needs now is not more people to desperately defend the increasingly beleaguered 'God of the Gaps'"<sup>4</sup> by defensively pointing to 'gaps' in the evolutionary theory. He is confident that current "research has closed many of those gaps, and others are under investigation"<sup>7</sup>. As such, skeptical Christians are now called upon to drop any "opposition to the evolutionary theory and accept evolution by natural selection as a valid explanation of the development of life"<sup>8</sup>

But then, what kind of biblical and scientific *evidence* is there to concretely prove the *development of life* by evolution? There is none!

Majority of the Christians have no access to any scientific findings or facts to convincingly accept evolutionary theory as a scientific reality. Any *'dissertation'* highlighting how research has closed many of the *gaps* in the evolutionary theory and in what way evolution specifically *'macroevolution'* is God's mechanism of creation would be of much help to concerned God-fearing Christians. This is necessary so as to *convincingly* give up any opposition to the evolutionary theory.

Notwithstanding the so-called *evidence* of evolution that seems to be appealing to the theistic evolutionists, it can be convincingly stated that "Theistic evolution is clearly not the solution to quieting the creationevolution controversy for many reasons. One is because leading educators, scientists and major science organizations are all hotly opposed to <u>any</u> and <u>all</u> worldviews that involve God, and this view now actually faces much more opposition than does creationism"<sup>9</sup>

Moreover, by blindly accepting *unproved* evolutionary speculations, theistic evolutionists are actually generating doubts as to the accuracy and appropriateness of all Scriptures in adopting a Christian worldview. "Once you accept evolution and its implications about history, then man becomes free to pick and choose which parts of the Bible he wants to accept" <sup>10</sup>

Reportedly, "Huxley mocked those who try to harmonize evolution and millions of years with the Bible, because it requires them to give up a historical Genesis while still trying to hold to the doctrines of the New Testament. He pointed out the various doctrines in the New Testament are dependent on the truths of biblical – Genesis events, such as Paul's teaching on the doctrine of sin, Christ's teaching on the doctrine of marriage, and the warning of the future judgment"<sup>11</sup>. However, the Bible has nothing to state about the <u>age</u> of the universe or of earth. As such, it is the misinterpretation of the Genesis account and not Genesis itself that is in sharp contradiction with scientific speculations and is the *cause* of much unhealthy debate.

Anyway, we are now confidently assured that any "<u>possibility</u>" of "*Evolution* of *Life Forms* and *Man* by *natural selection*" as "<u>good science</u>" need not <u>conflict</u> with one's "<u>faith in God</u>". But then, a <u>conflict</u> with what God authoritatively has to tell us in Genesis 1 and what the so-called 'good science' has to sheepily tell us is certainly inevitable. The 'good science' that assumes the possibility of *Evolution* of *Life Forms* and *Man* by *natural selection* is certainly very much at odds with Biblical Creation Science.

Nevertheless, in spite of the obvious conflict between Biblical Faith and the so-called good science, theistic evolutionists are at ease even as they assume that the Genesis 1 accounts of creation need not be taken literally. They are quite comfortable in accepting the Genesis creation accounts as a genre of creation epic adopted by Moses to tell people *How Great God Is*!

Subsequently, confident of their theological position built upon the sands of evolutionary myths, a joyful invitation is now made by them to the "best minds to join in the quest for innovation and discovery, and then stand back occasionally from what they are discovering in awe of the God of all Creation and gasp, 'How Great Thou Art'!"<sup>12</sup>

1: Creation and Evolution? op. cit. p.7 2: ibidem. p.7. 3: ibidem. p.7.

4: Ibid, p. 4; 5: *ibid*, p. 4; 6: *ibid*, p. 4; 7: *ibid*, p. 4; 8: *ibid*, p. 4.

9: Jerry Bergman. 10: Ken Ham, Couldn't God have Used Evolution? August 22, 2007.

11: Ken Ham, *ibid* 12: John Halford, *op. cit.*, p. 4.



#### **"GLORIFYING GOD OF THE GAPS"** WITH THE MYTHS OF EVOLUTION?

Theistic Evolutionists are convinced by the fallacies of evolutionary theory as if it's scientific truth and state that they "... cannot afford to hold back our best young people by trapping them in hidebound concepts and anti-scientific worldviews". According to them, "What the world needs now is not more people to desperately defend the increasingly beleaguered "God of the Gaps". We need our best minds to join in the quest for innovation and discovery, and then stand back occasionally from what they are discovering in awe of the God of all Creation and gasp, 'How great Thou art"<sup>1</sup>

In other words, to teach <u>Biblical Creation Truth</u> based upon a literal interpretation of Genesis 1 and 2 accounts of creation is to hold on to "*hidebound concepts and anti-scientific worldviews*"<sup>2</sup>. Instead, we are called upon to accept godless theories of Evolution as scientific facts and stand back in awe of the God of the Bible as the "*Creator of Evolution*".<sup>3</sup>

On the one hand, we are told that God has not revealed <u>how</u> He has created everything; on the other hand they *smuggle* into the Scriptures *atheistic* evolutionary concepts to tell us HOW God created everything in the course of billions of years. We are now called upon by the *Theistic Evolutionists* to stand in awe of God, rather the 'Unknown God, the Creator of Evolution' and gasp, 'How great Thou art?' They want the archaic ignorant Christians to convincingly accept by faith what the High Priests of Evolution has to teach in an attempt to fill in the existing gaps in the theory of evolution; and next, work *miracles* to bridge the unbridgeable gaps such as 'between living and non-living matter' and 'in the realm of particles, between the electrons constituting the atoms and the atoms themselves'<sup>4</sup> and so on, which scientists have not yet been and will never be able to bridge but 'fall back on a miracle or a hyper- scientific intervention' by God.

Perhaps, to the godly theistic evolutionists, God is no more a *Supreme Intelligent Designer* and *Omnipotent Creator* who is able to get things done miraculously by <u>fiat</u>, by mere <u>speaking</u>. Instead, God has been transformed into a <u>Dependent Evolutionist</u> who, in spite of His omnipotent power, chose to <u>depend</u> upon <u>evolution</u> governed by blind chance for the universe and life forms including <u>man</u> to appear in the course of <u>billions of years</u>.

No wonder, as pointed out earlier, Thomas Huxley (1825-1895), 'an ardent evolutionary humanist who popularized Darwin's ideas', "eloquently pointed out the <u>inconsistencies</u> of reinterpreting Scripture to <u>fit</u> with popular scientific theory. Huxley mocked those who try to <u>harmonize</u> evolution and billions of years with the Bible, because it requires them to give up a historical Genesis while still trying to hold to the doctrines of the New Testament. What was Huxley's point? He insisted that the theologians had to accept evolution and millions of years, but he pointed out that, to be consistent, they had to give up the Bible totally. <u>Compromise is impossible</u>"<sup>5</sup> Theistic evolutionists do compromise, nevertheless, to their own glory.

Theistic Evolutionists will do well to heed Huxley's taunt at them and decide either to wholeheartedly embrace evolution or to exclusively adhere to Biblical Christian Faith. For, "But once the door of compromise is unlocked, once Christian leaders insist we shouldn't interpret the Bible as written in Genesis, why should the world take heed of God's Word in any area? After all, if history in Genesis is not correct, how can one be sure the rest is correct? (John 3:12)"<sup>6</sup>

Even atheistic scientists themselves are not wholly convinced of any truth in the theory of evolution. As admitted by Professor Jerome, "We have no acceptable theory of evolution at the present time. <u>There is none</u>; and I cannot accept the theory that I teach to my students each year. Let me explain. I teach the synthetic theory known as the neo-Darwinian one, for one reason only; not because it's good, we know it is bad, but because there isn't any other. Whilst waiting to find something better, you are taught something which is known to be inexact, which is a first approximation."<sup>7</sup>. What a serious indictment that is! So, why should any persons of ordinary intelligence blindly accept the constantly *'mutating synthetic neo-Darwinian'* theories of evolution knowing they are *bad* theories having no basis? And why should *theistic evolutionists* seek to accommodate such *bad* theories and compromise with biblical truth of creation at a time when the atheistic evolutionists themselves candidly if not shamelessly admit that they have "*no acceptable theory of evolution at the present time*"?

"But the astounding thing is, that persons of intelligence, and of the highest education too, should be so <u>beguiled</u> as to <u>believe</u> in the <u>absurd</u> and <u>nonsensical</u> theory of evolution in these so-called enlightened times"<sup>8</sup>

One may easily conclude the so-called theistic evolutionists are also beguiled so as to believe in the *unbiblical* evolutionary theory. At the same time, as Pastors and godly Christians, they profess to know God as an *Omnipotent* <u>Creator</u> and then deny Him the *power* to create *by fiat, instantly*, and or to re-create and re-shape an existing creation "without form and void" in <u>six literal 24-hour days</u> and rest on the seventh 24-hour day.

Is the so-called *evidence* of evolution so subtly *deceitful*, so as to lure Christians to accept it as if it is truth? Nevertheless, "*The Bible in its entirety condemns the theories of both cosmic and organic evolution. It declares in no uncertain terms that God created all the material and moral creations, the animate and inanimate things, and that He is the first and last cause of all existing universes and the things therein*"<sup>9</sup>

The Theory of Evolution intrinsically rejects God, Christ, Holy Spirit and the Bible. It is totally *anti-Christian*. Instead of acknowledging God as the Creator of *matter* and *life*, its proponents substitute and worship '*blind force*', '*resident powers*' or '*deify chance*' to account for the existence of *matter* and *life* without the need for any Creator God.

Evolutionary hide-bound concepts *degrade* man to the level of a beast by theorizing that man has *descended* from some beast-like 'common ancestor' or from the so-called 'ape-men'. As such, it blatantly denies man as being created by God after His own 'Image and Likeness'. In that sense, Christ who is a *historical* figure is indirectly degraded to having descended from some ape-man ancestor. Thus, it indirectly degrades God. On what concrete basis theistic evolutionists can come to terms with blasphemous unscientific theories of evolution is difficult to understand? One is left imagining as to what kind of scientific evidence they have come across to convincingly *presume* man has *descended* from some imaginary 'common ancestor', which in turn, supposedly evolved from some vague primitive cellular forms through the course of billions of years.

However, neither man nor plants nor animals have descended from some common imaginary ancestor. "Despite the claims of evolution, the appearance of new species, antibiotic resistance in bacteria, pesticide resistance and sickle-cell anemia are not evidence in favor of evolution. They do, however, demonstrate the principle of natural selection acting on existing traits – a concept that creationists and evolutionists agree on.

The creationist model of how life spread across the globe after the Flood of Genesis uses many of the same principles of natural selection and adaptive radiation that are used in the evolution model. One of the main differences is that the biblical creation model recognizes that one kind cannot change into another and that the changes are a result of variation within the created kinds – not descent from a single common ancestor. As a result of the Curse, genetic mutations, representing a loss of information, have been accumulating, but these do not cause new kinds to emerge. Accepting the idea of a single common ancestor denies the authority of God's Word<sup>\*</sup>.

It's amazing as to how theistic evolutionists could allow themselves to be deceived into accepting evolutionary *myth* of man's descent from some ape-man and at the same time doctrinally look at man as God's creation, his 'fall into sin' and subsequent redemption of the fallen man from sin and death by the atoning and saving work of Christ. However, "To argue that the Christian can accept evolution on the grounds that the Bible is not to be taken literally, is a surrender to the foes of God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Bible and all Christian teachings" <sup>11</sup>

In a fitting "Conclusion" to his Article entitled "Theistic Evolution and Creation-Evolution Controversy", Jerry Bergman succinctly states: "Theistic Evolution is clearly not the solution to quieting the creationevolution controversy for many reasons. One is because leading educators, scientists, and major science organizations are all hotly opposed to any and all worldviews that involve God, and this view now actually faces much more opposition than does creationism. The solution to the controversy is not to adopt a position that does justice to neither the Science nor the Scriptures, but to advocate a position supported by the scientific data, and not science speculation based on naturalism"<sup>12</sup>

Further, Bergman quoting Provine "concludes that a person who argues that Darwinism and Theism are compatible is (1) an effective atheist, or (2) one who believes things demonstrably unscientific, or (3) asserts the existence of entities or processes for which no shred of evidence exists" <sup>13</sup> Biblically speaking, "Nothing about the Genesis text itself suggests that the biblical creation account is merely symbolic, poetic, allegorical, or mythical. The main thrust of the message simply cannot be reconciled with the notion that creation occurred via natural evolutionary processes over long periods of time." <sup>14</sup>

To some extent it is true that the "traditional six-day creationism" does not offer a proven, rigorous and valid scientific alternative to evolution. It is based on "a single narrow interpretation of the first chapter of the Bible"<sup>15</sup>. Nevertheless, the fact that God is the Originator of life and matter remains unchanged. The Theory of Evolution with all of its versions is not truly an "Operational Science" and only deals with 'imaginary' 'Origins'.

To be scientifically precise, "We need to be aware of the difference between operational science and origins science. Operational science is the result of experimental data or observations taken in the present, subject to peer review, and capable of repetition. Origins science is an extrapolation of presently observed phenomena into the past, in a manner which is not repeatable. When evolutionists are criticized for the latter, it is not because the principle of origins science is wrong, but because such a model cannot be accepted as a proven fact. So it is with creationists' models" <sup>16</sup>

Notwithstanding the vague speculations of the atheistic evolutionists relating to the *origin* of life, it is humanly impossible to explain the origin of life apart from God's revelation in the Bible. "*Research on the origin of life seems to be unique in that the conclusion has already been authoritatively accepted … One must conclude that, contrary to the established and current wisdom, a scenario describing the genesis of life on earth by chance and natural causes which can be accepted on the basis of <u>fact and not faith</u> has not <u>yet been written</u>"<sup>17</sup>* 

The Self-existent God is the Creator of life. In other words, beginning with the microscopic viruses, bacteria and unicellular simple life forms to the complex species of flora and fauna, all forms of life have been created by Him. Accordingly, "The only true account of the origin of life on earth is found in the account of the only Eyewitness who was there. The Bible explains that the presence of life on earth is the result of supernatural actions of an omnipotent Intelligent Designer—the God of the Bible. Many complain that accepting this supernatural explanation stops anyone from pursuing knowledge about the natural world, but the presence of a logical Creator provides a reason to look for order in the universe. This point is underscored by the fact that many of the major fields of science were founded by men who believed in the Creator God of the Bible. The only aspect of science that the acceptance of creation excludes is the story of life somehow resort to blind faith so as to accept their conclusions as truth.

Theistic evolutionists somehow prefer not to interpret the Creation accounts in Genesis literally. This they have to do in order to embrace vague evolutionary concepts. As such, their *unscriptural* reasoning is in tune with that of the modern skeptics. For, "Skeptics often claim, 'The Bible is not a science textbook.' This, of course, is true—because science textbooks change every year, whereas the Bible is the unchanging Word of God—the God who cannot lie. Nevertheless, the Bible can be relied upon when it touches on every scientific issue... It is the Bible that gives us the big picture. Within this big picture, we can build scientific models that help us explain how past events may have come about. "Scientific models, while helpful, must never take the place of Scripture. The scientific model can be superseded. Scripture cannot! If scientific evidence causes a creationist model to change, we should not let that shake our confidence in the accuracy and authority of Scripture" <sup>19</sup>. Next, "Technology has shown us that sophisticated machines require intelligent designers—not random chance. Science and technology are perfectly consistent with the Bible" 20

Prophet Isaiah's question to *theistic scientists* and *evolutionists* who believe in the evolutionary concepts would be: "To whom then will you liken God? Or with what likeness will you compare Him?" It's high time they listen to God and take His Word relating to creation accounts seriously and interpret the same *literally*. There is no need to sympathize with God as the beleaguered "God of the Gaps", and then serve Him with the *myths* of evolution to fill in the *unbridgeable* gaps in the evolutionary theory.

God's Word thunders at those who deny its truth and contradict God through evolutionary lies thereby defiling His Holiness and character. "The holiness of God is what drives and limits His revelation of Himself to His creation. Scripture is consistent. Holiness is God's fundamental nature and that unique nature so permeates what God is and does that no action or thought from the Godhead can override it. Humanity will never know holiness until the new heavens and the new earth. We may well experience righteousness in our lifetimes as our hearts long for the presence of the holy God, but God's holiness--God's perfection--can only be believed."<sup>21</sup> Theistic scientists and evolutionists should give up worshipping and glorifying the <u>Unknown God of the Gaps.</u> Instead, they should reverently "gasp" and start serving the God of the Bible, for He alone is: "Holy, holy, holy, LORD God Almighty.... Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created (Revelation 4:8, 11).

Gasp it if you can, and wonder! "It is HE that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof (including the theistic and atheistic evolutionists) are as grasshoppers; that stretched out the heavens <u>as a</u> curtain, and spread them out <u>as a</u> tent to dwell in" (Isaiah 40:18; 22).

Surely, God didn't take billions of years to *stretch out* the heavens *like* a curtain and spread them out as a tent to dwell in. The God of the Bible, who "IS", certainly <u>cannot</u> be a Creator of Evolution. The unproven Theory of Evolution is not only unscientific but totally unscriptural, and is a satanic lie. The Bible says it so and that should settle it, once for all, whether theistic scientists and evolutionists agree with it or not. The *myths* of pagan evolution don't glorify God but only please Satan. The pure biblical truth of Genesis and that of the rest of the Bible is what glorifies God!

Instead of accepting Genesis and other biblical accounts of creation literally, Theistic Evolutionists have sanctified lies of atheistic scientists. In doing so, they make God a liar. But "Because of His holiness, God cannot lie (Hebrews 6:18), and whenever God reveals anything, He must reveal the truth about Himself and His nature. The Creator God is "Truth" (John 14:6) and the originator of "Lie" is the Archenemy, Lucifer (John 8:44). The opposite of truth, even though it may contain partial truth, is the active agent that opposes God's truth as it is revealed to His creation. Therefore, the Creator God must reveal truth and cannot "be" untruth. When God speaks, He must speak truth. When God acts, God must act without "doing" error. One of the titles by which Jesus Christ is eternally known is "Faithful and True" (Revelation 19:11). God's holiness demands that the creation not distort anything about God--or about the creation itself.

"God could not create a lie -- He could not make anything that would inexorably lead us to a wrong conclusion. Nor could He create processes that would counter His own nature--or that would lead us to conclude something untrue about Him. Evolutionary mechanisms are, by their very nature, both random and nonfunctional. Nothing in naturalist theory "directs" evolution. Vast eons of time, in which chaos "works" and during which death "weeds out" the ineffective, are thought to somehow produce processes and systems of apparent design. No god in this system exists to create anything. Christians who seek to harmonize the biblical revelation of a holy God with the antithetical evolutionary theories are constructing dangerous hybrids that blaspheme the very God they insist they believe in. May God protect us from such thinking"<sup>22</sup>

1: J. Halford, Christian Odyssey, op. cit. p.4

2: ibid, p. 4

3: J. Tkach, www.wcg. org.

4: Lecomte DuNuouy, op. cit, p. 26.

5: Ken Ham, Couldn't God Have Used Evolution? featured in: The New Answers Book, www.answersingenesis.org.

6:Ken Ham, *ibid*, www.answersingenesis.org.

7: Professor Jerome Lejeune, *Evolution Exposed*, www.answersingenesis.org.

8: Savage, J. op. cit. p. 8.

9: Dake, F. J., op. cit. p. 82.

10: Patterson, Evolution Exposed, Biology, 2007; www.answersingenesis.org.

11: Dake, Finis J; op. cit; p. 81.

**12: Jerry Bergman, PhD,** *Theistic Evolution and Creation-Evolution Controversy*, www.icr.org.

13: Provine, W, 1988: Scientists, Face It! Science and Religion are Incompatible, Scientist, September, 5, p.10 quoted by Jerry Bergman, op.cit.

14: John MacArthur, *The Battle ... op. cit*; p.18.

15: Creation and Evolution", op.cit., p.5

16: Paul Taylor, AiG-UK, *Can Creation Models be Wrong?* September 4, 2007, www.answersingenesis.org.

17: Yockey, H.P., A calculation of the probability of spontaneous biogenesis by information theory, Journal of Theoretical Biology 67:377–398, 1977; quoted by Roger Patterson in "The Origin of Life", Evolution Exposed, www.answersingenesis.org

18: Roger Patterson, "The Origin of Life", www.answersingenesis.org, op. cit..

19: Paul Taylor, www. answers in genesis.org; op.cit

20:Dr. Jason Lisle, Ph.D., Can creationists be scientists? April 2005, www.answersingenesis.org..

21: Henry Morris III, God's Holiness Demands a Perfect Creation, www.icr.org.

22: Henry Morris III, D. Min, God's Holiness Demands a Perfect Creation, www.icr.org.



**PART THREE to follow deals comprehensively but not exhaustively with all the** *three* **major** *aeonian* **Phases or Epochs of the** *True Biblical or Scriptural Creationism.* All the biblical evidence relating to the Creation Truth that has been briefly highlighted in 'Part two' is further examined and dealt with, in detail.

A critical in-depth biblical evaluation of the *Traditional Six-day Creationism* is made. Next, the assumed contradictions in the so-called Gap Theory are examined in the light of clear Scriptural evidence to conclusively prove pre-Adamite Fall of Lucifer and the consequent destruction brought on earth *as in Genesis 1:2*. The Gap Theory is next convincingly replaced with a relevant Biblically based pre-historical, pre-Adamite Theology having evangelical connotations and much theological significance.

Next, the *phased* work of the *six-days* is covered by highlighting its *prophetic* or *predictive* evangelical significance in relation to God's dispensational restorative plan through a '*prophetic week*' of six millennial days under Satan's rule culminating in the Millennial Sabbath of God's rule.

Finally, the creation of *new* Heavens and *new* Earth as predicted in the Bible is dealt with briefly, followed by an 'Epilogue' depicting the New Spiritual Creation in Man, the pinnacle of God's creative works.

