

Fighting The Good Fight

David A. Kipfmiller

[Presented to the pastors of the Capitol Circuit, meeting at St. Paul's Ev. Lutheran church in Marshall, WI September 21, 1982]

Throughout my brief life I have often heard evolution referred to as a theory - and a theory is by definition, a guess. Unfortunately, though, this is no longer the case. Evolution is fact, scientific fact that is. And that is something we need to come to grips with.

By stating that evolution is fact, by no means do I intend to say that it is true. It is not. It contradicts everything that God, our Creator, has told us about the origins of the universe. It is not true -- but it is scientific fact! If that seems incongruous to us, it is because we deal with fact on a completely different basis than does the scientist. To the scientist a fact is something about which there is no longer any debate. He doesn't ask: "Is it true?" but "Does it work?". In his vocabulary a "fact" refers to the commonly accepted tenets of the scientific community. As such, then, it might as well be referred to as a law, the law of evolution.

I'm sure that all of us in this room would take issue with such a bold statement. Theologically speaking, we must take issue with it, for it contradicts the clear teachings of Scripture. But scientifically speaking (if we will be scientists) we have no recourse but to acknowledge it as one of the many laws of science.

Basically, that points out the difference between theology and science. They are for the most part irreconcilable. To be a "good" scientist in today's world you cannot be a good theologian. To be a good theologian you cannot be a "good" scientist. The two disciplines operate on different planes. Science operates on the plane of reason and deals with hypotheses, observations and demonstrable proofs; theology operates on the plane of faith and is concerned with revelation, God's mysteries, and the "evidence of things not seen". Science is based on man's ingenuity and imagination. At best it can arrive at relative truth -- truth that is subject to change over the centuries. Theology, on the other hand, comes from the mouth of God and is changeless and timeless Truth -- absolute truth. Jesus says as much in His High Priestly prayer, "Thy word is Truth", John 17:17.

As theologians, then, or even better, as pastors to whom is entrusted the care of Christ's redeemed children, we need to seriously confront the issue of science and evolution. We need to "fight the good fight" and to teach those in our care to do the same. The question is: On what field of battle should this fight be fought?

In recent years a movement has arisen called "Creation-Science". In general, it advocates "fighting the good fight" in the arena of science and scientific law. To me this is untenable. The "good fight of faith" needs to be fought in the arena of faith, with God's weapons and with God's strength. Anything short of this places us on shaky ground where the outcome of the battle is in jeopardy and uncertain. The purpose of this paper, then, is to demonstrate the sorry inadequacies of fighting the Lord's battles with anything but the Lord's weapons, and to lead us all to rely totally and completely on the sure Word of God which indeed is the only source and norm of every question of faith and life.

To begin, perhaps it would be best to demonstrate what a nebulous thing science is and to recognize its limitations. Far too often we give too much credit to science. We expect it to be an avenue to truth, the key which unlocks the secrets of the universe, or the knife that lays bare the laws by which God governs the worlds. Science is none of these. Science is merely that attempt by man to explain the environment he lives in and how it operates. Or, if you prefer, our definition could be this: science is man's attempt to discover truth through reason. That it falls far short of the goal, can readily be seen if we will examine it closely, with regard to its past, present and future.

An Unstable Past

I think we would all agree that each age of man has had its geniuses. Aristotle's philosophy is still being taught and debated. Euclid (about 300 B.C.) is even today considered the father of modern geometry.

Hammurabi, Confucius and Plato also come quickly to mind as first-rate thinkers. And certainly Ptolemy of Alexandria (A.D. 140) was no slouch either. In his great work, the *Almagest*, he provides the most complete description of planetary motion ever devised until recent times. He accounted for all observed planetary motions to an accuracy better than the limitations of the naked eye -- and without the benefit of a telescope! For 1500 years his laws of planetary motion were accepted as gospel truth. He had proved that the earth was the center of the universe. Everything that Ptolemy described fit exactly with what could be observed.

Today we are absolutely convinced that Ptolemy's laws are wrong. We look to Copernicus (1473-1543), Kepler (1571-1630) and Galileo (1564-1642) for the modern heliocentric view of our galaxy. But what about Ptolemy? Was he guilty of bad science? Not at all. His was the best science of the day -- and it lasted for 1500 years! Keep also in mind that his geocentric view was not easily overturned. Copernicus was, in his day, among the uninfluential minority; it took another hundred years before Kepler and Galileo could come up with enough evidence to change the mainstream of thought. Even then, Galileo was mercilessly attacked by the Roman Catholic church, branded as a heretic and almost burned at the stake! (Tying the Bible to science the church refused to accept any but the geocentric view which the Bible seemed to support. Today we have no problem with this. Is there a lesson for us here in history?)

Surely we will admit that science has had a stormy and uncertain past. Ptolemy's facts, his laws of nature, were accepted as divine truth and any tampering with them was considered heresy. Yet, these facts and laws were wrong, science tells us today. The sun, not the earth, is the center of our galaxy. The earth is not stationary in space but revolves around the sun. But before we criticize Ptolemy too much, keep in mind that his science did work. It fit in exactly with all the observations he was able to make. His science, his reality, was overturned, not because it was bad science, but because others, using better tools and interpreting the data from a different vantage point were able to demonstrate that their system and laws provided a better explanation for the workings of the universe. And this sort of scientific advancement is not limited to the past. We see the same kind of thing happening today.

A Dubious Present

Why is it that the best encyclopedias of just ten years ago are today considered completely out-of-date in the area of science? Why has the National Academy of Science stated that each scientist in our nation must be entirely retrained more than seven times during a lifetime of work? There can be only one answer. Science is changing and changing fast. All scientific knowledge, because of its *human origin*, is only tentative and subject to change.

We don't know if any of the scientific theories and laws we put so much stock in are really correct. They may be replaced by entirely new theories and laws. No honest scientist would ever claim that his law is absolutely true and not subject to change. He knows that his ideas, theories and laws can be, and probably will be, overturned. That doesn't mean that he's stupid. He is describing only what he sees in nature from his viewpoint and by using the best tools he has. But he can never be certain that what he has discovered is true. He only knows that it works (sometimes only with difficulty, though).

For the scientist evolution appears to work. Without the Word of God it is the best explanation that his reason can come up with. But even here there have been marked changes in evolutionary thought. Darwin's theory of evolution, is passe; it has been replaced, first with spontaneous generation and now with chemical evolution. Tomorrow perhaps another view will replace both of these. The only thing that is certain in science is that science is uncertain. It must be, because of its human origins. The laws of science are man's laws, not God's! We cannot teach our people that the laws of science are proved, or will always confirm God's Truth. The signature of man on them all is too much in evidence.

Note for example, the complete flip-flop of the scientific explanations of nature in just the past few years. "Atomic theory versus continuous matter, wave versus particle theory of light, quantum theory versus relativity, are but a few complete turn-arounds. In the case of matter, the view has flip-flopped five times. An approach to material truth would not permit such flip-flops, but only slight additions of complexity." (Sponholz,

Prof. M. "Idols of the Market Place" p 6)

Science laureate Robert Jastrow agrees that we must recognize the limitations of science. He states

...it is very important for people outside science to realize that our definition of reality changes -- almost from year to year. So what was reality in the nineteenth century is not real today. Relativity knocked everything into a cocked hat. What is reality today, and what the physicists are so proud of, may be nonsense in the next century. (from interview by B Durbin, "Christianity Today", Aug. 6, 1982, p. 15)

An Uncertain Future

What does the future hold for science? Will evolution be replaced by another law of beginnings? Will Einstein's theories be shelved as the geniuses of tomorrow open new avenues of thought? Who knows? One thing we can be certain of, though, is that science will progress no further than man's reason and imagination will take him. I have no hopes that science will ever demonstrate the truth of creation. I don't believe that even the best scientists of the 25th century will be able to explain the heart of God, His omnipotence or His redemptive plan for mankind either. These are outside of his realm; reason will never attain to such knowledge. They all are matters of faith and must be received by faith.

The main difference, then, that I see between science, on the one hand and God's revelation on the other, is that science is constantly changing in its search for truth, while God's revelation is Truth and therefore will never change. The hope of harmonizing the changing laws of men with the changeless Word of God is futile. By the time you have harmonized the two, science changes and you have to begin again. How much better to teach and confess the pure changeless Word of God and to let science wallow in its own uncertainty. Otherwise, faith will find itself continually floundering as it tries to respond to the ever changing laws of science. "With even the best of man-developed laws of nature having such flimsy foundations, one should not hesitate to reject any concept contrary to faith be it called theory, law, or even fact." (Sponholz, Prof. M., "A History of Science", p. 51)

The Supremacy Of God's Word

The Lutheran Church has always maintained the supremacy of God's Word. For us it is the only source and norm of faith and practice. I understand this to mean that where Scripture has spoken there is no room for debate; the question is already decided, be it in the area of doctrine, history or science. Since the Scriptures are divinely inspired, they are also inerrant. They cannot lie. For the Lutheran, God's Word is supreme. It needs no other "supporting evidence" nor does it need to be proved. What's more, it need not be reasonable either, for the Lutheran makes his reason captive to the Word of God.

The Reformed churches, on the other hand, have always been quick to draw unregenerate reason into the picture. "God does not expect us to accept anything that is unreasonable", is their cry. It is because of this, of course, that they deny such doctrines as infant baptism and the real presence in the Lord's Supper, and stumble with the question "*Cur alii prae aliis?*".

Historically, it is from this same camp of the Reformed that the creation-science movement received its impetus and greatest support. Lutherans have been "Johnny-come-latelys". But what the Lutherans lacked in priority, they seem to have made up in enthusiasm. Within our own circles there exists a Lutheran Science Institute which boasts of "communicating true science". Several of our synodical schools in their course descriptions boast also of this ability to distinguish between theories and the true laws of science.

What exactly is "*true science*"? In my research I was able to come up with two definitions. The first of these can hardly be acceptable to any of us. It states: "True science involves a willingness to cast aside preconceived notions, the strength to stand up to peer pressure, and a commitment to follow the search for truth wherever it might lead." (Sunderland, L. and Parker, G., "impact" (ICR publication), June 1982, No. 108, p. i) If that's the direction "true science" takes, I want nothing to do with it! It allows, yes, even encourages, that we judge the Bible correct only if our "search for truth" leads us in that direction. Scientific fact will determine the

veracity of Scripture.

The other definition comes from David Golisch, science teacher at Huron Valley Lutheran High School. He says that “true science is defined as that which does not disagree or negate Scripture”. This is better but it, too, is inadequate and misleading. It is possible, for example, for a scientific law to fit this definition and still be incorrect. Even if it does not conflict with Scripture it may still be wrong. (Remember Ptolemy and his geocentric viewpoint!) We are being unfair to our students if we teach them that the Bible confirms a scientific theory because it does not disprove it! That is poor logic and even worse theology.

Our Lutheran forefathers were always careful to point away from reason and to the Word. For them “true science” held no enticement. Allow me to piece together just a few of their many statements on the subject.

LUTHER No reason is so firm that it cannot again be overthrown by reason. There is no counsel, no matter how wise, no thing, no edifice, no matter how magnificent or strong, which cannot again be destroyed by human counsel, wisdom, and strength. And this can be seen in all things. Only the Word of God remains to all eternity. (Tischreden, Weimar edition, I, 530. Translated by Siegbert Becker)

WALTHER The charge is indeed valid that in our efforts to lead the present unbelieving generation back to faith we make no attempt to demonstrate to the world the harmony of faith and science. But we see no reproach in this charge; rather we glory in it, and we will not, by the grace of God, permit anyone to rob us of this glorying. For we are very certain that it is not possible to help the present apostate world with the lie that the divinely revealed truth is in perfect accord with the wisdom of this world; only the preaching of the divine foolishness, of the old unaltered Gospel, can help the world. Paul as well as the history of the church of all ages and of every Christian testified that the “foolish Gospel” is the power of God unto salvation to all that believe, to the Jew first and also the Greek (Rom. 1:16) A person who has been won for Christianity by showing him that Christianity can pass the sharpest probe of science is not yet won; his faith is no faith. (as quoted by Pieper, I, 164)

WALTHER Though science may consider the results of its research as absolutely certain truths, we do not regard science, but the Scriptures as infallible. If the results of scientific research contradict the clear Scriptures, we are *a priori* certain that they are nothing but positive error, even though we are not able to prove them erroneous except by an appeal to the Scriptures. When we must choose between science and Scripture, we say with Christ, our Lord: ‘The Scripture cannot be broken’ (John 10:35) and with the holy Apostle, ‘We bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ’ (2 Cor. 10:5). We do not wait for science to establish a foundation for us. We have it already; and prior to all scientific investigation and scrutiny it stands as firm as our God, who has laid it. *The findings of science can neither give us the faith nor rob us of it.* We stand on a rock; we know that not even the gates of hell, much less human science, can prevail against it. Therefore we laugh at all enemies and their scientific battering rams and siege artillery with which in insane rage they attack this rock towering over the turbulent waters of this world, towering as high as heaven. For thus says the Lord: ‘Whoever shall fall on this Stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder’ (Matt. 21:44). (as quoted by Pieper I, 162-163) (Emphasis mine - K)

PIEPER The Apostle Paul certainly knew his science and philosophy. But this same Apostle Paul would have us know that he never resorted in his preaching, even when dealing with a highly educated public, to scientific demonstrations. He would not offer his hearers such false props for their faith. He told the Corinthians: “My speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man’s wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power, that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God” (1 Cor. 2:4-5). Our old theologians expressed this truth in the terse and pointed phrase: *Theologia non est habitus demonstrativus, sed exhibitivus*. That means: Christian theology is the ability to present, or preach, the Christian doctrine to the world; Christian theology does not attempt to prove its truth by rational or philosophical arguments. As for proving its truth, the Holy Spirit, united with the Word, takes care of that when He crushes secure hearts through the preaching of the Law and creates faith in the Gospel through the preaching of God’s Gospel. That absolutely settles the case. (*Christian Dogmatics*, I, 109)

P. EICKMANN Where God has spoken, reason must bow in submission, every thought must be subjected to the obedience of Christ. In this wise is our approach to all things directed and our attitude conditioned.. This attitude is the result of faith that we have in Christ Jesus as our Savior, faith that has been created by the Holy Spirit through the Sacrament of Baptism and the preaching of the Gospel of salvation. It is not a result of an ability to reason, it is in fact entirely unreasonable. Reason has been dethroned and faith in Christ enthroned as the guiding principle in our lives. This is the attitude with which we approach all things in life and therefore science also. (as quoted by M. Sponholz, “Idols of the Market-Place”, p. 9)

S. BECKER It is this that man must learn that true knowledge can be found only in God’s revelation, and God’s revelation is to be found only in Scripture. Because of man’s total depravity and blindness, he can never read the revelation of God in nature fully nor draw conclusions correctly and with certainty. God must come to our aid, but because of man’s weakness and sinfulness, the majesty of God must hide behind the masks in order to reveal itself. Men should take care lest in sinful pride and presumption they are offended by the lowliness of the masks and by the simplicity of Scripture. It is the crib in which we find the Lord Christ. And only as we find Him there, and God in Him, can we know all creation correctly. (as quoted by M. Sponholz, “Idols of. the Market-Place”, p. 8)

Problems With Creation-Science

The first problem I see is that it is dangerous to faith. I know that in saying this I will arouse the wrath of many who, with the best intentions, support the creation-science movement. But before immediately condemning me, listen to the reasons why I feel duty-bound to make such a bold statement.

In the June 1982 cover letter of *Acts and Facts* Henry M. Morris shares part of a letter from an overseas pastor. Here is what he wrote:

I wish to express a word of appreciation for your work, and to let you know the impact your ministry has. Back in the summer of 1976, I attended your seminar on creation-science, and it has had a lasting effect on my life and faith. *The clear scientific evidence you presented proved to be exactly what I needed to set me free to trust God without reservation, and to know that the rest of His Word is also factually reliable*. I have had numerous occasions in many witnessing situations, when the material I received from you has

been invaluable. (Emphasis mine -.K.)

I trust that this overseas pastor is not of our fellowship! Although it may sound good on first reading, it nevertheless displays a spirit contrary to sound doctrine. Upon what is this pastor's "faith" based? On the Bible? On the sure clear words of Genesis 1 and 2? No! It is based on the "clear scientific evidence"! Even more revealing, this statement displays a lack of faith in the power and veracity of the Scriptures. Only after science was added did he feel "free to trust God without reservation". Certainly, this is not the kind of attitude we wish to instill in our children.

But, you say, we are careful to avoid just that sort of abuse in our *Lutheran* creation-science teachings. I trust that you are. But whenever you lead people away from Scripture to man's ideas, whenever you reduce faith to logical and reasonable postulates, you are operating in alien dangerous territory. Try as you might, I don't believe you can totally eliminate the type of thinking evidenced by that pastor. It's too easy to put the two together (science and faith) and to come up with what our old Lutheran theologians called a monstrosity, a *mixtum compositum* of theology and philosophy, "like unto the biform race of the Centaurs". (Quenstedt, I, 57 as quoted by Pieper)

Remember: "By *faith* we understand that the universe was formed at God's command, so that what is seen was not made out of what was visible," Hb. 11:3. Keep also in mind that "this is what the ancients were commended for", Hb. 11:2. I doubt that God will commend any effort that takes this out of the realm of faith and brings it into the arena of reason.

Another danger present in the creation-science movement is that it may provide a stumbling-block to faith for our college bound youth. By arming them with all the latest scientific evidence in support of creation, we somehow feel that we have fully equipped them to do battle in the university classroom. We have not. In fact we may have burdened them down with so many obsolete weapons that they can no longer successfully wield the only weapon that can prevail, the Word of God.

Very often a garbled, incomplete or just plain wrong message of science is sent out by untrained leaders of the church. I have not been trained in science, but in theology. I do not claim to know all the answers and counter arguments of every whim of evolution. I cannot show my students the errors of the latest developments of evolutionary thought. But I can teach them to live first by faith and to trust all of God's Word. I can teach them that God has made foolish the wisdom of the world (1 Co. 1:20). I can teach them that "the foolishness of God is wiser than man's wisdom" (1 Co. 1:25).

It is foolishness to destroy the theories of Darwin when today's evolution promotes chemical evolution. It is foolishness to clutch the Second Law of Thermodynamics as our last defense against evolution, when it has never been proved to even apply in biology.

If we prop up our faith, or that of our children, with out-dated laws of science and teach that these things show the Bible to be correct, what happens when university professors knock out these crutches to faith? (And they will!) If faith has been propped up by science, how will we be able to stand our ground when the science of tomorrow refutes and replaces the science we have learned?

Could it be that we are preparing our youth only for a fall from faith? I'm sure my Sunday School teacher had the best of intentions when she told me that dinosaurs never really existed, that they were only lies concocted by the evolutionist. Imagine the shock to my faith when later I saw the skeletons of such creatures. Could my teacher also have been wrong about evolution? Expect the same sort of doubts to arise when the evolutionist dismantles, one by one, the pet scientific theories you have taught your children. Should we not be willing to be ridiculed for our faith in Christ and His Word rather than for some pet scientific theory? "But whoever causes one of these little ones who believe in Me to stumble, it is better for him that a heavy millstone be hung around his neck, and that he be drowned in the depth of the sea," Mt. 18:6 (NASB).

For a long time such Christians saw the alternatives as science or faith - choose one. And they chose their faith. Then came the new generation of 'creationists' with the message that Christians can now have their cake and eat it too. The Bible has been right all along; science is now seen to affirm the simple story to which the faithful have been holding for so long. (Olson, E., "Hidden Agenda Behind the

Evolutionist/Creationist Debate”, Christianity Today, April 23, 1982, p. 29)

For me the choice is still the same. I choose faith and I find it hard to condone the actions of those who try to lend scientific respectability and credibility to a matter which must be accepted by faith alone. I am happy though that many others have also chosen faith.

What will be the predominant theme in days to come? Faith in man’s ability, in his reason? Or faith in the almighty power of God who has revealed Himself to us? Choose reason if you want to be in tune with the times, if you want to impress the scientific community, if you want to have popular appeal. But choose faith if you are concerned about the eternal welfare of the listener’s soul. Choose faith if you want to give him that peace which reason cannot understand. (Korthals, R. G., Essay published in *Creation, Evolution, And God’s Word*, p. 158.)

If we want to give our youth real weapons to use in this battle of faith, let us give them the “Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God”, Eph. 6:17. Let us give them the same weapons that Paul used so successfully because of their divine power. “The weapons we fight with are not the weapons of the world. On the contrary, they have divine power to demolish strongholds. We demolish arguments and every pretension that sets itself up against the knowledge of God, and we take captive every thought to make it obedient to Christ,” 2 Co. 10:4-5.

There are our weapons! Trust in God and fight the Lord's battles with the Lord's weapons! Surely, the Sword of the Spirit has not become so dull among us that we must discard it for the pen knife of science! Certainly, we are not ready to admit that we must use this Sword only with science’s cutting edge welded on in order for it to be effective! No, the Sword of the Spirit is still sharp enough, still sufficient to do battle with God’s enemies. Let us, then, use the Lord’s weapons -- not the toys of science!

The second problem I see in the creation-science movement is that in the end it is fruitless, a mere “chasing after the wind”. It is unnecessary. Allow me to illustrate what I mean from another field of scientific endeavor.

When archeology insisted for years that the Hittites never existed and that the Bible was in error on this point, did we stop teaching their existence as a matter of fact? Did we feel duty bound to send a team of Lutheran archeologists to dig up these “missing” people of the Bible? Of course not. We continued to teach their existence because God’s Word told us they did exist! When archeology some years later found evidence showing there really was such a people, did we clap our hands in glee and say, “now we can really be sure!”? Did we need the testimony of this science to believe the Scriptures? Did we rest our faith on archeological findings? No! We've always claimed we don’t need their scientific data to prove the Bible correct; the Bible proves itself. Why do we want to act any differently when it comes to creation versus evolution? When science tells me evolution is true I am not impressed, for I have something more sure than science. When creation-science demonstrates the fallacy of evolution I am not filled with glee and self-satisfaction. I knew it to be wrong all along; I did not need creation-science to tell me that.

How far would someone get in our Synod if he tried to raise funds for an expedition to find Noah’s Ark? I hope he would not get far at all. I hope he would be told that his expedition is unnecessary, that it is not the business of our church body to involve itself in such research, that not one widow’s mite will be directed away from the preaching of the Gospel to support such folly. I hope the same sort of reply will be given to those who expect synodical funding for a “Lutheran Science Institute”.

My third bone of contention with the movement is this, that it deals with the doctrine of creation on a plane different from any other doctrine of Scripture.

When we come to the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, the miracles of Jesus, the Resurrection or the Ascension of our Lord, we would be appalled if anyone were to try to add to these doctrines the type of scientific evidence the creation-scientist applies to the doctrine of creation.

Just this past week in the Madison based Capitol Times Abigail Van Buren of “Dear Abby” fame counseled a young girl who was afraid of becoming pregnant even though she did not engage in sexual intercourse. Without going into all the details, Abby’s reply was that it was technically possible to become

pregnant while still remaining a virgin. I'm sure, though, none of us would ever think of using this scientific evidence to support the Virgin Birth of Christ! I can still hear Professor Balge of our seminary telling us, in a way only he can, "Men, don't ever try to show your people that the virgin Birth is medically possible!" His point, of course, was that in trying to make it easy to swallow, in trying to make it reasonable to believe, you would end up destroying its miraculous character and removing it from the area of faith. I do not teach my students that the Virgin Birth is reasonably possible. I teach them it is positively true, though my reason cannot comprehend it. In the same way I teach them to accept, on the basis of faith alone, the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the dual nature of Christ, the Resurrection, the Ascension, salvation by grace through faith, the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper. None of these doctrines is reasonable. I cannot prove by any science that they are even possible. They are all matters of faith -- just as creation is. But how do you tell someone to have faith in these doctrines when you have trained him to use his reason when it comes to this other matter of faith, creation? Will he not want to apply his reason also to these articles of faith? How do you, explain to him it is permissible in the one case but not in the other?

Please do not ask me to teach creation as a scientific *possibility*. For then, I would have to teach that evolution is also a scientific *possibility*. That I cannot do. Creation is not a possibility: it is fact. But *science* does not tell me this; my Heavenly Father does.

A final objection to the creation-science movement is that in a sense, it brings God down to man's level.

I do not know the mathematics of God's almighty power. I do not understand the formula whereby He separated the light from the darkness, Gn. 1:4. (I do not see *nuclear fission* as some do in this passage!) I do not understand how He commands the morning or controls the springs of the sea. Neither can I answer His questions to Job: "Do you know the laws of the heavens? Can you set up God's dominion over the earth?" Job 38:33. No, I must rather confess with St. Paul, "Oh, the depth of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable His judgments, and His paths beyond tracing out!" Ro. 11:33.

We must leave God in the heavens. We need to acknowledge that we can never fully understand our God or figure out all the ways in which He works. I'm not convinced that the creation-science movement, with their emphasis on science and reason, is content to do this.

In the process we try to bring God down to man rather than, taking man up to God. We try to give him a God whose action and power can be understood. We feel we are helping -- and yet are we not actually depriving? For I want a God whose wisdom, power, attributes and might are so great that my frail human mind cannot begin to understand Him. I want a God who fills me with such wonder and awe that I feel compelled to fall on my face and worship Him. I want a God so all-knowing and powerful that He can reverse the forces of nature, if necessary, to protect me. I want a God so loving that He will forgive me again and again and again.

To have this kind of God I must have faith -- a faith which He gives me using as His instruments the pastors, teachers and members of His church. Are we doing all we can to aid in instilling this faith in our people today? Faith, not works, was the battle cry of the Reformation. Faith, not reason, should be the watchword of tomorrow. (Korthals, R.G. *Creation, Evolution, And God's Word*, p. 156-157.)

These, then, are the reasons for my skepticism with, and my opposition to, the creation-science movement. I see it as a dangerous unnecessary movement misguiding our youth. If there is controversy on this, then so be it. We should not be afraid of controversy or shy away from it at all costs. Controversy forces us to think and to examine our teachings again in the light of Scripture. If this paper causes us again to flee into the Scriptures for certainty I will be satisfied.

Finally, let me say that I do not consider it an error to combat evolution, defend the Bible, or confirm creation. These are things to which I am also committed. The error, however, is in looking to science and in appealing to reason to achieve these things. Fight the good fight with God's Word by faith.

Many times now I have heard the objection, "but we have to do something since so many are swallowing the lie of evolution". I agree. We do have to do something. But for me, the answer is not to give them the bitter Calvinistic pill of reason to swallow instead. The answer is not to fill them with science, but with the Word. If our people are being tempted to accept evolution as fact, don't try to combat it with

science. Rather, go back and teach again and again and again the inspiration and inerrancy of the Scriptures. Really, the question is not about evolution or creation. It is a question about the divine authority of the Word. And if we maintain and proclaim its divine authority, if we and our people can continue to say with Christ, “the Scripture cannot be broken” (Jn. 10: 35), then the urgency of the creation-science movement will not be real for us.

We have “Moses and the prophets”. Let us hear them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "Acts & Facts", Institute for Creation Research Newsletter. June 1982, Vol. 11, No. 6.
- Durbin, Bill. "A Scientist Caught Between Two Faiths". An interview with Prof. Robert Jastrow. *Christianity Today*, August 6, 1982.
- Durbin, Bill. "The Two Faiths Tied Together". An interview of Dr. Donald MacKay. *Christianity Today*, August 6, 1982.
- Fowler, Sir Ralph and Guggenheim, E.A. *Statistical Thermodynamics*. Cambridge University Press, 1952.
- Geisler, Norman L. "Creationism: A Case for Equal Time". *Christianity Today*, March 19, 1982.
- "impact", Institute for Creation Research Newsletter. June 1982, No. 108.
- Marsden, George M. "A Law to Limit the Options". *Christianity Today*, March 19, 1982.
- Morris, Henry M. Institute for Creation Research Newsletter. June 1982.
- Olson, Edwin A. "Hidden Agenda Behind the Evolutionist/Creationist Debate". *Christianity Today*, April 23, 1982.
- Pieper, Francis. *Christian Dogmatics*. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri, 1950. Vol. I.
- Rhodes, Frank H. "Scientific creationism will make self extinct". *The Capital Times*, Monday Section, p. 2. April 19, 1982. Madison, Wisconsin.
- Schaff, Philip. *History of the Christian Church*. Vol. 6,7,8.
- Sponholz, Martin P. "A History of Science", Unpublished conference paper presented to the Southwestern and Mississippi Valley Joint Conference, First Ev. Lutheran Church, La Crosse, Wisconsin, April 11, 1972.
- Sponholz, Martin P. "Idols of the Market-Place", presented at a science sectional of the Wisconsin Lutheran Secondary Teachers' Conference, Wisconsin Lutheran High School, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, October 25, 1978.
- Sponholz, Martin P. "Teaching Creation and Science", presented at a science sectional of the Wisconsin Lutheran State Teachers' Conference, Wisconsin Lutheran High School, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, October 27 & 28, 1977.
- Sponholz, Martin P. "Two Towers", presented at the Minnesota District Pastoral Conference, St. John's Ev. Lutheran Church, Minneapolis, Minnesota, April 20, 1982.
- The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*. Merrill C. Tenney, General Editor. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1978. Vol. Five: Q-Z.
- Zimmerman, Paul A. *Creation, Evolution, And God's Word*. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri, 1972.