



## The Book of Nature-Part 3--A Conflict Between Nature and the Bible? by Warren Krug (May-June, 2007)

### III. Is There a Conflict Between the Book of Nature and the Book of Books?

In the first two parts of this series we examined what we can learn about God from nature as well as what nature can't tell us about the Creator and His plan of salvation. One more issue needs to be addressed—the major alleged conflict between what we learn from nature and what we learn in the Bible. This conflict or disagreement is over origins, or between the theory of evolution and the account of divine creation as recorded in Genesis. It is said incorrectly that evolution is based on science, and, in the minds of many, science has taken on a godlike status. Therefore, if there is a conflict between science and the Bible, these people assume that science must be right.

#### A. The Differences

*1. Origins of Living Things.* The theory of evolution teaches that all living things have descended from an original living cell, each living species having evolved from other creatures not like themselves, a period that took millions of years. The book of Genesis teaches that all the various kinds of living creatures have descended from ancestors like themselves, each original ancestor created separately during a period of six days. A tree of life drawn by an evolutionist would be a single very wide tree with many branches and twigs representing the various life forms, and the trunk standing for the single original living cells. A creationist instead would draw a series of very narrow trees, each representing a different kind of life form, all having originated at the same time, and none having branches that connect with other trees. The creationist trees, based on the Bible, would allow for some variation within a created kind, but not enough variation to form a completely different life form.

This is an important point to remember because mainstream scientists often point to variation within a kind of living thing (which they call microevolution) as proof that molecule-to-man evolution is possible. However, variation within a kind, for which we have a plethora of examples, doesn't validate the idea of one kind evolving into a completely different kind, for which we have no indisputable examples.

*2. Age of the Universe.* The theory of evolution holds that the universe and world are billions of years old. This theory needs the Earth and the universe to be exceedingly old for the idea of amoeba-to-man evolution purely by chance to seem the least bit credible. Although the Bible itself doesn't say exactly how old the world is, careful examination of the Scripture, particularly the Old Testament genealogies, indicates that the universe and world can't be more than a few thousand years old.

*3. The Creator and Need for a Savior.* The most serious problem with the theory of evolution for a Christian is that evolution doesn't require a divine creator. Evolution or nature itself using mutations and "natural selection" does the creating. And, because mankind with its morals is superior to the "law of the jungle" code of the animal world from which humans are supposed to have evolved, evolution doesn't

see any need for a savior. In other words, according to evolution, mankind is getting better on its own without any help from God.

We know from the Bible that the opposite is true. Humans were created holy, but, because of the sin of Adam and Eve, fell from the lofty perch of holiness and now need a Savior to help them regain the perfection that mankind once enjoyed.

## **B. Attempts to Reconcile the Two Views.**

Down through the years attempts have been made to reconcile the two views or, at the very least, to find a way of remaining a Christian and still believe in evolution.

*1. Theistic Evolution.* Theistic evolutionists think God used evolution to create the universe. They believe almost everything about the theory other than the idea that evolution happens by pure chance or luck. As for the Bible, theistic evolutionists regard Genesis as a myth or an allegory, some say a story invented by Moses to tell to primitive men because they were too dull to understand evolution. As we have seen though, the theory of evolution wipes out the need for a savior, which runs counter to all of the rest of Scripture. Writing under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, St. Paul accepted the historicity of the Genesis account when he wrote in Romans 5:12, "Therefore, just as sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all men, because all sinned."

*2. Progressive Creation.* This idea is similar to theistic evolution except that progressive creationists believe God didn't just start the evolution process going but that He intervened at various times to keep it going. All the objections about theistic evolution are valid also for progressive creation.

*3. The Day-Age Theory.* According to this theory the Genesis days were really long periods of millions of years each, thus allowing enough time for evolution to occur. The evidence against this theory includes the fact that the Hebrew word for "day", *yom*, when attached to a numeral, as in the days of creation, always refers to a 24-hour day. Also, the expression "And there was evening, and there was morning" which occurs with each day of creation surely identifies these days as normal 24-hour days. From a scientific viewpoint, how could the plants created on day 3 survive for millions of years without sunlight, since the sun didn't appear until Day 4?

*4. The Gap Theory.* This idea proposes that there is a huge time gap between Genesis 1:1 and Genesis 1:2, thus again permitting evolution the long ages it requires. People who accept this theory believe the second verse of Genesis suggests that God destroyed an original creation, an act commonly blamed on Satan's rebellion against God. They believe this original destruction was responsible for some of the rock strata and fossils we see around the world, God then created a new world. However, Genesis 1:2 says, "Now the earth **was** formless and empty", not **became** formless and empty. The Gap Theory allows for billions of years of death and suffering before the Fall of Adam, an idea that doesn't agree with the rest of Scripture. St. Peter recognizes only one creation and only one destruction in history (Noah's Flood) when he writes, "Long ago by God's word the heavens existed and the earth was formed out of water and by water. By these waters also the world of that time was deluged and destroyed." (2 Peter 3:5-6)

**C. What the Book of Nature says about Evolution.** As Bible-believing Christians, we know there really can't be a conflict between God's Word and God's created world. So what does nature really have to say about the theory of evolution?

*1. Transitional Forms and the Fossil Record.* When we look at the created world, we at first may think we see many examples of evolution. For instance, according to a recent Life magazine, breeders are working on creating a new species of cat called a *toyger*—a feline with the size and temperament of a house cat but the stripes and rounded ears of a tiger. New varieties of plants and animals and microbes are constantly appearing, either in nature or in the scientist's laboratory.

The important thing to remember is that these new varieties are not new "kinds" of creatures. A tiger, a house cat, and a toyger are all 100% cats. All the many varieties of dogs including wolves, foxes, and coyotes are fully members of the dog kind which God created on the sixth day of creation. Some scientists refer to these new varieties as examples of "micro-evolution", but most creationists probably would prefer to call them examples of "variation within a kind."

If molecules-to-man evolution were a fact, we would expect to see in the world around us numerous examples of transitional forms between one kind of animal and an entirely different kind. This we don't see. No half dog-half chicken. No part cow-part whale. No reptile on its way toward becoming a bird. The evidence for transitional forms in the modern world is so weak, evolutionists have turned to the fossil record to find these "missing links." The fossil record it turns out isn't much help either. The late well-known evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould confessed, "All paleontologists know that the fossil record contains precious little in the way of intermediate forms; transitions between major groups are characteristically abrupt." <sup>1</sup>

So nature tells us that all creatures are descended from creatures more or less like themselves, "according to their kinds" as Genesis puts it. There is no evidence that any creature descended from an entirely different kind of creature, no matter how far back in its ancestry one wishes to go.

*2. Genetics and Mutations.* We know today that the blueprint for any creature lies in its genes. For an animal to produce an entirely different kind of animal, there would have to be a major change in its genetic code. Most mainstream scientists think that mutations can cause these changes and thus are basically responsible along with natural selection for amoeba-to-man evolution. However, mutations are not a positive force. Mutations corrupt or take away from the genetic code; there never has been an example of a mutation adding information to a gene. And, of course, to get from a one-celled organism to a human being, there would have to be a lot of added information. If mutations are not the driving force behind evolution, then what is?

*3. Second Law of Thermodynamics.* One well-established law in nature that rules out evolution is the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Besides reminding us that the total amount of useful energy in the universe is decreasing over time, the Second Law explains that the universe is moving from a state of order toward a state of disorder, a condition called *entropy*. Left to themselves, a car will eventually break down, a computer accumulates unwanted and maybe even dangerous files, a living organism will die and decay. The Second Law thus contradicts the theory of evolution which, as more and more complicated creatures evolve, needs more and more organization, not less.

The argument some evolutionists use to counter the Second Law of Thermodynamics objection is that the earth is an open system constantly getting additional energy from the sun. However, the sun's energy can only work on the genetic codes already present in creatures; it has no ability to add information to genes, which would be necessary for amoeba-to-man evolution to have occurred. **2**

We have only briefly touched on a few of the many biblical and scientific objections to the theory of evolution. It is impossible to reconcile the theory of evolution with either nature or the Bible. It is not surprising that nature and the Bible are in agreement because the Creator and Author of Scripture are one and the same.

Meanwhile we can and ought to praise the Lord for His many acts of love and kindness, evidence of which we have no trouble finding in the created world around us as well as, of course, in His Holy Word. LSI

## **References**

1. Stephen Jay Gould, "The Return of Hopeful Monsters," *Natural History* (June/July 1977), p.24, quoted in Morris, Henry M. and John D. *The Modern Creation Trilogy: Volume Two*, Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 1996.

2. Morris, Henry M. and John D., *The Modern Creation Trilogy—Volume Two*, Green Forest, Arkansas, Master Books, 1996.