

if you could ask God ANYTHING...

Sermon 3 – Genesis 1 “Hasn’t science disproven you?”

1. What insights have you gained from Kevin’s third Sunday talk? Did the talk raise questions for you?
2. Prior to this talk, what was your view on evolution?
3. Prior to this talk, what was your view on Genesis 1 and the Bible’s creation account?
4. Has this talk influenced your thinking? Has your position changed?
5. What are some of the flaws in evolution theory which Kevin identified?
6. Why do you consider the theory of evolution has held sway for so long, especially considering that various aspects have been debunked by the scientific community itself 30-40 years ago?
7. Some Christians have embraced the theory of evolution, combining it with an understanding of God as creator by saying that “God is the force behind the big bang?” Do you see any issues with this?
8. Read Acts 17:26 and Genesis 3:20 and discuss their implications for understanding God’s creative purposes and challenging the theory of evolution.
9. Read Romans 5:12. If Paul claims that sin came into the world through the one man Adam, what implications does this have for embracing a theory of evolution?
10. Someone says to you – ‘science has disproven God’. How would you begin to respond?
11. Someone else says to you – ‘evolution disproves God is creator’. Again, how would you respond?
12. A friend comments: ‘we live in a sophisticated society: we don’t need all that god stuff anymore – science has all the answers’. How would you respond?

Pray that we might have courage to challenge those we know who hold to the theory of evolution and be able to demonstrate some of the problems with the theory.

Pray that we will be strong to hold to the Bible’s view of God as creator.

Pray that this series will continue to train and equip us in our service of God.

Pray that non-Christians who have joined us for the series, will continue to consider the Lord Jesus and that the Lord will work in their hearts and reveal himself to them.

GOD AND EVOLUTION (Genesis 1:1-31)

The theory of evolution is, I believe, one of the major stumbling blocks major stumbling block for many people in seeking to believe in the God of the Bible. And by "Evolution", I am referring to the Darwinian theory that all life originated from single celled life, and gradually evolved into increasingly complex species.

In regard to this theory, there are two popular impressions that are given:

- 1. That the theory of evolution, in itself, somehow disproves the existence of God; and**
- 2. That the theory of evolution is supported by a vast, irrefutable body of evidence.**

I want to say this morning, as strongly as I can, that neither of these propositions is even close to being true.

Let's have a look at the first one, the idea that evolution has somehow disproved the existence of God.

THIS, JUST SIMPLY, ISN'T TRUE.

There are many Christians who believe that God used the process of evolution to create life. They see no conflict between their Christian faith, and the process of evolution. I am not of this opinion, but there are plenty of intelligent people who hold this position.

This view is commonly referred to as "theistic evolution" - the belief that God used the process of evolution to create life. . A survey of American churches in 2007 revealed that 51% of Protestants and 58% of Catholics believe that God used evolution to create life.

You see, the reason why many Christians feel quite comfortable believing in both God and Evolution is that the theory of Evolution provides absolutely no answers for the truly big questions regarding our origins:

How did non-living matter generate living organisms? - To date, there is no known natural process by which this could have occurred. Evolution does not have an answer to that question. In fact, the very notion is a direct contradiction of several of the laws of thermodynamics and genetics.

Even more importantly: **Where did matter come from in the very beginning - before the Big Bang?** Where did the stuff that went Bang come from? - Scientists have absolutely no idea.

In 2014 Bill Nye "The Science Guy", an atheist, had a debate with Ken Ham, a creationist, who asked him that very question, "Where did matter come from in the beginning?". And he responded, "*We don't know. This is the great mystery - you've hit the nail on the head!*"

But the Bible has a very clear answer to these questions:

Genesis 1:1 "*In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth.*" You see, the reason why science has not been able to find a *natural* cause for the origin of the universe, is because there *isn't* one! The universe was caused *supernaturally!*

The point is, Evolution, even if it is true, has not displaced God by any means, because it doesn't answer the biggest questions of all.

Now, let's examine the second proposition ...

- 2. That the theory of evolution is supported by a vast, irrefutable body of evidence.**

Now of course there is some evidence for evolution. Here is the best evidence we have to date ...

× 4 (pictures of apes and Donald Trump)

The impression we get from the popular media is that evolution is supported by a huge amount of irrefutable evidence. But not only is this *not* the case, but many significant scientific developments in recent decades have seriously undermined the theory of evolution. The reality is that the theory of evolution is in serious trouble today, and there are a growing number of respected scientists who have abandoned the theory completely.

In recent years, a number of academic papers and books have been published, discussing the significant flaws in the theory. One such work is *“More than Myth”* (Chartwell Press, 2014, Editors: Robert Stackpole and Paul Brown). Of particular significance is the chapter, *“Top 10 Scientific Problems With Biological and Chemical Evolution”* by Dr. Casey Luskin. Here are just the first 5:

1. The impossibility of random genetic mutations producing new genetic material.
2. The irreducible complexity of single-celled life.
3. The complete failure of the fossil record to provide support for Darwinian evolution.
4. The failure of molecular biology to provide evidence for evolution.
5. The now understood impossibility of natural selection creating new species.

Similarly, Dr. John Ashton’s book, *“In Six Days”*, edited by Dr John F Ashton, has 50 chapters, each written by a different scientist from various parts of the world. Each of them provides extensive scientific arguments for their view that the theory of evolution is no longer scientifically tenable, and they explain the growing scientific evidence supporting theistic creation. The contributing scientists are highly regarded internationally, and come from a wide range of fields including biology, chemistry, biochemistry, genetics, physics, zoology, astronomy, meteorology, engineering and botany.

Let Me Briefly Highlight A Couple Of These Major Flaws That Have Emerged In Recent Years Regarding The Theory Of Evolution:

THE COMPLETE FAILURE OF THE EVOLUTIONARY FOSSIL RECORD

Dr. Roberto Fondi, Professor of Palaeontology at the University of Seaella, Italy comments, *“The fundamental assumptions upon which evolution is based are not at all confirmed by palaeontology. If evolution had really happened, the evidence would be in abundance and incontestable. The museums would be overflowing with exhibits clearly documenting the transitions between various biological groups. But the fact is that after nearly two centuries of intense research, there are NO such exhibits. The very few fossils once claimed to be some kind of evolutionary link, such as the amphibians, *Ichtheostica* and *Simorea*, the bird *Archaeopteryx*, and the *Australopithecine* ape, *Homohabilis*, have now been rejected.”*

In terms of so-called human evolution, the original missing links, taught up until the 1970’s, have now all been disproved and completely discarded. These have all proven to be either hoaxes by fanatical atheists or false hopes based upon really poor science. For example:

- **Hesperopithecus** was believed to be one such missing link. Amazingly, all they had were some teeth and they managed to construct these imaginative drawings!
- But in the late 1960’s, Henry Fairfield Osborn’s field expedition proved beyond doubt that *Hesperopithecus* was simply the teeth of a modern-day wild pig!
- **Java Man** was discovered in 1891 by Eugene Dubois
- Yet Dubois also discovered fully human skulls at the same level as Java Man, and concealed them for 30 years. Before he died he confessed this and admitted that Java Man was really a gibbon.
- **Pitldown Man**, discovered in 1912 by Charles Dawson
- It was chemically analysed in 1953 by Prof. Kenneth Oakley, who proved conclusively that the skull was that of a modern human and the jawbone was that of an ape. The bones had been chemically treated by Dawson to make them appear old, and the teeth had been filed down to resemble human teeth. Charles Dawson was disgraced by the eventual unveiling of this fraud, which had fooled the scientific world for 40 years.
- **Neanderthal Man**, discovered in 1848 at Forbes Quarry, Gibraltar, was declared by evolutionists at the time to be THE missing link.

- In 1947, a Neanderthal Man was discovered to have lived in a cave AFTER modern man had inhabited it. Neanderthal Man is now known to have been a variation of modern homo-sapien.
- “Lucy” (an Australopithecine) is the latest supposed missing link hailed by evolutionists.
- However, living specimens of this creature have reportedly been discovered in the jungles of Sumatra. The creature, known as Orang Pendek, is simply another variety of the Orang monkey species, and not, as we were told, an ancient ancestor of homo sapiens. The well-known French science journal, “Science et Vie”, admitted this fact in its February 1999 issue with the headline “Farewell Lucy” (Adieu Lucy) and the statement that Australopithecus could not be considered the ancestor of man.
- **In fact, every single supposed transitional form between monkey and man has now been completely discredited.**
- The current monkey to man evolutionary chain now looks like this ... There is not a single transitional form in existence!
- This is also true of all supposed evolutionary stages. Fish to amphibians
- Amphibians to reptiles
- Reptiles to birds - there is not a single transitional fossil in existence!
- **PROF. ROBERTO FONDI, states, “There remains today not ONE SINGLE transitional link between any two species. The theory of evolution is NOT supported by paleontology.”¹**

The Smithsonian Museum in Washington DC is the premier museum in America, and is colloquially considered to be the “head office” of evolution. It used to have an exhibit called “Origin Of Life: Apes to Man”, which featured impressive representations of the various transitional ape-man forms. The display was eventually closed down in the 1980’s, and a sign was placed outside it reading,

“A lot has happened since this exhibit opened in 1974. The science of human evolution is a fast-changing field. Much of the material here is now out of date. We are developing a new exhibit based on the latest findings.” It never re-opened. Because there is now no evidence to support it! None!

In 1999, Colin Patterson, one of the world’s leading evolutionary palaeontologists, based at the British Museum of Natural History, wrote the landmark book,

“Evolution”. In it he failed to mention a SINGLE evolutionary transitional form.

When a Christian scientist, Luther D. Sunderland, wrote and asked why he had failed to mention any transitional forms, Patterson wrote back, saying,

“I fully agree with your comments on the lack of evidence of evolutionary transitional forms. If I knew of any (either fossil or living) I would certainly have included them in my book. I’ll lay it on the line - there is NOT ONE SUCH FOSSIL [emphasis mine] for which there is a watertight argument.” This now famous quote has severely embarrassed evolutionists, and Patterson, under pressure from the atheist movement, has subsequently tried to qualify his original comment.

If evolution was true, we should expect to find MILLIONS of transitional forms all over the earth.

Yet there is not *one such* transitional fossil!

A relatively recent stunning discovery which rocked the evolutionist world occurred in 1997, when Dr Mary Schweitzer, Professor of Paleontology, North Carolina State University, found soft tissue and haemoglobin molecules inside the bones of a T-Rex. But haemoglobin molecules only last 1,000’s of years not millions!

Another stunning find occurred in 1977, when a rotting Plesiosaur carcass was pulled up from the ocean bed by a Japanese fishing boat. Yet Plesiosaurs are supposed to have become extinct 150 million years ago!

As Prof. E.H. Andrews states, *“The fossil record now constitutes a severe embarrassment to the theory of evolution.”*

A second area which poses a major problem for evolution is

THE IRREDUCIBLE COMPLEXITY OF LIFE

Cells were once thought to be simple building blocks of life, but we now understand that this is not so. Cells are incredibly complex. Even the simplest cell is full of hundreds of molecular machines, each of which is comprised of dozens of independent parts, formed by the construction of DNA and RNA chains, each of which was constructed by other molecular machines inside the cell.

This is a computer enhanced picture, produced by Cambridge University, of inside a single cell. The large globe is the nucleus and what you're seeing are the superhighways carrying hundreds or even thousands of tiny molecular DNA machines, like little robots, each of which carries out a task essential for the cell to remain alive. The simplest of cells is unbelievable complex!

And all of these machines had to come into existence simultaneously in order for a single cell to be alive. And scientists have no idea how this could have happened. This poses a huge problem for the concept of the spontaneous generation of life!

Evolution has NO WAY of explaining how such a complex system could come about by itself.

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

Commenting on Darwin's statement, and in the light of our recent knowledge of the irreducible complexity of cells,

Dr. Michael Behe, Professor of Biochemistry at Lehigh University in Pennsylvania and a senior fellow of the Discovery Institute's Centre for Science and Culture, states,

"As the number of unexplained, irreducibly complex biological systems increases, our confidence that Darwin's 'criterion of failure' has been met skyrockets towards the maximum that science allows".

In other words, If Charles Darwin was alive today, he would almost certainly concede that his theory, according to his own defined parameters, has been refuted by overwhelming scientific evidence.

A third and final area that I will touch on very briefly, another major problem for Evolution, is

THE GENETIC IMPOSSIBILITY OF POSITIVE MUTATIONS

Professor Giuseppe Sermoniti, a highly respected Italian biochemist, geneticist, and molecular biologist states, *"Recent discoveries in molecular biology have deeply undermined the theory of evolution. The claim of evolution - that mutations are retained and strengthened by natural selection - is not true. What natural selection does is eliminate genetic mutations."*

Professor Macki Giertyche, a geneticist associated with Torun University, Poland, and a member of the Polish Academy of Dendrology, states: *"Evolution is not a science; it is a philosophy... The science of genetics shows that macro-evolution is not possible... The main argument of evolutionists is that small, positive (or beneficial) mutations occur in the reproduction cells and are retained by natural selection. These mutations are said to gradually accumulate over time until a new species is formed. Now, I am a geneticist, and I can confirm that in all the studies in all the laboratories around the world, where many generations of organisms have been observed, nowhere have positive mutations ever been observed. All mutations are either neutral or harmful - they are never an improvement."*

Dr. Ken Ham states, *"If they had known about genetics in Darwin's day, the theory of evolution would never have gotten off the ground."*

By the way, have you heard of **Mitochondrial Eve**?

In 1979, Drs Alan Wilson and Rebecca Cann's study of female mitochondrial DNA discovered that all women currently living had a single common female progenitor.

Two studies (1981 and 1983) cast doubt on this.

In 1986, after more detailed research, Wilson and Cann's hypothesis was finally, and very reluctantly, accepted by the scientific community. They published in the "Nature" and "Science" scientific journals in 1987.

A flurry of more popular publications then followed, including Newsweek
National Geographic

As well as a Discovery Channel documentary, entitled, "The Real Eve; 5 billion people from one woman"

The Wikipedia entry on Mitochondrial Eve states, "Shortly after the 1987 publication, criticism of its methodology was published. Although the original publication did have analytical limitations, the findings have since proven robust. The name Mitochondrial Eve alludes to biblical Eve."

How do evolutionists explain Mitochondrial Eve? They have to concede that all women alive today are descended from one woman - that's now scientifically established - but they propose that there were probably thousands of other women alive at the time of Mitochondrial Eve, but that Mitochondrial Eve's lineage is the only one that has survived to this day. The lineage of all the other women died out. What is their evidence for this postulation? Absolutely none. There is no evidence for this. They believe because they want to believe it - because otherwise they are faced with having to accept the story of the Bible. That there were literally only two original human beings, Adam and Eve.

.....

As a result of these, and many other, significant problems now emerging with the theory of evolution, two extremely important scientific conferences have been held in recent decades, to evaluate the ongoing viability of the theory of Evolution.

The first was in November 1980, at the Natural History Museum in Chicago, where a large number of the world's leading geneticists and other scientists met to consider the issue of whether the small changes in varieties, sometimes referred to as "micro-evolution", lead to the big changes necessary for Darwinian evolution ("macro-evolution"). The findings of the Chicago Conference were reported in the December 1980 issue of "Science" magazine, which stated,

"The central question of the Chicago conference was whether the mechanisms underlying micro-evolution can be extrapolated to explain the supposed phenomena of macro-evolution. At the risk of doing violence to the opinions of some of the scientists at the meeting, the answer was a clear 'No'."

In other words, a meeting to the world's leading geneticists came to the conclusion that Darwinian evolution is genetically impossible.

The second conference of scientists took place in 2002. The conference took place in France and was attended by leading scientists from around the world, who formed a voluntary organisation called CESHE (Cercle d'études Scientifique et Historique).

The purpose was, once again, to determine whether the theory of evolution can still be considered to be a valid scientific theory. After a period of intense scrutiny and rigorous evaluation of all the evidence, this was their conclusion:

"The theory of evolution is not supported by science. Many scientists have accepted the theory because they assume it to be an established scientific fact. Those scientists who have investigated it, however, find that evolution is a belief, not a science."

In his book, "God, Science and Evolution", Prof. E.H. Andrews wrote, "Speaking as a scientist, I believe that in another 20 years the theory of evolution will have been totally discredited, purely on scientific grounds. The enormous gaps in the theory are beginning to emerge - not, of course, in the popular versions of evolution, but in the findings of scientists who are studying these matters at depth.... The popular impression is given that evolution is scientifically proven. This view is terribly biased and ignores the yawning chasms in the theory which make it unacceptable to me as a scientist."

CONCLUSION

What's the take home message here.

Firstly, let me summarise in four quick points.

1. The scientific evidence for evolution is diminishing rapidly, with many recent discoveries contradicting the theory.
2. The only two scientific conventions ever held for the purpose of evaluating the theory have repudiated it.
3. Even if evolution is true, it does not disprove the existence of God, for it does not answer the ultimate questions of origin.
4. Christians should be equipped to engage in intelligent conversation with sceptics and enquirers on this topic.

It's truly puzzling to me how easily and unthinkingly a large portion of the Christian church has surrendered to the theory of evolution, relegating the biblical account of creation to realm of mythology and embracing the theories of atheistic scientists – theories which, over recent decades, have become increasingly unsubstantiated.

Whereas TRUE science, based on actual evidence, evidence that is accumulating rapidly, overwhelmingly supports the Biblical narrative of creation.

Max Born, the German physicist who won the Nobel Prize for science in 1954, said, *“Those who say that the study of science must make a person an atheist must be rather silly people.”*

Albert Einstein famously stated, *“The more I study science, the more I believe in God”*. Einstein is absolutely correct. God has nothing to fear from science. In the end, true science, evidential science, simply corroborates what the Bible has said all along.

Which will you believe? The increasingly unsubstantiated theories of man? Or the inspired Word of God himself?

Dr Henry Morris once said, *“In the first page of the Bible a child may learn more in one hour than all the scientists of the world have learned without it in thousands of years.”* And let me remind you what that first page of the Bible tells about actual events at the beginning of creation ...

In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. **(Gen 1:1)**

And the earth was without form, and void and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. **(Gen 1:2)**

Then God said, “Let there be light” and there was light. **(Gen 1:3)**

And God made a vault over the water, and he called the vault “sky”. **(Gen 1:7-8)**

And God said, “Let the water under the sky be gathered together, and let dry ground appear”. **(Gen 1:9)**

Then God said, “Let the land produce vegetation”. **(Gen 1:11)**

And God said, “Let there be lights in the heavens”. **(Gen 1:14)**

And God said, “Let the waters teem with living creatures”. **(Gen 1:20)**

... and let there be birds to fly across the vault of the sky. **(Gen 1:20)**

And God said, “Let the land produce living creatures”. **(Gen 1:24)**

The God said, “Let us make mankind in our image”. **(Gen 1:26)**

God saw all that he had made, and it was very good. **(Gen 1:31)**

I want to encourage you to place your faith in the Word of God on this issue. Trust what the Bible says. In the beginning God truly did create the heavens and the earth.

I will leave you with a quote by Dr Robert Jastrow, astrophysicist and founder of NASA's Goddard Space Institute, who commented on the growing scientific evidence for theistic creation, saying ...

"For the scientist who has lived by his faith in the power of reason, the story ends like a bad dream. He has scaled the mountain of ignorance, he is about to conquer the highest peak, and as he pulls himself over the final rock, he is greeted by a band of theologians who have been sitting there for centuries!"

By Kevin Simington