

The Newsletter says, I “ will be presenting a message on *The Christian World View and Evolution*. I will be examining the historical context of the development and acceptance of the Theory of Evolution and how understanding that will help us as Christians to see its roots and the mind set of those who espouse this theory. We will also see how we as Christians have been effected by this mind set, its fruit and how we should equip ourselves and our children to overcome the lies and propaganda associated with it.

Mat 10:16 "Behold, I am sending you forth like sheep in the midst of wolves. Therefore be as wise as serpents and innocent as doves.

This is the subject that was given to me for this talk. I am neither a scientist nor a trained philosopher, I am a preacher, therefore if you hear the ring of truth in what I am about to say I would challenge you to take it up with the Lord. I am also a student of history, especially as it pertains to the Christian Faith. My hobby is reading old books.

I would like to begin by tracing the the History of ideas as pertains to the subject at hand so that we can see how we arrived where we are at today.

Where did Science come from?? (1600's)

Francis Bacon first introduced the principles of inductive scientific method in order to unlock the secrets of the universe and demonstrate the Glory of God.

Isaac Newton using these principles demonstrated that the planets are in fixed orbit and invented forms of Calculus,

discovered that Light was made up of a spectrum of colors, and had many other great discoveries. However He moved away from science in his late twenties and in his later life wrote over a million words of commentary on the Scriptures, especially on the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation.

- He regarded religion and science as interrelated; science, indeed, the handmaiden of religion. In both he insisted upon a common mental approach, a foundation of facts, historical and natural. He corrected the death date (34) of Christ, and that of the Argonaut's search (956) and hence of Troy's fall, 904 (both about 3 centuries late by modern standards). His application of astronomical dating (eclipses, equinoctial precession, et at.) was revolutionary. He was, however, very much opposed to metaphysicians such as Descartes and Leibnitz, both in science and in theology. He looked upon history and nature as similar in that they both have latent secrets, both being actually simple and measurable.

Newton's whole life was dominated by religion, his search for the Creator of heaven and earth. Toward the end of his life he mused, "I do not know what I may appear to the world; but to myself I appear to have been but a little boy, playing on the sea-shore, and diverting myself, in now and then finding a smooth pebble or a prettier shell than ordinary, whilst the great ocean of truth lay all undiscovered before me."

There were others of this era who took the facts acquired by these godly men and tried to reinterpret them and rather than demonstrate the existence of God by the order of the universe they claimed that it made the idea of God unnecessary because

the universe ran like a machine.

Voltaire was one of these who duplicated the experiments of Newton and tried to make these claims.

It is important to look here at the character of these individuals to get a glimpse at the difference why one would take one side or the other in this issue.

- **Newton** was a godly man who died a virgin and held to the utmost personal moral standards. His main pursuit in life was truth.
- **Voltaire** was a lustful and blasphemous man who was kicked out of college and spent most of his time writing satires and sexually explicit poetry. He couldn't find God for the same reason a criminal can't find a policeman.

The idea of empiricism gave rise to rationalism and everything was subject to this new way of looking at things. In the 1700's the German school of Higher Criticism was established.

- In 1734 Johann Bengel published his Greek New Testament outlining the principles of textual criticism. Again, Bengel did this in the interest of Truth, but others began to distort this and the Scriptures came under attack by those who like Voltaire were adverse to the truths of Scripture.
- It is important to mention this because this laid the foundation for the acceptance of Evolution later in the 19th century
- These ideas brought to popularity alternate views of God and the Bible. In Europe Deism became popular and later this became Unitarian Christianity, denying the involvement of God in a personal way in the world

and relegating Jesus to the role of "Good Teacher."

- Thomas Jefferson and Ben Franklin were both deists. Denying all that is supernatural, Jefferson's Bible ends with the words "*So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch.*"
- The idea that only testable and verifiable data can be believed leads to the idea that there is no supernatural and when applied to faith, it guts the whole idea of the Gospel.
- Again, we see it is in the approach to Truth that where we see the discrepancy.

As rationalism advanced in 18th century and on into the 19th century it laid the foundation for the acceptance of Darwinian Evolution.

Charles Darwin was a Unitarian and came up in a skeptical household. He had a basic belief in God, but was biased against the idea that God acted in time on the behalf of His people.

- Charles' Father Robert was a doctor and wished his son to become one as well and sent him to Edinburgh to study Medicine.
- Charles could not tolerate the brutality of surgery and neglected his studies.
- His father chose for him as a second course of life that of an Anglican Minister. Though the Darwins believed little in common with the Anglican Church, it was considered a respectable job with a reasonable income so Charles was enrolled in Christ's College at Cambridge.
- At this point, Natural Science was primarily the enterprise of the Clergy and here is where young

Charles gained the knowledge that would later make him famous, or infamous depending upon which side you are on.

- Charles began his life with a general belief in God and even ended the famous book "*Origin of the Species*" with these words. Authors of the highest eminence seem to be fully satisfied with the view that each species has been independently created. To my mind it accords better with what we know of the laws impressed on matter by **the Creator**, that the production and extinction of the past and present inhabitants of the world should have been due to secondary causes, like those determining the birth and death of the individual. When I view all beings not as special creations, but as the lineal descendants of some few beings which lived long before the first bed of the Silurian system was deposited, they seem to me to become ennobled.
 - There are serious flaws here when this theory is compared with the Scriptures. For death to precede Adam is to destroy the entirety of the Scriptures. [Rom 5:12](#) Therefore, even as through one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed on all men inasmuch as all sinned:
- Charles struggled with the brutality of life, the loss of three of his children prematurely and his own personal faith crisis as well as a skewed understanding of the Scriptures and eventually became a full-fledged atheist.
- Charles misinterprets the Biblical understanding of the world by omitting the Fall and expecting everything to be goof and nice because God is supposed to be a good God. He mentions that a certain type of wasp that

paralyzes caterpillars and feeds them as live food to its young can hardly be the work of a beneficent Creator.

- He developed his theory in secret and was fearful of being branded a heretic, but his theory was eventually put forth by seven Anglican ministers as being scientific and plausible with the Christian Faith.
- **Here is a modern spokesman for the same idea, Steven Weinberg** - Ever the secular rationalist, Weinberg is known among scientists for his outspoken opinions on the subject of religion. Weinberg told a New York Times interviewer in 1999, "With or without religion, you would have good people doing good things and evil people doing evil things. But for good people to do evil things, that takes religion." His hostility to religion seems to have grown. "As time has passed," he observed, "my feelings have gotten stronger and stronger. I really dislike religion intensely." **He says later** - Weinberg points to the "anthropic principle," which he calls "a nice non-theistic explanation of why things are as nice as they are." The principle, in its weak form, states "that the laws of nature must allow for the appearance of living beings capable of studying the laws of nature." To fully explain the universe we find ourselves in, Weinberg suggests, we might have to resort to "a stronger form of the anthropic principle." It may be that the "final theory"—the theory that explains all of the laws of nature—turns out to be "the only logically consistent principles consistent with the appearance of intelligent life." In other words, the physical laws that govern our particular universe might be highly improbable—improbable to the point of seeming almost impossible—but, given enough time and enough universes being

created, a universe with laws such as we find in ours was bound to come along sooner or later.

- **The argument from probability** that life could not form by natural processes but must have been created is sometimes acknowledged by evolutionists as a strong argument.¹ The probability of the chance formation of a hypothetical functional 'simple' cell, given all the ingredients, is acknowledged² to be worse than 1 in 10^{57800} . This is a chance of 1 in a number with 57,800 zeros. It would take 11 full pages of magazine type to print this number. To try to put this in perspective, there are about 10^{80} (a number with 80 zeros) electrons in the universe. Even if every electron in our universe were another universe the same size as ours that would 'only' amount to 10^{160} electrons.

These numbers defy our ability to comprehend their size. Fred Hoyle, British mathematician and astronomer, has used analogies to try to convey the immensity of the problem. For example, Hoyle said the probability of the formation of just one of the many proteins on which life depends is comparable to that of the solar system packed full of blind people randomly shuffling Rubik's cubes all arriving at the solution at the same time³—and this is the chance of getting only one of the 400 or more proteins of the hypothetical minimum cell proposed by the evolutionists (real world 'simple' bacteria have about 2,000 proteins and are incredibly complex). As Hoyle points out, the program of the cell, encoded on the DNA, is also needed. In other words, life could not form by natural (random) processes.

All of this came to bear on the Church as it entered the 20th century. Charles Darwin's anti-God bias and pseudo-scientific findings won favor with a world that was fast becoming bent on self-satisfaction with the rise of industry and the development of great metropolitan societies.

Philosophies like

Hegelianism the idea that truth is arrived at by amalgamating ideas. Put forth by Georg Hegel.

Nihilism, by men like Friedrich Nietzsche which states that truth is not knowable and experience is the judge of reality

Existentialism came from Søren Kierkegaard stating that the same is true in religion, that believing is what makes things real. These became popular in the circles of higher education. Self-aggrandizement became the duty of Americans to prove that we have the better system of government as Communism and Capitalism were at war in the early 20th century

Which leads us to our own culture which is labeled **Post Modern** and which for obviously selfish reason denies the idea of absolute truth and makes the case for accepting whatever agrees with your own personal ideology.

Therefore even if the facts don't line up with the scientific paradigm, evolutionists choose to believe them because it is true for them because they agree with it even if the facts don't support the conclusion.

Before we proceed, let me say that logic is highly compatible with the Christian faith. Our faith is based

upon facts of History and logical conclusion about these facts.

I challenge you to take the sheet with the resources on it and spend some time getting to understand the issues and the Biblical responses to them. Don't just come hear some guy talk about them, if they are indeed true you have an obligation to proclaim them to the culture at large!

Jesus is the Logos in John 1, the very idea of logic, the whole thought process of God expressed in a human form.

He is the Way the _____ and the Life in John 14:6

God, through Isaiah challenges us, "Come now, let us reason together, says the LORD: though your sins are like scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they are red like crimson, they shall become like wool." **Isa 1:18**

Let me give you a concrete example of this line of reasoning. See Dialogue on Relativism at http://www.carm.org/relativism/relativism_dialogue.htm

As Christians we are up against an irrational assertion that facts are irrelevant and that personal satisfaction is the most important thing.

If we are to counteract this trend we have to do two things to be effective as I see it.

1. We need to observe the flow of ideas and see where we have been affected by them. Products of Post-Modern thought include;
 - a. Living for personal interest (even helping others is because I like the way it makes me feel)

- b. Rejection of authority
- c. Divorce, immorality, pornography
- d. Creating a separate youth culture and catering to the selfishness of the individual from adolescence.
- e. Creating "Seeker Sensitive" Churches that cater to the culture rather than exalt Christ as transcendent over it.
- f. The Church Growth Movement which implements business principles to grow the Church and ignores God's concept of Church growth which is building up the individual spiritually
- g. Over-emphasis on group rights, i.e. feminism, gay rights, affirmative action.....
- h. Etc.

Once we are aware of these we need to correct them and live according to the Truth we say we Believe.

In the past the Church has generally done one of two things,
- either bow to society as the majority of the denominational churches have since the late 1800's
- or close in on themselves as with the fundamentalists and cease to engage the culture, but major on minors within the Christian culture.

It has only been in the last thirty to forty years or so that the Church has really begun to engage the culture on these issues. But if we engage the culture intellectually without bringing the truth of the Gospel to bear on it we will still lose the battle.

We need not only to believe this stuff, but we need to demonstrate it in our lives and speak it with our mouths.

If we want to protect our children from falling prey to these lies we need to demonstrate to them that we not only reject the lie of evolution, but the premises on which it is established, that of self-seeking.

- We need to become familiar with the truth and use it as God has ordained it to be used, that is to effect the conscience of the culture.

I teach apologetics and evangelism and I believe in the necessity of apologetics, but that is not the method that God has prescribed to win others to Christ.

- We need to always be ready to give an answer **1 Peter 3:15** but sanctify the Lord God in your hearts, and *be* ready always to *give* an answer to everyone who asks you a reason of the hope in you, with meekness and fear; **16** having a good conscience, that while they speak against you as evildoers they may be shamed, those falsely accusing your good behavior in Christ.
- **Winning an argument is not tantamount to winning someone to Christ!**
- We need to begin by “sanctify(ing) the Lord God in our hearts!”
 - He must be first in our hearts and lives or we are deceiving ourselves!
 - We need to be aware enough of the truth and the culture to win a hearing and then engage them at the level of the conscience.

- Study the New Testament and see how often that Jesus and the Disciples engage people with the Law and convict them of sin before they present the grace of Christ in the Gospel. I can only think of one case where it is not done this way, that of Nicodemus in John 3 and he came humbly asking of the way of salvation and aware of his own inability.

I believe that I have accomplished what I set out to do here, Remember;

- Science and faith are not opposites as those who espouse science as supreme would have you believe. Science is the handmaid of faith, its servant!
- Interpretation of the facts is based on presuppositional bias which is in favor of the Biblical understanding especially since that is where “science” got its start.
- **1Th 5:21** but test everything; hold fast what is good.
- The reason for denying the Truth of scripture is based upon false philosophy that denys the reality of truth or the possibility of perceiving truth aright.
- It is, whether perceived or not by the one who holds it, based upon the desire for personal liberty and sovereignty.
- We are all subject to these as products of our own culture and therefore should be on our guard!
- The only way to to perform our duty to our families as Christian parents is to guard against these ideas that support this false notion within our family structure
- We have a responsibility to confront the culture on this stuff at the level of conscience!

