

# Science and Faith

By Paul Penner

## Science & Faith...

I was listening to a news clip from NBC the other night and observed Ronald Reagan (son of former President Reagan) very passionately opposing the presentation of creation and / or intelligent design in the public school because as he said "it is not science". He was very animated in his opposition. I believe that he is thinking that evolution is science and creation is religion. So to take this a little further... according to this line of reasoning science is truth and religion is superstitious untruth at worst and allegorical or mythical at best. Recently I spoke with a university student who as a believer who was open to the idea of the story of creation being mythical.

In school I learned that the scientific method for discovering truth required...

- competing hypotheses that could be proven or disproven;
- a test method with controls in order to yield measurable data which could be correlated against the hypotheses;
- accurate data collection
- compare results
- discard the hypothesis with the lowest correlation.

This is the empirical method. It yields probabilities rather than absolute definitive truth. The scientific method starts with assumptions and a prioris, which are generated rationally and then tested. The basic assumptions in evolution are just that - rational assumptions or speculations to predict the data that is anticipated to see which hypothesis best fits the data. Contradictions to what is anticipated through known cause and effects call a prediction into question or even dismiss it. Let's look at the basic assumptions of evolution...

- The material universe can be explained through natural causes (*and non-natural ones do not exist*). *If this is true and evolutionists assume it to be true, then the references to the supernatural and miracles in the Bible cannot be taken literally. According to this assumption if there is no supernatural... then there is no God.*
- All effects are produced by causes which can still be observed and continue to operate in the present as in the past without interruption. This continuity of natural law is called Uniformitarianism. *What about the evidence for a world-wide flood?*

At some point in the distant past an explosion took place, called the Big Bang, that sent matter hurling into space resulting in the universe as we see it. This happened 12-15 billion years ago according to evolutionary theory.

*The Big Bang still doesn't account for the original mass. Where did it come from? Without an explanation one is left with the eternity of matter, which contradicts the laws of thermodynamics as well as the evolutionary premise of uniformitarianism.*

- The Big Bang produced the stellar and cosmic order & complexity that constitutes the universe you see today. The order and complexity came from disorder and chaos either in one or in several progressive explosions by random chance (*rather than by intelligent design*). *There are problems with the Big Bang theory. The original mass containing the entire cosmos (about the size of a silver dollar) would have had to have an explosion force which projected all the matter in the universe initially many (trillions) times greater than the speed of light into order to come into the present state of the universe quickly and then slow down to the current cosmological constant all within the span of a split second. (Doesn't this sound like a creation? Albeit outside of current known natural laws?)*
- It took large amounts of time (ie. 12-15 Billions of years) for accidental and incidental inter actions and reactions to produce the order and complex environment that we see today in which life could emerge. *What about Polonium 18? Polonium 18 clearly renders a scientifically documented time where processes requiring long periods of time are incompatible with the known visible effects of Polonium 18.*
- Living organisms emerged from non-living matter by random chance processes. That is non-life became life. *The known- laws of biogenics contradict this assumption 100% of the time. There are no known exceptions (including the test tube protein often cited as proof that life can be generated in a test tube. But the protein generated was infinitely far from what could be defined as 'life' within the scientific community.)*
- Mutations within living organisms allowed primitive, non-complex life forms, to evolve into complex life forms over long periods of time resulting in specie-to- specie change – or what is called macroevolution. *Macroevolution has nowhere ever been observed, and there are no non-complex living cells. Macroevolution is assumed as a postulate for the theory of evolution because it is an abstract theoretical possibility and the other option is creation which is ruled out by theoretical bias rather than compelling data. An abstract can be imagined in the mind, but has no correspondence in reality. The probability of macro-evolution occurring within the DNA structure is non-existent when considering the mathematical probabilities within known biology.*
- The best & most adapted life forms survived and evolution continues through a process of upward mutation and natural selection. *Natural selection only works within existing genetic variation, but never produces new varieties. Rather it reduces genetic varieties.*

- The above assumptions represent the basic model of evolution. Each assumption is a hypothesis rather than an established fact precisely because it is a theoretical abstract still needing reality testing that draws strong correspondence (ie. contradiction exempt) with other known data. But such strong correspondence does not exist. There are numerous contradictions, which make the evolutionary hypothesis incredulous. That's why they are still assumptions and why evolution is still a theory. What is used to support the theory is disconnected interpretations of data - rather than empirically reproducible, observable and non-contradictory data. At worst, known laws and observations and competing interpretations of the data contradict the theory of evolution at each assumption.

For persons with a faith persuasion, it contradicts the revelation of Scripture when interpreted from a historical grammatical frame of reference - meaning a plain face-value reading within the context of the culture and language it was written. It is obvious that Jesus really believed in a literal 6 day creation, a literal Adam and Eve, original sin effecting death, miracles, Noah's flood, that His creation produces after its own kind, that He was the Son of God, the resurrection, an eternal judgement of an eternal soul. All of these are casualties in the theory of evolution. They become religious imaginings rather than realities within a purely physical universe.

Jesus said - if you don't believe Moses how will you believe in the One Moses wrote about? As you know Moses wrote Genesis. He also said that when we forget to thank God as our creator it leads to foolish speculations (Romans 1).

Consider the following, which a noted atheist writes concerning evolution and its relationship to the integrity of the Christian faith. "Christianity has fought and still fights, and will fight science to the desperate end over evolution, because evolution utterly and finally destroys the very reason Jesus' earthly life was supposedly made necessary. Destroy Adam and Eve and the original sin, and in the rubble you will find the sorry remains of the son of god. Take away the meaning of his death. If Jesus was not the redeemer who died for our sins, and this is what evolution means, then Christianity is nothing. Christianity, if it is to survive, must have Adam and the original sin and the fall from grace, or it cannot have Jesus the redeemer who restores to those who believe what Adam's disobedience took away." (G.Richard Bozarth, "The Meaning of Evolution," *American Atheist* (February 1978) p. 30.