

Not a few people are troubled about the relationship between science and faith, and this is particularly true in the area of origins. Is it possible to pursue an interest in science, or to be scientifically minded, and still believe that there is a God who created our world and universe?

First, it needs to be mentioned that science itself can only deal with how the universe operates or works, because this is what we can actually observe and test. The subject of the origin of life and the universe is outside the scope of human observation, and, therefore, does not technically come under the definition of science per se. Since no human was present to observe the universe coming into existence by chance or evolution, and no human was present to observe the universe coming into existence by design or creation, both evolution and creation are, ultimately, positions of faith and not science. However, it is possible to evaluate which faith, evolution or creation, is more consistent with the actual, empirical facts of science.

The creationists believe that the scientific evidence from genetics, biogenesis, thermodynamics, paleontology, information theory, laws of probability, and other areas of science better support faith in creation (the belief that an intelligent power was the First Cause behind the origin of life, natural species, and the universe) rather than chance or evolution. One problem with the evolutionary theory is that it attempts to explain the origin of the universe by laws which describe its operation. It's much like attempting to explain the origin of a TV set by the various laws that govern the operation of the TV. Such laws may be adequate to explain the orderly system in a TV set operates or functions, but they are not adequate to explain the actual origin of that order itself. Similarly the laws of chemistry and physics are adequate to explain how living things function and operate, but they are not adequate to explain the origin of the biological order or complexity in living things or, for that matter, the origin of life and the universe itself.

A foundational tenet of evolutionary theory is the belief that the first living organism evolved from nonliving matter. This belief is known as spontaneous generation or the theory of abiogenesis. This evolutionary theory was successfully refuted by the experiments of the brilliant creationist and scientist Louis Pasteur in the late nineteenth century. All empirical and scientific evidence to this day demonstrates that life can only come from preexisting life. Even in the laboratory, scientists with all their intelligence, planning, and sophisticated equipment and technology have not been able to create life from nonliving matter. They haven't even come close. Contrary to popular opinion, genetic engineering has not produced life from nonliving matter. In genetic engineering, scientists have been able to alter the genes of already existing forms of life. By doing this they have been able to produce new forms of life, to a limited degree, but they did not create these life forms from nonliving matter. Also, genetic engineering would not help page twosupport evolution because, unlike evolution, genetic engineering is not a procedure that is left to chance, but rather it is a procedure that is the result of intelligence and sophisticated technology. What

happens many times in genetic engineering is that scientists transplant a gene from one organism into the genetic code of another organism which does not possess that gene. But, again, in all cases involving genetic engineering, scientists begin with already existing genes and already existing organisms or parts of organisms.

As regarding the origin of species, all of the scientific evidence from genetics supports the possibility of only limited biological variation. For example, variation within a biological kind is possible, such as varieties of dogs, cats, horses, cows, etc., but not variation across kinds, such as a dog becoming a cat, or variation from simpler kinds to more complex ones. The theory of evolution, however, demands variation across biological kinds as well as variation from simpler forms of life to more complex forms. Evolutionists recognizing the genetic limits to variation argue that mutations in the genetic code of organisms can produce the changes demanded by the theory of evolution. However, the facts are otherwise. Mutations are random changes, or accidents, in the genetic code of organisms caused by various environmental forces such as radiation. Because they are accidents, mutations are almost always harmful. Statistics from laboratory experiments demonstrate that between 99.7 and 99.9 percent of all mutations are harmful to the organism affected, not beneficial. Those mutations which are not harmful have been found to be only neutral in their effect toward organisms. Even if a good mutation did occur, for every good one there will be hundreds of bad (or harmful) ones, and the net effect, over time, will be harmful, if not lethal, to the individual organism and for the species as a whole. Furthermore, mutations do not produce any new traits or characteristics in organisms. They merely modify existing traits or characteristics and thus, again, produce variation within a certain biological group or kind.

Another argument often used to support evolution is the fossil record. However, there are no actual transitional links in the fossil record to support the theory of evolution. All of the species of plants and animals in the fossil record are fully-formed or complete. There are no fossils of partially-evolved species to indicate that there once was a process of evolution going on. As regarding the fossil evidence used to support human evolution, there are diametrically different interpretations of the same evidence even among evolutionists. All of the so-called "missing links" that have been discovered have been found to be either hoaxes, nonhuman, or human. There are no actual transitional links between ape-like forms and humans anymore than there are actual transitional links between apes and quadruped (four-legged) animals of the ground from which evolutionists claim apes have descended.

Another argument often used to support the theory of evolution is that of homology. Evolutionists claim that the similarities between the various forms of life are evidence of a common biological ancestry. But this is only one interpretation. The creationists believe that the similarities between the various forms of life are due to a common Designer rather than a common ancestor. Creationists believe that the Creator designed similar functions for similar purposes and different functions for different purposes in all the various forms of life. There is no evidence either in the fossil record or from genetics for a

common biological ancestry.

Obviously, due to limited space, what has been said so far is not comprehensive and does not address many questions or problems, but the fact remains that there is a good deal of scientific evidence refuting the evolutionary theory as the only rational explanation for the origin of life and the universe. Readers who are interested may obtain some excellent books written by scientists who are creationists from the Institute for Creation Research P.O. Box 2667, El Cajon, California 92021.

(Also by the same author of this essay: ORIGINS?, a forty page booklet on creation and evolution published by the Banner of Truth Trust, and available through your local Christian, or even general, bookstore.)

A Personal Word: The God of creation has made Himself known in the Person of His eternal and only begotten Son, Jesus Christ. The Bible says that the Lord Jesus lived a sinless life on earth and that He died and shed His blood on the Cross to pay for our sins. He also rose from the dead and now offers forgiveness and eternal life to all who will repent and put their faith in Him and receive Him as their personal Lord and Savior. To find out more, read the Holy Bible. I recommend that you begin by reading the Gospel of John in the New Testament. The Bible says, "For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him will not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16). May God bless you, dear reader and friend.