

The Case For Creation



Sermons On The Subjects Of Creation And Evolution

This material is from **ExecutableOutlines.com**, a web site containing sermon outlines and Bible studies by Mark A. Copeland. Visit the web site to browse or download additional material for church or personal use.

The outlines were developed in the course of my ministry as a preacher of the gospel. Feel free to use them as they are, or adapt them to suit your own personal style.

To God Be The Glory!

Executable Outlines, Copyright © Mark A. Copeland, 2009

The Case For Creation

Table Of Contents

The Biblical Case For Creation	3
The Philosophical Case For Creation	5
The Scientific Case For Creation	8
The Historical Case For Creation	12
The Days Of Creation	17
The Case For Six Literal 24 Hour Days	19
Difficulties With Evolutionary Science	22
Difficulties With Evolutionary Scientists	26
Resources For Further Study	28

The Case For Creation

The Biblical Case For Creation

INTRODUCTION

1. Among the fundamental questions of life, are those related to the issue of **origins**...
 - a. Where did life come from?
 - b. How did it all begin?
2. The answers basically fall into two groups...
 - a. **Matter is eternal**, and life has evolved through purely natural processes
 - b. **Matter is not eternal**, and life was created by a supernatural force
3. The answers are not without consequence...
 - a. Those who believe matter is eternal tend to deny the existence of God
 - b. Those who believe matter was created tend to believe in a Supreme Being

[The question of origins cannot be answered with 100% certainty. But there is evidence from **various sources** that make it very reasonable to believe matter (and life) was **created** by a Supreme Being. In this lesson we shall review **one source** as we examine “**The Biblical Case For Creation**”...]

I. FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT

A. THE TESTIMONY OF MOSES...

1. In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth... - **Gen 1:1**
 2. In six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, and all that is in them - **Gen 1:2-2:3; Exo 20:11; 31:17**
- **The lawgiver of Israel attests to the creation of all things by God**

B. THE TESTIMONY OF KINGS...

1. David, king of Israel - **1Ch 16:26**
 2. Solomon, king of Israel - **Pr 3:19; 8:22-30; Ecc 12:1**
 3. Hiram, king of Tyre - **2Ch 2:12**
 4. Hezekiah, king of Judah - **2Ki 19:15**
- **The wisest kings of Israel and Tyre attest to the creation of all things by God**

C. THE TESTIMONY OF PSALMISTS...

1. The heavens, the work of God - **Psa 8:3**
 2. By His word the heavens were made - **Psa 33:6-9**
 3. He laid the foundation of the earth, the heavens the work of His hands - **Psa 102:25**
 4. Many other passages - **Psa 104:24; 115:15; 121:2; 124:8; 134:3; 136:5-9; 146:6; 148:4-5**
- **The singers of Israel attest to the creation of all things by God**

D. THE TESTIMONY OF PROPHETS...

1. Isaiah, prophet to kings - **Isa 37:16; 40:26,28; 42:5; 44:24; 45:18; 51:13**
2. Jeremiah, prophet to a dying nation - **Jer 10:11-12; 32:17; 51:15**
3. Zechariah - prophet to a restored nation - **Zec 12:1**

-- **Prophets of Israel attest to the creation of all things by God**

[The testimony of the Old Testament is clear. As proclaimed by the returned captives of Israel, God created both the heavens the and earth (cf. **Neh 9:6**). Let us now consider the case for creation...]

II. FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT

A. THE TESTIMONY OF CHRIST...

1. He spoke of the beginning of creation - **Mk 10:6**
 2. In which God created mankind and all things - **Mk 10:6; 13:19**
- **Jesus certainly attests to the creation of all things by God**

B. THE TESTIMONY OF THE APOSTLES...

1. By John in his gospel - **Jn 1:1-3,10**
 2. By the apostles in their prayer - **Ac 4:24**
 3. By Paul in his preaching - **Ac 14:15; 17:24**
 4. By Paul in his epistles - **Ro 1:20; 1Co 8:6; Col 1:16-17**
 5. By the writer of Hebrews - **He 1:2; 3:4; 11:3**
 6. By Peter in his epistle - **2Pe 3:5**
 7. By John in the Revelation shown him - **Re 10:5-6**
- **The apostles attest to the creation of all things by God**

C. THE TESTIMONY OF HEAVEN...

1. By the twenty four elders around the throne of God - **Re 4:11**
 2. By an angel flying through the midst of heaven - **Re 14:7**
- **The heavenly voices attest to the creation of all things by God**

CONCLUSION

1. The **Biblical answer** to the question of origins is clear...
 - a. Matter is not eternal, but was created by a Supreme Being
 - b. Created by the God of Israel, together with His Son and Spirit - **Gen 1:1-2,26; Col 1:16-17**
2. Those believing in creation by a Supreme Being join those who...
 - a. Had a great impact on the history of mankind (Moses, David, Solomon, Jesus, Paul, etc.)
 - b. Have a solid foundation on which to build their lives and direct their actions
3. Of course, not all are willing to accept the Biblical answer...
 - a. Some **not wanting to**, unwilling to face the consequences
 - b. Some **not aware of the evidences** that support creation

In our next study, we shall consider another one of those evidences:

“The Philosophical Case For Creation”

The Case For Creation

The Philosophical Case For Creation

INTRODUCTION

1. In our introduction to “**The Case For Creation**”, we raised several basic questions...
 - a. Where did life come from? How did it all begin?
 - b. Is matter eternal, with life evolving through purely natural processes?
 - c. Is matter not eternal, with life created by a supernatural force?
2. We began by reviewing “**The Biblical Case For Creation**”...
 - a. Which states that matter is not eternal, but created by a Supreme Being
 - b. E.g., “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth” - **Gen 1:1**
3. Many, of course, are not content with simply accepting the Biblical claim...
 - a. Wanting more reasons to believe in God and creation
 - b. Leading some to consider philosophical reasons for their faith

[“**The Philosophical Case For Creation**” presents several reasons to believe in God and creation as the explanation for the origin of life. Let’s briefly review five, beginning with...]

I. THE UNIVERSAL SENSE OF OUGHT

A. EXPLANATION...

1. Everywhere people have a sense of “ought”, a moral code of some sort
 - a. That in certain circumstances, certain things should be done - cf. **Ro 2:14-15**
 - b. Even among the most remote tribes cut off from civilization
 2. Even atheists and agnostics have a sense of justice
 - a. Who are angered when it is violated
 - b. As in cases of rape and murder
- **Also called the moral or anthropological argument**

B. IMPLICATION...

1. This moral nature in man suggests a Moral Being as the Original Cause of life - **Ps 89:14**
 2. If there is no God, there is no right or wrong, good or evil
 3. If there is no God, no atheist can object on moral grounds to murder or rape
- **Life from random chance does not explain the universal sense of ought**

[A similar reason to believe in God and creation as the origin of life is...]

II. THE UNIVERSAL RELIGIOUS INSTINCT

A. EXPLANATION...

1. “Men in all the world, and throughout all time, not only believe in deity, but also engage in acts of worship and devotion.” - **Ferrell Jenkins, Introduction To Christian Evidences**
2. “The religious principle is extremely potent in all nations, dominating their thought and history.” - **ibid.**

3. "Everywhere the human heart has a craving for God. There will be exceptions as individuals, but the exceptions do not invalidate the rule. The atheist is an exception in every society!" - **ibid.**
- **Also called the general argument**

B. IMPLICATION...

1. For every deep longing of man, there is something that satisfies it (e.g., hunger-food)
 2. There must be a reality (i.e., God) that complements our universal religious craving
 3. Solomon writes of God placing eternity in the hearts of man - **Ecc 3:11**
 4. Paul says a longing for God was placed in man by God Himself - **Ac 17:26-27**
 5. Only the fool and the wicked repress their religious instincts - **Ps 14:1; 10:4; Ro 1:18,28**
- **Life from random chance does not explain the universal religious instinct**

[Another reason to believe in God and creation as the origin of life is...]

III. THE PRESENCE OF BEAUTY AND SUBLIMITY

A. EXPLANATION...

1. This argument is based upon the presence of beauty and sublimity in the universe
 2. It observes that we have both...
 - a. The presence of beauty in nature itself, and in art produced by man
 - b. The response of man to such beauty (appreciation and awe)
- **Also called the aesthetic argument**

B. IMPLICATION...

1. How did this "beauty" and the "ability to appreciate" develop?
 2. Was it the result of blind chance, or did it come ?
 3. Or did it come from a Supreme Being, who Himself is artistic, with an appreciation for beauty? - cf. **Exo 28:2; Job 40:9-10; Ps 19:1-2; 96:4-6**
- **Life from random chance does not explain the presence of beauty and sublimity**

[Then there are two philosophical arguments that are strongly supported by science. The first being...]

IV. EVERY EFFECT MUST HAVE A CAUSE

A. EXPLANATION...

1. One form of this argument has three simple steps:
 - a. Whatever begins to exist must have a cause
 - b. The universe began to exist
 - c. Therefore the universe has a cause
 2. This argument is known as the **Kalam Cosmological Argument**
 - a. Formulated in its present form by al-Ghazali
 - b. A Muslim who lived from 1058 to 1111
- **This argument is generally known as the cosmological argument**

B. IMPLICATION...

1. Many scientists today believe the First Cause is the "Big Bang"
 - a. Because of the evidence from astronomy
 - b. But the Big Bang is itself an effect

- c. What caused the Big Bang?
 - 2. The Bible reveals an adequate cause: “In the beginning God...” - **Gen 1:1**
 - a. A common objection: “Who caused God?”
 - 1) This objection fails to carefully note the first premise of the argument
 - 2) I.e., “whatever **begins to exist** must have a cause”
 - b. By definition God is eternal
 - 1) He is an eternal being, possessing eternal power - **Ps 90:2**; cf. **Ro 1:20**
 - 2) He is a spiritual being - **Jn 4:24**
 - 3) His omnipresence illustrates how He defies laws of nature - **Jer 23:23-24**
 - c. So the argument does not apply to Him - He is the Uncaused Cause of all things!
- **God is the ultimate First Cause (not an effect that requires a cause)**

[Finally, discoveries in molecular biology and other scientific fields strongly support...]

IV. THE EVIDENCE OF INTELLIGENT DESIGN

A. EXPLANATION...

- 1. Whatever is designed must have a Designer
 - a. A watch shows design, and implies a watchmaker
 - b. To credit such intricate and precise workmanship to blind chance is unreasonable
 - 2. Many things in the natural world show evidence of design
 - a. Orderly movement of heavenly bodies, making space travel possible
 - b. Animal instinct, such as the migration patterns of birds, eels, and salmon
 - c. Biological machines in simplest of cells
 - 3. Therefore a designer exists
- **Also called the teleological argument**

B. IMPLICATION...

- 1. Intelligent design suggests a Being with intelligence possessing purpose
 - 2. To credit intricate and precise design to blind chance is unreasonable
 - 3. Contemplating on the universe and the human body rightfully produces awe, and points man to his Creator - cf. **Ps 19:1-2; 139:14; Ro 1:19-20**
- **Life from random chance does not explain the evident intelligent design**

CONCLUSION

- 1. What reasons are there to believe that life originates from an Almighty Creator...?
 - a. The universal sense of ought
 - b. The universal religious instinct
 - c. The presence of beauty and sublimity
 - d. The argument from first cause
 - e. The evidence of intelligent design
- 2. These are mostly philosophical arguments...
 - a. Especially the first three
 - b. But the last two depend heavily on scientific evidence

Most people today are probably persuaded by science rather than philosophy, so in our next study we will focus more on...

“The Scientific Case For Creation”

The Case For Creation

The Scientific Case For Creation

INTRODUCTION

1. In this series, we are examining several basic questions...
 - a. Where did life come from? How did it all begin?
 - b. Is matter eternal, with life evolving through purely natural processes?
 - c. Is matter not eternal, with life created by a supernatural force?
2. Thus far we have considered...
 - a. The Biblical Case For Creation
 - b. The Philosophical Case For Creation
3. Now we shall consider **The Scientific Case For Creation...**
 - a. Based on the evidence of intelligent design
 - b. Which argues that evidence of design points to a creator

[**Lee Strobel** in “The Case For A Creator” offers a cumulative case for creation, beginning with...]

I. THE EVIDENCE OF COSMOLOGY

A. THE UNIVERSE HAD A BEGINNING...

1. Scientific discoveries in the past 50 years confirm the universe had a beginning
2. The universe is expanding in outward directions, suggesting one point of origin
- **Every indication is that the universe began at some point**

B. HOW DID THE UNIVERSE BEGIN...?

1. Many scientists subscribe to the “Big Bang” theory
2. “Almost everyone now believes that the universe, and time itself, had a beginning at the Big Bang.” - **Stephen Hawking**
3. But no one has been able to explain the cause of the “Big Bang” itself
 - a. Some have speculated of multiple universes being formed ad infinitum
 - b. But there is no evidence for such multiple universes
4. Both scientist and Christian depend on faith to explain the beginning of the universe
- **God as described in the Bible is certainly a sufficient First Cause**

[From the cosmos we turn our attention closer to home, where we discover...]

II. THE EVIDENCE OF PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY

A. THE FINE-TUNING OF THE UNIVERSE...

1. More than thirty separate parameters require precise calibration to produce a life-sustaining planet - **Robert Collins, physicist-philosopher**
2. “If you change a little bit the laws of nature, or you change a little bit the constants of nature -- like the charge on the electron -- then the way the universe develops is so changed, it is very likely that intelligent life would not have been able to develop.” - **Dr. Dennis Scania,**

head of Cambridge University Observatories

3. “If we nudge one of these constants just a few percent in one direction, stars burn out within a million years of their formation, and there is no time for evolution. If we nudge it a few percent in the other direction, then no elements heavier than helium form. No carbon, no life. Not even any chemistry. No complexity at all.” - **Dr. David D. Deutsch, Institute of Mathematics, Oxford University**
 4. “The really amazing thing is not that life on Earth is balanced on a knife-edge, but that the entire universe is balanced on a knife-edge, and would be total chaos if any of the natural ‘constants’ were off even slightly. - **Dr. Paul Davies, professor of theoretical physics at Adelaide University**
 5. This “fine-tuning” is so pronounced, many scientists have come to espouse “The Anthropic Principle,” which contends that the universe was brought into existence intentionally for the sake of producing mankind
- **The possibility that life exists based on random chance alone is astronomical!**

B. SUGGESTING INTELLIGENT DESIGN...

1. “The fine-tuning of the physical laws and constants of the universe and the precise configuration of its initial conditions...suggest the need for a cause that’s intelligent.” - **Stephen C. Meyer, Science philosopher**
 2. “It is hard to resist the impression that the present structure of the universe, apparently so sensitive to minor alterations in numbers, has been rather carefully thought out...” - **Paul Davies, physicist**
 3. “The seemingly miraculous concurrence of these numerical values must remain the most compelling evidence for cosmic design.” - **ibid.**
 4. “It is quite easy to understand why so many scientists have changed their minds in the past thirty years, agreeing that the universe cannot reasonably be explained as a cosmic accident.” - **Walter Bradley, scientist**
 5. “Evidence for an intelligent designer becomes more compelling the more we understand our carefully crafted habitat.” - **ibid.**
 6. “If the universe had not been made with the most exacting precision we could never have come into existence.” - **John A. O’Keefe, Harvard-educated astrophysicist of NASA**
 7. “It is my view that these circumstances indicate the universe was created for man to live in.” - **ibid.**
- **The evidence for intelligent design in physics and astronomy is overwhelming!**

[From the fine-tuning of the universe and conditions required for life on this planet, we turn our focus to smallest of cells and...]

III. THE EVIDENCE OF BIOCHEMISTRY

A. THE AMAZING MOLECULAR MACHINES...

1. Such as the simple cell
 - a. “Most scientists speculated that the deeper they delved into the cell, the more simplicity they would find. But the opposite happened.” - **Michael Behe, biochemist**
 - b. “We have always underestimated the cell...The entire cell can be viewed as a factory that contains an elaborate network of interlocking assembly lines, each of which is composed of a set of large protein machines.” - **Bruce Alberts, president, National Academy of Sciences**
2. Such as the bacterial flagellum

- a. “A flagellum is on the order of a couple of microns. A micron is about 1/20,000 of an inch. Most of its length is the propeller. The motor itself would be maybe 1/100,000ths of an inch.” - **Behe, *ibid.***
 - b. “The flagellum’s propeller can spin at 10,000 rpm...can stop spinning within a quarter turn and instantly start spinning the other way at 10,000 rpm.” - ***ibid.***
 - c. “The most efficient machine in the universe” - **Howard Berg of Harvard**
- **Such complexity at the molecular level cannot be explained by the theory of evolution**

B. IMPLICATING INTELLIGENT DESIGN...

1. “If the creation of a simple device (like a mouse trap) requires intelligent design, then we have to ask, ‘What about the finely tuned machines of the cellular world?’ - **Behe, *ibid.***
 2. “If evolution can’t adequately explain them, then scientists should be free to consider other alternatives.” - ***ibid.***
 3. “Right now, there’s only one principle that we know can come up with complex interactive systems, and that’s intelligence.” - ***ibid.***
- **The evidence for intelligent design in biochemistry is mind-boggling!**

[The amazing complexity of the cell is made possible because of the instructions found in its DNA, which leads us to...]

IV. THE EVIDENCE OF BIOLOGICAL INFORMATION

A. THE COMPLEXITY OF DNA...

1. DNA is often compared to a set of blueprints or a recipe, or a code, since it contains the instructions needed to construct other components of cells, such as proteins and RNA molecules - **Wikipedia**
 2. “An organism accesses the information that it needs from DNA so it can build some of its critical components.” - **Meyer, *ibid.***
 3. “DNA is like a software program, only much more complex than anything we’ve ever designed.” - **Bill Gates, founder of Microsoft**
 4. “Human DNA contains more organized information than the Encyclopedia Britannica.” - **Georg Sim Johnson, *Did Darwin Get It Right?***
 5. “If the full text of the encyclopedia were to arrive in computer code from outer space, most people would regard this as proof of the existence of extraterrestrial intelligence.” - ***ibid.***
 6. “But when seen in nature, it is explained as the workings of random forces.” - ***ibid.***
- **The sequential and logical nature of DNA makes random forces highly unlikely**

B. INDICATING INTELLIGENT DESIGN...

1. “Whenever you find a sequential arrangement that’s complex and corresponds to an independent pattern or functional requirement, this kind of information is always the product of intelligence.” - **Meyer, *ibid.***
2. “The origin of information in DNA - which is necessary for life to begin - is best explained by an intelligent cause rather than any of the types of naturalistic causes that scientists typically use to explain biological phenomena.” - ***ibid.***
3. “This new realm of molecular genetics is where we see the most compelling evidence of design on the earth.” - **Dean Kenyon, biology professor**
4. “An honest man, armed with all the knowledge available to us now, could only state that in some sense, the origin of life appears at the moment to be almost a miracle, so many are the conditions which would have had to have been satisfied to get it going.” - **Francis Crick,**

Nobel Prize winner

-- **The evidence of intelligent design is found in the smallest building blocks of life!**

CONCLUSION

1. In this brief presentation of “**The Scientific Case For Creation**”, we have touched on...
 - a. The evidence of cosmology
 - b. The evidence of physics and astronomy
 - c. The evidence of biochemistry
 - d. The evidence of biological information-- **All of which point toward creation by an intelligent designer**

2. As our scientific knowledge increases, so does evidence for creation by an intelligent designer...
 - a. “Ironically, the picture of the universe bequeathed to us by the most advanced twentieth-century science is closer in spirit to the vision presented in...Genesis than anything offered by science since Copernicus.” - **Patrick Glynn, former atheist and author of God: The Evidence**
 - b. “It now seems to me that the findings of more than fifty years of DNA research have provided materials for a new and enormously powerful argument to design.” - **Anthony Flew, philosopher and former atheist**

Note: Much of the material in this lesson comes from [“The Case For A Creator” by Lee Strobel](#), which describes his own spiritual journey from atheist to believer.

Perhaps it would thus be fitting to conclude with this quotation:

“One of the most interesting things I’ve learned as I’ve gone on this journey of scientific discovery has been that you don’t have to commit intellectual suicide to acknowledge the existence of an Intelligent Designer, because today science is pointing more directly toward a Creator than at any time in the history of the world.” - **Lee Strobel**

Confirming what the Bible revealed thousands of years ago...

*The heavens declare the glory of God; And the firmament shows His handiwork.
Day unto day utters speech, And night unto night reveals knowledge.*

- *Psalms 19:1-2*

For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse.

- *Romans 1:20*

By faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that the things which are seen were not made of things which are visible.

- *Hebrews 11:3*

Our next study we will consider...

“The Historical Case For Creation”

The Case For Creation

The Historical Case For Creation

INTRODUCTION

1. In this series, we have briefly considered...
 - a. The Biblical Case For Creation
 - b. The Philosophical Case For Creation
 - c. The Scientific Case For Creation
2. Now we shall consider **The Historical Case For Creation...**
 - a. Which examines historical evidence for the resurrection of Christ
 - b. Then considers the implication of the resurrection to the issue of creation

[So we begin by first considering...]

I. THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCE FOR THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST

A. THE HISTORICITY OF JESUS...

1. Only the most ignorant or prejudiced skeptic would question this fact
 2. Because unbiased sources attest to the historicity of Jesus
 - a. Roman historians
 - 1) Tacitus (112 A.D.) in his "Annals"
 - 2) Pliny the Younger (112 A.D.) in his letter to the emperor Trajan
 - 3) Suetonius (120 A.D.), a court official under Hadrian
 - b. Jewish sources, while denying His deity, attest to His historicity
 - 1) Flavius Josephus (b. 37 A.D.), Jewish historian makes several references to Jesus
 - 2) The Talmud (books of Jewish law) speak frequently of Jesus
 - c. Samaritan historian, Thallus (52 A.D.), tried to explain the darkness at the crucifixion
 3. So overwhelming is the evidence, even atheistic historians admit Jesus lived
 - a. "One is obliged to say, 'Here was a man. This part of the tale could not have been invented.'" - **H. G. Wells, Outline Of History**
 - b. **Will Durant** spent two chapters on Jesus in his book, The Story Of Our Civilization
- **Fact #1: Jesus actually lived as a person of history**

B. THE HISTORICAL RELIABILITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT...

1. Its authors claim to write as historians or as eyewitnesses to real events
 - a. Luke, the physician
 - 1) His gospel (Luke) and history of the early church (Acts) compose over a third of the New Testament
 - 2) He wrote as one describing historical events - **Lk 2:1-4; Ac 1:1-3**
 - b. John, the beloved disciple
 - 1) His gospel (John) was written as an eyewitness account - **Jn 20:30-31; 21:24-25**
 - 2) In his epistle (1st John), he claimed to be an eyewitness - **1Jn 1:1-4**
 - c. Paul, the Jewish rabbi
 - 1) Half of the books of the New Testament are his personal letters
 - 2) He claimed to have been an eyewitness, along with others - **1Co 15:3-8**

2. As a historical document, it's evidence is remarkable!
 - a. Written soon after the events it records
 - 1) "In my opinion, every book of the New Testament was written between the forties and eighties of the First Century A.D." - **Nelson Glueck, former president of the Jewish Theological Seminary in the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, and renowned Jewish archaeologist**
 - 2) "We can already say emphatically that there is no longer any solid basis for dating any book of the New Testament after 80 A.D." - **W. F. Albright, Biblical archaeologist**
 - b. Noted for historical accuracy in areas that can be tested
 - 1) "It may be stated categorically that no archaeological discovery has ever controverted a Biblical reference." - **Glueck, ibid.**
 - 2) "Luke is a historian of the first rank; not merely are his statements of fact trustworthy, he is possessed of the true historic sense...in short, this author should be placed along with the greatest of historians." - **Sir William Ramsay**
 - c. Manuscript attestation for the New Testament unsurpassed
 - 1) In the number of copies for the purpose of comparison
 - a) Over 4,000 Greek manuscripts, 13,000 copies of portions of the New Testament
 - b) Contrast that with other historical documents (Caesar's Gallic Wars, only 10 Greek manuscripts; Annals of Tacitus, 2; Livy, 20; Plato, 7; Sophocles, 100)
 - 2) In the time between the originals and earliest copies
 - a) Fragments exist that are within 50-100 years; complete copies that are within 300-400 years after the originals were written
 - b) Compare this with manuscripts of other classical histories
 - 1/ Histories of Thucydides - 1300 years
 - 2/ Histories of Herodotus - 1350 years
 - 3/ Caesar's Gallic War - 950 years
 - 4/ Roman History of Livy - 350 years (the earliest copy is only a fragment)
 - 5/ Histories of Tacitus - 750 years
 - 6/ Annals of Tacitus - 950 years (there are only two manuscripts)
 - d. Variances between the ancient copies are minuscule
 - 1) Only 1/2 of one percent is in question (compared to 5 percent for the Iliad)
 - 2) Even then, it can be stated: "No fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith rests on a disputed reading...It cannot be too strongly asserted that in substance the text of the Bible is certain: especially is this the case with the New Testament." - **Sir Frederick Kenyon, authority in the field of New Testament textual criticism**
 3. "The evidence for our New Testament writings is ever so much greater than the evidence for many writings of classical authors, the authenticity of which no one dreams of questioning. And if the New Testament were a collection of secular writings, their authenticity would generally be as beyond all doubt." - **F. F. Bruce**
- **Fact #2: The reliability of the New Testament as a historical document is very strong**

C. THE STRENGTH OF THE APOSTLES' TESTIMONY...

1. Demonstrated by the nature of their testimony
 - a. Their testimony appealed to empirical evidence
 - 1) Evidence derived from experiment and observation rather than theory
 - 2) For forty days they were given infallible proofs - **Ac 1:3**
 - 3) They ate and drank with Jesus - **Ac 10:41**
 - 4) They saw, heard, and touched Him - **Jn 20:24-28; 1Jn 1:1-2**

- b. There is no way they could have been deceived or deluded
 - 1) If all they had were individual dreams, visions, or hallucinations...perhaps
 - 2) But they testified that Jesus appeared to them in groups as well as to individuals
 - 2. Demonstrated by their transformation
 - a. Prior to the resurrection, Jesus' disciples were afraid and without hope
 - 1) They fled at his arrest - **Mk 14:50**
 - 2) Peter cowardly denied Him three times - **Mk 14:66-72**
 - 3) The women mourned His crucifixion - **Lk 23:27**
 - 4) After His death, the disciples were sad - **Lk 24:13-17**
 - 5) After His death, the disciples hid behind closed doors, for fear of the Jews - **Jn 20:19**
 - b. After the resurrection, they fearlessly praised God and proclaimed Jesus!
 - 1) Praising God in the temple - **Lk 24:52-53**
 - 2) Proclaiming Christ, despite persecution - **Ac 5:28-32,41-42**
 - c. This transformation in their lives is strong evidence for the resurrection, as admitted by an Orthodox Jewish scholar:
 - 1) "If the disciples were totally disappointed and on the verge of desperate flight because of the very real reason of the crucifixion, it took another very real reason in order to transform them from a band of disheartened and dejected Jews into the most self-confident missionary society in world history." - **Pinchas Lapide, former Chairman of the Applied Linguistics Department at Israel's Bar-Ilan University (TIME, May 7, 1979)**
 - 2) He concluded that a bodily resurrection could possibly have been that reason!
 - 3. Demonstrated by their high moral standard
 - a. They taught others to live holy lives - **1Th 4:1-7; Ep 4:25**
 - b. They lived their own lives in unimpeachable way - **1Th 2:3-12**
 - c. Does this sound like people who propagate lies when they know better?
 - 4. Demonstrated by the price they paid
 - a. The apostle Paul's hardship were many - **2Co 11:23-28**
 - b. The apostles endured much suffering because of their testimony - **1Co 4:9-13**
 - c. All but one died a martyr's death because of their testimony
 - d. Even Jesus' brother, James, was thrown off the temple and then clubbed to death for his testimony
 - e. There was no motive for them to persistently lie about Jesus' resurrection!
- **Fact #3: The testimony of the apostles is very strong**

D. THE NEW TESTAMENT IS EITHER TRUE OR A CONTRIVED LIE...

- 1. The writers of the New Testament leave us no alternative
 - a. They are either eyewitnesses or false witnesses - **1Co 15:14-15**
 - b. Events occurred as described, or they are cunningly devised fables - **2Pe 1:16-18**
- 2. We cannot say they might have been sincerely deceived
 - a. Especially in reference to the resurrection of Jesus
 - 1) They claim they ate and drank with Him afterwards - **Ac 10:39-41**
 - 2) They claim they saw and touched Him - **1Jn 1:1-4**
 - b. They leave us no room saying they were mistaken or deceived!
 - 1) Some sympathetic skeptics have tried to offer this as an alternative
 - 2) That perhaps in their grief and loss over the crucifixion of Jesus they hallucinated or had grief-inspired visions of Jesus
 - 3) But hallucinations and visions are highly individualistic experiences
 - a) One person might see the hallucination or vision

- b) But several or many people don't see the same vision at the same time!
- 4) The resurrection appearances of Jesus include those witnessed by many at the same time - cf. **1Co 15:4-8**

-- **Fact #4: The New Testament is either true or a cunningly devised fable**

[With these historical facts before us, we are now ready to consider...]

II. THE IMPLICATION OF THIS EVIDENCE

A. WE ARE FORCED TO MAKE A DECISION...

1. Concerning Jesus
 - a. We can't deny that He lived
 - b. Therefore we must decide who He is
 - 1) Is He what His followers claimed, the Son of God? - cf. **Mt 16:13-17**
 - 2) Or is the New Testament's representation of Him false?
 2. Concerning the evidence of the New Testament as a historical document
 - a. We can't deny the overwhelming evidence for the New Testament
 - b. Therefore we must decide concerning its historical reliability
 - 1) Will we accept it on the same basis we accept other historical documents?
 - 2) If so, then will we either accept it at face value, or reject it and along with all other historical documents whose evidence are much less?
 3. Concerning the testimony of the apostles
 - a. We can't deny that they testified to the resurrection of Jesus
 - b. Therefore we must decide whether their testimony is reliable
 - 1) Did they lie, or did they really see, touch, and eat with a resurrected Jesus?
 - 2) Or were they charlatans who suffered and died, knowing it was all for a lie?
 4. Concerning whether the New Testament is true
 - a. We cannot say that it was simply a sincere but mistaken effort to explain who Jesus was
 - b. Therefore we must decide whether it is true, or a carefully contrived lie!
- **We cannot avoid making a decision regarding the evidence!**

B. THE IMPLICATIONS OF OUR DECISION...

1. If we decide the New Testament is a carefully contrived lie
 - a. We must concede that a book with the world's highest standard of morality was composed by a group of liars, frauds, and deceivers!
 - 1) For what book contains a higher standard of love and morality?
 - 2) E.g., Jesus' Sermon On The Mount, and Paul's Discourse On Love
 - b. We must concede that a book with overwhelming evidence as a historical document was carefully put together to deceive
 - 1) Known historical names, places and events were carefully intertwined with bold-faced lies
 - 2) Solemn affirmations concerning its truthfulness are made, intended to deceive those to whom such affirmations were made
 - c. Is it reasonable or logical to draw such a conclusion?
2. If we decide the testimony of the New Testament is historically true
 - a. Then everything that Jesus taught is true
 - b. Including His implicit and explicit testimony to **the reality of creation!**
 - 1) He spoke of the beginning of creation - **Mk 10:6**
 - 2) In which God created mankind and all things - **Mk 10:6; 13:19**

- c. Creation may be hard to fathom, but if one rose from the dead, anything is possible!
- **The historical evidence for the resurrection also supports the case for creation!**

CONCLUSION

1. Four facts contribute to faith in the resurrection of Jesus...
 - a. The historicity of Jesus
 - b. The historical reliability of the New Testament
 - c. The strength of the apostles' testimony
 - d. The New Testament is either true or a carefully contrived lie-- **In view of the first three, what reasonable conclusion can we make of the fourth?**

2. With the same type of evidence used to establish any fact of history...
 - a. It is reasonable to believe in the resurrection of Jesus from the dead
 - b. Which in turn makes it possible to believe in creation as the origin of life
 - c. For He who rose from the dead testified to the reality of the Creation

3. Thus we add **“The Historical Case For Creation”** to...
 - a. The Biblical Case For Creation
 - b. The Philosophical Case For Creation
 - c. The Scientific Case For Creation

Our next four lessons will address various matters related to the issue of Creation, beginning with...

“The Days Of Creation”

The Case For Creation

The Days Of Creation

INTRODUCTION

1. In this study, we have briefly considered...
 - a. The **Biblical Case** For Creation
 - b. The **Philosophical Case** For Creation
 - c. The **Scientific Case** For Creation
 - d. The **Historical Case** For Creation

2. In the remaining lessons, we shall address issues related to both creation and evolution...
 - a. The days of creation in Genesis 1 and 2
 - b. Difficulties with the theory of evolution

[Some believe creationism and evolution theory can be reconciled by how one defines the word “day” as used in Genesis chapter one. Well, let’s take a look at...]

I. THE DAYS OF CREATION (DEFINITION)

A. THE HEBREW WORD “YOM”...

1. A noun meaning day, time, year
 2. It is used to describe:
 - a. The period of light (as contrasted with the period of darkness) - **Gen 1:5; 1Ki 19:4**
 - b. The period of twenty-four hours - **Deu 16:8; 2Ki 25:30**
 - c. A generic span of time - **Gen 26:8; Num 20:15**
 - d. A given point of time - **Gen 2:17; 47:29**
 - e. In the plural, a year - **Lev 25:29; 1Sa 27:7**
- **The Complete WordStudy Dictionary**

B. “YOM” IN GENESIS 1 AND 2...

1. The daylight hours from sunrise to sunset - **Gen 1:5,14,18** (“the day”)
 2. A literal 24 hour cycle - **Gen 1:14** (“for days”)
 3. A generic span of time - **Gen 2:4** (“in the day...”)
- **Moses used the word “yom” at least three different ways**

[Because **yom** can be diverse in its meaning, there are at least four views as to the days of creation...]

II. THE DAYS OF CREATION (FOUR VIEWS)

A. YOUNG EARTH CREATIONISM...

1. God created all things (heavens and earth) in six 24-hour days - **Gen 1:3-2:2; Exo 20:11**
2. The earth is thousands rather than billions of years old
3. Proponents of this view include:
 - a. Henry M. Morris, Duane Gish ([Institute For Creation Research](#))
 - b. Ken Ham ([Answers In Genesis](#))
 - c. [The Creation Research Society](#)

-- **This is the most literal view of the Genesis account**

B. GAP CREATIONISM...

1. There was a gap of time between the 1st and 2nd verses of Genesis - **Gen 1:1-2**
2. There was a pre-Adamic world, which experienced a cataclysmic judgment, leaving the planet in a chaotic state - **Gen 1:2**
3. From which God then re-created the world in six literal 24 hour days - **Gen 1:2-3**
4. This view attempts to reconcile the apparent age of the earth, the literal days of creation, plus the origin of Satan and evil before the Fall of man
5. Proponents of this view include:
 - a. C. I. Scofield, Harry Rimmer, Arthur Pink, Donald Grey Barnhouse
 - b. David Reagan ([Learn The Bible](#)), Gaines R. Johnson ([Christian Geology Ministry](#))

-- **This view was once very popular, not so much today**

C. PROGRESSIVE CREATIONISM...

1. Each “day” is a long period of geological time - cf. “day” in **Gen 2:3**
2. God created new forms of life gradually, over a period of hundreds of millions of years
3. This view generally rejects macro-evolution, believing it to be biologically untenable and not supported by the fossil record
4. Proponents of this view include:
 - a. Bernard Ramm, and many members of [The American Scientific Affiliation](#)
 - b. Hugh Ross ([Reasons To Believe](#))
 - c. [Answers In Creation](#)
 - d. [God And Science](#)
 - e. John Clayton ([Does God Exist?](#))

-- **This view has become more popular in recent times**

D. LITERARY FRAMEWORK THEORY...

1. Genesis 1-2 is not a literal or scientific description of the origin of the universe
2. Rather, an ancient religious text which outlines a theology of creation
3. The seven day “framework” is therefore not meant to be chronological but a literary or symbolic structure designed to reinforce the purposefulness of God in creation and the Sabbath commandment - [Wikipedia, Framework Interpretation \(Genesis\)](#)
4. Proponents of this view include:
 - a. Many theistic evolutionists and some Progressive Creationists ([sample](#))
 - b. The Catholic Church is also supportive of this view ([sample](#))

-- **This view considers the Genesis account completely symbolic or figurative**

CONCLUSION

1. Each of these views has been held by people who...
 - a. Believe the Bible is the inspired Word of God
 - b. Believe that God is the Creator of all things
2. Some may have been persuaded to a particular view...
 - a. By what they believe to be overwhelming scientific evidence
 - b. Without considering the case for six literal 24 hour days

In our next study, we shall consider “**The Case For Six Literal 24 Hour Days**”...

The Case For Creation

The Case For Six Literal 24 Hour Days

INTRODUCTION

1. I believe it fair to say that any casual, first-time reader of Genesis...
 - a. Will conclude it teaches all things were created in six days
 - b. That those days were six literal 24 hour days
2. The popularity of the theory of evolution has led many to...
 - a. Discount any literal interpretation of Genesis 1
 - b. Seek biblical support for a less literal understanding of the days of creation

[On the other hand, there are good reasons to take the Genesis account at face value, for both biblical and scientific reasons. **From a biblical perspective**, let's consider some...]

I. ARGUMENTS FOR SIX LITERAL 24 HOUR DAYS

A. HEBREW LEXICONS AND DICTIONARIES...

1. Lexicographers consistently cite the enumerated days of Genesis 1:1–31 as examples of a solar day - **Robert V. McCabe**, [A Defense Of Literal Days In The Creation Week](#)
2. The following examples were offered by McCabe (plus one that I found):
 - a. The Dictionary Of Classical Hebrew - **Clines**
 - b. A Hebrew And English Lexicon Of The Old Testament - **Brown, Driver, Briggs**
 - c. The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament - **Baumgartner, Stamm**
 - d. Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament - **Saeboe**
 - e. New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis - **Verhoef**
 - f. Dictionary Of Biblical Languages With Semantic Domains: Hebrew (Old Testament) - **Swanson**

-- **These lexicons and dictionaries cite the days of creation as literal 24 hour days**

B. SEMANTIC CONSTRAINTS FOR SINGULAR USE OF “DAY”...

1. “When **yôm** is used in the singular and is not part of a compound grammatical construction, it is consistently used in reference to a literal day of 24 hours or to the daytime portion of a literal day.” - **McCabe, ibid.**
2. “The extended, non-literal meanings of the term **yôm** are always found in connection with prepositions, prepositional phrases with a verb, compound constructions, formulas, technical expressions, genitive combinations, construct phrases, and the like. In other words, extended, non-literal meanings of this Hebrew term have special linguistic and contextual connections which indicate clearly that a non-literal meaning is intended. If such special linguistic connections are absent, the term **yôm** does not have an extended, non-literal meaning; it has its normal meaning of a literal day of 24-hours.” - **Gerhard F. Hasel**, as quoted by McCabe

-- **The semantic use of the singular suggests a literal day**

C. NUMERIC QUALIFIERS AND “DAY”...

1. “When each day of the creation week is summarized, the singular ‘day’ is modified by a numerical qualifier, ‘first day’ (v.5), ‘second day’ (v.8), and sequentially continuing to the

‘sixth day’ (vv. 13, 19, 24, 31).” - **McCabe, ibid.**

2. “When **yôm** is qualified by a number, it is almost invariably used in a literal sense.” - **ibid.**
- **The numeric qualifiers suggest a literal day**

D. SEQUENTIAL NUMBERING AND “DAY”...

1. “The sequential use of the ordinal numbers “first” through “sixth” for each day of the creation week, followed by the “seventh day” indicates a chronological progression of days.” - **E. J. Young**, as referenced by McCabe
 2. “What seems of significance is the sequential emphasis of the numerals 1–7 without any break or temporal interruption. This seven-day schema, the schema of the week of six workdays followed by ‘the seventh day’ as rest day, interlinks the creation “days” as normal days in a consecutive and non-interrupted sequence.” - **Hasel, ibid.**
- **The sequential numbering suggests a literal day**

E. EVENING AND MORNING AS QUALIFIERS OF “DAY”...

1. “So the evening and the morning were the ____ day.” - **Gen 1:5,8,13,19,23,31**
 2. “Whether ‘evening’ and ‘morning’ are used together in a context with **yôm** (19 times beyond the 6 uses in Genesis 1) or they are used without **yôm** (38 times), they are used consistently in reference to literal days.” - **McCabe, ibid.**
- **The use of morning and evening suggest a literal day**

F. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS AND “DAY”...

1. **Problem one**
 - a. Fruit trees and seed-bearing plants were created on the third day - **Gen 1:11-12**
 - b. Much vegetation requires insects for pollination
 - c. Insects were not created until the sixth day - **Gen 1:24-25**
 - d. It would be impossible for many plants to survive long periods without insects
 - e. “A symbiotic relationship between plants and animals is coordinate with literal and successive days in Genesis 1, but this would not be the case if the days refer to extended periods.” - **McCabe, ibid.**
 2. **Problem two**
 - a. “If days are figurative and if there is any consistency in interpretation, then there must extended periods of light corresponding to ‘morning’ and of darkness corresponding to ‘evening.’” - **ibid.**
 - b. “This would guarantee that both plant and animal life would be unable to survive.” - **ibid.**
- **The sequence of events suggest a literal day**

G. SCRIPTURAL CONSIDERATIONS...

1. **In the Old Testament**
 - a. “There are two passages, dealing with regulations for the observance of the Sabbath that cogently reinforce a literal interpretation of the days in the creation week.” - **McCabe, ibid.**
 - b. “These passages are **Exo 20:8-11** and **Exo 31:14-17.**” - **ibid.**
 - c. “According to these two texts, the references to the creation week are not analogous - man’s rest is not simply like God’s rest on the seventh day - instead, man is to imitate the divine Exemplar. Since God worked for six days and rested on the seventh, the nation of Israel must follow his example.” - **ibid.**
2. **In the New Testament**
 1. The origin of man and marriage was “from the beginning of the creation”

- a. Man was created male and female “from the beginning” - **Mk 10:6**; cf. **Gen 1:27**
 - b. The institution of marriage soon followed - **Mk 10:7-8**; cf. **Gen 2:20-24**
 - c. If it was **ages** after “the beginning of creation”, this would not be true
 - 2. Death and corruption was a consequence of Adam’s sin
 - a. By man came death, in Adam all die - **Gen 2:17**; cf. **1Co 15:21-22**
 - b. By man’s sin, the earth was cursed - **Gen 3:17**; cf. **Ro 8:20-22**
 - c. If the “days” of Genesis 1 are long periods of time, death and corruption occurred long before Adam
- **The scriptural considerations suggest the Genesis account should be taken literally**

[Such are some of the Biblical or scriptural reasons for taking Genesis 1-2 at face value. It is certainly not an exhaustive treatment of the subject. **For more information**, including resources that subscribe to a literal view of the days of Creation from a scientific perspective, here are some...]

II. RESOURCES FOR SIX LITERAL 24 HOUR DAYS

A. FROM A BIBLICAL PERSPECTIVE...

- 1. [A Defense Of Literal Days In The Creation Week](#) - Robert V. McCabe, Professor of Old Testament at Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary
 - 2. [Creation Days And Orthodox Jewish Tradition](#) - Paul-James Griffiths
 - 3. [A Summary Of Evidence For Literal 24-Hr Creation Days In Genesis 1](#) - Andrew S. Kulikovsky
 - 4. [The Days Of Creation: A Semantic Approach](#) - James Stambaugh
 - 5. [Studies About The Days Of Genesis 1](#) - David E. Pratte
- **These resources argue that the case for six literal 24 hour days is biblically sound**

B. FROM A SCIENTIFIC PERSPECTIVE...

- 1. [Institute For Creation Research](#) - Henry M. Morris, Duane Gish
 - 2. [Answers In Genesis](#) - Ken Ham
 - 3. [The Creation Research Society](#)
 - 4. [Bible.ca’s Scientific Evidence For Creation](#) - Don Patton, Steve Rudd
 - 5. [A List Of Over 175 Scientists](#) - who accept the biblical account of Creation
- **These resources argue that the case for six literal 24 hour days is scientifically sound**

CONCLUSION

- 1. Before rejecting that God created all things in six literal 24 hours days, one should ask...
 - a. Is it consistent in regards to Hebrew syntax as found in the Bible?
 - b. Is it in harmony with the rest of the biblical record?

-- **For those who accept the Bible as the Word of God, such concerns should be paramount**
- 2. One should also ask...
 - a. Must we force our view of Genesis 1 to fit popular evolutionary thinking?
 - b. Is it scientifically necessary to do so?

-- **Has the theory of evolution been proven as it relates to origins?**

To help answer the latter questions, our next two lessons will focus on problems with the theory of evolution...

The Case For Creation

Difficulties With Evolutionary Science

INTRODUCTION

1. Many people assume that science has proven evolution as a fact...
 - a. That it is no longer a theory
 - b. But an irrefutable explanation for the origin of life
 - c. A good reason to reject the Biblical account of creation

2. This is because most are unaware that...
 - a. Crucial elements of evolutionary theory have never been proven
 - b. There is a growing dissent among scientists regarding evolution

[In this study I want to illustrate that there are difficulties with evolutionary science, leading some to suggest that it is a “theory in crisis”. But first we should carefully define our terms...]

I. DEFINITION OF EVOLUTION

A. IN SIMPLEST TERMS...

1. Evolution = change
 2. Evolution = change over time
 3. Evolution = a process that results in heritable changes in a population spread over many generations
- **Both creationists and evolutionists agree with this basic definition**

B. MICROEVOLUTION...

1. This term generally refers to evolutionary change **below** the level of species
 2. Though some apply it to changes **below** the level of genera or even families
 - a. The Genesis account refers to God creating “according to its **kind**” - **Gen 1:24-25**
 - b. Some understand “kind=species”, but “kind” might include genera or families
 3. This change is easily observable, especially within species
 4. Even if it were shown that evolution produces a change from one species to another, it does not necessarily contradict the Genesis account
- **Creationists acknowledge this degree of evolution as factual**

C. MACROEVOLUTION...

1. This term generally refers to evolutionary change **at or above** the level of species
 2. Though some apply it to changes **above** the level of genera or families
 3. This relates to large scale changes over geological time, e.g., “from amoeba to man”
 4. This degree of change is not observable, but assumed based on extrapolation
- **Evolutionists claim this degree of evolution as factual**

D. OTHER TERMS...

1. Darwinism - A theory of organic evolution claiming that new species arise and are perpetuated by **natural selection**
2. Neo-Darwinism - A modern Darwinian theory that explains new species in terms of **genetic**

mutations, more properly known as Modern Evolution Synthesis

-- **In both views, evidence from microevolution is extrapolated to support macroevolution**

[The difficulties of evolutionary science discussed in this lesson pertain to **macroevolution**, not microevolution. Microevolution is a fact, but macroevolution is a theory much in dispute...]

II. DIFFICULTIES WITH EVOLUTION

A. IT IS A LIMITED THEORY...

1. "It is now approximately half a century since the neo-Darwinian synthesis was formulated. A great deal of research has been carried on within the paradigm it defines. Yet the successes of the theory are limited to the interpretation of the minutiae of evolution, such as the adaptive change in coloration of moths; while it has remarkably little to say on the questions which interest us most, such as how there came to be moths in the first place." - **Ho, Mae-Wan & Saunders, P.T., "Beyond neo-Darwinism - An Epigenetic Approach to Evolution," Journal of Theoretical Biology, Vol. 78, 1979**
 2. "Clearly something is missing from biology. It appears that Darwin's theory works for the small-scale aspects of evolution: it can explain the variations and the adaptations within species that produce fine-tuning of varieties to different habitats. The large-scale differences of form between types of organism that are the foundation of biological classification systems seem to require a principle other than natural selection operating on small variations, some process that gives rise to distinctly different forms of organism. This is the problem of emergent order in evolution, the origins of novel structures in organisms that has always been a primary interest in biology." - **Goodwin, Brian [Professor of Biology, Open University, UK], "How The Leopard Changed Its Spots: The Evolution of Complexity," 1994**
- **Microevolution has been proven, but macroevolution has not!**

B. IT IS A FAILED THEORY...

1. "Neo-Darwinism has failed as an evolutionary theory that can explain the origin of species, understood as organisms of distinctive form and behaviour. In other words, it is not an adequate theory of evolution. What it does provide is a partial theory of adaptation, or microevolution (small-scale adaptive changes in organisms)." - **Goodwin, Brian [Professor of Biology, Open University, UK], "Neo-Darwinism has failed as an evolutionary theory," The Times Higher Education Supplement, May 19, 1995**
 2. "My main criticism of Darwinism is that it fails in its initial objective, which is to explain the origin of species. Now, let me explain exactly what I mean by that. I mean it fails to explain the emergence of organisms, the specific forms during evolution like algae and ferns and flowering plants, corals, starfish, crabs, fish, birds." - **Goodwin, Brian, "An interview with Professor Brian Goodwin by Dr. David King," GenEthics News, Issue 11. March/April 1996**
- **These are not the words of a creationist!**

C. IT IS A DYING THEORY...

1. "I well remember how the synthetic theory beguiled me with its unifying power when I was a graduate student in the mid-1960's. Since then I have been watching it slowly unravel as a universal description of evolution. The molecular assault came first, followed quickly by renewed attention to unorthodox theories of speciation and by challenges at the level of macroevolution itself. I have been reluctant to admit it-since beguiling is often forever-but if Mayr's characterization of the synthetic theory is accurate, then that theory, as a general

- proposition, is effectively dead, despite its persistence as textbook orthodoxy.” - **Gould, Stephen Jay [Professor of Zoology and Geology, Harvard University, USA], “Is a new and general theory of evolution emerging?,” *Paleobiology*, Vol. 6, No. 1, January 1980**
2. “More and more workers are showing signs of dissatisfaction with the synthetic theory. Some are attacking its philosophical foundations, arguing that the reason that it has been so amply confirmed is simply that it is unfalsifiable: with a little ingenuity any observation can be made to appear consistent with it. Others have been deliberately setting out to work in just those areas in which neo-Darwinism is least comfortable, like the problem of the gaps in the fossil record or the mechanisms of non-Mendelian inheritance. Still others, notably some systematists, have decided to ignore the theory altogether, and to carry on their research without any a priori assumption about how evolution has occurred. Perhaps most significantly of all, there is now appearing a stream of articles and books defending the synthetic theory. It is not so long ago that hardly anyone thought this was necessary.” - **Ho, Mae-Wan [Biologist, The Open University, UK] & Saunders, Peter T. [Mathematician, University of London], eds., “Beyond Neo-Darwinism: An Introduction to the New Evolutionary Paradigm,” Academic Press: London, 1984**
 3. “The ‘modern evolutionary synthesis’ convinced most biologists that natural selection was the only directive influence on adaptive evolution. Today, however, dissatisfaction with the synthesis is widespread, and creationists and antidarwinians are multiplying. The central problem with the synthesis is its failure to show (or to provide distinct signs) that natural selection of random mutations could account for observed levels of adaptation.” - **Leigh, Egbert G., Jr. [Biologist, Smithsonian Institution, USA], “The modern synthesis, Ronald Fisher and creationism,” *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, Vol. 14, No. 12**
- **Scientists are having to go “back to the drawing board”!**

[To my knowledge, the scientists quoted above are not creationists. But together with many other scientists they illustrate a growing...]

III. DISSENT REGARDING EVOLUTION

A. SCIENTIFIC DISSENT REGARDING DARWINISM...

1. “During recent decades, new scientific evidence from many scientific disciplines such as cosmology, physics, biology, “artificial intelligence” research, and others have caused scientists to begin questioning Darwinism’s central tenet of natural selection and studying the evidence supporting it in greater detail.”
2. “Yet public TV programs, educational policy statements, and science textbooks have asserted that Darwin’s theory of evolution fully explains the complexity of living things. The public has been assured that all known evidence supports Darwinism and that virtually every scientist in the world believes the theory to be true.”
3. “The scientists on this list dispute the first claim and stand as living testimony in contradiction to the second. Since Discovery Institute launched this list in 2001, hundreds of scientists have courageously stepped forward to sign their names.”
4. “The list is growing and includes scientists from the US National Academy of Sciences, Russian, Hungarian and Czech National Academies, as well as from universities such as Yale, Princeton, Stanford, MIT, UC Berkeley, UCLA, and others.”
5. **Their Statement:** “We are skeptical of claims for the ability of random mutation and natural selection to account for the complexity of life. Careful examination of the evidence for Darwinian theory should be encouraged.”
6. Over 700 scientists have signed the above statement - [The List Of Scientists](#)

-- [Scientific Dissent From Darwinism](#)

B. MEDICAL DISSENT REGARDING DARWINISM...

1. “Sadly, academic freedom is no longer assured in many countries. This is especially true when it involves espousing views contrary to the theory of Darwinian macroevolution.”
 2. “Numerous instances have been documented where scientists and teachers have either been censored or removed from their positions for allowing or facilitating open discussion of the empirical problems of macroevolution.”
 3. “As academia has suppressed freedom of speech in this area, another avenue needs to be available to promote accurate information and the free exchange of ideas concerning the debate over Darwinism and alternative theories on origins.”
 4. “Physicians and Surgeons for Scientific Integrity (PSSI) was established as a means for physicians and surgeons to publicly be counted among those skeptical of nature-driven Darwinian macroevolution.”
 5. **Their statement:** “As medical doctors we are skeptical of the claims for the ability of random mutation and natural selection to account for the origination and complexity of life and we therefore dissent from Darwinian macroevolution as a viable theory. This does not imply the endorsement of any alternative theory.”
 6. Almost 300 doctors have signed the above statement - [The List Of Doctors](#)
- [Physicians And Surgeons For Scientific Integrity](#)

CONCLUSION

1. I have not presented specific problems with macroevolution, such as...
 - a. The Cambrian explosion
 - b. Gaps in the fossil records
 - c. Lack of transitional forms
 - d. Evidence of humans coexisting with dinosaurs

-- **I am not scientist, and willing to let others evaluate such evidence**
2. But it does not take a trained scientist to know that **macroevolution...**
 - a. Is only a theory, not yet proven
 - b. Is a leap of blind faith (requiring extrapolation without sufficient evidence)

-- **The major difference between the Biblical account and Darwinian theory**
3. My purpose is simply to emphasize...
 - a. “There is scientific dissent from Darwinism.”
 - b. “It deserves to be heard.”

-- **Dissent From Evolution, ibid.**

Reasons why we do not often hear about such dissent in our schools and mainstream media will be considered in our next and final lesson...

Note: Quotations in the section “**Difficulties With Evolution**” were copied from a compilation of quotes on creation and evolution by [Stephen E. Jones](#).

The Case For Creation

Difficulties With Evolutionary Scientists

INTRODUCTION

1. In this series we have presented evidence...
 - a. From scientists who argue for creation, based on intelligent design
 - b. From scientists who question macroevolution, based on lack of scientific support
2. Yet we often hear from teachers, scientists, and the media that evolution is...
 - a. No longer a theory, but a fact
 - b. A good reason to reject the Biblical account of creation

[If the issue is still debatable, then why do so many want to squelch open discussion in our schools, scientific journals, etc.? That such is going on should be evident, but in case not, consider some...]

I. PROBLEMS WITH EVOLUTIONARY SCIENTISTS

A. EVIDENCE OF MISCONDUCT...

1. **Misleading** - "Present-day ultra-Darwinism, which is so sure of itself, impresses incompletely informed biologists, misleads them, and inspires fallacious interpretations." - Grasse, Pierre-P., [editor of the 28-volume "Traite de Zoologie," former Chair of Evolution, Sorbonne University and ex-president of the French Academie des Sciences], "Evolution of Living Organisms: Evidence for a New Theory of Transformation," [1973], Academic Press: New York NY, 1977, p. 6
 2. **Fraudulent** - "...we have proffered a collective tacit acceptance of the story of gradual adaptive change, a story that strengthened and became even more entrenched as the synthesis took hold. We paleontologists have said that the history of life supports that interpretation, all the while really knowing that it does not." - Eldredge, Niles, [Chairman and Curator of Invertebrates, American Museum of Natural History], "Time Frames: The Rethinking of Darwinian Evolution and the Theory of Punctuated Equilibria," Simon & Schuster: New York NY, 1985, p. 144
- Evolutionary scientists have been known not to be truthful about the evidence

B. EVIDENCE OF DISCRIMINATION...

1. Serious and widespread discrimination against creationists is well documented - Jerry Bergman, [Contemporary Suppression Of The Theistic Worldview](#)
2. Over 100 active creationists employed in academia experienced one form or another of the following discrimination:
 - a. Derogatory and inappropriate comments
 - b. Refusal of admittance to graduate programs
 - c. Refusal to award degree
 - d. Denial of promotion
 - e. Denial of tenure - **ibid.**
3. Similar discrimination against students; what some educators have suggested:
 - a. That professors fail any student in his class, no matter what the grade record indicates
 - b. Retracting grades and even degrees if a person espouses creationism after passing the

- course or graduation
- c. Not awarding creationists with advanced degrees (e.g., PHDs) - **ibid.**
- 4. Other articles one might read
 - a. [Quick, Let's Discriminate Against the Creationists!](#)
 - b. [Bias In Higher Education](#)
 - c. [Science Magazine Refuses To Hire Creationist](#)
 - d. [Biologist Fired For Beliefs, Suit Says](#)
- **Evolutionary scientists have been known to carry out inquisitions against creationists**

[Opposition if not outright persecution by evolutionary scientists is certainly not universal. Some possess true scientific integrity, and have no problems with allowing opposing views to be taught and held. For those who seek to silence critical examination of macroevolution, let me offer some...]

II. REASONS FOR SUCH BEHAVIOR

A. PEER PRESSURE...

- 1. To succeed in the scientific field, one requires peer approval
- 2. The results of one's research must be submitted for peer review
- **While peer review has its merits, it can easily become peer pressure**

B. POLITICAL PRESSURE...

- 1. Opposing theories have their ardent advocates
- 2. Universities compete for research grants
- 3. Science organizations vie for media attention
- **Like politicians, scientists must often subscribe to popular opinion to succeed**

C. PECUNIARY PRESSURE...

- 1. Scientists are supported by public and private institutions
- 2. They must answer those who support them
- 3. If research counters their benefactors, pressure is applied to change the results
- **Scientists run the risk of being fired, having their funding cut off**

D. PERSONAL PRESSURE...

- 1. Personal motives can be a factor
- 2. Such as a strong desire to prove there is no God, no right or wrong
- 3. Twisting evidence, overstating one's case, to justify one's immoral behavior
- **Some love darkness more than light because their deeds are evil - Jn 3:19-20**

CONCLUSION

- 1. My point is simply this: scientists are human...
 - a. Subject to failings common to us all - **Ro 3:23**
 - b. Often corrupt, like many politicians, lawyers, car salesmen, preachers - cf. **Ro 3:9**
- 2. We should not be quick to place our faith in man...
 - a. It is better to trust in the Lord - **Psa 118:8-9**
 - b. It is better to trust in the Creator - **Psa 146:3-6**

I hope this series will encourage more careful and critical study in the case for creation...

The Case For Creation

Resources For Further Study

The following resources are suggested by [Center For Science & Culture](#):

Books

[Darwin on Trial](#), by Phillip Johnson

[Darwin's Black Box](#), by Michael Behe

[Design Inference](#), by William Dembski

[Design Revolution: Answering the Toughest Questions About Intelligent Design](#), by William Dembski

[Icons of Evolution](#), by Jonathan Wells

[The Mystery of Life's Origin: Reassessing Current Theories](#), by Charles B. Thaxton

[The Privileged Planet](#), by Guillermo Gonzalez and Jay Richards

[Darwinism, Design, and Public Education](#), edited by John Angus Campbell and Stephen Meyer

Articles

[The Origin of Biological Information and the Higher Taxonomic Categories](#)

By: Stephen C. Meyer, Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington

[Intelligent Design is not Creationism](#)

By: Stephen C Meyer, The Daily Telegraph (London)

[Molecular Machines: Experimental Support for the Design Inference](#)

By: Michael J. Behe, Cosmic Pursuit

[Evolution: Debate it](#)

By: John Angus Campbell & Stephen C. Meyer, USA Today

[Science & Design](#)

By: William Dembski, First Things

[DNA and Other Designs](#)

By: Stephen C. Meyer, First Things

[Survival of the Fakest \(PDF\)](#)

By: Jonathan Wells, American Spectator

[Are We Alone?](#)

By: Jay W. Richards & Guillermo Gonzalez, The American Spectator

Multimedia

[Privileged Planet](#)

New science documentary explores Earth's extraordinary place in the cosmos

[Unlocking the Mystery of Life](#)

Documentary reveals growing number of scientific challenges to Darwinian evolution

[Icons of Evolution](#)

Are students learning the whole truth about Darwin's theory of evolution?

[Where Does the Evidence Lead?](#)

Modular classroom version of Unlocking the Mystery of Life