

**THE CREATION
OF SPECIES**

This is version 1.02 published April 2011.

As author, I have placed this work in the public domain.

Comments are welcome. I may be reached at

author@ptgbook.org

I may revise and improve this article over time. The latest version may be browsed online at

<http://www.ptgbook.org/creationofspecies.htm>

Table of Contents

Introduction	5
Creation of Species Part One - Intelligent Design and the Creation of Species	7
Genesis Misunderstood	7
Problems with the Theory of Evolution	10
Why Science CANNOT Prove Evolution	13
Why God may have Created Species over Time	16
Guided Modification and Branching	23
Creation of Species Part Two - Why Evolution is a Faith	27
How the Scientific Method Prevents Science from Proving Evolution!	27
Consideration of Supernatural Causes Not Allowed in Science	29
The Limits of Science	33
Can Science Disprove Creation by God?	34
Evolution is a Faith	37
Are the Evils of this World Evidence Against God's Existence?	38
Evolution as Taught in the Public Schools is Unconstitutional	41
Conclusion	44
CONTACT INFO AND PERMISSIONS	46

LINKS OF INTEREST

46

Introduction

One of the great controversies in the teaching of science in public supported schools has been evolution. Many students who have been raised to believe in God and the Bible or have chosen to believe in God and the Bible for their own reasons often feel challenged by their science teachers on the subject of evolution.

In public schools, millions of students are taught evolution as truth, as fact, and those students who disagree are challenged by their teachers. Many students find it difficult to deal with these challenges because they have not studied the issue in depth before. Their teachers have. Their teachers often have been schooled in the arguments used on both sides in this controversy, and they have long experience in debating the issue.

This has also been a legal controversy with court cases concerning the teaching of evolution, intelligent design, or creation in the public schools. Many intelligent design proponents want intelligent design taught as an alternative interpretation of the evidence along side evolution, while evolutionists oppose this saying that would be introducing religion into science classes.

Evolutionists firmly state that evolution is true, that it is a fact, that it happened. In fact, evolution has not been proved and cannot be proved. But the reason it cannot be proved may be surprising. The reason it cannot be proved goes beyond whether or not evolution happened. The reason it cannot be proved has to do with a fundamental limitation of science, a self-imposed limitation that science has adopted as part of the scientific method as it is practiced in science.

As surprising as it may seem, the scientific method itself, as practiced by science, does not allow evolution to be proved! Even if evolution were true, science would not be able to prove it rationally using the scientific method. Nor can science disprove creation or intelligent design. I will show why later in this article.

Does the physical evidence of fossils and genetics point to evolution as the process by which species originated, as scientists and evolutionists claim? Can evolution be proved?

Is there a contradiction between the Bible and the physical evidence?

Is the teaching of evolution in public schools constitutional?

These are the topics I will address in this article.

Many people are taught that the Bible says that the earth is 6,000 years old and was created in six days. Others say that the Bible is not intended to be taken literally, and a figurative reading allows for the six days of creation to be an undetermined amount of

time that could have been millions of years. I will show that both of these views are wrong, that the Bible is intended to be taken literally, but that even a literal reading of Genesis does not say that the earth was created and came into existence in six days and is only 6,000 years old.

I will show that the Genesis account in the Bible, even when understood literally, does not say that the earth is only six thousand years old. The six days of creation described in the first chapter of Genesis are indeed six literal, 24-hour days, and this creation occurred approximately six thousand years ago. But the earth had already existed before the six days began, and as far as the Bible is concerned, may have existed for hundreds of millions of years. Moreover, there is evidence in the Bible that the condition of the earth being covered in water and in darkness as described in the second verse of Genesis is not the original condition of the earth as God created it. The earth came to be covered in water and in darkness at some point in time after God created it, and the earth could have been populated with life prior to that, life that resulted in the fossil records we see today. During the six days described in Genesis chapter one, God renewed the surface of the earth, that is, restored it to a condition it once was in.

I will also suggest possible reasons why God, who has the power to create all life instantly, may have chosen instead to develop species gradually or at selected times over millions of years in a way consistent with the fossil record and the evidence of genetics.

I will show how the Bible account can be reconciled with the fossil evidence and suggest one possible explanation for why life may have appeared gradually or in stages on the earth with the simpler forms appearing before the more complex forms, and why there appears to be an inter-relatedness between species in the genetic code. Many people who believe in God do not understand why God, who has all power and can create all species instantly if He wants, would take a long time to create all the species that have existed. I offer a possible explanation for this.

I will show that evolution not only is unproved, but it cannot be proved by science, and is in fact a faith adopted by those who believe it, not a religious faith, but a faith that there is no God who intervenes in physical processes on the earth. Those who believe in evolution do so because they have made a personal choice to believe it. It is a subjective opinion and decision. Evolution cannot be proved by science. Even if evolution were true, it could not be proved by science using the scientific method, and I will explain why.

Much of the information and ideas in this article are also in the free online book, *The True Gospel and the Ezekiel Warning*, chapters one and six. This book, like this article, is in the public domain and can be downloaded in .pdf file format. Other chapters in the book explain what Bible prophecy predicts for the English-speaking nations in the world in the years just ahead, as well as what the Bible teaches about major religious doctrines.

CREATION OF SPECIES - PART ONE

INTELLIGENT DESIGN

AND THE

CREATION OF SPECIES

Genesis Misunderstood

Many people who believe in evolution try to refute the creation account in Genesis by saying that science proves that the earth is more than 6,000 years old. But this argument is based on a misunderstanding of Genesis. The Bible does not say that the earth is 6,000 years old. And I am not saying that the account in Genesis is using metaphor. The Genesis account is literal, but it does not indicate at all when the earth itself was created.

Let's start with Genesis 1:1: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" (all Bible quotes are from the King James Version unless otherwise indicated). This is a simple statement that God created the earth and the entire universe. It does not say when He did it or how.

Now at this point in the narrative, the earth exists. Verse 1 just said God created the earth. Now look at the next verse, Genesis 1:2: "And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness *was* upon the face of the deep. And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." Verse two is describing the condition of the earth at this point in the narrative. It is covered with darkness and with water. But it exists. God had already created it in verse one.

How long did the earth exist in the condition described in verse two? How long was the earth covered with water and in darkness? A day? A week? A year? A million years? The Bible DOES NOT SAY.

Is there a period of time between verse 1 and verse 2? In other words, could the condition of the earth described in verse 2 NOT be the way God originally created it? Could God have created the earth, not covered with water, but with land areas and in light not darkness, even with life on it, in verse 1? And could something have happened later in time to cause the condition described in verse 2 with the earth covered in water and in darkness? Genesis itself DOES NOT SAY. However, there is an indication elsewhere in the Bible that shows that God did not originally create the earth "without form, and void," and that this must have been a condition that came upon the earth later, after God created the earth as stated in verse 1, but before verse 2.

Isaiah 45:18 says, "For thus saith the LORD that created the heavens; God himself that formed the earth and made it; he hath established it, he created it not in vain, he formed it to be inhabited: I *am* the LORD; and *there is* none else."

Where this verse says that God did not create the earth in vain, the words "in vain" are translated from the same Hebrew word in the original text that is translated "without form" in Genesis 1:2. You can check this out with Strong's Exhaustive Concordance, which lists every word in the Bible and every place it is used, and also gives the Hebrew and Greek words that each English word is translated from. So in effect, Isaiah 45:18 is saying that God did not create the earth without form and void. So the earth would not have been in this condition originally, without form and void, with water and darkness covering the earth. This condition of waste and desolation came later.

What could cause the earth to become "without form, and void," completely covered in water, and in darkness? This pictures the result of destruction and chaos, and can come about as a result of sin and rebellion against God and His ways. For example, this is why the flood came upon the earth in the days of Noah. Notice the reasons for the flood: "And GOD saw that the wickedness of man *was* great in the earth, and *that* every imagination of the thoughts of his heart *was* only evil continually. And it repented the LORD that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart. And the LORD said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them" (Genesis 6:5-7). "And God said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them; and, behold, I will destroy them with the earth" (Genesis 6:13). "And, behold, I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein *is* the breath of life, from under heaven; *and* every thing that *is* in the earth shall die" (Genesis 6:17). Then the flood came and covered the whole earth (Genesis 7:17-20).

The sins of mankind, especially violence, were the cause of the flood in the days of Noah. What could be a cause for the surface of the earth to be destroyed by water before man was even created?

When Adam was created, Satan, described as the serpent, was already on the earth. We first read of him in Genesis 3:1, yet he is not included in the description starting in

Genesis 1:2 through all of chapter 2. Satan existed before Adam was created and before the six days of creation described in Genesis 1:2-31.

Before man existed, when the earth was first created, angels existed and were joyous at the creation of the earth (Job 38:4-7). Lucifer was not created evil by God. He was originally perfect in his ways until he sinned (Ezekiel 28:14-15). He was also on this earth, and he rebelled against God, desiring to rise above the heights of the clouds (Isaiah 14:12-14). There are indications that he led one third of God's angels into rebellion with him and they became demons (Revelation 12:3-4), suggesting that Lucifer and about a third of the angels inhabited this earth before man. How many angels is that? Revelation 5:11 indicates there are more than ten thousand time ten thousand righteous angels around God's throne in heaven, so the number of angels who were on the earth under Lucifer's supervision and who became demons when they followed Satan's rebellion could be more than 50 million.

If this is the case, the sin and rebellion of Satan and his demons on the earth could have been the cause of the destruction of the surface of the earth that we see in Genesis 1:2, "And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness *was* upon the face of the deep. And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters," just as the sins of mankind resulted in the destruction of the earth by flood in Noah's day. But if this is the case, and I believe it is, then as far as the Bible is concerned there could have been a period of time AFTER the earth was created and BEFORE the destruction described in the second verse of Genesis that lasted hundreds of millions of years, and the earth could have been filled with life at that time.

The Bible does not say anything about the plant and animal life forms that existed before Genesis 1:2 and how long ago they existed, but science does. Fossils have been found that appear to be millions of years old, and there have been found fossils of many species, such as the dinosaurs, that never existed in the days of Noah when he brought all the animals into the ark.

The account of the six days of creation contained in the first chapter of Genesis does not describe the original creation of the earth, but a re-creation, a refreshing, a renewal of the surface of the earth and a clearing of any dust that obscured visibility of the other bodies in the solar system in preparation for the creation of Adam and Eve. The account is from point of view of someone on the surface of the earth. When God said, "Let there be light," enough of whatever dust was obscuring light from the sun was cleared away so that light was able to reach the surface, yet diffuse, not allowing the sun, moon, and stars to be clearly seen. On another day, God made the sun, moon, and stars into lights for signs and for season visible from the surface of the earth by clearing away any remaining dust so that the heavenly bodies could be seen clearly from the earth. God restored the same species of life that existed before the disaster struck, with exactly the same genetic coding.

Some will say that radiocarbon dating establishes dates for humans and their artifacts that cannot be reconciled with Bible chronology. But radiocarbon dating is based on an

assumption that the intensity of cosmic rays that bombard the atmosphere of the earth from space has always been constant, and this assumption is unproven. If the intensity of cosmic rays reaching the earth was different in the past, dates established by radiocarbon dating by scientists today would be inaccurate. Also, fossils of creatures that are similar in their skeletal structure to humans today could be fossils of animals, similar to humans, but not human, just as the great apes today are similar in body structure to humans but are not human.

Therefore, fossil evidence does not prove that the creation account in Genesis is wrong.

But though there is no contradiction between physical evidence and the creation account in Genesis, I believe there are very serious problems with the theory of evolution itself.

Problems with the Theory of Evolution

I will state right here that although I have done some reading on the subject of the theory of evolution, I am not an expert on it. But what I have learned suggests serious problems with the theory, and I invite the interested reader to do his or her own research on the subject, with these problems in mind.

While the majority of scientists support evolution, a minority disagree with it, and many of them have published books and articles showing how evolution is inconsistent with the evidence.

For example, Darwin's theory proposes that new species gradually emerge from older species through a number of small changes due to random mutation and natural selection. One would expect to find transitional fossils that show the stages from one species to another. But these transition forms are not found in the fossil record, but rather the record shows that species have appeared abruptly, not gradually. The lack of transitional fossils, some scientists say, **DISPROVES** evolution.

Also, experience with mutations shows that random mutations are almost always harmful, and rather than produce new species, natural selection tends to weed out mutations. Species can change and new varieties can develop, but within limits, and a species never changes into a different kind, according to these scientists.

One of the main problems with evolution is that the theory does not explain how complex organ systems and biological mechanisms can gradually come into existence through a process of random mutation and natural selection, when **MANY** changes would have to occur together in the genetic blueprint before any of them would confer any advantage to survival and the propagation of the species. This is called "irreducible complexity."

One example is the woodpecker. While most birds eat seeds or insects that are found out in the open, the woodpecker eats insects found inside of the trunks or branches of trees. This bird gets these insects out of the tree by drilling a hole into the wood with its beak, then getting the insects that are inside with its tongue. This requires a combination of highly sophisticated organs and instincts, all working together, which other birds do not have, in order for any of them to have a benefit.

In order to find the insects, such as ants, that have tunneled into the tree, the woodpecker uses its hearing to find them as they are moving around or digging tunnels. This requires a specially developed sense of hearing. In order to drill into the wood, the woodpecker has specialized feet and tail feathers that enable the bird to maintain a strong and favorable grip and position on the tree, as well as an especially hard beak that other birds do not have. The beak has to be hard enough to drill a hole into the tree. Once the bird has drilled a hole to reach the tunnel containing the insects, it inserts a long, sticky tongue into the tunnel, and the insects stick to the woodpecker's tongue. Other birds do not have tongues of this type. The woodpecker has especially strong neck muscles for delivering blows strong enough to penetrate the tree, and to do so repeatedly in rapid succession without fatigue. Finally and most importantly, the bird must have the right instincts to use all these specialized organs together to actually obtain its food this way, and other birds do not have these instincts. It would do a bird no good to have an especially hard beak, special claws and tail feathers for maintaining a strong position for drilling on the trunk, extra strong neck muscles, specialized hearing that can locate the insects in the tree, and a specialized long, sticky tongue, if it did not have the instincts to use these organs together to find and catch insects inside the trunk of a tree.

How could all these characteristics have evolved gradually if most of them have no particular advantage unless all are present, fully developed, at the same time? Generally, there is a biological cost, in energy, growth time, and nutritional requirements, to any organ or system, and highly developed and sophisticated organs tend to diminish if they are not useful to a species. A bird would not tend to have extra strong neck muscles if those muscles are not being used to drill into a tree. Even if random genetic mutations produced a bird with stronger than average neck muscles (one mutation would not likely be enough for such a muscle system, it would likely require many genetic changes, because it takes a whole group of muscles working together along with neck bones that can take the stress), unless that extra strength is used, not only does the group of mutations provide no survival advantage, but it actually will hurt the bird's chances for survival, since more food would be required to grow and maintain muscles that are larger and stronger than necessary.

So in order for ANY of these special characteristics of a woodpecker to be developed and continue, each one has to be an advantage, not a disadvantage, to the bird's survival and reproduction. Yet for these characteristics to be an advantage, all have to be present at the same time. How can this happen gradually? A bird would have to have thousands, maybe tens or hundreds of thousands of genetic mutations, or more, in order for all these characteristics to appear fully developed, or else the bird would not be able to obtain its

food this way. The odds against this ever happening even in hundreds of millions of years are astronomical.

Another example is the archer fish. This is a fish that obtains insect food by squirting a jet of water from its mouth above the surface of the water to knock an insect off a low-lying branch or twig of a tree that is over the water. The fish eats the insect after it is shot down and falls into the water. To do this successfully requires not only the ability to squirt water out of its mouth at high speed, but extremely complex and highly developed instincts to see the insect above water, aim the stream of water accurately, and allow for the distortion due to the bending of light as it passes from air to water at the surface.

There are many other examples of irreducible complexity in the natural world, such as in symbiotic relationships between species, bees and flowers being an example, and the migration of birds and fish.

From what I have read, I think scientists have acknowledged that the development of complex systems that require many genetic changes all at once before any of them confer a survival advantage is a problem with the current theory, and they have started to say that evolution must happen in sudden spurts, not gradually, what they call punctuated equilibrium. But I have read of no explanation as to HOW this could occur.

I believe there may be another flaw in the theory of evolution that has been identified more recently, and it comes from information theory. Biologists realize that the genes of a species are a genetic code, similar in many ways to computer code. The genes are a coded blueprint that determines the characteristics of the species, just as computer code determines the characteristics of a piece of computer software. But the amount and complexity of information coded in the genes of even a relatively simple species are so vast that, even if it were possible for species to evolve, it would seem that even billions of years would not be sufficient to produce the quantity of code and the information in it. In other words, even if evolution were possible, and based on the impossibility of complex systems developing suddenly I believe evolution is not possible, but even if it were, some scientists say that there has not been enough time on the earth, even after hundreds of millions of years, for evolution to have produced the species that exist today.

In a sense, evolution is not a complete theory. It states that random genetic changes that give a species an advantage can be preserved and spread through natural selection, and it states that this can result in new species, even all species that exists, but it does not provide an explanation of how this can occur that actually works. Scientists and teachers who promote the theory of evolution like to say that just because they do not know all the details of how it occurred does not mean that the theory is wrong. But this is misleading. The reason they do not know the details is not that there are many possible ways it could have occurred and they just don't know which one actually happened. The reason they do not know the details is that they know of NO possible way it could have occurred.

Why do scientists and teachers believe evolution in the absence of any real workable explanation as to how it could have occurred? I think that for many people, evolution is a

faith. They choose to believe it because they want to, just as many others believe in their religion of choice because they want to. I think that those who believe in atheistic evolution find comfort in the idea that there is no God who has authority over their actions and will judge them for what they do in this life.

I do not say that everyone who believes in some form of evolution is an atheist. Certainly there are those who believe that God exists and have strong religious beliefs and who also believe in some kind of evolution. Nevertheless, many of those who strongly believe in evolution are atheists or agnostics and I think they find comfort in the idea of "no God," and the theory of evolution helps them in their belief that there is no God who intervenes in the universe and has the authority to tell them how to live their lives.

Why Science CANNOT Prove Evolution

Evolution cannot be proved and is a faith, not a religious faith, but an anti-religious faith.

What do I mean by "faith?" Evolution is a faith in the sense that it is a chosen belief system that cannot be proved by physical evidence. Believing in evolution is a personal, subjective choice, and evolution is not subject to physical proof.

Here is a test that can show that the theory of evolution is a kind of faith for those who believe it. The next time a scientist, advocate of evolution, biology teacher, or college professor challenges you on evolution and wants to know why you don't believe it, try asking, "Can you prove evolution according to the rules of formal logic?" Many colleges offer courses in formal logic. Formal logic is logic based on deductive reasoning. This is the same kind of reasoning used to produce proofs in geometry. It is illustrated by the example, "All dogs bark. Sandy is a dog. Therefore, Sandy barks." Used properly it can be very accurate, but it has a limitation. It can only reason from assumed premises. In the above example, it is assumed that all dogs bark. Then, based on this assumption, if Sandy is a dog, you can prove that Sandy barks. But if the premise is wrong, your conclusion can be wrong.

The false premise in evolution that the scientific community assumes is that there is no God who intervenes in physical processes.

People often think of science as a field of knowledge, a category of information, a subject matter. This is often how the term "science" is used. Courses in school for example are divided into categories such as science, mathematics, history, etc. and books in libraries and bookstores are grouped in similar ways. But science is more than a category or field of knowledge. It is a way of looking at the world and a way of trying to discover knowledge. It is a culture and a community committed to discovering new knowledge using the scientific method. And the scientific method, as it is practiced by science, excludes consideration of supernatural causes as explanations for physical evidence.

The scientific method works fine in the laboratory. God seldom intervenes in everyday processes and experiments. God allows natural laws to operate without interference because He wants man to be able to work with a predictable environment, and because He has chosen not to make His presence known in such a way that it would be impossible for men to deny His existence. But that does not mean that God did not create the universe, or life itself. This assumption, that God never intervenes in physical processes, does not work well in explaining how things came into existence in the first place, or the past history of how everything came to be the way it is. When scientists use the scientific method, with its build-in assumption that there is no God who intervenes in physical processes, to explain the origins of life, they are using for a purpose for which it is not suited, and it doesn't work.

According to the scientific method as practiced, there is no God who intervenes in physical processes, and the scientific method is the only way of thinking most scientists and educators will acknowledge as a way of investigating the origin of species. So their thinking about evolution is distorted and biased from the beginning.

This is why the scientific community cannot accept or even objectively consider creation by God as an explanation for life on earth.

If you want to prove something rationally and objectively, and if you are honest in wanting to find the truth, you have to be willing to look at both sides of an issue objectively without bias. If you only look at one side, you are not being objective and your conclusions may be wrong. That is why science cannot prove evolution. It cannot prove evolution because it cannot look at both sides, creation and evolution, without bias. It cannot look at both sides because the scientific method does not allow science to consider supernatural causes for any physical evidence. That possibility is always rejected without consideration.

You cannot objectively prove something by only looking at one side of an issue. The question is, did God create life or did life evolve through natural processes? If you are really after truth, you have to look at both sides of a question objectively and without bias. But scientists, in their work as scientists, cannot do that with evolution and creation. The scientific method forbids it, as does peer pressure of the scientific community. The scientific method as it is applied forbids the consideration of supernatural explanations for evidence. So the scientific method cannot examine both sides of the issue, which is necessary for proof.

The alternative to evolution is creation by God. To prove that evolution must have happened a scientist would have to prove that the evidence cannot be explained by creation by God.

Even if evolution were possible, or in other words, even if a process of random mutation and natural selection was sufficient to explain how species came into existence, this alone would not prove evolution happened. If creation by God is also sufficient to explain how

life arrived at its present variety, then how can we know that life came through evolution and natural selection and not intelligent design by a creator God?

If both evolution via natural selection can explain the evidence, and also intelligent design by God can explain the evidence, then either of these is possible and evolution via natural causes has not been proved to be the origin of the species. Then it is wrong to teach it as a fact.

You need to examine both sides without bias if you really are after truth and want to prove it rationally. You can't look just at one side. So for science to prove evolution happened, it has to show: a) evolution can explain the evidence, and b) creation cannot explain the evidence. It can try to do (a) but not (b). Science cannot examine supernatural and theological explanations for the evidence. It is not equipped to do so. Science is limited to the scientific method, which is a way of thinking built on the traditions of the scientific community. The scientific method does not permit consideration of supernatural causes. So science cannot look at both sides, as long as it follows the scientific method.

Scientists and educators cannot prove evolution according to formal logic without setting as a premise that there is no God who intervenes in physical processes, and this premise is false. Nevertheless, they accept this premise without proof. For them, though they will not call it a faith, it is a faith and it is like a religion.

Evolution cannot be proved by science. The scientific method itself rules out such proof. The scientific method itself prevents science from trying to prove evolution rationally.

And if a scientist as an individual really examined both sides of the issue carefully and without bias, I believe he would conclude that the evidence is consistent only with creation and not with evolution, and he could prove for himself that evolution never occurred. But he would have great difficulty if he tried teaching that in the course of his work, and would risk rejection by the scientific and educational communities.

Many people who look at this issue with an open mind are troubled by the idea that God created life because the fossil evidence appears to them to indicate that the different life forms appeared at different times on the earth over hundreds of millions of years, with the simplest life forms appearing first and the more complex life forms appearing later. Also, there are fossils of life forms such as the dinosaurs that have become extinct. They cannot imagine why an all-powerful creator God would choose to create the various life forms in this order and over such a long period of time, or why God would create some life forms only to allow them to become extinct later.

I do not know all the events that may have taken place on the earth before the account of the six days in Genesis. The Bible does not give details. I also do not know if scientists accurately know the ages of various fossils they find. Scientists may or may not be mistaken in estimating the ages of the fossils that appear to be tens or even hundreds of millions of years old. But suppose scientists are right about the ages of the fossils of

dinosaurs and various other ancient species. Suppose scientists are right that the fossils of simpler life-forms are older than the more complex life forms. Does that prove that evolution is the process by which all the species came to be? Absolutely not.

Because the Bible does not tell us how and when God created different species before the earth was covered with water and God renewed the face of the earth in six days, we cannot know exactly how, when, and why God created the life-forms that resulted in fossils of dinosaurs and other animals. He may have had particular reasons for creating the simpler life forms first and the more complex life forms later, and reasons for allowing the dinosaurs and many other life forms to become extinct, reasons we cannot know since God does not reveal them in the Bible. But because we do not know what those reasons are does not mean that God did not have reasons. We could speculate about God's reasons, and our speculations might be right or wrong. But our lack of knowledge about reasons God might have for creating life in the order in which it appears in the fossil record does not prove that God did not create life. And if you can't prove that God did not create life, you cannot prove that evolution occurred.

The premise contained in the scientific method, as it is practiced, that there is no God who intervenes in physical processes is itself unproved and unprovable. Yet it is the basis for all scientific investigation into the origin of life. This is why evolution is a faith.

Why God may have Created Species over Time

In this section, I want to speculate on a possible explanation, consistent with a literal understanding of Genesis, for the appearance of species in stages over millions of years in the past and why the genetic code seems to show an inter-relatedness between species.

I want to emphasize that this is speculation only. I have shown earlier in this article that the Bible indicates that the darkness and desolation that existed on the surface of the earth as described in verse 2 of Genesis chapter 1 was not the original state of the earth as God created it. The earth existed before the six days of creation, perhaps for hundreds of millions of years, and could have been inhabited by any number and kinds of life forms as far as the Bible is concerned. The Bible does not say. Also, if the earth was inhabited by species that appeared gradually or in stages with simple life being followed by complex life, the Bible does not say why or how God created life in that manner. And since the Bible is silent about this, I cannot know for certain. So what I offer here is only one possibility, a speculation, on what might have occurred. I do not say that this is the way it happened, only that it is a possibility.

Why do I speculate at all? Why not just say, "I don't know," and leave it at that?

Many of those who have an open mind and are willing to believe that God created life stumble over a problem. This problem and issue is that evidence is shown to them from

the fossil record that suggests that life has existed for millions of years, and that simple forms of life existed before more complex forms of life. Moreover, the evidence shows that some species that existed, the dinosaurs being the best known example, do not exist today. So the question arises, if God created life and all the species on earth, why would He create them gradually or in stages over millions of years, creating simple species before complex ones, and letting some species become extinct? If God is all wise and all powerful (He is) and had the infinite intelligence and power to create this entire universe with all its billions of galaxies (He did), why did He not create all the life forms He wanted, exactly perfect and all at once? This question can be a mystery, a dilemma, a puzzle for those who believe in creation or have an open mind and just want to know the truth.

I have said before that God could have reasons that we do not know about for why He did things certain ways. But that may be hard for some to accept without at least some example of why He might have done things a certain way. We like to see examples of things to illustrate what we learn. God may have many reasons for creating species in stages over millions of years, but without at least one example that could illustrate this, it can be hard for some to accept. That is why I offer this speculation as a possibility. It can serve as an example to illustrate that there may be reasons why God caused life to appear on the earth gradually in the millions of years before the six days of Genesis 1:3-31 that are not recorded in the Bible and that science cannot discover. The actual reasons why God created life in a way consistent with fossil record and DNA evidence and how He did it may be completely different from the ideas I express in this section, but at least what I am suggesting can illustrate that explanations are possible.

I have previously shown that before the creation of man during the six days described in Genesis, angels existed (Job 38:4-7). Lucifer was a great angel, and God did not create him evil. Originally, Lucifer was not evil. But God gave him free moral agency and the power to choose between good and evil. He was perfect in his ways until sin was found in him (Ezekiel 28:14-15). Apparently, before he sinned, God placed Lucifer and one-third of the angels on this earth (Revelation 12:4, Luke 4:5-7, John 14:30). Lucifer was in a position of leadership over those angels. His job was to supervise those angels under God's overall rulership.

Herbert W. Armstrong spoke and wrote extensively about the Bible. He published the Plain Truth magazine from 1934 until his death in 1986 and he is the author of Mystery of the Ages and many other books, booklets, and articles. Mr. Armstrong taught in Mystery of the Ages that Lucifer was placed in a position of rulership with one third of the angels on the earth, and God gave them the job of using their creative abilities to preserve and beautify the surface of the earth. This earth was to be a testing ground to see if they would remain loyal to God. They were perfect in their ways until Lucifer sinned and became Satan, which means enemy. Mr. Armstrong taught that He used his powers of persuasion and influence to gradually turn the angels under his supervision into sin and rebellion against God and they became demons. But it might have taken millions of years for Lucifer, now become Satan, to turn the angels under his authority against God.

Mr. Armstrong never said exactly how he thought the angels were to beautify the surface of the earth, and the Bible itself does not reveal it.

But God must have given them some job and activity to do. Angels have great powers and minds, probably much greater than man. God did not put them on the earth to be idle. God intended that they use their abilities in some accomplishment and challenge to match their great abilities, not existing in a state of boredom with nothing to do. And they must have started on the right track with whatever job God gave them to do. Lucifer was perfect in his ways, living righteously for a time, before eventually he turned to sin. Even after that, it may have taken a long time for him to lead his angels into sin also.

Might God have used the angels and given them a job relating to physical life itself on the earth?

God himself is all wise and all powerful. Nothing is impossible for Him. His powers are infinite. But not so the angels. Though their powers are greater than man's, they are finite. Their powers are less than God's. They have to learn through experience and it takes them time to do what they do, just as with man.

God is the creator. God created life. But God can accomplish His will by using His servants as tools. God's servants have a role to play in what God accomplishes. This is illustrated by how God builds His Church. Jesus Christ said, "I will build my church" (Matthew 16:18), but Christ delegates work to His human servants in building that church, such as the work of preaching and teaching that the apostles and ministers did. God works, but He often accomplishes His work by delegating tasks to others. This is illustrated by the account in John 4:1-3 which says that Jesus baptized more disciples than John, then says that Jesus Himself did not baptize, but His disciples did the baptizing. The baptizing was attributed to Jesus even though it was His disciples that did the baptizing, because Jesus baptized through His disciples, using His disciples as the tools and the means for baptizing, and the disciples baptized by Jesus' authority.

Likewise, God is the creator of life, but in creating life God could delegate certain tasks if that is His will.

Suppose God gave the angels on the earth a role to play in helping to develop all the vast variety of species of life on the earth? Is that possible?

Perhaps God created the first simple forms of life with the genetic code contained in the DNA that would be the basic scheme for producing all life on earth. He then could have provided the angels on the earth with extensive instruction on how the genetic code worked and in general terms what forms of life He wanted developed on this planet. It would then be the task of the angels to work with the basic life form and the knowledge of genetics God taught them and using their brilliant minds and their labor, in an organized and harmonious way under Lucifer's coordination, develop the variety of plant and animal species that God intended cover the earth and beautify it, under God's overall

direction and authority. Considering the number and complexity of the species today, it is easy to see how this could have been a tremendous project that could challenge the abilities of the angels and keep them occupied for millions of years. This project would require that the angels be organized, perhaps groups of them working on various families of species. It would require that they work harmoniously as a team and cooperate with each other so that the various species fit well into the ecology made up of all other species -- no angel could be a "lone wolf" and breed any kind of species he wanted without regard to the effect on the overall ecology. It would also be an important test of character by requiring the angels on the earth to follow the overall direction of God in the kind of life that they developed, and not just develop any kind of plant or animal (or disease organism?) that they wanted.

Why would God have angels help develop life forms rather than God simply creating every plant and animal species directly by Himself in one day? God is certainly capable of creating anything He wants without anybody's help. God with His infinite mind, power, wisdom, and knowledge could develop every species of life perfectly and more quickly than all the angels put together. Actually, whatever work God wanted the angels to do, God could do it Himself easier and more quickly, but God did not put angels on earth to be idle. He wanted them to have work and activity that would match their abilities, keep them challenged, provide intellectual and emotional fulfillment for them, and provide the proving ground to test Lucifer and his angels to see if they would remain loyal, to see if they would obey God and work together harmoniously. This would be a test of their character and at the same time give them the opportunity to participate in one of God's great creative projects.

If this speculation is true, how could angels develop new species? Though their minds would be greater than man's mind, their minds would be far less than God's mind. They would probably have to proceed slowly learning from experience as they went. With a basic one-celled organism to start with, they could breed that species, then take some descendants of the original cell and make small modifications to the genetic code. This would alter the characteristics of following generations. They could then watch the new organism carefully to make sure the genetic change had the desired effect.

It would probably be a long time before they had the skill and experience to go on to multi-celled organisms. In most cases, even when they progressed to the more complex plants and animals, they would change and develop new species and make a large number of small changes in succeeding generations, constantly observing and checking the results in each generation before making further changes. Not only would they have to make sure each change in a developing species took place as planned, they would have to make sure that it fit in with the overall ecology and did not upset the balance. This could not be done hastily.

An analogy with this would be the way man develops a physical invention such as the automobile or television. The first Model T car was very crude by today's automotive standards; the first TV was black and white, large, heavy, expensive, and had a round screen. Today's automobiles and televisions are far more advanced, yet we progressed

from the earlier versions to more advanced models not all at once but little by little, a small improvement one year, another small improvement the next year. Even so, most small improvements were the result of hundreds of highly trained scientists, engineers, and technicians working together as a team. It took "generations" of automobiles to get to where we are today simply because it took years to develop the knowledge and ideas, and each improvement was built upon what went before. That takes time, lots of it, and plenty of cooperative effort.

And think of how much more complex is the simplest one-celled organism than an automobile or TV set!

God must have given the angels on the earth plenty of help and direction along the way, especially to ensure that His overall principles and laws were followed. God may have intended that animals not hunt and destroy each other but eat vegetation and live in harmony and peace. It would be the task of Lucifer and the angels on earth to ensure that the animals had the right instincts and digestive systems to live that way. However, God may not have necessarily given the angels an exact blueprint for every species to be developed. Having laid down the broad guiding principles, and having created within Lucifer and the angels great minds and creative intelligence, God may have instructed them to use their minds to design and create all manner of beautiful flowers, trees, fruits and grains for food, fish and beautiful birds, mammals of various kinds and colors and markings, etc. It would be up to them to work out the details just as a human artist, music composer, or automobile designer uses his creative mind to design a work of art, a piece of music, or an automobile.

But at some point in time, Lucifer sinned, became Satan the adversary, and began to sway the angels under his influence to join him in rebelling against God. Mr. Armstrong has said that it must have taken Satan a long time to turn one-third of the angels, which were on earth with him and under his authority, against God. During this time, these angels may still have been developing life but not necessarily according to God's guiding principles and laws. Scientists can tell from the teeth of dinosaur fossils which ones had teeth designed to crush plants and which had teeth suited for tearing flesh. Perhaps some large plant eating dinosaurs were harmless and beautiful but I don't think God intended the angels to develop Tyrannosaurus Rex, a killing machine. Yet God must have allowed this to continue for a time, just as God allowed the violence that filled the earth before the flood in Noah's day to continue for a while. Perhaps in the time that the dinosaurs existed, God allowed Lucifer to continue as he was because not every angel on earth had yet made his decision whether to follow Satan or remain loyal to God.

Scientists say that something happened some millions of years ago to cause all of the dinosaurs and many other species to become extinct on the earth, not gradually but all at once. They speculate that a great asteroid struck the earth, filling the atmosphere with sun-blocking dust, and changing the climate causing many species to die out suddenly. But not all species died out - many continued. After that, millions of years went by while many old species continued and many new species developed and appeared, according to scientists.

At some point in pre-history, God must have decided that the time for the dinosaurs to end had come, and He caused or allowed them and many other species to end. But it was not yet time for the earth to become "without form, and void." God for His own reasons allowed the development of species to continue for some millions of years more even under the imperfect and corrupt leadership of Lucifer now become Satan. Perhaps the destruction of the dinosaurs was a warning to Lucifer and the angels on the earth that God was in charge and God gave them time to see what they would do. Perhaps some angels on earth had not yet turned to rebellion and were still developing life mostly according to God's principles and laws. Perhaps Satan, though had chosen the path of sin, simply was not fully ready to launch an all-out rebellion against God's throne in heaven.

But eventually, Satan tried, as Mr. Armstrong described it, to knock God off His throne, Satan and his demons were defeated and cast down to earth (Isaiah 14:12-14, Luke 10:18), and the surface of the earth was destroyed and covered by water. This was the condition when God recreated the surface of the earth and created Adam.

Could angels develop new species or does only God have that power?

It depends on how much power God gave the angels.

In the speculative scenario I described, the angels on earth were not creating life from dead matter, but merely using pre-existing life starting with the first living cell God created and guiding the development of that life into new species. In a similar manner, man, using selective breeding and other techniques, changes and enhances breeds of plants and animals and produces new varieties that did not exist before in the same form. As an example, look at the huge variety of the different breeds of dogs. Although all dogs are the same species technically, dogs come in every size, shape, markings, coloring, temperament, and ability (even a dog's instinct varies and has been developed by breed - watch a pointer point at a bird without even being trained, or a border collie try to herd and control other animals!). Now that man is learning more about genetics, he is using genetic engineering to splice genes from one species to another and thus changing a species. Although man has not yet been able to create new genetic material, in principle there is no reason why he could not do so in the future. The atoms and molecules that make up the genes behave according to laws of physics and chemistry, which man is able to discover. If man is someday able to decipher and understand the genetic code completely and learns how to assemble genetic material atom by atom according to his designs, there is no basic reason why man could not create new genes that never existed before. And if man with his puny mind can do this without God's help in a few hundred years, what could angels, who are greater than man, do with God's direction and instruction over hundreds of millions of years?

If angels did help develop life into its various forms over hundreds of millions of years, this could account for the fossil record. The simplest life forms would be the earliest and the most complex ones would be the latest. All life would have been descended from the first cell God created and provided for the angels on earth to begin to work with. What

the blind random forces of nature could not accomplish even in billions of years, angels under God's direction and with God's help and empowerment could accomplish.

What about the species alive today?

When the surface of the earth was destroyed and became "without form, and void," covered with water and in darkness as described in Genesis 1:2, all plant and animal life in existence at that time died. But though they had died, a great many species of plants and animals had been **DESIGNED AND TESTED**. The genetic code had been developed. There had been a working ecology, though it may have been imperfect.

When God recreated plant and animal life in the six days of creation, did He design everything from scratch? Did He re-invent the wheel so to speak? A great deal of work had been accomplished in designing and testing the genetic blueprints for a great variety of species of life. According to fossil evidence, the fossils that appear to be only a few hundreds of thousands of years old or younger appear for the most part the same as species alive on earth today. If these designs for life were complete, tested together in an ecology that lasted for a long time, and commissioned originally by God to be developed by the one-third of the angels that were placed on the earth, why would God throw away what could be useful to Him and start from scratch? Why not simply recreate or re-assemble those species exactly according to the genetic coding or "blueprints" that had already been designed and tested, keeping those species that served God's purpose and omitting any that did not?

If the angels had a role in helping to develop the variety of life, not everything that the angels on the earth may have produced was flawed or imperfect just because they eventually rebelled. Much of what was developed may have been done before Satan rebelled, and even to the end or close to the end some angels on earth may have remained loyal to God. Whatever species God did not want was left destroyed, the good ones were restored. Perhaps God added some new species to replace those that were flawed.

This could explain why scientists find such a close relationship and similarity between the genetic coding of similar species today. The existing species, though not descended from common ancestors (they were created, brought into physical existence directly by God during the six days of creation week six thousand years ago), could have been created according to the **PATTERN**, the **GENETIC DESIGN**, of species that were developed over millions of years of breeding and genetic engineering from a common ancestor, the original cell created by God. They would have the same DNA, the same genes as the species that existed before. God restored whatever was good that was already developed.

As I said before, I am only suggesting this as a possibility and I am not saying this is what definitely happened. But it can illustrate the general principle, that events could have occurred in the distant past, events managed and directed by God, that can account for the fossil evidence. I have tried to suggest a possible reason for God to create life gradually or in stages, using angels as His agents to participate in the process in some

way. Perhaps it was not this way at all, and God has other reasons for creating life the way it appears in the fossil record. I do not know. But I know that scientists cannot prove that God did not create species even gradually over hundreds millions of years. And if they cannot prove that God did not create the species of life, they cannot prove that evolution is true.

And I know of nothing in the Bible that rules out the hypothetical scenario I described.

There is also another, much simpler possibility. For those who believe that God would never give the angels power to work with life forms and change genetic code to develop new species, it may be that God created all species directly and simply assigned the angels some job of working with the life God created, managing it for example, and God created more complex forms of life after simpler ones so the angels could learn gradually through experience the skills they needed to do whatever job God gave them in managing and regulating the ecology.

Guided Modification and Branching

I am not a scientist. I cannot verify the evidence science claims it has in the fossil record and genetics for common descent of species. Scientists claim that the fossil record all over the world shows that simpler species appeared earlier than more complex species. They also claim that the genetic record shows an inter-relatedness of species that suggest that they branched from common ancestors. While the majority of scientists claim that this shows evolution through natural forces only, a minority of scientists say that the fossil record does not show gradual change, but the abrupt appearance of new species and that missing transitional forms point to creation, not evolution.

But while I cannot verify whether or not the evidence seems to point to common descent and branching of species with more complex species descending from simpler ones over millions of years, I do know that even if this is true it can be consistent with creation and does not prove evolution.

Guided genetic modification and branching of species can be a way God created and developed the species and is consistent with the Bible account.

"Guided Modification and Branching" (GMB) is a term that refers to the intelligent design of species by making modifications to the genetic code from one generation to the next to produce news species from existing ones.

God could have changed the genetic code, either directly or through the work of angels, to develop new species from old ones, and He could have done it at various intervals over millions of years during the time the earth existed before disaster engulfed the earth and God renewed the surface of the earth in six days. He could have done it this way to allow

the angels to learn through experience how to manage the ecology, rather than creating all species all at once. This would explain common descent, and it would explain the fossil record.

Random mutation would still occur, but the vast majority of mutations are harmful, with only a few being neutral or beneficial. The primary role of natural selection is to weed out most harmful and damaged genes - neutral or rare beneficial changes to genes could remain. There would also be opportunity for new varieties of a particular species or "kind" to develop to take advantage of local or changing conditions, but within limits. Major changes would be designed, developed, and managed by God or by God's angels under God's supervision and direction.

With guided modification and branching, there is no problem with irreducible complexity because God could design all features in a new species that are required to work together all at once. There is no problem explaining punctuated equilibrium either, because God could design and make all the genetic changes to introduce a complete new species suddenly without transitional forms.

But also, guided modification and branching would result in the same evidence of genetic interrelatedness of species and the appearance of simpler forms millions of years before complex forms that evolutionists claim shows evolution through natural forces only.

The main work of building a species is designing the genetic code for that species. It makes more sense to use the code of an existing species and modify it than to design everything from scratch. Computer programmers understand this. Often if a programmer is writing a new computer program, he does not write it from scratch. He starts with code from a similar program and adds any necessary modifications. He may also take building blocks of code which he has used and tested in other, simpler programs and use them to build the new program.

God originally created the earth, not in chaos, but perfect with an atmosphere, oceans, and land areas suitable for life, but without life or with only a simple, primitive form of life. Then over millions of years He developed or guided the development of a huge variety of species, but at a pace that enabled the angels to learn from experience how to manage a growing ecology. God gave Lucifer the job of helping to supervise the angels and coordinate their work in God's service. This earth with its life was a proving ground for Lucifer and the angels who were placed under his supervision, perhaps about a third of all angels (Revelation 12:4).

But at some point in time Lucifer turned against God and began to persuade many angels under his influence also to turn against God. Lucifer, now become Satan, and the angels who joined him in his sin and hostility to God (who became demons) eventually mounted a full scale rebellion against God (Isaiah 14:12-15, Luke 10:18). How long all of this took and what events took place during this time is not revealed in the Bible, but there could have been many events and stages that occurred over millions of years. But eventually, the rebellion of Satan and his demons resulted in the destruction of the

surface of the earth just as the wickedness and violence of mankind resulted in the flood in Noah's day.

Then in six days God repaired the damage to the earth, once again making the surface suitable for life, and directly restored the species that had existed just prior to the destruction. God restored those species by recreating them, directly and all at once, but using the same genetic code that had been developed over millions of years in stages before the destruction.

The state of the earth in Genesis 1:2 cannot be how God originally created the earth. It would make no sense for God to first create the earth desolate, in chaos and confusion, and then clean up the mess and make it a beautiful place. God is not the author of confusion and chaos (1 Corinthians 14:33, Isaiah 45:18). Why would God create the earth that way originally?

But chaos and desolation can be the result of sin, either of the sin of Satan and his demons or the sin of man.

Physical evidence itself seems to show that the earth existed and was populated with life for millions of years.

Guided modification and branching is not evolution. Evolution is the development of species from a common ancestor through natural forces only. Guided genetic modification and branching is a form of intelligent design. It is the intelligent design and development of species by God directly or indirectly through the work of angels over millions of years by modifying the genetic code of existing species to produce new species in a planned, intelligent way. It can explain descent of plant and animal species from a common ancestor over millions of years, not through natural forces only, but through supernatural design and control.

What about man? The Bible is clear that the first man and woman were made on the sixth day of creation about 6,000 years ago. Man did not exist in the world that existed before the destruction and before the renewal of the surface of the earth in six days, although there could be animals that closely resembled man in that earlier world.

Though humans are genetically similar to the great apes, there is a vast difference between human kind and animals. The mind of man is orders of magnitude greater than the minds of even the most intelligent of animals. The Bible says that man was made in the image of God. It does not speak that way of any animal. There is a spirit in man which empowers the human mind beyond what is possible with the physical brain only (Job 32:8, Zechariah 12:1, 1 Corinthians 2:11).

Is the above scenario true or false? It is consistent with physical evidence, and it is consistent with the Bible. I believe it is a better explanation than evolution because it can account for things, such as irreducible complexity, punctuated equilibrium, and the absence of transitional species, that evolution has difficulty with.

In any case, science cannot prove guided modification and branching false as an explanation for the origin of species because its main characteristic that makes it different from evolution is that there was supernatural intervention in modifying the genetic code to produce new species. Otherwise, it would look like evolution in the fossil record and genetic code. And science cannot prove that God's design and intervention was not part of the process that produced new species from old and resulted in the evidence we see today in the fossil record and genetic coding.

CREATION OF SPECIES - PART TWO

WHY EVOLUTION IS A FAITH

How the Scientific Method Prevents Science from Proving Evolution!

Science cannot logically prove that evolution actually happened because the scientific method itself, as actually practiced by science, PREVENTS science from proving that evolution occurred!

As startling as it may seem, the scientific method as practiced by science does not allow science to prove that evolution actually happened and is the way that species came to be on the earth. Actually, I do not think evolution can be proved in any case because I think it is false. But even if evolution were true and could be proved, the scientific method itself does not allow such proof in science.

How can this be?

Evolution can be defined as the belief that life in all its variety came into existence over time through the operation of natural forces only. This is how evolution is taught in public schools.

The opposite belief is the belief that God supernaturally intervened, directly or indirectly, in physical processes to create life in all its variety. Those who believe in divine creation may believe that God's creative power was exercised suddenly or gradually, but nevertheless, there was supernatural intervention that produced life and the species of life. According to this belief, life we see today in all its variety did NOT come into existence only through natural forces.

Although some people, in their personal beliefs, may merge the ideas of evolution with their belief in creation by believing that God guided a kind of evolutionary process, this is not evolution as taught by science and as taught in public schools. Public education

allows for NO supernatural intervention in the development of life. Evolution as taught by science in public schools allows for no influences on the development of life but natural forces only.

Can science prove that evolution happened?

You cannot logically prove something by only looking at one side of an issue. You can only prove something by looking at both sides objectively with an open mind. This is basic.

In order to prove the truth of something logically, you have to look at all sides of an issue without bias. In the case of the issue of the origin of life, to prove logically that evolution as taught by science is the way life actually came into existence, it is not sufficient to prove that evolution is possible. It is not sufficient to prove that evolution can explain all the physical evidence, including the fossil record, the structure and chemistry of living organisms, and genetics. Science must also prove that no other explanation is possible, in other words, that evolution is the ONLY explanation that can consistently account for all of the evidence. In short, science must prove that divine creation never occurred and there were no supernatural causes that brought about the development of life on earth.

If both evolution and creation can explain the evidence, then you have no proof that evolution occurred. That is why supernatural creation must be disproved in order to prove evolution. Proving that evolution is possible is not proving that it happened.

Evolutionists point to physical evidence to try to show that evolution is possible, and they believe that evolution is actually the process by which all the species came into existence. But trying to prove that evolution as a process is possible and may have occurred, and trying to prove that evolution actually happened are two different things. A scientist could show that evolution is possible and may have occurred if he could demonstrate that evolution is consistent with all known evidence. But to prove that it actually did happen he would have to go a step further. He would have to prove that no other explanation is consistent with all the evidence. He would have to show that evolution is the only way life could have come into existence and is the only explanation that fits the evidence. So how could he do that?

The alternative to evolution is creation by God. To prove that evolution must have happened a scientist would have to prove that the evidence cannot be explained by supernatural creation or any creationist explanation. A scientist would have to show that creation cannot explain the evidence and therefore is impossible.

Can science prove that God did not create life in a way that is exactly consistent with the physical evidence? Can science prove that there is no God who has supernaturally intervened in physical processes to create life in all its variety that we see today?

No, science cannot prove that.

Why?

Consideration of Supernatural Causes Not Allowed in Science

To determine if any creationist explanations can account for the physical evidence, you have to consider and evaluate proposed explanations for how supernatural intervention could have resulted in the physical record. You have to consider supernatural causes before you can rule them out according to evidence. But science cannot consider supernatural causes. That is forbidden by the scientific method.

Science cannot examine both sides of the issue without bias, which is required for proof, because science has set limits on itself. Science limits itself to consideration of natural causes only. Science cannot rule out supernatural causes because science cannot examine or consider supernatural causes in order to prove logically that they cannot explain the evidence and therefore could not have occurred. Science can only look at one side of the issue. It cannot examine the other side to either prove or disprove it.

Science is a culture, a community, a process for trying to discover new knowledge, and a way of thinking. It is a way of looking at the world and a way of trying to discover knowledge. The foundation of this community and way of thinking is the scientific method. The scientific method is the only method for investigating questions of science that the scientific community will accept. It is the basis for discussion of scientific issues. Reasoning outside of the scientific method is not allowed in a scientist's work. And a basic premise of the scientific method as practiced by the scientific community is that no supernatural explanation for any physical evidence is even to be considered. In other words, the possibility that there is a God who might intervene in any physical process is excluded in scientific thinking. The scientific method therefore rules out even considering the possibility that God created life and all the species even before any physical evidence is examined. And the scientific method is the only method of investigation a scientist may use in his work.

A recent Nova program I saw on PBS entitled, "Judgment Day, Intelligent Design on Trial," described a trial involving the Dover school board in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania over the issue of whether or not intelligent design is science and may be taught as science in the public schools. Irreducible complexity was used as an argument to support the idea that there is scientific evidence that life came about through intelligent design, not evolution. This program describes intelligent design as promoted by Discovery Institute and quotes from a pro-intelligent design book entitled, "Darwin on Trial" by Phillip E. Johnson. On December 20, 2005 the court made its decision that intelligent design is not science.

What I found especially significant in this program were statements made about attempts to introduce supernatural causes into science. One speaker said, "With the scientific revolution, the work of Galileo, Newton, and others banished supernatural explanations from science." A pro-evolution speaker also said, "...when you loosen the walls around what is science and permit the supernatural, permit deities, you are really destroying what makes science so vitally important to the progress that our civilization has witnessed over the last four or five hundred years, you're going back to before the scientific revolution, and that's a pretty scary thing."

Ask any scientist, "In your work with other scientists and in your scientific writings, can you suggest supernatural causes for the evidence you examine in your work? Would that be accepted in the scientific community as a valid explanation for the evidence?" The answer would be, no. Why? Supernatural explanations are never accepted according to the scientific method as practiced by the scientific community. Science NEVER considers supernatural explanations for evidence.

Science requires that scientific theories be empirically testable and be based on multiple observation, often in the form of controlled, repeatable experiments. This alone excludes consideration of supernatural causes for physical evidence. The intervention of God is not subject to repeatable experiment. God chooses when and how to intervene in physical processes, and such choices are not predictable in their details.

Science has intentionally put examination of the possibility of supernatural causes for physical evidence outside of its field of study.

In science, the scientific method is the lens through which all physical evidence is evaluated. The scientific method is the basis for all reasoning that scientists are expected to employ in their work as scientists. Reasoning outside of the scientific method is not allowed. This approach, when applied to the origin of things, denies even the possibility of a creator God before any evidence is even examined. One who adopts this method in exploring the origins of things has no choice but to search only for physical explanations for any evidence he finds. The scientific community is made up of hundreds of thousands of scientists who spend their whole lives evaluating physical evidence and proposing explanations from this point of view. Millions of man-years have been expended to explain fossils, radio carbon dating, DNA, etc. from an evolutionary point of view.

Scientists and science teachers may challenge those who believe in creation to explain some point of physical evidence, such as radiocarbon measurements, fossils, or evidence regarding the rate of genetic mutations, and say to a believer in creation, perhaps a young student, "How can you explain this apart from evolution?" Then the student or believer in creation is expected to come up with an alternative explanation in the next couple of seconds or the teacher may say, "See, there is no explanation apart from evolution, therefore this proves that evolution is true." But that is not logical. If a student does not think of an alternative explanation, that is not proof that there is no explanation. To be fair, not only should the student have an equal number of years to explain the evidence

according to intelligent design, the same number of years scientists have had to explain it according to the theory of evolution, but the student would need access to the original physical evidence itself as well as the equipment and training needed to examine the evidence, not just published reports of the evidence after it has been selected and interpreted by those who accept and practice the evolutionary faith.

The point is, the whole field of study of the physical evidence in life and in the earth is dominated by a community of scientists who are biased right from the beginning of their education and training against belief in a creator God who can intervene in natural processes, and therefore their conclusions and explanations are untrustworthy. To use an analogy, if this were a court case, if a prospective jury member had such a degree of bias one way or another, he could rightly be dismissed from being on the jury.

Science behaves as if God and the supernatural do not exist. But science has never proved that God and the supernatural do not exist or that God has never intervened miraculously in physical processes. This is an assumption without proof.

Science excludes the consideration of supernatural causes from its studies of physical processes. The supernatural is strictly beyond the scope of science.

Yet excluding consideration of supernatural causes is not proof that there are no supernatural causes. Indeed, some scientists do believe in a creator God who created the universe. But those scientists keep those beliefs out of the scientific work they do that is accepted by the scientific community and is taught in the public schools. They do not propose in the work they do and papers they write that the cause of certain evidence is supernatural intervention. That is not allowed by science. And if a scientist does propose supernatural explanations for physical evidence, such explanations are kept out of science teachings in the public schools.

Science cannot prove evolution happened because you cannot prove which of two explanations is true by only examining one of them, and the scientific method does not allow consideration of supernatural causes. It therefore cannot prove by examination that creation did not occur. And if the evidence can be equally explained by both evolution and creation, then both are possible and neither is proved.

Some evolutionists claim that the evidence "points to" evolution, not creation. But evidence, apart from interpretation, never points to anything, and the character of the interpretation is influenced by the bias of the person doing the interpreting.

Evolutionists will talk about the evidence pointing to this or that explanation, as if evidence can interpret itself. Saying that evidence points to something leaves out the process of human interpretation and understanding. Evidence is mindless. It does not come with labels attached indicating the cause of the evidence. Evidence means nothing, says nothing, points to nothing, until it is interpreted by the human mind. The evidence itself is always neutral. But when scientists examine evidence, they interpret it. The

interpretation is the product of the human mind. And if the reasoning process of the mind of the person who interprets the evidence is faulty, the conclusions will be faulty.

To say that evidence points to a conclusion about a cause is a figure of speech. It is the mind of man that interprets the evidence and points to a possible explanation.

How does a scientist interpret evidence? There is a creative process and a critical process. In the creative process, the scientist invents ideas about what could have caused the evidence to exist. In the critical process, the scientist tests those ideas, tries to find flaws in them, and the ideas that stand up under scrutiny are the ones that have potential to be right. Those ideas that cannot be broken during the critical process are ones most likely to be suggested as the true cause of the evidence. And then a scientist might say that the evidence points to a certain cause. But it is his mind and the explanations his mind invents and accepts that point to a possible cause. Sometimes the creative process and critical process can occur in the human mind in such rapid succession that the scientist may not even be aware of it. The conclusion may seem to jump out at him instantly. Nevertheless, interpretation comes from the mind, not the evidence.

Why are supernatural causes never considered by scientists? Scientists do not in the course of their work as scientists invent ideas for supernatural explanations as they do for natural explanations. Supernatural explanations never make it to the critical thinking stage because they are not produced in the creative process. They are ruled out as unacceptable without examination. The bias in science against God is absolute. All thinking is based on the assumption that God does not exist as a being who creates or intervenes in natural processes.

One person told me that evidence establishes a model. But this leaves out the human factor. It is not evidence that establishes a scientific model, but a scientist, a living person, who with his mind establishes a model which he thinks is based on the evidence and explains the evidence. It is the human mind that constructs the model. And this is done by examining various hypotheses that can explain the evidence. Before the scientist even writes a description of a model or explanation on paper, he rehearses possibilities in his mind. This is part of the mental process. He may quickly consider and rule out several ideas in his mind before seriously considering one or a few explanations. He has to use his imagination first to construct explanations, and then he uses critical thinking to try to tear down his explanations, and whichever ones can stand up to this critical process become viable explanations for the evidence. What I am saying is that a scientist in his work never constructs supernatural explanations, even in the imagination stage - supernatural explanations never make it to first base.

And if the scientist does construct a supernatural explanation, because he personally believes in God, he will almost always be sure to keep it out of his work and his writing unless he is willing to throw away his career.

The Limits of Science

A definition of science is that it is the study of NATURAL phenomena. This is its specialization, and its limitation.

Science has set limits on itself. It chooses not to consider the supernatural in its investigations. It limits itself to consideration of physical causes only.

For atheists, this does not seem like a limitation. Atheists generally do not believe in supernatural causes. They think they do not exist. But that is a choice the atheists make. They cannot prove it logically, and they have no right to try to impose their choice on others.

Science is not wrong to limit itself to examination of physical causes only. This limitation for science has advantages in the investigation of everyday processes. It forces science to do the work of looking for physical causes for physical processes. Science is not equipped to study God and the reasons why God may have created life the way He did. The limitations the scientific method imposes on science are useful for examination of everyday repeatable processes and laboratory experiments.

The scientific method works fine in the laboratory and in investigating everyday processes because God allows the universe to follow the natural laws He has created and does not ordinarily interfere with natural law. He does not make His presence known by constantly intervening in the physical operation of the universe. God wants man to be able to work with matter and energy and to be able to control his environment to a degree, and physical processes need to be predictable for men to understand and work with them. Also, it is not God's will to reveal Himself to mankind at this time in such a way that men cannot deny His existence. At this time, God is giving mankind a free choice about this, and so He stays in the background right now. But that does not mean that God did not create the universe, or life itself. This assumption, that God never intervenes in physical processes, does not work well in explaining how things came into existence in the first place or the past history of how everything came to be the way it is. When scientists use the scientific method in the laboratory, they are using it properly, but when they try to use it to explain the origins of life, they are using it for a purpose to which it is ill suited, and it fails miserably.

Science may be within its limits when it investigates whether evolution is possible or not.

Science exceeds its self-imposed limits when it teaches that evolution is not only possible but that it happened. When evolutionists teach that life came into existence through natural forces only, they are crossing the boundary of science into the realm of faith. There is no logical justification for saying that supernatural intervention never occurred unless you first examine without bias and disprove supernatural explanations for the physical record of life on earth. Science not only has not done that, it cannot do that according to its self-imposed limits of the scientific method.

Some opponents of evolution use the term "intelligent design" to refer to the concept that life shows design by an intelligent being. This is sometimes promoted as a scientific theory without stating who the intelligent designer is. But scientists know that the term "intelligent design" refers to design and creation by an intelligent God. And in the minds of most scientists, to even consider such a possibility as an explanation for physical evidence would be a violation of the scientific method.

Therefore, scientists within the scope of their scientific work and teaching CANNOT accept creation by God or intelligent design. They have no choice but to try to fit all physical evidence into the evolutionary framework. They are required to be biased against creation even before they look at the evidence, and they have no choice but to explain the evidence in evolutionary terms. If a scientist thought he found evidence of creation, he could not even succeed in publishing it in mainstream scientific journals. Although a minority of scientists may personally believe in a creator God who controls and intervenes in the universe, those scientists must keep those personal views out of their scientific work and teaching. And the scientific community as a whole rejects the idea of a creator God. This rejection is based on the community's faith in the scientific method, not on logical proof.

Therefore, science cannot examine whether or not supernatural causes can explain the physical evidence, and thus cannot prove that supernatural causes cannot explain the evidence. Without proof that supernatural causes cannot explain the evidence, there is no proof that there were never supernatural causes for life on earth. And without that, science cannot prove that God did not create life.

If God created life, evolution is false. If science cannot prove that God did not create life, it cannot prove that evolution is true.

This is why the scientific method does not allow evolution to be proved. It does not allow science to examine supernatural causes in order to eliminate them as possible explanations for the evidence. The scientific method does not allow creation by God to be disproved, and thus does not allow evolution to be logically proved.

Since science has put limitations on its methods of investigation and interpretation, it should acknowledge those same limitations in its conclusions. It has restricted itself to examination of physical, repeatable processes only, and it should restrict its conclusions to repeatable processes and not be dogmatic about origins.

Can Science Disprove Creation by God?

If a scientist wants to prove that evolution definitely happened by showing that no creationist explanation is consistent with the evidence, how would he go about doing

that? He has a bigger job than just showing that the physical evidence suggests an earth older than 6,000 years. For one thing, not all creationists believe that the earth is only 6,000 years old; some people, like myself, believe the earth is several billions or at least hundreds of millions of years old, and that life existed on the earth millions of years ago as indicated in the fossil record, but that God nevertheless designed and created life. Even among those who think the earth is only 6,000 years old, many of these people have explanations for the physical evidence consistent with a 6,000 year old earth. A scientist may not agree with these explanations, but can he prove them wrong logically?

How can a scientist prove that intelligent design never occurred? How can he prove that no logical self-consistent creationist explanation for the evidence is possible? To put it another way, how can he prove that every creationist explanation is inconsistent with the evidence? Many or most of those who believe in creation believe in a God who can do anything, create anything out of nothing, change anything, and perform any miracle. How could a scientist prove that such a God did not design and create life and the different species of life outside the normal workings of physical law in a way that is consistent with the physical evidence?

Since such a God is capable of creating any kind of life, at any time and in any way He chooses, there is no question of whether an all powerful God is able to create life the way it appears in the fossil record and in life forms today. The question becomes, why would God choose to create life the way that He did? And that becomes a theological question, which science cannot deal with. Not knowing God's reasons for every choice He makes does not prove that God did not create life.

How could a scientist, following the scientific method, even approach such a problem? The scientific method does not allow for supernatural explanations of evidence. So even if it were possible to prove that the evidence cannot be explained by creation, a scientist could not do it in the course of his work. To do this, he would have to consider, evaluate, and then rule out supernatural explanations for the origin of life. He would have to get involved in theology in order to try to rule out any explanation that God created life in a way consistent with the evidence. He can try to do this as a private individual, but it can't be part of his work, his writing, his publishing, and his teaching as a scientist because the scientific method rules out consideration of supernatural explanations for evidence.

You can't know from scientific experiments and observations what God may have done in the past. You can't use scientific experiments to prove that God did not create life. The best a scientist can do is to try to show that evolution is possible, but he can't prove it actually happened. And I personally do not believe that evolution is even possible.

Some evolutionists say there they do not believe God exists because they see no evidence of God. Yet the greatest evidence of God's creative action is the universe itself. The universe shows design choices that have been made to make the universe as it is with the number of dimensions it has, the number and kinds of forces, and the laws of nature that make the universe able to support life. The universe did not create itself. There has to be a Creator.

The fact that these evolutionists deny that this universe is evidence of a Creator shows that their bias against God is real.

Some will say that the evidence points to evolution. This is not true. Evidence does not point to anything apart from human interpretation. And the bias of science prevents any interpretation of evidence other than natural causes.

Evidence alone does not point to anything. It does not come with a handy label attached to it identifying its cause. When a scientist digs up a fossil bone, he does not find a white tag attached to it with neatly printed black letters saying, "killed by an asteroid strike in the North American continent 90 million years ago."

First you discover evidence. Then you interpret it and try to identify the cause. Knowledge of evidence comes before you know what the evidence points to. It is in this step of interpretation that a scientist does not consider the possibility that the evidence was caused by God's intervention in the natural world. So with that interpretation, there will never be evidence of the supernatural from a scientific point of view.

Science NEVER considers the possibility of supernatural causes for the evidence it examines. In his day-to-day work, a scientist in examining evidence does not consider and evaluate supernatural causes for the evidence he is looking at. He only considers natural explanations.

When a scientist examines a piece of evidence, he looks for natural causes. He might have two or three ideas for natural causes for the evidence. He then looks for further evidence that will narrow down the possibilities among possible natural causes. He does not add the possibility in his lab notes or papers he submits to scientific journals, "maybe God caused it supernaturally." And if he has no idea what could have caused it naturally, he simply keeps looking until he finds what he thinks is a plausible natural cause. And if he cannot find any natural cause, the question remains an open issue that scientists claim they will eventually find a natural explanation for, some day.

Science can never see evidence of God's supernatural intervention in the natural world, not because the evidence does not exist, but because the traditions of science prevent science from acknowledging evidence for God's existence and intervention in the universe. Science will always find a way to interpret evidence only according to its pre-conceived bias against God.

Science, with its traditions and scientific method, does not accept the possibility of the design and development of species by God through a process of guided genetic modification and branching, even though that possibility is consistent with all the physical evidence, because science will not accept the possibility of God's existence and intervention.

Evolution Is a Faith

Why do many people believe evolution in the absence of logical proof? I think that for many scientists and educators, evolution is a faith. It is like a religion for them. They believe it because they want to believe it. In this respect, they are like millions of people who believe their religious ideas because they want to. Just as millions of people who practice their traditional religious beliefs and customs find that belief in God and in an afterlife comforts them, so many of those who believe in evolution find comfort in the idea that there is no God who has the authority to tell them how to live their lives and they will never be held accountable by a higher power for what they do in this physical life.

Most people have a built-in bias against God telling them what to do. Some people deal with this by choosing religions that express their own inclinations and opinions, and some deal with this by denying the existence of God altogether. The theory of evolution, as a faith, despite its lack of logical proof, enables those who believe in it to believe that there is no God who intervenes in human affairs and has the authority to tell men how to live.

One might define "faith" as a strong belief in something without objective physical evidence and proof that can be seen and examined, especially in regard to religious thought. The belief, without logical proof, that there is no God who has supernaturally intervened in physical processes to create life, would certainly fall into that definition. It is not a religious faith, actually. It is an anti-religious faith. And in the educational system and scientific community, the majority who practice this faith are in a position of power and influence that enables them to put enormous pressure to conform upon those who do not want to accept this faith.

There is a problem with the way evolution is taught in the schools. Though it is called a theory, it is not taught just as a possibility of how life and all the species might have come into existence. It is taught as fact, as the way life actually came to be. One of the principles that the scientific community claims to follow is that for a theory to qualify as scientific, it should be considered provisional or tentative, admitting that it might not be correct rather than asserting certainty. Yet that is not how evolution is taught. Evolution is presented in the classroom and textbooks as a certainty. No room is allowed for doubt about whether evolution actually occurred or not. Yet evolution is unproved and unprovable. What is happening is that the scientific and educational communities are trying to impose their faith in evolution upon their students. And in many cases they are succeeding.

Evolutionists can become quite vehement in their defense of their faith in evolution, and many of them become offended or angry if you call evolution a faith and unproven. But they are being emotional, not logical. In science, the only way you can know something is true is to prove it, and the only way you can prove something by the physical evidence

is to show that your explanation covers all the facts and that no other explanation can explain all the facts, which science never attempts to prove with evolution.

To rule out creation or intelligent design, an evolutionist would have to show that no creationist explanation is consistent with the evidence. If he cannot do that, then he would have to be content merely to acknowledge that evolution is one possible explanation for life, but not the only one. But if he takes that route, he is in conflict with how evolution is actually taught in schools. It is not taught as a possible way life may have come into existence, it is taught as the only way, the one way, the way it definitely happened.

No scientist in his work or his private writings has ever proven that God did not create the species of life. And if God did create the species, then evolution is false.

Those who believe in evolution have made a choice to believe something they cannot prove from physical evidence, whether they realize it or not. Evolution has never been proved. It is a faith held by those who choose to believe it.

Evolution is a faith taught in the public schools. It is a faith that God has not intervened in the past in physical processes to create life in all its variety.

Are the Evils of this World Evidence Against God's Existence?

Some atheists reason that there cannot be a God because of the suffering in the world. They reason that if God exists and He is good, He would not allow the wars, the injustice, the poverty, and the general suffering of mankind that occurs on this earth. But this is short-sighted. God is allowing mankind to experience lessons that show that the way of man, cut off from God, leads to suffering and destruction. God has a purpose and a plan, and this plan is revealed in the Bible, as I have shown in my book, *The True Gospel and the Ezekiel Warning*. This physical life is temporary, and God has a plan for teaching mankind lessons, lessons that will bring benefits for all eternity, and the suffering of this life is part of that plan. It will work for good in the end. But the atheist is unwilling to trust in the goodness and wisdom of God and will not look to the Bible for answers with an open mind.

The suffering in this world may be the atheists' excuse for denying God's existence. I do not think it is the real reason. I think the idea that there is a God who has authority to tell them how to live their lives is personally distasteful to them, and denying God's existence helps them feel free of that authority.

The Bible reveals God's plan for mankind, and God helps those who are willing to believe and obey Him to understand the Bible. Though God allows us to suffer many evils in this life, that suffering will work good in the end, to teach us lessons that will last for eternity, and to test us. Paul writes in Romans 8:18-39 that the suffering in this life is not worthy to be compared with the glory will be revealed after this age. God permits us to suffer just as a loving father disciplines his children for their long-term good.

The seven day week is a model of God's seven thousand year plan for mankind (2 Peter 3:8). Just as the seventh day, the weekly Sabbath of rest from the burdens of the work week, follows the six days of labor, so a one thousand year period of peace and happiness will follow six thousand years of war and suffering. God has allotted mankind six thousand years to be cut off from His rule and to write the lesson in human suffering that man's ways cut off from God only leads to suffering and death. Then Christ will return to rule the earth for one thousand years and teach mankind God's law and way of life (Revelation 20:1-4), and God's rule will bring peace and happiness to the earth. Then men can compare the history of the six thousand years of man's self-rule with the one thousand years of God's rule and see which way is best.

God says in His word that He is a God of love, mercy, righteousness, justice, wisdom, and power, but the atheist is not willing to believe that. It takes faith in God's righteousness and truthfulness to believe Him and trust His plan for mankind, and the atheist is not willing to trust that God knows what He doing and has mankind's best interest at heart.

God has far more wisdom than man, and God requires that we trust Him even when we do not understand every reason for God's judgments (Isaiah 55:8-9).

There are answers to the question of why God allows suffering. But science cannot examine that question because it limits itself to the study of natural causes only and cannot look at questions about God and His ways.

An atheist may conclude there is no God because of the suffering in this world, and that conclusion may drive his decision to believe in evolution. But that is not science. That reinforces my point, that within the discipline of science, one cannot prove that there is no God who intervenes in physical processes or that evolution is true. Any reasoning a person might use about the existence of God goes outside of science, into philosophy or theology. And since it is not part of science, it is hidden from students in the science classroom. Students are taught that evolution occurred through natural forces only, but they are not told that the reason evolutionists are certain of this is that they think God is ridiculous or that the suffering of this world shows that God does not exist. They are only told the conclusion, evolution, but not the real reasons behind the conclusion.

So atheists and evolutionists use science and the scientific method as a shield and a cover for the real reasons they believe in evolution.

My point is, you have to go outside the role of scientist and outside the scientific method to even begin to explore the issues involved here. Science has never explored the issue of God's existence in light of the suffering that exists on earth. It can't. It doesn't want to. It shouldn't.

Individual scientists can study this on their own and reach their own private conclusions, but that is not part of their work and teaching as scientists.

The problem is that science teaches evolution as fact without examining the evidence that a believer in God might present for the existence and intervention of God. Why is that wrong? The problem is not that it doesn't examine theological issues of "why does God allow suffering?" The problem is that science doesn't acknowledge that such an examination is necessary to refute the evidence a believer of God might present to show God exists and intervenes in the physical universe.

Evolutionists can't counter the arguments of those who believe in God within the bounds of science and the scientific method. You have to step outside of science and talk about, "How can an all-powerful, all-benevolent God allow so much suffering? Therefore, since there is no answer, there must be no God." That may be philosophy, and theology might offer an explanation, but it is not a science question.

The problem is that the unspoken reasoning of evolutionist writers and teachers that the suffering in the world is evidence for them that there is no God is never openly discussed or put on the table for students to examine themselves. This is important, because many of those students and their families have considered that same issue, "why does God allow suffering," and reached a different conclusion. They believe that suffering is not evidence against the existence of God.

There are hidden reasons, having nothing to do with science, why evolutionists believe in evolution, and these reasons are not openly acknowledged to students in the classroom so they can decide for themselves if they agree with them or not.

Teachers and advocates of evolution in public school classrooms should acknowledge that their teaching of evolution through natural causes only as definite fact is partially based on their belief that there is no God who intervenes in physical processes. This would be a way of laying the biases of science on the table, which now are partially hidden. It would help to clarify in the minds of the students the limitations of science and the scientific method.

Evolution as Taught in the Public Schools Is Unconstitutional

Evolution is a science issue, but it is also a religious issue and an issue of constitutional law.

The Constitution forbids government and its agencies from promoting religious beliefs or interfering in the free exercise of religious beliefs. In other words, as the courts have interpreted the First Amendment, the government should be neutral in regards to particular religions and religion in general. It should not take a stand for or against any religious belief. But government supported schools are certainly not neutral in the science classroom.

Evolution is taught as fact, as something that is definitely true, as what actually happened to bring the species into existence. It is not taught just as a possibility. It is taught as a fact in public schools, whether the words "fact" or "proved" are actually used or not. It is taught as if it is known to be true. Also, evolution as taught in the public schools allows no possibility of supernatural intervention by God to bring the species into existence. It is strictly natural forces only.

In the minds of the students, this implies that science thinks it has proved that evolution definitely happened. Yet to prove evolution you have to show that it is the only reasonable explanation that can account for the physical evidence. The scientific method does not allow science to show this. The best it can do is try to prove that evolution is possible. But to prove it happened, it has to rule out the alternative, creation or intervention by God.

In other words, if both evolution and creation can explain the fossil and genetic evidence, then both are possible and neither is proved or disproved. If that is the case, then it is dishonest for science to teach students that they know it happened since they cannot logically prove it.

Can science show that creation is impossible, that it is not consistent with the evidence? Science has never proved that and cannot prove it because the scientific method does not allow examination and evaluation of supernatural explanations for evidence. So it cannot look at both sides, which is logically required for proof. ***The scientific method and the traditions of the scientific community do not allow science to even consider the possibility of creation as an explanation for the evidence long enough to rule it out!***

Evolution is taught in the public school classroom as fact even though it cannot be proved. The reason it cannot be proved is that science by its own traditions and rules cannot consider possible supernatural explanations for evidence in order to examine both sides of the evolution-vs.-creation controversy without bias, which would be required for honest proof. You cannot prove something rationally by only looking at one side of an

argument, and the scientific community does not allow itself to look at the possibility of intelligent design or creation by God.

Evolution as taught in the public schools includes the belief that all species came into existence through natural forces only. Yet it is impossible to prove that God did not guide the process.

Evolutionists will agree that you cannot prove the non-existence or non-intervention of God, but they will reply that you cannot prove that "flying spaghetti monsters" do not exist either. What they are really saying is that the idea of God is ridiculous and should not be considered, just as the idea of a flying spaghetti monster is ridiculous.

That is how they view belief in God. To them, it is ridiculous. And they can be very militant about this. I think that what is happening is that deep down where they won't admit it to themselves they know that their position cannot be supported by logic, but they don't want to give up what they believe. So they attack with ridicule those who challenge them. Their belief in evolution is a subjective, chosen belief system not based on physical proof, but they won't admit it. Probably, they do not want to believe in God because they do not want to believe that they will be held accountable for what they do by a God who has the authority to tell them how to live their lives.

And this is really the bottom line of evolution. The idea that belief in God is ridiculous is the hidden assumption behind evolutionary thinking that allows science to teach the belief that species came into existence through natural forces only.

The real problem is that this assumption is not openly acknowledged in the public school classroom.

Evolution is a faith. It is a belief based on subjective personal choice, the choice to believe that God is ridiculous, but not on proof based on physical evidence that can be seen and examined. It has never been logically proved to have occurred, and cannot be proved by science using the scientific method. It is not a religious faith, but in a sense it is an anti-religious faith. It is a faith that there is no creator God who has intervened in physical processes to create species. As such, it is a faith that directly contradicts the Bible and the religious beliefs of many students and parents of students in public schools. Many parents teach their children their family religious beliefs and traditions, and the public, government supported schools teach a faith directly contradictory to those family religious traditions. This is not the neutrality in religious matters that the Constitution requires of the government.

In effect, the way evolution is taught in public schools violates the First Amendment rights of parents and students by seeking to indoctrinate students in a faith contrary to their own religious faith. This violates the clause that says that government cannot prohibit the free exercise of religious beliefs.

If evolution could be logically proved as true, then it might be constitutional to teach it as truth in the public schools. But science cannot prove evolution to be true, and therefore evolution is a faith, something believed by the choice of the believer without physical proof. And it is a faith that is directly contradictory to the faith of the parents of students and the students themselves who believe in the God of the Bible, and that is prohibited by the Constitution.

The best science can say, if it is honest, is that evolution is science's best explanation for how life might have arisen naturally if God did not create life supernaturally. But science cannot prove that evolution actually happened.

If the theory of evolution was taught in public schools only as a possible way the species of life could have arisen, it might be constitutional. But when evolution is taught as the way species definitely did arise and that supernatural intervention never occurred, it becomes a faith and unconstitutional. And that is exactly the way it is taught in science classes in all or almost all public schools. Students are taught that evolution happened.

Students need to clearly be told the limitations and biases of science and the unproven assumptions that evolution is based on. They need to be told that evolution is only science's best explanation for the evidence assuming there has been no supernatural intervention in physical processes by God. Evolution is based partly on that assumption, and that should be made clear in the classroom.

If students were told that the teachings of science about the origins of life are limited to consideration of natural causes only, and that science cannot consider, evaluate, *or disprove* supernatural explanations for life, that might help to make it constitutional. But to the best of my knowledge, that is seldom if ever the practice in public schools.

The origin of species is not just an issue of science. It is an issue of religion, and it is an issue of constitutional law which guarantees freedom of religious beliefs in this country. In teaching that species came about through natural causes only, science is indirectly trying to establish a monopoly on the exploration of the origin of species, and it does it by denying the validity of God and the supernatural. Science limits itself, which is fine, but tries to impose that limitation on the whole question of the origin of species, which is not fine. Religion can also study that issue, and science does not have the legal right to say that only science's conclusions are correct. Natural explanations are not the only explanations that can be true, and the scientific method is not the only valid means for discovering truth.

Science can rightly limit itself to the study of natural causes only. Studying natural processes is science's rightful specialty, and it is what science is equipped for. Science can rightly qualify what they teach in the schools by teaching evolution as science's best explanation for life IF there are no supernatural causes. Science doesn't do that. Science says, "Species evolved through natural causes only." Period.

The teaching of evolution as fact in the public school classroom is based on the unspoken belief of hard-core evolutionists that belief in creation by God is ridiculous and therefore does not need to be disproved in order to prove that species evolved through natural forces only. But millions of Americans do not think belief in God is ridiculous, and they rely on the Constitution to protect their rights to practice their beliefs and pass their beliefs on to their children. And science is not up front about this in the classroom or in public discussion about evolution, unless backed into a corner. When science teaches students that life came through natural causes only, students are not told that supernatural causes need not be considered because belief in God is ridiculous. They are shown the conclusion without being clearly shown the biased premise that is part of the foundation for that conclusion.

Conclusion

I am not a scientist. I understand the concepts and general principles of science, but I lack the detailed knowledge of biology and paleontology. I know that the scientific community has a culture of bias against consideration of God's creative design. I know that science cannot rationally prove that such intelligent design did not occur, no matter what the details are in the fossil and genetic record. The bias of science is made obvious by its claim that species came into existence through natural forces only in spite of the fact that science cannot disprove creation or guidance from God. It is also made obvious to anyone who has tried to debate the issue with evolutionists by the emotional hostility and ridicule evolutionists use to block rational discussion.

I know that a minority of scientists do not believe in evolution and claim that the fossil record actually *disproves* evolution by the absence of transitional forms. These scientists claim that, rather than show the gradual transition from one species to another, fossils show the sudden appearance and long periods of stability of species. Transitional fossils, which should appear if evolution is true, simply are missing, they say.

I have heard many reports, as many of you have, that the scientific community is very harsh towards scientists who do not accept the doctrine of evolution, that scientists, educators, and journalists who speak against evolution are persecuted and their careers sometimes damaged or destroyed by evolutionists for disagreeing with the majority opinion. Based on my own experience in blogs and forums trying to hold rational discussions of these issues with evolutionists, I believe these reports. The hostility and bias is real.

Public schools teach that all species, including the human race, came into existence through natural forces only. But this has never been proved, nor can it be proved by science. If God intervened to create the species or guide their development, then evolution as taught in public schools is not true. Science has never proved, nor can it prove, that God has not intervened supernaturally to produce the species that exist.

Evolutionists often say that evolution is a fact and that the physical evidence points to evolution, not creation. But evidence, without human interpretation of the evidence, points to nothing. Evidence must be interpreted before it points to any conclusion, and if the person doing the interpreting is biased in his interpretation, then his conclusions cannot be trusted. When science interprets evidence, it does so from the worldview that there is no God who intervenes in physical processes. Under those circumstances, the scientist will always interpret the evidence to point to evolution through natural causes only. But that interpretation is not necessarily valid.

Science cannot prove evolution occurred because the scientific method, as practiced by science, does not allow consideration of supernatural causes, so the alternative to evolution, creation, can never be examined by science to see if it is consistent with the evidence. Science cannot prove or disprove creation because it cannot consider creation. It limits itself to consideration of natural causes only when examining evidence. It cannot rule out creation, and it cannot look at both sides without bias, which is a condition for honest, rational proof.

To prove that the species of life came into existence only through natural forces only, which is exactly what evolution claims, you have to prove that God did not create the species and there was no supernatural, intelligent intervention in the design of species. Science has never done that and cannot do that. The scientific method does not allow science to examine honestly and without bias the creationist point of view, and thus science cannot disprove it.

When evidence is interpreted without bias and the person doing the interpreting is willing to consider both evolution and intelligent design without bias, the evidence does NOT point to evolution more than to creation or intelligent design.

There is no inconsistency between the physical evidence and the Bible account of creation. According to a literal understanding of Genesis, the earth existed before the six days of creation and could have existed, filled with life, for hundreds of millions of years. There are reasons why God may have developed the design of the species over millions of years consistent with the fossil record and the genetic code.

At some point after that, a disaster came to the earth, destroying the surface of the earth and putting the earth into darkness. Then in six days God renewed and refreshed the surface of the earth, repairing the damage, and restoring the species that had existed previously.

Evolution as taught in public schools is a kind of faith. It is a faith in the sense that it is a belief system chosen for subjective reasons not subject to physical proof. Those who believe it do so because they choose to believe it, not because they are able to prove it logically. It is a theory based on the belief, unproved, that there is no God who intervenes in physical processes and who has created the earth, the universe, life on this earth, and our human minds. That is their choice. But the educational system has

adopted that choice and faith and tries to impose it on those who pass through the educational system, and to do this it has to package evolution, not as faith, but as science and as proven fact.

This issue is bigger than science. It is a scientific issue, but it is a religious issue and a legal issue as well. Science does not have a monopoly on the study of the origin of species, and science does not have the right to impose its "natural causes only" limitation on the study of this issue.

Students who are seeking truth about the origin of species should examine both sides without prejudice and make their own decision about what to believe, even if their science teachers are not willing to do the same thing.

CONTACT INFO AND PERMISSIONS

As author of this article, I have placed it in the public domain. It may be freely copied and distributed.

Comments are welcome and may be sent to author@ptgbook.org.

This is version 1.02, published April 2011.

LINKS OF INTEREST

The website for this article is:

<http://www.ptgbook.org/creationofspecies.htm>.

You can read the latest version of this article online and download this article in .pdf format from this site.

The True Gospel and the Ezekiel Warning is a full-length book that explains what the true gospel is and what the Bible teaches about major religious doctrines. This book also explains the identity of the United States and other English-speaking nations in Bible

prophecy and it shows what prophecy says is just ahead. It also discusses the evolution vs. creation controversy and shows how God views our materialistic society. This book, like this article, is free and in the public domain. You can read it online or download a copy in .pdf format. You can browse this book online or download it from:

<http://www.ptgbook.org/truegospelandezekielwarning.htm>.