

INTELLIGENT DESIGN

AND THE

CREATION OF SPECIES

Introduction

In this article, I want to talk about the issue of evolution, intelligent design, and the creation account in Genesis.

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 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 choice to believe it. It cannot be proved by science, and I will explain why.

I will also suggest a way that the Bible account can be reconciled with the fossil evidence and suggest one possible explanation for why life may have appeared gradually 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 life immediately in a short time if He wants, would take a long time to create all the species that have existed and why there appears to be imperfections in the species that have existed. I offer a possible explanation for this.

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, was 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 of the positions of the other bodies in the solar system in preparation for the creation of Adam and Eve.

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.

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".

Herbert W. Armstrong published a number of articles and booklets that take a detailed look at certain particular species and their characteristics and ask, "How could these characteristics have evolved gradually?"

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 his beak, then getting the insects that are inside with his 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 published by the Church when Mr. Armstrong was alive involves 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.

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. But I have read of no explanation as to HOW this could occur.

I believe there is 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, 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, 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 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 logical flaws, 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.

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

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.

Science is a culture, a community, a process for trying to discover new knowledge, and a way of thinking. 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 that 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 on the earth, even before any physical evidence is examined. And the scientific method is the only method of investigation a scientist may use in his work.

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.

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 for a purpose to which it is ill suited, and it fails miserably.

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.

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.

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.

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 to them.

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 another problem with evolution, and that is the way it 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.

Evolution cannot be proved by science. The scientific method itself rules out such proof.

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 creation by God.

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. 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 (which evolution does not) and that no other explanation can explain all the facts (which evolution never attempts to prove).

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.

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 that 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, and do it 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 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.

So 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.

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.

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 gradually 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.

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

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.

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.

Why God may have Created Life Gradually

In this section, I want to speculate on a possible explanation, consistent with a literal understanding of Genesis, for the gradual appearance of life 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 life that appeared gradually 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 on earth, why would He create it gradually 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 life gradually, 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. 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.

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. 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 a 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 descendents 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 animal 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 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, 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 life even gradually over hundreds

millions of years. And if they cannot prove that God did not create 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 gradually 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.

Conclusion

Evolution, though it is taught in schools as fact, has never been proved by science. It CANNOT be proved by science, because you cannot prove the truth of any controversy by only looking at one side, and science does not and cannot look at the creationist point of view objectively. To prove that all life came into existence only through natural forces, which is exactly what evolution claims, you have to prove that God did not create life and there was no supernatural, intelligent intervention in the design of species. Science has never done that and cannot do that.

Therefore, evolution is a kind of faith. 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 a 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.

Evolution has never been proven.

CONTACT INFORMATION AND PERMISSIONS

This article may be freely printed, copied, or emailed. As author, I have placed it in the public domain. This article can also be found on my website and browsed online or downloaded in .pdf format. The website address for this article is: <http://www.ptgbook.org/creationofspecies.htm>.

Questions and comments are welcome. You may email me at author@ptgbook.org. If I expand or make corrections to this article, you can always find the latest version on the website named above.

This is version 1.02 of this article, published November, 2007.

RELATED WEBSITES OF INTEREST:

Preaching the Gospel is a public domain full-length book I have written that explains how to prove that the Bible is the inspired Word of God, what the true gospel is, and how to preach the true gospel effectively. It also explains what Bible prophecy predicts for the United States and the whole world in the years soon ahead of us. You may browse it or download it from my web site at <http://www.ptgbook.org>.

Evolution Is a Faith is an article that focuses on the point that science cannot logically prove evolution as truth because the scientific method does not allow science to examine and disprove supernatural causes for life. It contains much information from this article, but omits the study of Genesis and speculation about the fossil record. It covers the point about evolution being a faith more thoroughly than this article. Like this article, it is in the public domain. You may browse it or download from the site at <http://www.ptgbook.org/evolutionisfaith.htm>.