

A DAWN PUBLICATION

EVOLUTION VERSUS THE BIBLE

The question we have for discussion at this time is contained in a letter, which reads:

"Dear Friends: In Sunday School I was taught many of the stories of the Bible, including the one in the Book of Genesis concerning the creation of Adam and Eve. their disobedience of divine law, and their being driven out of the Garden of Eden. Now I am in college, and am being told that the Genesis account of creation is not intended to be factual, but is merely an allegory, and that man is in reality a creature of evolution. I have discussed this with my parents and others, and they tell me not to be concerned, that we can believe the Bible and also believe the theory of human evolution. Is this really true? Naturally at this point I am somewhat confused."

We are quite sure that this young man is not alone in facing the problem he presents here. Does the Bible offer a solution? As

you read that letter it raises two main points which call for examination. One is whether or not the theory of human evolution is a true explanation of the origin of man. The other question is whether or not one can believe the Bible and also accept the theory of human evolution. First, let us take a look at the theory of human evolution..

Not being a scientist, I do agree with the many scientists who today are frank to acknowledge that the theory of human evolution is as yet unproven so far as archeological findings are concerned. No less an authority than the late Dr. William Emerson Ritter, who was at one time Professor of Zoology at the University of California. made the observation that the whole battleground of evolution will have to be fought over again, not between scientists and theologians, but between the scientists themselves. This being true, those of us who are not scientists might with profit look into the subject ourselves, especially along lines where a great knowledge of science is not required.

In support of the viewpoint of many of the scientists just mentioned, we might add that Charles Darwin himself, who is given credit for being chiefly responsible for introducing the theory of human evolution to the world, made a very revealing statement. In his

book, "The Origin of Species," he says that in spite of all the efforts of trained observers, not a single change of one species into another is on record. If there is no proof of one species changing into another, then there is no proof of the theory of human evolution.

It is interesting to note in this connection that the Bible account of creation declares the fixity of species. We are informed in the Genesis record of creation that each of the various orders of creation was brought forth "after its kind." Nearly six thousand years later Charles Darwin had to admit that this was true. As we understand it, we should make a distinction between "species" and "varieties."

There are many varieties of each species. Just think of the many varieties of horses and dogs. All one needs to do is to visit a well-stocked zoo to realize how many varieties of each species of animals there really are. These varieties, however, do not evolve into new species. They remain horses, dogs, apes, and monkeys, etc.

Considering the thought, if the theory of human evolution is true, why do we not see the process of evolution going on all around us today? Evolutionists claim that

fish evolved into birds, although, as Mr. Darwin admitted, there is no proof of this. If it were true, why do we not now see fish evolving into birds? Why do we not see creatures which are half fish and half bird wiggling around on the beaches, uncertain as to whether they should dive for the water or attempt to fly? Why did the process of evolution suddenly stop at some point in the dim past? Why did the fish, the birds, and the animals suddenly decide to remain as they were and be content with their lot?

Not being a scientist these are questions that seem very reasonable. Additionally, what about the "missing link" between ape and man for which evolutionists are still searching? The only answer to that question is that the "missing link" is still missing. But why should this be? If there ever was a "missing link," there must have been more than one. There must have been a species of the creatures which were half ape and half man. Since they must have been of a higher order than the ape, why did they not survive, as the ape has survived? Why did these creatures, superior in intelligence to the ape, go out of existence? Why should it be necessary to dig all over the earth in the hope of finding even a single skeleton, or partial skeleton, of one of these so-called "missing links?"

One of the claimed proofs of the theory of evolution is that the general average of intelligence of the human race is increasing. In this connection, the marvelous increase in scientific knowledge and invention is cited. Actually, however, the general level of human intelligence today is not higher than in the past. We have a few wonderful inventors, it is true, but even so most of the fundamental inventions were stumbled upon by chance. However, looking back into the distant past, consider the Great Pyramid of Egypt, the ancient temples with their marvelous architecture, the hanging gardens of Babylon, the superb paintings by ancient artists, and the unsurpassed music of ancient times. These indicate that the basic intelligence of man in past ages was just as high or even higher than it is today.

Scientific knowledge and invention has grown, but this fact is not because of an increase in man's intellectual capacity. The real explanation is that our present increase of knowledge has come by God's design, and in fulfillment of prophecies found in the Bible. The Prophet Daniel foretold this increase of knowledge, and explained that it would lead to much and rapid travel, described by him as a running "to and fro."— Dan. 12:4

The Bible shows that this is in preparation

for the establishment of Christ's kingdom. It started with the invention of the printing press. This has made possible the accumulation and sharing of knowledge, and its being passed on from one generation to another. Man, or shall we say, a few individuals among men, have achieved marvelous things from which we all benefit. Probably people in ancient times, had they had the opportunity, would have been just as adept at pushing buttons, operating computers and other electronic devices, as we are today.

Doubtless that is true. Also, we know that the scientists today are unlocking some of the secrets and powers of nature which, while they can make certain uses of them, they are unable to control or even fully explain. Indeed, the human race could even be destroyed by them. There are certain questions which God asked the Prophet Job, questions to which Job did not know the answer any more than the scientists know the answers today.

"Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge? Gird up now thy loins like a man; for I will demand of thee, and answer thou me. Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare, if thou hast understanding. Who shut up the sea with doors, when it brake

forth, as if it had issued out of the womb? Hast thou commanded the morning since thy days; and caused the dayspring to know his place? Have the gates of death been opened unto thee? or hast thou seen the doors of the shadow of death? Where is the way where light dwelleth? and as for darkness, where is the place thereof? Canst thou lift up thy voice to the clouds, that abundance of waters may cover thee? Who hath put wisdom in the inward parts? or who hath given understanding to the heart?"— Job 38:2-4, 8, 12, 17, 19, 34, 36

JOB ANSWERS THE LORD

"I know that thou canst do everything, and that no thought can be withholden from thee. Who is he that hideth counsel without knowledge? therefore have I uttered that I understood not; things too wonderful for me, which I knew not ... I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee. Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes."— Job 42:2-6

Job was surely wise in recognizing the superior wisdom of the great Creator. Scientists today are still unable to truly answer the questions which God asked Job, such as what is light, and what is darkness? And where does light go when it goes out, and where does the darkness go when the light returns? One of the

questions God asked Job, was, "Who hath put wisdom in the inward parts? or who hath given understanding to the heart?"

That question brings us right back to the Genesis record of creation, where we are informed that God created man in his own image. The possession of the image of God implies wisdom in the inward parts, and an understanding heart. Certainly the lower animals do not possess these qualities, nor has any evolutionist ever been able to explain what brought about this tremendous separation between man and the highest form of lower animal.

This brings us to the second important question in our young student's letter; that is, as to whether or not it is possible or inconsistent, to believe in the theory of human evolution and at the same time to have faith in the Bible as the inspired Word of God.

We do not think it is possible to accept the Bible as the inspired Word of God and at the same time believe in the theory of human evolution. Reasoning on this is based partly on statements made in the New Testament by the great Apostle Paul: "Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all

be made alive." "The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." "The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven." — I Cor. 15: 21,22,45,47

Paul's statement that the first man was made a living soul, and also his reference to Adam as being an earthly creature, are virtually quotations from the opening chapters of the Book of Genesis. Now, if the Genesis record of creation is merely an allegory, or myth, the great Apostle Paul was deceived, and we could have no confidence in any of his teachings. It is evident, then, that the Apostle Paul was not an evolutionist.

In his sermon on Mars' hill, preached to the philosophers of Greece, Paul said that God had made of one blood all nations to dwell on the face of the whole earth, thus emphasizing that man is a direct creation of God, not a creature of evolution. (Acts 17:26) How absolutely true to facts the Genesis record of man's creation really is! In chapter 2, verse 7, we read that "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." We know that this is scientifically correct. Man's body is composed entirely of elements found in "mother earth." What

about the "breath of life" that was breathed into Adam's nostrils?

We certainly know that the air we breathe is the "breath of life." In Leviticus 17:11, we read the "the life of the flesh is in the blood," and now we know that the life-giving oxygen of the air, breathed into the lungs, is carried by the blood to every part of the body. How wonderful that Moses should know this nearly four thousand years ago! A human soul, then, is the entire being made up of the body and the breath of life, rather than a separate entity within the body which can live apart from the body.

More and more of the religious leaders of our day are coming to see the matter in this, the scriptural way. Getting back to the disharmony of the Bible with the theory of human evolution, I think it is also well to note that Jesus, as well as Paul, believed that because of sin, man is a fallen and dying creature. Jesus taught that he would give his life in sacrifice to the sin-cursed and dying human race. Paul taught that Jesus Christ, by the grace of God, tasted death for every man, thus taking the sinner's place in death, and opening the way for a resurrection of the dead.— John 6:51; Heb. 2:9; Acts 24:15

Redemption though Christ and the resurrection of the dead, are the great

foundation themes of the Bible. If the theory of evolution is true, then Christianity has no foundation. In such a case the Bible would be, at best, merely a collection of moral philosophies, plus untrue and deceptive allegories.

Another point. Luke, the physician and writer of the Gospel of Luke, traces the genealogy of Jesus all the way back through the Old Testament to the first man, Adam, whom he mentions by name. Then he affirms that Adam was the "son of God" (Luke 3:23-38) If the theory of human evolution is true, then Luke should have written that Adam was the son, not of God, but of a "missing link."

It is very apparent that the Apostle Paul, as well as Luke, had confidence in the Genesis record of creation, and believed that a man named Adam actually lived, and that he was the first man, the direct creation of God. It was Luke who also recorded the message of the angels on the night Jesus was born:

"Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be unto all people; for unto you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, which is Christ the Lord." (Luke 2:10, 11) If Luke was mistaken with respect to Adam being the Son of God,

then we could have no confidence in what he says concerning the birth of Jesus, and the purpose of his birth. Besides this, if the theory of human evolution is true, then man does not need a Savior, for he is not a fallen creature, but one who is evolving to an ever higher plane of life. This would mean, of course, that Jesus did not come to earth to save mankind from sin and death. The Prophet Isaiah, in a prophecy of Jesus' death, disagreed with this thought:

"He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep, have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth."— Psa. 53:5-7

We would have to agree that this vivid prophecy of the suffering and death of Jesus would be without vital meaning if man is not, as the Bible teaches, a fallen creature, needing redemption from sin and death. It is the death and resurrection of Jesus, as man's Redeemer, that constitutes our real hope of life beyond the grave - life,

through the resurrection of the dead. When we believe what the Bible says concerning the creation and fall of man, we can also accept its assurance that the Creator will, as he has promised, use his mighty power to restore the dead to life. Certainly the One who created life in the first place should be abundantly able to restore life!

That he surely will do. The Apostle Peter assures us of this. Peter refers to the future time of restoration as "times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." (Acts 3:19-21) Thus we see that all God's prophets, whose prophecies are recorded in the Bible, conceded that man is a fallen creature, and foretold his restoration during the coming "times of restitution." Moses was one of God's holy prophets. In a wonderful prayer recorded in the Ninetieth Psalm, we hear Moses rejoicing in the hope of restoration from death:

"Lord, thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God. Thou turnest man to destruction, and sayest, Return, ye children of men."— Psalms 90:1-3

Moses had a beautiful way of describing the resurrection! He speaks of it as the Lord saying, "Return, ye children of men." Isaiah described the resurrection as the "ransomed of the Lord" returning from death. (Isa. 35:10) Jesus said that all in their graves would hear his voice, and come forth. (John 5:28, 29) Paul said that there would be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust. (Acts 24:14, 15) All of these statements in the Bible reveal that man is fallen, a dying creature, and that his only hope of life after death is in the fulfillment of God's promises to restore the dead to life.

To accept this simple fact of divine revelation should do much to give us a settled and abiding faith. It is a faith that bridges the uncertainties of today, and gives us a bright hope for tomorrow - God's tomorrow!

WHAT SOME SCIENTISTS THINK

Many suppose that all scientists are convinced that the theory of human evolution has been definitely established as a fact beyond reasonable controversy. But this is not true. There are scientists who are willing to admit that the theory of human evolution is still unproved. Following are brief statements by some of these:

Prof. Beale, of King's College, London, a distinguished physiologist, said:

"There is no evidence that man has descended from or is, or was, in any way specially related to any other organism in nature, through evolution, or by any other process. In support of all naturalistic conjectures concerning man's origin there is not at this time, a shadow of scientific evidence."

Prof. Virchow, a naturalist of world-wide fame, said: "The attempt to find the transition from the animal to man has ended in total failure. The middle link has not been found and never will be. Evolution is all nonsense. It cannot be proved by science that man descended from the ape or from any other animal.

"Sir William Dawson, an eminent geologist of Canada, said: "The record of the rocks is decidedly against evolutionists, especially in the abrupt appearance of new forms of specific types, and without predecessors ... Paleontology furnishes no evidence as to the actual transformation of one species into another. No such case is certainly known. Nothing is said about the origin of man except what is told in Scripture." Man is a fallen creature, and is not evolving to higher levels of intelligence.

On this point the late Prof. John Arthur Thomson of Aberdeen, a leading evolutionist, frankly admits that: "Modern research is leading us away from the picture of primitive man as brutish, dull, lascivious, and bellicose. There is more justification for regarding primitive man as clever, kindly, generous, and inventive."

Along this line Professors Albert Shepherd and John Seybold Morris, in their "Outline of History," say: "When we open the first page of authentic history we find man in possession of almost all the fundamental inventions. He had learned the art, not only of using tools, but also of making them ... In drawing, painting, and sculpture he had developed a very respectable ability in response to his instinctive desire to express his love of the beautiful ... Such a picture as these earliest records present to us differs in no great essential from life lived today on great areas of the world's surface. How all these inventions and discoveries came about we have no certain knowledge."

Prof. Louis Trenchard More, in his book, "Dogma of Evolution," page 160 says: "The more one studies paleontology [fossils] the more certain does one become that evolution is based on faith alone; exactly the same sort of faith which it is necessary to have when one encounters the great

"mysteries" of religion. The changes that are noted as time progresses show no orderly and no consecutive evolutionary chain and, above all, they give us no clue whatever as to the cause of variation. ... The evidence from paleontology is for discontinuity; only by faith and imagination is there continuity of variation."