

# A 14 billion (or 6,000) year old debate

## Devil's Advocate

Brian Burgess  
Managing Editor

Most people dislike evolution out of self interest. If evolution had thought and could judge us by its general standards most of us would be dead. This somewhat dark realization, however, does not make evolution false.

Religion gives many people answers that make them feel good, and because of this it is often unquestioned. Evolution illuminates certain hard truths about us that make us uncomfortable which leads to outright rejection by many. It is important to clarify many of the illusions propagated by the religious on evolution to show why I and many free thinking individuals support the pursuits of science over the claims of dogma.

Potentially the most important note on evolution one can make is that it, unlike religion, can undergo huge changes and adaptations as data that contradicts something previously believed is found. Religion does not allow this kind of growth. Instead it sinks its feet into the silt bed of an ever growing stream of knowledge that shows not only the low probability of God's existence, but also just how useless he would be to us regardless.

This stream is often battled with what's called the straw man fallacy. The straw man is the creation of a similar, yet weaker, argument than is originally made, and then refuting it. Examples of straw men in the Christian rejection of evolutionary theory are things such as, "If we came from monkeys, why are there still monkeys?" or, "If we were ten feet closer to the sun we'd burn up! God is great!"

The problem is that these claims are made from a repulsively obvious lack of understanding of what they are rejecting. We happen to be a different species of a large number of varying types of "monkeys", and if ten feet closer to the sun makes us burn, skyscrapers would melt.

What's worse is that because evolutionary theorists would not be so audacious as to claim to have all the answers (yet), people tend to fill the blanks with God. This is yet another logical fallacy: Ad Ignorantium (Thanks Dr. Bringle!). This fallacy states that just because one side is lacking certain evidence, the other side must be true.

To say that God must exist because scientists can't give an all encompassing answer as quickly as religion (which in itself is as suspicious as a team with 3G who knows all the answers at trivia, ahem Snow Leopards) is utterly preposterous. Indeed, I would hope that any answer of that magnitude would be tediously looked over and tested to exhaustion.

The religious will gladly ignore evolution to preserve their ego and money laundering institutions, yet run to their doctor to get vaccines that would not be possible without our understanding of evolution. In fact if it weren't for evolution we wouldn't have many of the medical practices and understandings we now have. I think that warrants some respect.

It is important to note that evolutionary theory does not take the stance that God does not exist. It simply has found no evidence to suggest he does. On the day that evidence is found I can personally promise that every thinking Atheist will call their mulligan and repent. But until that day I will continue to put my faith in results rather than rules.

## Voice of Reason

Bryan Koffman  
Contributor

"By faith we understand that the universe was created by the word of God, so that what is seen was not made out of things that are visible." Hebrews 11:13

God is not against science - that is, good science. If God created the universe for his glory and so that men would seek after him (Rom. 1:20), it should not be opposed to him, nor should it bear false witness against him. The problems between God and science ensue, not because the natural world is incompatible with God, but because the interpretation of nature (science) or the interpretation of God (theology) is incorrect. The problem is bad theology or bad science.

Though some theories are more legitimate than others, Christians are allowed to have various views on the methods of creation; this is a secondary or "open-handed" doctrine, one that should be studied and lively debated in a spirit of love, but not one that we divide over (primary or "close-handed" doctrines). From literal 6-day creationists to theistic evolutionists, the spectrum is large and inclusive.

But one thing that we cannot deny Biblically, and I would argue scientifically as well, is that God did it. This means naturalistic evolution - evolution that is solely attributed to nature, with no help from God - is entirely false. Not surprisingly, many scientists are coming to this conclusion as well, including the head of the Human Genome Project, Dr. Francis Collins.

Here are some major problems with Naturalistic macro-evolution:

- It purports that nothing made everything. This is particularly strange when renowned theoretical physicist Steven Hawking writes, "Almost everyone now believes that the universe, and time itself, had a beginning at the big bang." So our origin is essentially miraculous, yet God-less.
- It purports that chaos made order, contradicting the 2nd law of thermodynamics. On this Hawking comments, "The odds against a universe like ours emerging out of something like the big bang are enormous. I think there are clearly religious implications." He also admits, "It would be very difficult to explain why the universe would have begun in just this way except as the act of a God who intended to create beings like us."
- It purports that impersonal matter made personal humanity. In a naturalistic worldview, all our feelings, emotions, and thoughts are merely the crashing together of atoms. Love, compassion, and beauty are merely illusions.
- It purports to be unbiased science, when leading scientists repeatedly make statements like Nobel laureate George Wald's: "Spontaneous generation was disproved one hundred years ago, but that leads us to only one other conclusion, that of supernatural creation. We cannot accept that on philosophical grounds; therefore, we choose to believe the impossible: that life arose spontaneously by chance!" (Read Romans 1:18-25.)

Naturalistic macro-evolution says that we come from no one, we exist for no cause, and when we die we go nowhere, yet somehow, out of that, we're supposed to create a meaningful and purposeful life. Renowned atheistic philosopher Bertrand Russell summarizes this worldview by saying, "...only on the firm foundation of the unyielding despair, can the soul's habitation henceforth be safely built." I joyfully disagree.

The truth is we have been created in the image of a loving God, and have been given dignity, honor, value, and purpose. And that God has come into his creation as the God-man Jesus Christ to save us from being merely part of the Circle of Death - cause it doesn't end in life.

## This space for rent!

For advertising rates and more information,  
visit us online:  
[www.brevard.edu/clarion](http://www.brevard.edu/clarion)