

# The Truth of Creation

By Jane Titrud

There is a reason why the Bible begins with the stories of creation and the fall. They are both foundational to understanding God's plan of salvation, which is revealed in the rest of the Scriptures. If there were no creation, for instance, mankind would not be answerable to the Creator. Similarly, if there were no first man and no original sin resulting in death for all mankind (Rom. 5:12), there would be no need for the Son of God to come in the flesh as the second Adam (1 Cor. 15:45, 47) to die for all (2 Cor. 5:14, Heb. 10:12) in order to reconcile the world to God (2 Cor. 5:18, 19) and thereby bring about the hope of eternal life (1 Cor. 15:21, 22, 26).

The opening chapters of Genesis are that important, hence the need to defend them from attack. Evolution is such an attack. Many have become convinced through the teachings of evolution that evolution is a fact, that science is the measure of truth, and that evolution disproves the biblical account of creation. Such ideas pose a very real threat to the gospel so they need to be addressed. The only question is how to best go about doing so.

It would seem helpful to first understand the nature of the problem. One of the reasons evolution has gained such prominence in today's world is that modern science has largely come to be defined in terms of *naturalism*. This is the notion that science must be explained in *natural* terms without any reference to the *supernatural* (i.e., God) or else it is not true science. Since creation requires a *supernatural* Creator, creation science is oftentimes rejected by the world as invalid. Creationists, on the other hand, argue that creation science is not only *real* science but *better* science because evolution is built upon faulty assumptions associated with naturalism. Yet, the scientific method, which involves testable hypotheses, is not well suited to the matter of origins in either case.

When scientists study the here and now, they are primarily concerned with discovering the natural processes involved in how things work today. In order to apply the scientific method successfully in these situations, however, all known variables must be controlled. Outside factors cannot be allowed to influence the outcome of an experiment if it is to be valid. This means that scientists must also assume that not even God will be manipulating the results. Those who believe in creation must make this assumption the same as evolutionists. But, this generally causes no conflict with biblical truth, for even though miracles can happen in everyday situations, they are rare.

Trying to study and explain the origin of all things, however, involves an entirely different set of circumstances. The focus now is no longer on the present but on the past. Also, rather than merely being concerned with *natural* processes, the question now concerns how the universe came to be. Did it come about *naturally* or through a *supernatural* act of special creation? This changes things. Now one *cannot* rule God out of the picture without introducing bias, for an act of creation would require a Creator. At the same time, one cannot conduct direct scientific experiments in the matter because one cannot go back to the beginning. Scientists also have no ability to reproduce the supernatural workings of God, nor are they able to make observations over the long periods of time supposedly involved in evolution. The familiar scientific method used by scientists in the present, consequently, does *not* directly apply to the matter of origins. Instead, the role of science in this realm is limited at best.

Researchers can still conduct experiments and gather data from the world around them to see whether the results *best* fit a scenario consistent with special creation or rather with evolution. It is just that this data must be interpreted. Nature does not directly speak to anyone. When creationists and evolutionists observe and interpret the same data, however, their conclusions differ. This is partly because creationists and evolutionists *begin* with different underlying assumptions. But it is also because they are not even asking the same questions. Creationists believe the Word of God and are, therefore, interested in confirming the original action of God. Evolutionists who are guided by naturalistic assumptions, on the other hand, are not interested in questions about any possible action of

God because most do not believe in God. They are rather interested in trying to explain how the universe came into existence *naturally*. Many Christians have thus come to think of evolution as either a “false science” or “*merely a theory*.” But, there is more to it than that.

People today have lost sight of the fact that science is an extension of philosophy. It begins with assumptions and involves logic just like other forms of reason. Only in the case of origins, the philosophical aspect of science is magnified more than usual because of experimental limitations.

Rather than being a *scientific* “theory,” therefore, evolution is better described in terms of being a *philosophical* “ordering principle”—a “framework” if you will—capable of interpreting and organizing data according to prior beliefs. Ordering principles pertain to the way the mind makes sense out of the information it takes in from the world around us.

Indeed, both creation and evolution are major ordering principles capable of assembling information and ideas into complete world views, and each requires faith. From the standpoint of the beginning, moreover, they basically represent the only two possibilities available with respect to the origin of the universe. That is, either the universe and everything we observe in it is the result of a *supernatural* act of special creation out of nothing, or else the universe came into being as the result of a *natural* event called “The Big Bang,” and natural processes supposedly took over from there.

From “The Big Bang” on, the ability of evolution to organize data around the central theme of naturalism without reference to the Bible is what has given people the impression that it is true. To many, the Bible represents religion—not science. Hence, the more evolution seems to explain, the harder it is to refute. And, many modern scientists make a career out of trying to explain everything in terms of evolutionary philosophy. This even goes beyond the biological and physical sciences to include psychology and various social sciences. Consequently, evolution not only affects one’s view of science, but it also affects lives—which no doubt has been satan’s plan all along.

Human reason also figures into the picture by means of a principle known as “Occam’s Razor.” This principle basically says that one should not multiply explanations for any given phenomenon without warrant—all things being equal, the simplest answer tends to be the right one. Under ordinary circumstances, moreover, this generally represents sound reasoning. If a traffic light fails to work, for instance, it is better to assume that an electrical or computer problem is the culprit rather than postulating that God struck it. Applying this principle to the subject of origins, however, tends to block creationist thinking. That is because naturalistic evolutionists think in terms of *natural* explanations *always* being the *simpler* ones—indeed, they are the *better* ones.

To illustrate how Occam’s Razor can be used against creationist arguments, let us consider two well-known laws of nature called “The First and Second Laws of Thermodynamics.” Creationists have been citing these two laws for decades, saying that they “disprove” evolution but to no avail.

The First Law basically says that matter can neither be created or destroyed. Creationists argue that this law *requires* the action of a Creator to explain the existence of the universe we live in. Otherwise, matter would have had to naturally arise out of nothing, which this law forbids. The Second Law, in turn, says that everything tends to move from a state of order to disorder. That is, living things grow old, machines wear out, our homes get messy, etc. Once again, creationists argue that this law “disproves” the notion that “The Big Bang” could be the source of all things. “The Big Bang” was supposedly a gigantic explosion, and explosions generally result in chaos. Chaos, moreover, does not generally lead to increasing order over time. So, how is it that evolutionary scientists seem content to ignore such well-established laws of science?

Atheistic physicist Dr. Steven Hawking essentially explains the First Law away by appealing to “quantum mechanics,” which is physics on the level of subatomic particles. On this level, extremely small particles seem to pop in and out of existence, so Dr. Hawking uses this strange phenomenon to explain the evolutionary theory of “The Big Bang.” He says that “The Big Bang” began with a “quantum fluctuation” in the existence of a very small point known as a “singularity,” which contained everything in the universe only extremely concentrated in one tiny spot. In other words, quantum

mechanics supposedly supplies a *natural* explanation as to how something as massive as the entire universe could indeed have originally popped out of nothing. This, in turn, allows him to further forgo the need to acknowledge the existence of the Creator even though he cannot prove this theory.

If this seems too technical to understand, remember—all I am basically trying to show is how Occam's Razor is used to block creationist arguments. Not only do naturalistic evolutionists think in terms of *natural* explanations being the *simpler* ones, but they apparently modify Occam's Razor even further to imply that *natural* explanations tend to be the *better* ones. This allows them to either ignore or explain away any *supernatural* requirements—even known laws of science—and simply wait for something *better* to come along. This, in turn, lets them continue their costly research into the matter of origins. Such explanations do not even have to be verifiable. They must merely be naturalistic.

Notice also how atheistic thinking requires *naturalism*. If atheistic scientists failed to maintain this underlying philosophy of evolution, it would mean giving up an entire way of thinking. In this mindset, therefore, *naturalistic evolution is a law of science*. It is *not* just a theory. *Evolution is a fact* because the only other alternative is supernatural creation. Moreover, *natural science is the measure of truth* because the Bible speaks of God and creation. Thus, we have a case of an ordering principle taking on a life of its own. This may even explain how modern science came to be defined in terms of naturalism in the first place. This powerful delusion is not fueled by scientific proof, but by an underlying bias against God and a manipulation of Occam's Razor to suit the purposes of naturalism.

Such a situation requires an even more powerful solution, which the gospel alone can supply. The gospel is not science. Yet, the underlying problem here is not science either. It is unbelief, which is something the gospel is designed to address. Moreover, in convicting people of their sins, the Holy Spirit bears witness to the fallen condition of mankind in general, which, in turn, goes back to the Genesis account of creation and the fall. The New Testament also teaches that Christ is both God and Creator (John 1:1–3; Col. 1:15–17). Hence, the gospel verifies the truth of creation. One merely needs to decide what to believe. Either Christ is who the Bible says He is—i.e., the Creator—or He is not. It is as simple as that. And for Believers, **CREATION IS AS TRUE AS THE CREATOR**.

Creationists, however, typically take a different approach. Their writings make mention of the fact that neither creation nor evolution can be proven or disproven directly. Yet, in their zeal to defend creation, they seem to forget this fact. Sometimes it is because new research has come up that is very hard to ignore. It seems to make evolution look impossible and that “true science” can disprove evolution after all. Thus, they use creation science to try and defend the truth of creation. However, as just stated, most evolutionists are not interested in scientific questions about God. They *cannot* and *will not* even accept the best evidence in favor of *supernatural* creation. Such would require a crisis of faith, and the power to change hearts and minds is just not present in science the way it is in the gospel.

All I am saying is that we should not short-change the effectiveness of the gospel in this case. The scientific aspect of creationism is still valid in that it bears witness to the fact that biblical creation is neither unscientific nor does science require a foundation of naturalistic assumptions. Indeed, creation scientists have been able to show that creation and the biblical flood explain the raw data found in nature much better than evolution. From the standpoint of confirming God's Word, this kind of information can be quite edifying. Creation science can also help people who once believed in evolution to reprogram their minds following conversion to the gospel. It is just that science can never replace the need for faith. For, “*by faith we understand that the worlds were prepared by the word of God, so that what is seen was not made out of things which are visible*” (Heb. 11:3 NASB).

Besides, the Bible provides no solid basis for the notion that mere science can be used to *prove* the existence of God. There are even negative consequences associated with trying to do so. For one thing, it can lead to confusion. Approaching the creation vs. evolution argument by means of science without addressing the underlying philosophical issues merely pits the “science” of one viewpoint against the “science” of another. The “facts” of science are often in flux anyway, but putting them in the context of two rival sciences opens them up to reinterpretation and can, thus, lead to shaken faith.

Romans 1:18–23 is often cited to justify the notion that “true science” should be able to *prove* God. It just *seems* obvious: “*For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who suppress the truth in unrighteousness, because that which is known about God is evident within them; for God made it evident to them. For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes, His eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly seen, being understood through what has been made, so they are without excuse*” (vv. 18–20). Yet, this is not talking about scientific *proof* but rather about the creation providing *ample grounds for faith* in the eternal power and divine nature of God. It is just that men suppress this truth in unrighteousness, as they would rather have the final say. Unbelievers, thus, become entangled in futile speculations until their foolish hearts are darkened (vv. 21–23). This has surely happened in the case of evolution. Indeed, it is surprising how many evolutionists seem to openly tolerate pagan religions while resisting the God of the Bible. But, since any study of origins requires assumptions, even creation science cannot be the measure of truth. One must, therefore, be careful of taking pride in human wisdom in this case as well.

Even Psalms 14:1–3, where it says: “*The fool has said in his heart, ‘There is no God,’*” and Psalms 10: 4, 11 are not referring to a scientific ability to *prove* God and creation but rather to the heart of the wicked—people who refuse to acknowledge God in the process of going about their sin. They are being foolish because they will answer to Him some day whether they want to or not.

Making evolution and its followers look foolish by elevating creation science can even be counterproductive by giving people a false sense of security with respect to their beliefs. Our young people are especially vulnerable here. It is surprising just how quickly an evolutionary professor on his own turf can explain away the so-called “evidence” of creation. Someone who does not realize that evolution is an effective ordering principle may not even know what hit him. I know because this happened to me. Over forty years ago, I was led into evolution under such circumstances, and I became so steeped in it that I became an atheist. At that point, there was nothing about creation that could prove the existence of God to me. Science seemed to say otherwise. It was faith in Jesus Christ that eventually led me to accept the truth about creation. And, my salvation came about through the faithful witness of one who did not even know how to answer my questions about evolution. This, in turn, goes right along with Proverbs 9:10, which says, “*The fear of the LORD is the beginning of wisdom, And the knowledge of the Holy One is understanding*” Amen.