

Questions for Lesson 25: Evolution and God

1. In this series we have repeatedly shown a drawing with two arrows one presenting science and one representing faith. What is the point of this drawing?

ANSWER: That science and faith are not enemies, they are friends. If science gives us the facts that are properties of God's creation of the cosmos, and if the Bible is given by the same God who tells us what He has done, they cannot possibly conflict. If they do conflict, we either have bad science or bad theology or both. It is the contention of this series that we have had a lot of both.

2. What do we mean when we say the “evolution assumes creation?”

Answer: Evolution assumes that all the things that are needed to produce the ingredients of life have been created and are therefore available for evolution to work on. This includes the creation of time, space, the Higgs Boson, the Higgs field (or whatever we find in the future causes matter to exist and have mass) etc. All evolution tries to do is explain how the already created matter changed (evolved) by means of the already created physical laws to produce the living things we see today.

3. What is the difference between “naturalism” and “evolution”?

Answer: Naturalism is the claim that everything that has ever happened or will happen in the universe can be explained by science. Evolution is simply “unfolding change” but doesn't tell us what unfolded the change or what may have designed the change. Most atheists believe in naturalism as well as evolution, but many scientists who are evolutionists are firm believers in God.

4. What is the difference between the fact of evolution and the theory of evolution?

Answer: The “fact” refers to changes that can be observed and do, in fact, occur. These are changes within a species and can be manipulated. The “theory” of evolution is the hypothesis that evolution has taken place in the past in such a way that all living things are the product of chance and are all from a common ancestor. This cannot be observed or duplicated experimentally. Note: We don't use the prefixes *micro* and *macro* applied to evolution, because of controversy over where micro ends and macro begins. Most claims of macro-evolution are not observed and can't be duplicated.

5. The Miller /Urey experiment in which ammonia, methane, water, and hydrogen were catalyzed with an electrical spark to produce amino acids, is sometimes used to try to prove that life could have come into existence by chance on the primitive earth. What is the major problem with this proposal?

Answer: There are many problems, but the most severe is the assumption that the test tube environment of the experiment duplicates the primitive earth. Miller chose these chemicals because of their chemical activity, but we know that is not what the early earth looked like. Three of these gases have such a low mass that the Earth's gravity cannot keep them from escaping. There is much evidence that oxygen was present in the ancient earth--carbonates and oxides in the rocks being one of the main evidences. Other problems involve the fact that the electrical discharge destroys amino acids much faster than it forms them, and there are many agents in the primitive earth

that would also destroy organic molecules as quickly as they formed. Add this to the probability arguments presented in lesson 6 and you have a very poor hypothesis.

6. Give some examples of factual evolutionary change from the Bible.

Answer: The fact that all people on the earth came from Adam and Eve and yet we are all different racially and otherwise. The serpent lost his legs and that loss was genetic in nature. Jacob's manipulation of Laban's livestock.

7. What does the word "kind" mean in the Bible?

Answer: It is from the Hebrew word *min* and is a broad word referring to groups of animals. It is used in Genesis (e.g. v. 11). See 1 Corinthians 15:39 for the similar concept where Paul says there are four "kinds of flesh." "Species" and "kind" are not the same.

8. What is a fossil?

Answer: Any evidence of life that has existed in the past, including bones, skin, tracks, waste products, etc.

9. Why does the proof or disproof of evolution depend ultimately upon the fossil record?

Answer: The fossils show what actually happened historically. The biological evidence gives ideas of what might have happened, but no proof that it actually did.

10. Why is the fact that all animals have lungs, stomachs, eyes, thyroid glands, pancreases, etc., is not a proof that we all evolved from an amoeba?

Answer: We are created by the same engineer who used the best physical plan for all of us. Also, we could not eat or make medicine from animals if this were not true.

11. Why are vestigial organs not a proof we all came from an amoeba?

Answer: Because God did not equip us just to live wherever you live. What is useful in one place is not necessarily useful somewhere else on this earth. Also, the number of truly vestigial organs keeps dropping as we learn more about our bodies.

12. For years scientists have said that humans have a 99 percent genetic similarity to chimpanzees (although some recent research has shown it to be closer to 90%) Does that prove that we and the apes have a common origin?

Answer: Yes, but the question is what is the origin--God or chance? Converging evolution predicts that we will have similar characteristics because we live in similar ways. Both apes and humans have stereoscopic vision to reach out and grab things, both have an opposable thumbs, both have their nose above their mouths to give flavor, both have tooth structure which allows them to be omnivores--to eat anything. The genetic makeup to allow these similarities has to be the same, but that is no proof of a common ancestor. A porpoise and a shark have some sections of their DNA that are the same and are made for swimming in the ocean, but it is not a proof of common descent. The shark is a primitive fish and the porpoise is an advanced mammal. What is amazing is how different humans and chimps are considering that we are so close genetically. Researchers are amazed that the genetics do not have stronger influences.