

Checking Your Brain at the Church Door?

Allen Shepherd

When the foundations are destroyed, what can the righteous do?
Psalm 11:3

While I was in my teens, my father subscribed to the journal *Scientific American*. I loved science and read it avidly and continue to read it to this day. However, the magazine uniformly condemns Creationism, a cherished tenant of my faith. John Rennie, the editor, characterizes creationists as irrational, superstitious, benighted, ignorant, and obstructionist.¹ He also likened us to ostriches with our heads in the sand, fearing we might see something that conflicts with our faith or shatters our treasured beliefs. Recently he wrote an article describing fifteen ways to expose “Creationist Nonsense.”²

Is that how we as Seventh-day Adventist creationists come across? Do we indeed stop thinking when we read our Bibles or darken the doors of the sanctuary? Are we afraid of the truth? Or do we have a reason (not mere conviction) for the hope within us (1 Pet 3:15)? In the following two-part essay, I have written about how I personally have dealt with this dilemma. I am a physician, but I am untrained in any of the biologic sciences except medicine (I do have a BA in Chemistry). So this is the work of a nonprofessional who has grappled with these issues.

The first part will cover reasons for my belief that a God created the universe, in contrast to atheism, and the second will be an examination of the evidences pro and con for the two theories of the origin of life’s diversity: Divine Creation and Darwinian Evolution.

¹ John Rennie, “A Total Eclipse of Reason,” *Scientific American* 281/4 (October, 1999): 124. The terms used are Rennie’s.

² John Rennie, “Fifteen Answers to Creationist Nonsense,” *Scientific American* 287/1 (July, 2002): 78–85.

SHEPHERD: CHECKING YOUR BRAIN AT THE CHURCH DOOR?

Evidences for Theism?

Just how many have fallen for this “irrational, superstitious, nonsense”? The vast majority of Americans believe that God created the heavens and the earth. About 50% hold to a literal 7-day creation, though this theory is excluded from the schools and ridiculed by the media and scientific community. Another 35% believe in God-directed evolution. About 10% do not believe that God had a hand in it, and another small percentage do not know.³ Among scientists, the percentage of believers is less, but even among them, 40% believe in a God who answers prayer.⁴ Throughout history almost all humans have believed in a god, whether Babylonian mystics, Baal worshipers, Greeks thinkers, human-sacrificing Mayans, or fundamentalist Christians. It is as if it were (to put it in evolutionary terms) selectively bred into us. Atheism has held little attraction for the vast majority.

But perhaps this huge multitude simply longs with all its heart to believe, and “brave new world” atheists are the only ones willing to face the cold hard facts of reality.⁵ Are the rest of us just attempting to ameliorate the anxiety caused by the harsh meaninglessness of the universe?

Or are there evidences for belief in a Creator? Despite what several prominent members of the scientific community say, there are *logical* reasons for believing that God created the heavens and the earth. The most amazing are the characteristics of our universe favoring human existence.

The Fine Tuning of the Universe. Over the past century it has become apparent that the universe is finely tuned to the needs of life on earth. Although several have written on this topic, called the anthropic principle, a recent and easily readable book is “Just Six Numbers,” by Rees.⁶ In this small tome, he tells of six qualities of the universe described by six fundamental physical constants. Each seems to have been honed to the finest of tolerances so that humans might exist. The most amazing is Ω , (Omega), the number describing the expansion rate of the universe, or the balance between gravity and outward expansion. This number is accurate to one in a million billion (1,000,000,000,000,000; 88)!

³ Gallop Poll web site. The most recent poll on this topic was February of 2001. The question asked was regarding the origin of humankind.

⁴ Edward J. Larson and Larry Witham, “Scientists and Religion in America,” *Scientific American* 281/3 (Sept. 1999): 81–85.

⁵ John M. Robinson, ed., *Origin and Evolution of the Universe: Evidence for Design?* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s UP, 1987), 23-25. This is a compilation of rather ponderous essays by scientists who wish to explain away the evidence for design and the very small probability that the universe could have occurred by chance. At the end, at least one (Hugo Meyness) allows that all the speculation might not stand the test of Ockham’s razor (255). (Ockham’s razor: the best explanation of an event is the one that is the simplest.) However, the essays show the thinking of an atheistic group addressing these issues. The pages noted are the conclusions reached by Robert H. Haynes in his essay, “The ‘Purpose’ of Chance in Light of the Physical Basis of Evolution.”

⁶ Martin J. Rees, *Just Six Numbers: The Deep Forces That Shape the Universe* (New York: Basic Books, 2000).

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

This is incredible precision. He discusses this astonishing finding and how each of the numbers impacts life on our planet. We could not exist without this accuracy.

He does not subscribe to belief in a deity, but his reason for skepticism is telling (148-150). He gives no logic for his rejection of this idea, but merely states a preference and begins to speculate about “multi-verses” (other universes besides ours). However, there is no evidence presented to support the existence of other universes. In fact, we are unable to know of them, even if they do exist. So his thinking is based on speculation he chooses to believe and a presupposition that eliminates God (see also Robinson, 247-257).

This fine-tuning is the strongest evidence for God’s existence (aside from Scripture). Order, elegance, design, and the big bang also point to a Creator.

Order and Elegance. There is much order seen in the universe and in living organisms. The laws of physics and life show thoughtful synthesis. But I find most impressive the order inherent in the Periodic Table of the Elements. This arrangement of the 92 naturally occurring atoms (along with the several man-made ones) was discovered by Mendeleev in the mid 19th century. He grouped the families of elements together from lightest to heaviest by examining their shared characteristics and realized there was a repetitive sequence. He then placed them in an order that predicted some that had not yet been discovered. Discovery of these confirmed the table’s truth.

The whole material universe is made of these elements. We humans are made of the same stuff as the stars. The elements’ electron properties allow for the construction of a wonderful array of chemical compounds (as especially seen in the chemistry of life: proteins, DNA, etc), while characteristics of the nucleus allow fusion to release massive amounts of energy, giving light and warmth (the stars burn hydrogen in their nuclear reactors, forming helium and heavier elements).

But these diverse elements with all their amazing combinations and derivations are concocted using three forms of matter: protons, neutrons, and electrons; and three forces: the weak and strong nuclear forces and the electromagnetic force. A few basic laws govern their actions. This is an elegant order. Such beauty and complexity from such simplicity!

During my career as a surgeon, I have seen some who operate with finesse and others who, shall we say, perform with lesser skill. I know the thinking and planning and experience it takes to make an operation look easy. It does not happen by accident. It is deliberate and intentional. And we praise surgeons who devote their lives to perfecting their craft in the service of others.

The elegance and beauty in the order of the very atoms of our being do not give the appearance of the workings of chance, but rather of careful thought and

SHEPHERD: CHECKING YOUR BRAIN AT THE CHURCH DOOR?

intention, like a well planned operation. I see this as strong evidence for a Creator who knew the nature of his medium and used it with grace and skill.

The Big Bang. Although not all would agree with various details of the Big Bang theory, it has been accepted by most cosmologists as a fairly accurate description of the origin of the universe. It has a very interesting feature: a beginning. This theory of origins is consistent with Genesis 1:1. It also argues against an eternal or cyclical universe. This makes atheists uncomfortable. Arthur Eddington, a British physicist and atheist who experimentally confirmed Einstein's general theory of relativity in 1919, said, "Philosophically, the notion of a beginning to the present order is repugnant to me. I should like to find a genuine loophole." If the universe has a beginning, who initiated it? A Creator outside the universe itself is a logical deduction.

Design. The biological realm shows amazing design. The eye has most often been cited to demonstrate this property of nature. But there are many examples: wings, hands, social structures, etc. Michael Dickinson recently reviewed experiments on insect flight.⁷ This extremely complex skill is carried out by a creature with the proverbial brain of a fly. And yet these tiny living machines can maneuver like nothing else known to man. How did they develop the ability to do these astounding feats? The belief that this could happen by gradual change through natural selection (this is no explanation mind you, but mere assertion) is a true act of faith.

Skeptics have claimed that the design argument is of itself not strong enough to support belief in the existence of God. I do not hold to that view. As my partner in practice said, "Things just look too good to have happened by chance." In combination with the order and accuracy seen in the deep realities of the universe, a very strong *cognitive* position can be taken and defended.

Three Further Points. Some atheists, after listening to these points, have said, "Why doesn't God reveal himself to us? Why doesn't he just show himself (as one suggested) by writing his name in the sky so that we could know? Why isn't it simple?"

God *has* revealed himself in nature and Scripture and has given us minds to see and eyes to read. The example of the Israelites at Sinai warns us (Exod 32). They saw the smoke and fire and heard God speak, but in forty days they were worshiping a golden calf. Jesus cautioned those that were looking for a sign (Matt 12:39) and said that they would not believe even if someone rose from the dead (Luke 16:19–31). Apparently God feels that people must decide on the basis of evidence and the witness of another who writes what he has seen. And who said life would be simple?

⁷ Michael Dickinson, "Solving the Mystery of Insect Flight," *Scientific American* 284/6 (June, 2001): 48-55.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Second, some have said, “How can we know which God this creator is? There are many gods. How do you know it is the Christian God who creates?” The implication is that since it is impossible to know, it is of no consequence.

This is shallow thinking. Man has explored the atom and sent probes deep into space. Is he unable to search out the most significant Being in the universe? Besides, we can simplify the quest by considering only those gods that claim to be Creator. Even the Phoenician sailors taking Jonah to Tarshish knew that the Creator was of a different order. Let questioners examine the various gods’ claims. I think it will be clear.

And third, some have said, “Well then, who created God, and who created him, and who created him, etc.? This is called an endless regression, and it side-steps the issue. The question under consideration is whether the universe shows signs of *intentional* creation or the mere *workings* of chance. It shows the characteristics of intention by its fine-tuning and design. From our experience in daily life with cause and effect, only one entity we know can be intentional, a mind. Therefore it is the product of Mind. If we have established this, then we can discuss by what means and where the Mind came from, etc. However, these musings do not change the answer to the primary question: the appearance of intention.

Conclusion. This evidence leads me to believe in a Creator, one who possesses consummate ability. I have excellent evidence for this belief and can stand without shame when called on by my God to do so. I do not fear the purveyors of purposelessness that some in modern science would endorse.⁸

However, atheism’s strongest scientific argument is Darwin’s theory.

The findings of science support belief in a Creator. But belief in a literal 7-day creation is not so clearly sustained. Scripture says that our knowledge of this comes through faith (Heb 11:3). This, though, does not mean that there is *no* evidence. We will look at this in the next part of this essay.

Checking Your Brain at the Church Door? (Part II)

In the first part I presented the evidence for theism. There are good reasons for believing in a Creator God, including the order and fine-tuning of the universe and the evidence from design. Einstein (no dummy) believed an intelligence had made the cosmos.⁹ Defending this proposition is not difficult, nor does it involve the denial of the scientific evidence. The evidence indeed *points* to a Creator.

But God calls Adventists to take a biblical position: We are to warn the world of the near coming of our Lord, admonishing them to return to their Creator and show their allegiance by keeping the 7th day holy as a memorial of a lit-

⁸ Richard Dawkins, “God’s Utility Function,” *Scientific American* 273/5, (November, 1995): 80–85.

⁹ Robinson, 273-275.

SHEPHERD: CHECKING YOUR BRAIN AT THE CHURCH DOOR?

eral 7-day creation. Holding this ground requires something more than scientific evidence, for even believing scientists by and large subscribe to an ancient earth and Darwin's theory of evolution. The Catholic church and most Protestant bodies no longer accept the literal truth of the story in Genesis 1.

Can we defend our position logically? Below I present evidences pro and con for each theory. Although not exhaustive, I have tried to look at the issue from many perspectives. Creation will be presented first, followed by Darwin's theory of evolution, followed by my conclusions.

There are some who hold to various combinations of these two systems (theistic evolution, for example). Any combination will share in the strengths and weakness of each and may involve internal contradictions. I have therefore chosen to view them separately so the contrasts will be cast in sharp relief.

For those interested in a very candid discussion of the problems facing Creationists, Ariel Roth's book *Origins* is the best I know.¹⁰ He gives a thorough presentation of the weaknesses and strengths of each position. Leonard Brand's *Faith Reason and Earth History* also takes a creationist stance.¹¹

Creation: Pro

The Bible Supports this Theory. Although this may seem elementary, the Bible has great persuasive power, so much so that it stands, in spite of the assaults of atheists and agnostics for centuries. As mentioned in the first part, about 50% of Americans believe in a literal 7-day creation, despite the reported evidence against a literal reading of Genesis 1, and even though the media and most scientists reject it.¹² Two pillars of objective reality support the Bible: The changed lives of those who believe¹³ and the fulfillment of prophetic predictions, such as those found in Genesis 12, Daniel 2, 7, and 9, and those describing the character and work of the Messiah.

Jesus, the Disciples, and Paul Assumed the Truth of this Theory. See Matt 19:4–6; Mark 10:6–9; Acts 17:24; Col 3:16, 17; Heb 11:3; 2 Pet 3:3–7; Rev 4:11; and 14:7. For some Christians and Jews, their endorsement is pivotal.

The Story of Redemption Seems to Make No Sense Without the Stories of Genesis 1–3. Bultmann, in his small book *New Testament and Mythology*,₂ noted the close relationship between the story of the fall and the need for salvation. If there were no fall, why need there be salvation and atonement?¹⁴ By rejecting a creation and fall, Darwin's theory undermines the doctrine of salvation.

¹⁰ Ariel A. Roth, *Origins: Linking Science and Scripture* (Washington: Review and Herald, 1998).

¹¹ Leonard Brand, *Faith, Reason, and Earth History* (Berrien Springs: Andrews UP, 1997).

¹² Gallop Poll web site; 2001 poll regarding human origins.

¹³ See Armand M. Nicholi, Jr., *The Question of God* (New York: Free Press, 2002). This fascinating book by a Harvard psychiatrist compares the lives of Freud the atheist and C. S. Lewis the believer.

¹⁴ Rudolph Bultmann, *New Testament and Mythology*, 1941.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

The Story Gives Purpose. In Genesis 1, God works with intention and deliberation to make a world suitable for the crown of creation, humankind. Humans have a role to play, and God has given them a work to do and a place under the sun. They are the children of the Most High, rather than the offspring of the scum of the earth. They are legitimate beings, not an accident. God comes at eventide each day to speak to the man and woman. He talks personally to them at the fall. All this shows more than casual concern. This contrasts starkly with the purposelessness at the foundation of evolutionary theory, where there is only chance and ultimate meaninglessness.¹⁵ Stories of redemption are present throughout all great literature and have an appeal to all that is good and great in the human spirit.¹⁶

There Is a Certain Incompatibility Between Evolutionary Theory and the Character of God Revealed in Scripture. Natural selection ruthlessly culls the infirm and weak, while Jesus stoops to care for the “least of these my brethren.” Millions of years of death by an uncaring universe, contrasted with numbered hairs and heaven’s interest in fallen sparrows.

Notice that these “pros” are not based on evidence that is strictly scientific in nature. But there is other evidence besides that which can be tested using the scientific method. The claims of God in the Bible are of such a character. God challenges the other gods to tell the future (Isa 41:21–24). This is evidence that can be checked against history but does not fall under the rules laid down by science. The testimony of a changed life is outside the ways of science, yet remains a powerful incentive to belief.

Creation: Con

The Creation Story in Genesis Is Not a Scientifically Stated Theory. It is, rather, more like rhythmic prose. It does not lend itself to dissection by using the scientific method, as this technique was not practiced by the ancients. Moses knew nothing of radiometric dating, fossils, sedimentary layers hundreds of feet thick, or pseudogenes. Of course, no one was present at the beginning, so neither theory is demonstrable, nor, in the strictest sense, refutable (a scientist has to repeat an experiment to tell whether it is true or false). All arguments on each side are inferences from the data.¹⁷ There is, however, one statement in the creation story that can be tested: God said that all the animals and plants would produce after their kind. The theory of evolution disputes this statement, asserting that over long periods of time, a “kind” will gradually change into another: that is, it will become a different “kind.” Strictly speaking, the fossil record seems to

¹⁵ Richard Dawkins, “God’s Utility Function,” *Scientific American* 273/5 (November, 1995): 85.

¹⁶ See Huston Smith, *Why Religion Matters* (New York: HarperCollins, 2001), a fascinating book by the son of missionaries to China. He describes the conflict in worldviews between science and religion. See particularly chapters 3, 12, and 14.

¹⁷ Colin Patterson, *Evolution*, 2nd ed. (Ithaca: Comstock, 1999), 45.

SHEPHERD: CHECKING YOUR BRAIN AT THE CHURCH DOOR?

support the creationist view.¹⁸ In other words, few transitional forms are found (macro-evolution has not been demonstrated). Geneticists have been exploring the very edges of the genetic makeup of some “kinds” (we used fruit flies in biology lab) to see if they can show where transition into another “kind” occurs. Yet they come to a boundary they cannot cross.¹⁹

The Creation Theory Has Minimal Explaining Power. Let me give an example. An occasional whale is caught that has vestigial legs.²⁰ These do not seem to have a specific purpose. Creationists would say that God just made them that way, while evolutionists would postulate that the ancestors of whales must have had useful legs and walked on land. The theory of evolution thus has power to explain something that seems strange and is unaccountable according to the creation theory. Situations such as this put creationists in a defensive position. There have been some successes here, but the overall impression is a kind of tentativeness and jury-rigging that makes for embarrassment. (See, however, Behe for an excellent discussion of this problem.²¹ Behe argues that we cannot plumb all the reasons why a Designer would do what He does and therefore cannot use so-called design flaws or apparent abnormalities to postulate the lack of a Designer. See also Roth, 108-109).

The Earth Appears Old. This and reason No. 4 under Evolution: Pros below are the most serious criticisms of the theory. Huge layers of fossil-containing sediment, moving continents, radiometric dating, fossil magnetic imprints, etc., all seem to speak of an ancient earth.²²

Almost No Scientists Accept a Literal 7-Day Creation as a Viable Theory. The intellectual elite of the world do not even consider creation a “real” theory. Even believing while working in an unrelated area of science has caused “banning.”²³

Evolution: Pro

The Theory Is Accepted as Truth by the Scientific Establishment. There is a broad consensus that there is no other explanation for the facts of biology. Those who accept this theory can avoid conflict with scientific thought and literature. I have not seen a mainstream scientific article defending creation.

¹⁸ See Stephen Jay Gould and Niles Eldredge, “Punctuated Equilibria: The Tempo and Mode of Evolution Reconsidered,” *Paleobiology* 3 (1977): 115–151. Though evolutionists, these two scientists showed that the fossil remains do not record smooth transitions between groups. Rather, each species was distinct. They postulated that evolution occurred rapidly in isolated groups that were not preserved. This explained the lack of transitional forms in the fossil record.

¹⁹ See Roth, 178-190.

²⁰ Kate Wong, “The Mammals that Conquered the Seas,” *Scientific American*, 286/5 (May, 2002): 70-79. The chart on page 74 of this article shows the various purported whale ancestors, but documents no transitional forms between the fossil species.

²¹ Michael J. Behe, *Darwin's Black Box* (New York: Free Press, 1996), 222-227.

²² Roth, 233-261, gives a creationist answer to this problem.

²³ Behe, 237.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

The Many Evidences for the Great Age of the Earth. A long age for the earth is no problem for evolutionary theory.

The Continuity of Life or Common Descent. The plants and animals all have the same genetic code and use the same basic molecules to construct their bodies, trunks, fibers, etc. Creationists would say that God did it that way, while evolutionists point to this as evidence that all came from a simple common ancestor.

The Geologic Column. The fossils begin as less complex organisms at the deepest layers and become more complex as one ascends to shallower levels. There seems to be a more or less orderly progression. It is not smooth, but it does not seem to be random, nor does order progress from more complex to simpler. If geologists could find a dinosaur bone firmly and unmistakably embedded in the Precambrian layer (one of the earliest fossil layers—the dinosaurs are thought to have lived hundreds of millions of years later), it would be strong evidence that both existed at the same time. This would destroy the theory. As far as I know, no one has found such a fossil.²⁴

Evolution: Con

This Theory Tends to Support Materialism and Atheism. Dawkins, the prominent British evolutionist, feels it became much easier to be an intellectually fulfilled atheist after Darwin's theory. Those theists who accept this theory accept a God who is more distant and more peripherally involved in his creation. Atheists will enquire of them, why do you need God if it all works without him (see Patterson, 118)? Some might argue that philosophy is irrelevant to this discussion. This is not so. Atheism and materialism are not attractive, in spite of what their proponents say. These theories, when taken to their logical conclusion, embrace a purposeless existence or fatal relativism. The Governments with the worst human rights records have been atheistic (the French Revolution, Communism, and Nazism). Atheists have often accused theists of grave atrocities, not without some justification, but their own hands literally drip with blood. The world has seen no greater and more efficient murderers than atheists in power. The Marxist and Nazi experiments of the 20th century are sobering evidence of the bankruptcy of atheistic social theory.

The Origin of Life. Evolution has no theory for the origin of life. Much speculation is presented as if it were true, but there is no good theory. See *Origins of Life* by Freeman Dyson for a discussion of each of the three proposed possibilities.²⁵ They all have fatal flaws, but speculation abounds.

An article in the April 2001 issue of *Scientific American* demonstrates this.²⁶ The author, Robert Hazen, argues that certain minerals may have been

²⁴ Roth has a good discussion of this problem from a creationist viewpoint, 147-175.

²⁵ Freeman Dyson, *Origins of Life* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999).

²⁶ Robert Hazen, "Life's Rocky Start," *Scientific American* 284/4 (April, 2001): 77-85.

SHEPHERD: CHECKING YOUR BRAIN AT THE CHURCH DOOR?

essential in the formation of life. He suggests one of them, calcite, as a catalyst that would have helped sort the amino acids in the primordial organic soup. But careful thinking shows that this mineral is inadequate for the task. There is no way that more than one protein could form by the chance sorting of amino acids.²⁷

There is nothing wrong with speculation. It has opened up vast areas of knowledge unknowable without these flights of imagination. But the above idea has strong arguments against it. However, whenever the popular scientific press reviews new “evidence” on the origin of life, from Stanley Miller’s bell jar experiments in the 50’s to Hazen’s “Mineral Stars in the Movie of Life” in 2001, there is wild optimism about the “breakthroughs” that have been made. These are uniformly overstated.

Design. Darwinians tell us that we are not using our minds when we believe that there is a Creator. But they must deny the use of their senses when viewing the cosmos. The universe and the life on our planet have a purposeful look. They appear as if they were made the way they are for a reason.²⁸

Social Darwinism. A few years after Darwin, Herbert Spencer described ideas to harness the theory to improve the human species. If the rule is: “survival of the fittest,” why not help survival along with a little cognitive input? Thus we saw the birth of eugenics and the “Super Race.” This thinking was one foundation of Hitler’s social program to exterminate “defective races and individuals”

II Peter 3:3-7 seems to describe the doctrine of uniformitarianism that has been held by many scientists since the beginning of the 18th century and is a basic assumption of Darwin’s thesis. This theory states that the processes we see active on earth today are the only ones that have operated in the past. Many scientists now include some forms of catastrophism (such as meteors striking the earth), though few believe in a universal flood. These verses tell us that in the last days, men would be scoffers, saying the world has lasted a great length of time and that the flood story is a myth. They thus seem to confirm the description found in Scripture.

Darwin Said: “If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down.”²⁹ Behe seems to have demonstrated this with his ideas about irreducible complexity.³⁰

Synthesis

So How Do I Put This All Together? I have met God. I have seen him work in my life and in the lives of others. I particularly remember experiences as

²⁷ A creationist said: “What do you get after cooking primordial soup for a billion years? Very old primordial soup.”

²⁸ See Roth, 94-112, and Behe.

²⁹ Quoted by Patterson, 117.

³⁰ See Behe, 232-253, for a discussion on choosing one’s philosophical foundations.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

a colporteur in central California between my first and second years of medical school. God's Spirit appealed to the people through us as we went from door to door. This answered any lingering doubts in my mind about his existence. The reasoned responses to atheism's arguments came later, but confirmed my experience.

I have seen God speak to the most basic human needs through His Word, the Bible. There is a solace there that exists nowhere else. I have also seen that if the church had only adhered firmly to Scripture, much error and many conflicts could have been avoided. This is not an anti-intellectual position, for study of the Bible requires careful thought, and its deepest secrets open only to the diligent seeker.

I have seen how the theory of evolution has shaken the faith of old and young alike in the truth of the Bible. Some recover and rethink their doctrine of the Bible or adjust their view of science. But others are unable to do this and leave the church in body or, if unable to do so, in mind. This theory causes such destruction of faith that I cannot see that it is part of the truth of God.

I therefore give more weight to the evidences for creationism and set aside those interpretations of science that support Darwin's theory. I have made a conscious decision to give greater weight to arguments supporting Scripture than to the findings of science that conflict with revelation. I have not ignored science nor denied its findings, but accept revelation as a higher, more complete knowledge. This is an informed decision after looking at all the evidence, including that of the scientists and my own experience. There have been days and nights of prayer and struggle.

Both theories have gaps in their science that must be bridged by belief in something that cannot be proven. Creation has difficulties with the apparent age of the earth, the continuity of life, and the geologic column. Evolution has problems with the origin of life, the order seen in living things, and the origin of the laws of the universe (molecular laws, etc.). Both are logical if certain assumptions are accepted. Each depends on a leap of faith of some kind. The Bible is up front about this. It confesses that belief in creation is an act of faith (Heb 11:3). There is evidence, but faith is required. Many scientists are less transparent, refusing to see that their position also requires faith: faith that science will in the future be able to answer all the questions of life for which it has no answer now.

For those struggling with science, John, in his first letter, describes Christ as One seen, heard, and touched, that is, scientifically examined. He then writes his thesis on the findings: God is light, and there is no darkness in him (1 John 1:5).

And what is the conclusion of the skeptics after all their careful research? "The universe that we observe has precisely the properties we should expect if there is, at bottom, no design, no purpose, no evil and no good, nothing but pitiless indifference."³¹

³¹ Dawkins, 85.

SHEPHERD: CHECKING YOUR BRAIN AT THE CHURCH DOOR?

I have chosen a life colored by faith. Habitual faith is a treasure I have fought for. It requires exercise to become strong and to remain healthy. We cannot let the world rob us by its sophisticated arguments and caustic ridicule.

The majority of evolutionists would not be convinced by these arguments, but I think it is clear that creationists are still using their brains, in contrast to Mr. Rennie's contention. Not as atheists use theirs, but using them nevertheless.