



**General Topics :: Does the Bible disprove the Theory of Evolution?**

**Does the Bible disprove the Theory of Evolution? - posted by dougr777 (), on: 2010/5/8 0:20**

No.

That's what a local pastor wrote in our newspaper in our community.

<http://sgretz.blogspot.com/>

He wrote:

--> "The Bible is not a science textbook. It was written centuries ago with a "pre-scientific" point of view.

The language of science observes the natural world and deals with the questions "what?" "when?" and "how?" The language of faith deals with the question "why?" The Bible's creation story affirms all life came about due to God's creative power—but it wasn't written to tell us HOW, or exactly WHEN that happened.

Some Christians take that story literally, insisting the Bible teaches God created the world in six 24-hour days, roughly 6,000 years ago. They see scientific theories of species evolving over billions of years as a threat to their belief in the inerrancy of Scripture.

We've been down this road before. 400 years ago, when Galileo suggested the earth revolved around the sun, the church forced him to recant, insisting the Bible proved the opposite view. That didn't change the facts—it only discredited the church in the eyes of many thinking people for a long time.

Over 1,000 years before, St. Augustine had warned about this: "find a Christian mistaken in a field which they themselves know well, and hear him maintain his foolish opinions about the Scriptures, how are they going to believe those Scriptures in matters concerning the Kingdom of Heaven?" Church leaders who renounced Galileo should have heeded Augustine's warning—and we should too!

----

How would you respond to this? thoughts?

Feel free to comment on his blog if the Lord leads.

Doug

**Re: Does the Bible disprove the Theory of Evolution? - posted by mguldner (), on: 2010/5/8 0:27**

Well I believe in the literal interpretation of Scripture. You might google something else that is going around called "the Gap Theory" It's basically a way for Christians to view the Bible story in light of Evolution pretty much combining the two ideas.

**Re: Does the Bible disprove the Theory of Evolution? - posted by RainMan, on: 2010/5/8 9:23**

i to believe in the inerrancy of scriptures. But scientifically speaking it is easy for God to either speed up or slow down time. I believe time is a creation of God and he is not bound by it. I believe creation took 6 days as the bible says simply as the God that created time he can cram 600 billion years of creative work into a nano-second if he chooses to. I believe creation in genesis is told from God's perspective as an infinite being and to that infinite being it took 6 days. From a scientific perspective what we perceive took Gazillion of years took God six days. I think time can be accelerated within a black hole or by gravity so even in the universe as we know it time is in a constant state of flux (i think). The question of evolution is another animal all together. Is it feasible that God used evolution in the creation process that may have taken gazillions of years i can say i know either way so ill stick to what the bible says and go along with six days. Even if God came down and tried to explain the process of creation to einstein i doubt his simple human mind would be able to compre

hence the thoughts of God.

There was a really good ministry on TV a while back with christian scientists i think called answers in genesis.

I think like paul said we should become all things to all men that we may save someone. How great is our God

**Re: Does the Bible disprove the Theory of Evolution? - posted by Goldminer (), on: 2010/5/8 9:43**

I believe the bible is just as it happened.

They have found no missing links that are valid. If you look at an eagles eye, piece of lichen, butterflies wing, a human, sea anemone, whale, armadillo, ant, etc. you will see it is not possible for these things to just happen. If God is God, and He is, it is nothing for Him to create instantly. The sheer diversity itself is enough. Our little minds can only think of the small thoughts about the vastness that we have a reference to, but miriads more exist at a testimony:

Rom 1:20 For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse:

Rom 1:21 Because that, when they knew God, they glorified not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.

Rom 1:22 Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools,

Isa 40:12 ¶ Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance?

They are still finding new unknown species daily, but no missing links. A tooth does not a missing link make.

**Re: Does the Bible disprove the Theory of Evolution? - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/5/8 9:47**

Quote:

-----Some Christians take that story literally, insisting the Bible teaches God created the world in six 24-hour days, roughly 6,000 years ago. They see scientific theories of species evolving over billions of years as a threat to their belief in the inerrancy of Scripture

The two ideas are truly mutually exclusive. Take, for example, Big Bang cosmology and the subsequent evolution of the planets and eventually life. The chronology of these events, if evolution were true, conflicts with the chronology of events in Genesis 1. The Gen. 1 chronology would not work to bring about life in the evolutionary framework. So the two are mutually exclusive and one must be "rearranged" if we are to say the scripture is inerrant. Guess which one usually gets "rearranged".

Genesis is a book of history. If it cannot be taken literally, but must be "interpreted" in light of what modern secular, and God-rejecting I might add, theories, then how can we place any confidence in the remainder of the book? It leads to the idea that, "it was wrong about creation, so it must be a religious book that teaches good morals and nothing more, and a book that I can re-interpret to mean what I desire it to mean." The historicity of Genesis is vital to the reliability of the remainder of scripture.

This is not to say that we somehow try to "prove" the historicity of Genesis. We accept it and use it as the foundation for all our endeavors. The pastor is right. The Bible is not a "science" textbook, but it is a history book that places scientific discovery in its proper context and guides us in interpreting scientific data. If radiometric dating tells us a piece of petrified wood is 2 billion years old, we say, "Wait a minute, there must be something wrong with the process of radiometric dating because the history book of the earth tells us through geology and plain history that the earth is only about six to seven thousand years old." Because we accept the plain teaching of scripture as totally reliable, we question the method of dating and do further research in that area rather than looking at the theoretical dating method as reliable and taking the scissors and tape to scripture.

If the foundation, the word, is open to constant revision and reinterpretation as scientific theory dictates, then our faith stands not in the word of God, but in the theory of scientists. Enter men like Richard Dawkins who have become atheists because they see this truth and apply it to their lives consistently.

**Re: Does the Bible disprove the Theory of Evolution? - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2010/5/8 12:13**

Doug,

I do not have the scientific expertise to prove creation above evolution.

But do consider this: believing God in all he says brings one to LIFE.

What does belief in evolution lead one to - eventually?

I am just glad humans cannot plumb the depth, the greatness of God. I am glad He is greater than any man's intellect. He is worthy of all praise and honor and glory and all nature is a fine demonstration of this fact. Let us not rob him of this!

God is beautiful, don't you think? Just look around - ever notice the different shade of green in the spring when trees leaf out? Or, look at all the kinds of flowers. Many shades of color and shape - they are also multifunctional. The one ladies I love the most are the beauty it lends to the environment.

God is THE most AWESOME creator! Nature proves it. Romans 1:19-20.

ginnyrose

**Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2010/5/8 14:08**

Hi RainMan...

-- You wrote: "I believe in the inerrancy of scriptures. But scientifically speaking it is easy for God to either speed up or slow down time. I believe time is a creation of God and he is not bound by it. I believe creation took 6 days as the bible says simply as the God that created time he can cram 600 billion years of creative work into a nano-second if he chooses to. I believe creation in genesis is told from God's perspective as an infinite being and to that infinite being it took 6 days. From a scientific perspective what we perceive took gazillion of years took God six days. I think time can be accelerated within a black hole or by gravity so even in the universe as we know it time is in a constant state of flux (I think)."

I had a Physics professor at the secular university that I attended who also taught Sunday School at a nearby church. He was a well-recognized professor, and I enjoyed spending time in his office after class. He even wrote a letter of recommendation from which I received a scholarship from NASA. He would tell people the same thing that you just did -- that God was not confined by an earthly concept of "time." In addition, God is not confined by the laws of Physics either (laws that he created to govern nature).

The professor pointed out that several of the six "days" of Creation took place BEFORE God had created the Sun, Moon and stars on the 4th day. Likewise, God created plants, trees and other forms of vegetation on the 3rd day -- again, BEFORE there was a Sun, Moon or stars. My professor made the comment that God had already created "light" and a difference between "night and day" from this "light" that likely established the sudden and accelerated process of photosynthesis to take place. In other words, my professor was explaining that the laws of nature (physics, chemistry, biology, etc...) were not established until the six days were completed.

One reason that many secular scientists scoff at the notion of Creation has less to do with the theory of evolution (because, believe it or not, there are still some scientists who do not embrace macro-evolution but still embrace the Big Bang) and more to do with the nature of "light." According to Einstein's (et al's) theories of Relativity and Special Relativity, time is NOT a universal constant...but is "relative" according to placement. In other words, a millisecond on Earth is NOT equivalent to a millisecond while traveling on a space ship traveling at or near the speed of light. To scientists, the only universal constant is the speed at which light travels (\*which is odd given that speed is measured by distance divided by time anyway).

To illustrate this, here is a quick illustration: A married couple is traveling on a high speed glass train. The husband asks his wife for a candy bar. She takes it out of her purse and throws it to him. What is the speed (distance divided by time) at which the candy bar traveled? Well, this depends upon relativity perspective. To the husband, the wife tossed the candy bar at 3 miles per hour (a very slow and catchable speed). However, to a person observing from a train platform, they saw this candy bar travel at 103 mph (3 mph for the toss + 100 mph for the train speed). Now, to a person on the Int

International Space Station, this candy bar traveled 1103 mph (1000 mph for the rotation of the Earth + 100 mph for the train speed + 3 mph for the toss). To a person in a spaceship traveling to Mars, they would see this speed differently given the rate of the Earth's revolution around the Sun. This "speed" would be relative to the placement of the observer.

According to Einstein, the highest speed that can be observed -- regardless of relative placement -- is the speed of light. This is the sudden and never-decreasing "burst" of light away from its emitter (approximately 186,000 miles per second). They believe that this speed from the burst of light-producing energy will never change (and will remain the same regardless of perspective). This is why they consider it the universal physical constant. Of course, I always wonder what one lightwave would look like to another lightwave traveling beside it. Since any significant mass increases exponentially with speed, scientists assert that it would take an infinite amount of energy to accelerate to that speed. Mass would likewise increase...resulting in disaster in terms of gravitational pull.

Scientists scoff at the notion of a young universe because of this very reason. They look at the vast expanse of space. They consider the speed of light to be a constant (that travels at approximately 186,000 miles per second). Remember when your school teacher used to tell you that "looking at a star is looking back in time" because our perspective is what that light looked like at the time according to the distance? In other words, a star that we see that is 10,000 light years away (186,000 miles per second X 10,000 years = 9.4605284  $\times 10^{19}$  meters) is supposedly seeing that that star looked like 10,000 years ago. According to scientists, most of the stars in the universe are more than 6000 light years away from the Earth. The fact that their light has already arrived to Earth to be seen is "proof" enough to them that the Universe is older than 6000 years old.

However, I agree with what you and my professor stated. God was NOT confined to the laws of nature when He created the Universe. He is not confined to the speed of light. Since God is infinite, He could burst an infinite amount of design into a single "day" of Creation -- even if this "day" was 24 hours relative to the Earth. I suppose that some scientists have difficulty with such a notion because they can't understand something (or Someone) who is not bound to the constraints of the laws of nature (including Physics, distance, time and the speed of light).

I do, however, believe that God "rested" from exceeding those physical laws on the 7th day. While He is still not bound to those laws (after all, He is omnipotent and is able to be everywhere throughout Eternity AND this physical universe at any given moment), I do believe that God has chosen the boundaries of the laws of nature for our own good and protection. It is unfortunate that some minds will look at those laws and try to reason away the One who created them in the first place.

\*EDIT - When I interned with NASA each summer, I knew quite a few engineers, scientists and mathematicians who were sincere believers.

**Re: , on: 2010/5/8 14:09**

I don't believe in the evolution to which they teach in schools, however, I do believe that the word evolution does exist in creation, as we can see it all around us. Well, not instantly of course, but over time we can see evolution that God has caused the Earth to regenerate itself like the Human body was designed to.

Many have different ideas of the creation story and without the Holy Spirits help we can create our own beginnings of how it all happened.

Me thinks that God was creating the Paradise and in creating the Paradise whatever spiritual thing was being created in this Paradise had a natural correspondent being created on earth.

In this Paradise the Light was called Day, it was a living Day, as Darkness was a living Night. Everything in this Paradise was Spiritual. Both the Light and the Darkness that God created was good.

Outside this realm to which we know as Earth has all the likenesses of what Adam and Eve saw in the Paradise of God.

If any man be contentious over these words, I have no trouble believing that God created things instantly and created everything that was created in that first 24 hour period. However, when we see how God works in our own lives how He gradually makes us into what He wants us to become, it's easy to second guess the creation story as merely being done in 7 days. In fact, it's much more glorious to see the creation being created over a good period of time.

But the big bang is sheer foolishness to which no evolutionist can give a proper answer for, at least I haven't met one.

**Re: creationist cosmology - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/5/8 14:36**

Chris: Have you read Dr. Menton's creation cosmology? I think the book is called Starlight and Time. He really takes general relativity and the fact that the earth does seem to be roughly at the center of an expanding universe and shows why the cosmos "looks" so old from our frame of reference using the theory of relativity. It is almost as if his cosmology "falls out" of Einstein's theory. It also answers many hard questions that the big bang theory utterly fails to answer. I think you would really enjoy it. Ultimately all we have are theories where cosmology is concerned, but Dr. Menton's is true to the Biblical account.

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2010/5/8 15:08**

Still thinking about this issue....

I love to look at nature, observe life, how things function and what they look like...and I am so amazed.

Many years ago there was a flock of cedar waxwings that settled in our cedar trees by our house. They were a migratory flock that stopped en route to - who knows where. Anyhow, some flew into our windows, stunning them, falling to the ground under the windows. I went outside, picked up a couple and studied the birds. The colors of their feathers, the placement of them - all consistent from one bird to the next. On each bird there were one or two red feathers on each wing (EDIT for clarity), surrounded by brown feathers - all exactly at the same place. What purpose did those two (or one - I could not tell for certain) feathers serve on that bird except to incite wonder and praise from me for their creator?

I am convinced you will have limited success in convincing any evolutionist from the scripture the error of evolution because the Bible is not a source of authority in his/her life. Evolution serves to create within its adherents a distrust for the Word of God. If it can be discredited, how can I know but what the remaining is not in suspect? (The assumption of God being the creator is woven throughout the entire WORD.) Evolution vs creation is a philosophical issue not a scientific one. (And be careful you do not confuse mutations with evolution.)

Ravi Zacharias said it well when he said: "Is it possible that somewhere in the deepest recesses of the human heart, we are really not battling intellectual ideas as much as we are fighting for the right for our own sexual proclivities and our passionate indulgences?"

My thoughts..

ginnyrose

**Re: - posted by deltadom (), on: 2010/5/8 15:52**

The Bible is essentially the History of Man!

We went to a conference in which was called Darwinism is Dead hosted by Moriel which had scientists like Professor Andy Macintosh (Thermodynamics), John Mackay (Geologist, Fossils) and Others.

Stating that some Non Christian Scientists do not believe in Evolution, the most embarrassing thing was the cover of the New Scientist which stated Darwinism is Wrong (<http://www.newscientist.com/article/mg20126921.600-why-darwin-was-wrong-about-the-tree-of-life.html>) and the embarrassing findings of a T-Rex bone with live red blood cells! and the finding of a dinosaur with skin on and other embarrassing things like this!

People do not understand that things like Fossils actually provide evidence for the Flood as fossils do not form over a slow period of time!

I think it was Rick Oliver was saying that there are massive Warehouses where any fossil that does not agree with the Evolutionary Propaganda is put in a warehouse.

The fossil record essentially provides evidence of a flood! They were also saying that the amount of human fossils mixed in with all the other fossils are too embarrassing to the Evolutionists.

It may not be one of the key notes but to state that Mount St. Helens which was a volcano provided evidence that rapid catastrophe provided fossilized wood and such things!

There are other Professors like John C. Sanford which goes into Genetic Information a bit more in detail and then you have Professor Stuart Burgess which adds the Teleological or Design Argument into a bit more depth! There are others like Werner Gitt. Answers in Genesis is a brilliant website to prove Evolution a fallacious argument! It is not Darwin but Charles Lytle and others.

**General Topics :: Does the Bible disprove the Theory of Evolution?**

What we have to believe is the Bible is one hundred percent true! Evolution is a scientific argument as you cannot do good science without him!