

First printing: August 2006

Copyright © 1993, 2006 by Werner Gitt. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission of the publisher except in the case of brief quotations in articles and reviews. For information write: Master Books, P.O. Box 726, Green Forest, AR 72638.

ISBN-13: 978-0-89051-483-2

ISBN-10: 0-89051-483-6

Library of Congress Number: 2006931166

Cover by Left Coast Design, Portland, Oregon

Unless otherwise noted, all Scripture is from the New International Version of the Bible.

Printed in the United States of America

Please visit our website for other great titles:
www.masterbooks.net.

For information regarding author interviews, please contact the publicity department at (870) 438-5288.



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The original manuscript was scrutinized by Professor Dr. Horst W. Beck, Dr. Reinhard Junker, and Dr. Jan Kaminski. I am very grateful for all their suggestions and additions.

I am grateful to Professor Jaap Kies, who was able to devote his valuable time to the translation of this book. A special note of appreciation is due to Marianne Rothe, who edited the translation.

CONTENTS

Introduction	7
1. Scientific Questions	9
1.1 The Principles of Science Theory	9
1.2 The Basic Assumptions of Evolution.....	12
1.3 The Basic Assumptions of Creationism.....	16
1.4 The Basic Assumptions of Theistic Evolution.....	22
1.5 Some Consequences	23
2. Anthropological Observations.....	25
2.1 The Origin of Man (OB1).....	25
2.2 The Origin of Human Language (OB2)	27
2.3 The Origin of the Sexes (OB3)	30
2.4 The Origin of Marriage (OB4)	31
2.5 The Origin of Death (OB5)	33
2.6 The Origin of Religions (OB6).....	39
2.7 The So-called “Fundamental Law of Biogenetics” (OB7)	41
2.8 The Essential Nature of Man (OB8).....	43
2.9 Human Behavior (OB9).....	45
3. Astronomical Observations	49
3.1 The Origin of the Universe (OB10).....	49
3.2 The Future of the Universe (OB11).....	53
3.3 The Center of the Universe (OB12).....	54
4. Biological Observations.....	57
4.1 The First Life on Earth (OB13)	57
4.2 “Each According to Its Kind” (OB14).....	59

4.3	Animal Nourishment (OB15)	62
4.4	Differences Between Human Life and Animal Life (OB16).....	63
5.	Observations on Information Science.....	67
5.1	What is Information? The View of Information Science (OB17).....	67
5.2	What is Information? The Biblical View (OB18).....	71
5.3	What is Life? The Evolutionary View.....	72
5.4	What is Life? The Informational View (OB19).....	73
5.5	What is Life? The Biblical View (OB20).....	76
5.6	The Origin of Biological Information and of Life	78
6.	Progressive Evolution or Completed Creation?.....	83
7.	The Consequences of Theistic Evolution	87
7.1	Danger No 1: Denial of Central Biblical Teachings...	87
7.2	Danger No 2: Misrepresentation of the Nature of God	90
7.3	Danger No 3: Loss of the Key for Finding God	92
7.4	Danger No 4: God's Incarnation Becomes Incidental.....	93
7.5	Danger No 5: Relativation of Jesus' Work of Redemption	94
7.6	Danger No 6: God Becomes a God of the Gaps.....	95
7.7	Danger No 7: Loss of Biblical Chronology.....	97
7.8	Danger No 8: Misinterpretation of Reality.....	99
7.9	Danger No 9: Loss of Creation Concepts.....	101
7.10	Danger No 10: Missing the Purpose	103
	References	107
	Index of Authors	115
	Abbreviations of the Books of the Bible.....	117
	Glossary: Explanation of Terms	119
	About the Author.....	142



INTRODUCTION

The theory of evolution is currently so widely established that it could be described as the all-inclusive and even the only philosophy of the 20th century.

The idea of self-organization from the simple to the more complex has been commonly appropriated — even in disciplines foreign to biological evolution. The development of computers is often falsely referred to as the “evolution of computers,” even though the current high-performance computers are the result of intensive research by many brilliant minds. They have been planned, constructed, and produced on purpose, and are clearly not the result of an evolutionary process.

Theology, too, was affected; evolutionary ideas have even been carried into biblical exegesis.

We will show below why evolutionistic thought is completely foreign to the Bible. This book is aimed predominantly at Christian readers who might be inclined to accept some version of theistic evolution. Over and above that, the book is set out in such a way that skeptical readers may also be guided to some decision.

The basic assumptions of science are discussed in a separate chapter. This should enable the reader to recognize which basic assumptions he automatically accepts when he decides for or against creation or evolution.

Use of the term “the theory of evolution” is intentionally avoided, because, according to the standards of science theory, evolution is a philosophical doctrine, and not a scientific theory. For the same reason, we do not refer to creation theory, but to the biblical doctrine of creation. Creation research concerns itself with deducing models from physical reality, which are based on fundamental biblical statements. A total of 20 objections (OB1 to OB20) against theistic evolution is discussed in this book. In addition to valid criticisms of evolution, the alternative, creation, is increasingly expounded more clearly in recent literature, such as [B4, E2, G3, G5, G7, G8, G10, G11, J2, S3, S4, S5]. This book also refers repeatedly to this very sustainable alternative.

As far as possible, the objections are discussed along the following lines:

1. The dictates of evolution
2. Scientific objections against these dictums
3. Biblical refutations of evolutionary assumptions

The author is an information scientist, but the discussions on information concepts in chapter 6 should be readily understood by the layman. In the last chapter, scientific and biblical objections against evolution culminate in the exposition of ten dangers inherent in theistic evolution. Many quotations expose the anti-biblical nature of such a viewpoint.



SCIENTIFIC QUESTIONS

1.1 THE PRINCIPLES OF SCIENCE THEORY

Science theory concerns itself with the possibilities and the limits of scientific knowledge. The basic assumptions of a theory are discussed, applicable methods for increasing man's knowledge are explained, and, eventually, the validity of scientific pronouncements is reviewed and evaluated. Some basic principles (P1–P11) are enunciated below:

P1: *Every theory requires basic assumptions* (a priori postulates) which cannot be proved. These presuppositions are not observable, but are of a metaphysical nature (Greek: *metà tá physiká* = above physics, i.e., not based on observation). Such assumptions are recognized by convention. As W. Stegmüller [S7, p. 33] affirms: “One need not push knowledge aside to make place for belief. Rather, one must already believe something before you can speak of knowledge and science.”

P2: *The basic assumptions are arbitrary postulates* which appear plausible to the author. According to the theoretician Karl R. Popper, the

fundamental principles of a theoretical system may be compared to the conclusions reached by a jury in a criminal case. The verdict is the basis for the practical processes which comprise the joint deductions made from the statutes of criminal law. The verdict, however, need not be the final judgment; it can be repealed or revised by an appropriate process.

Popper explains [P5, p. 110–111], “The analogy between this procedure and that by which we decide basic statements is clear. It throws light, for example, upon their relativity, and the way in which they depend upon questions raised by the theory. In the case of the trial by jury, it would be clearly impossible to *apply* the ‘theory’ unless there is first a verdict arrived at by decision; yet the verdict has to be found in a procedure that conforms to, and thus applies, part of the general legal code. The case is analogous to that of basic statements. Their acceptance is part of the application of a theoretical system; and it is only this application which makes any further applications of the theoretical system possible. The empirical basis of objective science has thus nothing ‘absolute’ about it. Science does not rest upon rock. The bold structure of its theories rises, as it were, above a swamp. It is like a building erected on piles. The piles are driven down from above into the swamp, but not down to any natural or ‘given’ base; and when we cease our attempts to drive our piles into a deeper layer, it is not because we have reached firm ground. We simply stop when we are satisfied that they are firm enough to carry the structure, at least for the time being.”

P3: *The initial postulates must be mutually consistent and should be free from inherent contradictions.*

P4: *When competing theories contradict one another (apart from errors in measurement and observations), the fault is not to be sought in the facts, but in differences in the basic postulates.*

P5: *The basic postulates may be objectively criticized and even rejected. The quality of the basic assumptions of two competing systems determines the practical success of the ensuing theories.*

P6: *If a theory is successful, it does not follow that it is correct.* “Consequently, theories are never empirically verifiable” (K. Popper; [P5, p. 17]). According to Popper, consistency is not a truth criterion, but, on the other hand, inconsistency does falsify a theory. No all-inclusive theorem, like “All swans are white” can ever be verified, not even by endless experimentation. Theories can only survive, and are only provisionally valid, for as long as they are not shown to be false by empirical reality (when a single black swan is found), and subsequently replaced by a new, better theory.

P7: *An empirical scientific system must allow experimentation.* Popper proposes the falsifiability of a theory as criterion, not its verifiability. This means that it must be possible to negate a theory by means of methodical experimentation; the logical structure of the system must allow for negation [P5, p. 41]. “It must be possible for an empirical scientific system to be refuted by experience.” One single contradictory experimental or observational result is therefore sufficient to discard a theory in its present form. A theory is good exactly when it can very readily be refuted. If it then survives any barrage of cross-fire attacks, it proves its merit. It becomes a “natural law” only after very many substantiations.

The physical law of the conservation of energy is a prime example of a very easily refutable theory, because one single unexpected experimental result will be sufficient to disprove it. This has never happened, and this law is generally accepted. Furthermore, it is a fundamentally important and useful theorem in all the exact and technical sciences. Any theory which ensures itself against falsification, and which is therefore inviolable, is scientifically trivial and untenable. It only provides a philosophical viewpoint.

Consequently, Popper defines the “real sciences” as follows [P5, p. 314]:

Insofar as a scientific statement speaks about reality, it must be falsifiable: and insofar as it is not falsifiable, it does not speak about reality.

P8: *It is necessary to distinguish between structural and exact sciences* on the one hand, and historical-interpretive sciences on the other hand, because of fundamental differences. This aspect is discussed fully in [P6, p. 112 ff].

P9: *In contrast to the theorems of the structural sciences (mathematics, informatics), no theorems of the experimental sciences can be proved; they are only more, or less, strongly established: "All knowledge is only inferential. The various conjectures or hypotheses are intuitive inferences. They are weeded out by experience, bitter experiences, and they are replaced by better conjectures: This is the only end result of experimentation in science"* (K.R. Popper; [P5, p. 565]).

Popper also states that sure knowledge is denied us. Our knowledge is a guessing game, a network of hypotheses, a fabric of conjectures [P5, p. 278]: "We do not know: we can only guess. And our guesses are guided by the unscientific, the metaphysical faith in laws, in regularities which we can uncover, discover."

P10: *A theory can only be advanced if an example that can be practically duplicated (by experiment or observation), is available.* The theorems derived from the theory must be testable, or rejectable by falsification. The acceptance of a theory depends on its repeatability.

P11: *A theory must allow predictions.* The correctness of such predictions is a prerequisite for the acceptability of a theory.

In what follows, we will discuss the essential theoretical principles of the doctrines of creation and of evolution, and of theistic evolution. It will be patently clear that the two views are so strongly divergent, that reconciliation is totally impossible. This calls for a decision. In chapters 3 to 6 we will show that the observations and facts of the exact sciences can be convincingly explained by the creation model.

1.2 THE BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF EVOLUTION

The following assumptions (E1 to E12) are fundamental principles of the doctrine of evolution but, unfortunately, they very seldom if

ever appear explicitly in evolutionary writings, although evolutionary findings depend fundamentally on them.

They are usually taken for granted and are often only implied, so that the reader finds it difficult to determine whether the statements made about evolution are based on observational data or are the basic assumptions dressed up as conclusions.

E1: *The basic principle, evolution, is taken for granted.* F.M. Wuketits, an evolution theorist, writes [W5, p. 11]: “We pre-suppose the essential correctness of biological evolution, yes, we assume that evolution is universally valid.”

Siewing defines biological evolution as follows [S6, p. 171]: “The essence of the theory of evolution is contained in the statement that all systematic categories are eventually related; therefore, all known organisms are descendants of one common ancestor.”

E2: *Evolution is a universal principle:* “The principle of development not only holds for life on earth; it extends much further. It is quite clearly the most widely valid principle imaginable, because it encompasses the entire universe. . . . All of reality around us is characterized by a history of self-development. Biological evolution is only part of this universal process” (Hoimar von Ditfurth; [D3, p. 22]).

E3a: *One should not drag in a creator* (or synonyms such as designer, planning spirit, or “demiurge”). Ernest Kahane, a French molecular biologist, formulates it as follows [S5, p. 16]: “It is absurd and absolutely preposterous to believe that a living cell could come into existence by itself; but, notwithstanding, I do believe it, because I cannot imagine anything else.” Assumption E3b follows as a consequence of E3a:

E3b: *This world, including all living organisms, is based exclusively on matter and materialistic principles.* It follows that the origin of life can only be found in matter. One can therefore exclude the possibility of a spiritual author for matter itself and for all life forms.

This view frees us from the difficulty of assuming that at some stage during the course of the development of our earth, after

animal life had started, something immaterial or psychical, nobody knows from where, stepped in and caused various effects in brains and brain capacities (B Rensch; [R1, p. 235]).

E4: *Matter is taken for granted.* The law of the conservation of energy together with Einstein's equivalence of matter and energy, $E = mc^2$, states that the sum total of all energy and all matter in our universe is constant. There is thus no scientific explanation for the origin of matter and energy, and it is therefore necessary to assume that all the energy must have existed before the supposed big bang.

E5: *As far as scientific laws are concerned, there is no difference between the origin of the earth and of all life, and their subsequent development (the principle of uniformity).*

The mechanisms of the processes through which the earth and all life on earth originated were subject to the same laws that govern the present observable reality (compare assumption C3 of creationism).

E6: *Evolution relies on processes that allow increases in organization from the simple to the more complex, from non-life to life, from lower to higher life forms.*

These processes are described as the "self-organization of matter." The so-called evolutionary factors are mentioned as cause (see E7). In the vein of E6, B. Rensch defines the evolution of the cosmos up to man as follows [R1, p. 235]: "Evolution manifests itself as a continuous progression from the origin of the solar system and the earth, through the assemblage of the first elements of life, followed by true forms of life, and increasingly higher developed groups of animals, leading up to man."

E7: *The following factors are assumed as the driving forces of evolution: Mutation, selection, isolation, and mixing.* Chance and necessity, long time epochs, ecological changes, and death are additional indispensable factors which are included in the "actual" evolutionary factors.

E7a: *"Mutation and selection are the driving forces of evolution"* (K. Lorenz).

Comment: If there were only one single example (experiment or observation) of the origin of a new kind of organism or a new structure, then E7a would have been a derived theory. The mechanisms, mutation and selection, do occur, and the appearance of a new kind would imply new genetic information. Because of the lack of any evidence of new genetic information, E7a remains an assumption.

E7b: *Death is an undisputed essential factor in evolution.* Biologist H. Mohr states [M2, p. 12]: “If there were no death, then no life would have existed. . . . There is no other way around this axiom of evolutionary theory.”

E8: *There is no plan in evolution, neither is there any purpose.* No causes should be postulated for the purposefulness perceived in organic life, because that would imply a Creator: “It is not necessary to assume a mysterious guiding principle for the purposefulness observed in the structure and life of all organisms . . . neither was a wise Creator necessary for their origin” (B. Rensch; [R1, p. 66]). Other quotations point in the same direction: “No causes can operate from the future; therefore there can be no pre-determined evolutionary purposes” (*H. v. Ditfurth*).

E9: *There are no definite beginning and end points on the time axis.* Anybody can therefore have as much time as he likes for the process of evolution. With a universe oscillating from one big bang to the next, E9 becomes patently obvious [W2, p. 16]: “Many cosmologists embrace the model of an oscillating universe on philosophical grounds, mainly because it glibly evades the issue of Genesis.” Because of the unlimited available time in the future, Carsten Bresch hopefully expects further evolutionary “hits” [B7, p. 291]: “When unlimited time is available, then sometime, somewhere, one individual will progress to the next step when he ‘throws a six.’ ”

E10: *The present is the key to the past.* This means that present-day observational data may be extrapolated as far back in time as one wishes. Examples: The present annual rate of erosion of the Grand Canyon is 0.15 mm. This leads to an age of 10 million years. The

current measured rate of expansion of the universe based on the Hubble constant, places the time of the big bang at 18 thousand million years in the past. Astronomer O. Heckmann criticizes this “remarkable sport” and describes it as calculating with “reckless abandon” [H4, p. 90].

E11: *There was a smooth transition from non-life to life.* The continuous development from simple atoms and molecules up to man is regarded as a smooth changeover from one example to the next: “The smooth conversion (from non-life to life) is a postulate of a reductionistic explanation” (B.-O. Küppers; [K4, p. 200]).

E12: *Evolution will persist in the distant future:* “When this planet becomes a ‘monon,’ evolution will enter its intellectual phase. We can only guess about its future course. . . . The direction is illustrated in the development from chaos to an intellectual intergalactic supermind; each one of us is a small part of it all” (Carsten Bresch; [B7, p. 265, 293]).

Comment: It is significant that the enunciations of the doctrine of evolution do not comprise the final conclusions resulting from measurements and observations, but more often than not, they describe the system of basic assumptions. As regards models of the origin of things and life, only theories which fit the concepts of evolution are allowed (the science of evolutionary knowledge!). Sir Arthur Keith summarizes the above as follows: “Evolution is unproven and unprovable. We believe it, however, because the only alternative is an act of creation by a God, and that is unthinkable.”

The evolutionary understanding of the Bible: There is no personal God. Consequently, the Bible has been written BY humans FOR humans, as any other piece of literature. The Bible reflects the thoughts of the time and place of its writing, and thus has no claim to the truth, neither can it be regarded as authoritative.

1.3 THE BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF CREATIONISM

Theories and models of the various creation disciplines are based on the following presuppositions. Assumptions E1 and C1, E2 and C2

. . . E12 and C12 deal with the same topics; their contents, however, are diametrically opposed. The basic assumptions clearly show that these two sets of principles are incompatible.

C1: *The basic principle of creation is taken for granted.* An understanding of the original creation can only be obtained through a biblical “temper of mind.” Biblical revelations are the key for understanding this world. The Bible is the basic, irreplaceable source of information. It is a fact of creation that we may not extrapolate the currently valid natural laws into the six days of creation. Our present experiences do not allow us to really evaluate something that has just been created.

Examples: All adults were children. But Adam could not have been created as a baby; he was a grown man. He never was a child, and it does not make sense to extrapolate a number of years into his life, just because our pre-present experiences require that every adult should have been a child. Similarly, all the stars were immediately visible in spite of immense distances. Trees were not made as seedlings; they were fully grown and complete. Neither did the birds first have to hatch from their eggs and eventually grow up. The old question of “Which was first — the hen or the egg?” has a clear and unambiguous biblical answer.

C2: *Creation is a universal principle,* that is, the entire universe and all life on earth originated at creation. According to John 1:1–3, creation encompasses everything from the microcosm to the macrocosm and from inanimate matter to man: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. . . . All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made” (KJV).

C3: *The Creator exists.* He is the God of the Bible. The Bible begins with the affirmation “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth,” and this is clearly an important basic assumption as defined by us. God is not there to fill the as yet unexplainable gaps in natural phenomena, but He is the Primal Cause of ALL things, whether or not we already understand them scientifically. If we should relegate to

the Creator only those matters which are not (yet) explainable, then everything which has already been explained, may be used to “prove” the non-existence of God. Then, as scientific knowledge accumulates, God is increasingly “explained away” (see chapter 8.6).

C4: The matter of the entire universe has been created without the use of previously existing matter. This basic principle is formulated in Hebrews 11:3: “By faith we understand that the universe was formed at God’s command, so that what is seen was not made out of what was visible.”

C5: There is a fundamental difference between the creation of the world and all living organisms on the one hand, and the subsequent processes. Natural laws derive from our experiences with matter which consistently repeat themselves; the present creation functions according to these laws in every detail. They were established at creation and provide the limits within which expected outcomes are guaranteed and can even be calculated beforehand (e.g., the law of gravity, and the laws governing chemical reactions). These limits demarcate both possible events as in technological achievements, as well as impossible events (e.g., stones falling upward, and “perpetual motion” machines functioning without energy being supplied). The physical processes within living organisms are also subject to these limits.

C6: God’s creative activities cannot be explained in terms of natural laws, neither are they subject to the above limits. Creation is a singular event by which the present natural laws came into existence. Concerning these creative acts, one can only look so far across this “event horizon” as God reveals in His Word. That which God has revealed in Holy Scripture is therefore fundamental and irrefutable information which cannot be obtained otherwise.

Comment: According to the well-known law of the conservation of energy, energy cannot be created nor can it be destroyed in this universe. This fact illuminates basic assumption C6. The origin of the energy presently in the universe cannot be described in terms of known physical laws, because creation occurred outside the currently valid laws. Evolutionary presupposition E6 is contradicted by C6.

Analogy: The origin of the Bible can be seen as analogous to the creation of the universe. If creation cannot be explained in terms of natural laws, neither can the origin of God's Word be explained by scientific methods like history, text criticisms, or archaeology. According to Isaiah 55:8–9, the acts of God concerning the establishment of the Bible is outside our field of understanding, therefore we can only understand it as far as it is revealed in God's Word.

C7: The following factors or causes of creation are mentioned many times in the Bible:

- by the Word of God: Psalm 33:6; John 1:1–4; Hebrews 11:3
- by the power of God: Jeremiah 10:12
- by God's wisdom: Psalm 104:24; Proverbs 3:19; Colossians 2:3
- according to the will of God: Genesis 1:26; Revelation 4:11
- by the Son of God: John 1:1–4 & 10; Colossians 1:15–17; Hebrews 1:2b
- according to the character of Jesus: Matthew 11:29; John 10:11; John 14:27
- out of nothing: Hebrews 11:3
- instantaneously: Psalm 33:6

These factors were in operation during the six days of creation. They are not subject to natural laws and can therefore only be comprehended by faith (Heb. 11:3).

C8: Purposes require a Designer. Aspects of creation clearly point to the Creator (Rom. 1:19–20). They bear witness to the wisdom (genius, intelligence, richness of ideas; Col. 2:3) and omnipotence (Ps. 19:2) of the Creator; but they do not disclose His other characteristics (like love, grace, goodness) and functions (Savior, Redeemer, Comforter) which are essential for our faith in Him.

In the vein of C8 it has been reasoned as follows: "Let us imagine that some astronauts discovered a golden calf on the moon, or that deep sea

explorers stumble on a statue of Venus. Even if they bore the inscription ‘sculpsit evolutio’ (shaped by evolution), I regard it as more likely that intelligent beings had produced them, than assuming that chance and necessity were the cause” (L. Oeing-Hanhoff [O1 p 63]).

Comment: It is highly significant that the remarkable genius observed in nature is explained (especially in living organisms). One should not replace the biblical conclusions, leading from creation to the Creator, with contrived philosophical “proofs” of God’s existence — “For although they knew God . . .” (Rom. 1:21).

Knowledge of God and Christ is only obtained through the Word of God in the Bible: As proclaimed by the spoken and the written word (Rom. 10:17; Rev. 1:3) and the personal witness of believers (Acts 1:8).

C9: *There is a definite beginning point of time, as set out in Genesis 1:1.* Time and matter came into existence at creation, and they will also have a definite end (Rev. 10:6). The age of the universe is tied up with the existence of human generations (biblical genealogies), and is definitely not of the order of millions or billions of years.

C10: *The past is the key to the present.* This is exactly the inverse of the evolutionary presupposition E8. The present can only be understood in the light of three crucial past events: creation, man’s sin, and the flood of Noah. Three secondary basic theorems can be deduced:

C10a: *Death is the result of the sin of the first human couple* (Gen. 2:17; Gen. 3:17–19; Rom. 5:12, 14; Rom. 6:23; 1 Cor. 15:21).

C10b: *All life forms were adversely affected by man’s sin* (Rom. 8:20, 22). The destructive biological structures (e.g., bacteria which cause diseases; parasites; death-dealing mechanisms of snakes, spiders, predatory plants, and animals; and tribulations resulting from “thorns and thistles”) cannot be explained except as a result of sin. The generally observed impermanence of things has also been caused by sin.

C10c: *The present geological structures of the earth’s crust cannot be explained without recourse to Noah’s flood.*

C11: *There is a clear difference between living organisms and non-living matter.* Matter and energy are necessary fundamental qualities of all life, but they do not distinguish living systems from non-living systems. One of the central characteristics of all living creatures is the inherent information required for all life processes and the genetic information required for procreation. Information is an essential aspect of all life forms. In the extreme case, sub-microscopic viroids are no more than bearers of information. On the other hand, even very complex organic compounds like proteins are not alive, because they do not contain encoded information. It should be obvious that information distinguishes between living and inanimate substances. Pasteur's statement that life can only come from life (*omne vivum ex vivo*), can thus be expressed as follows: Information must have a source.

C12: *The creation of living organisms (original kinds) is completed.* As described in Genesis 1, all original living types ("each according to its kind") were created during the six days of creation. All later changes (e.g., races) are merely variations of the previously created original kinds.

Creation research comprises the following: (**Note:** Creation research refers to the investigation of that which has already been created; God's creative acts themselves are hidden from us [see assumption C6].)

1. *All scientifically available facts are used.* As far as they involve measurements and observations, facts are processed by means of currently available scientific instruments.

2. *Biblical statements are not the object of creation research, rather, they are the point of departure.* It is not the intention to prove the validity of Bible, but to show that the facts of nature can be much more readily explained by means of premises based on the Bible than by using an evolutionary approach.

3. *All theories based on the assumption of evolution are evaluated critically.* When considering scientific results (facts and meanings), there is a distinct difference between the purely factual aspects of data, and

conclusions based on the doctrine of evolution. Theories formulated in creation research are equally subject to critical scrutiny and eventual improvement. Only explicit biblical statements are not questioned.

4. How the Bible is understood: Human authors wrote as inspired by God's Holy Spirit (2 Pet. 1:20, 21; 2 Tim. 3:16). God supervised the exact words used originally, even to the point of the actual choice of correct idiomatic expressions, without circumventing the personalities of the writers. In this way, the Bible carries the seal of truth, and all its pronouncements are authoritative — whether they deal with questions of faith and salvation, questions of daily life, or matters of scientific importance [G6, p. 44–45]. The Bible is the ONLY revelation authorized by God, apart from personal guidance in daily matters. God abhors all other purported revelations (e.g., occultism, meditation, and the founding of cults and religions). See Deuteronomy 4:2; Proverbs 30:6; 1 Corinthians 4:6; and Revelation 22:18–19. Further aspects of the interpretation of the Bible are discussed in chapter 8.1.

1.4 THE BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF THEISTIC EVOLUTION

Evolutionary assumptions E1, E2, E5, E6, E7, E9, E10, E11, and E12 are directly applicable to “theistic evolution.” Three additional theorems distinguish it from “plain” evolution. There is an unbridgeable chasm between theistic evolution and the biblical doctrine of creation.

T1: God used evolution as a means of creating.

T2: The Bible contains no usable or relevant ideas which can be applied in present-day science.

T3: Evolutionistic pronouncements have priority over biblical statements. The Bible must be reinterpreted when and wherever it contradicts the present evolutionary world view. J. Illies states [I5]: “Using a correction factor of 1 to 365,000, brings us to two thousand million years, which is much closer to the truth.”

The theistic approach to understanding the Bible: The existence of God is assumed, but He is not at all the form-giving and inspiring author of

the Scriptures. Rather, the Bible is regarded as the product of historical influences; the writers reflected their own circumstances and the contemporary world view. A. Läpple uses this view when he describes the Bible as being conceived by human endeavors [L1, p. 42]:

They regarded the earth as a round, flat disk. It is the center of the universe, floating on the primeval ocean — the waters below the earth. . . . The solid firmament above spans the terrestrial disk, with the sun, moon, and stars fixed to it like lamps.

The Bible is regarded as a collection of documents which partially contains God's Word, among others. According to this viewpoint, various creation myths and different traditions are recognized. The real contents are only revealed when these cultural and historical shells are removed. The Bible thus contains no authoritative, binding truths, but must be freshly interpreted and corrected for every era and in every situation.

1.5 SOME CONSEQUENCES

1. *From the philosophy of science:* No absolute knowledge is available. The idea of autonomous human reason has been shown to be invalid according to present-day theories of science. All of man's science has a preliminary character, as Popper maintained [P5, p. 280–281], “The old scientific ideal of *episteme* — of absolutely certain, demonstrable knowledge — has proved to be an idol. The demand for scientific objectivity makes it inevitable that every scientific statement must remain *tentative for ever* . . . for it is not his *possession* of knowledge, of irrefutable truth, that makes the man of science, but his persistent and recklessly critical *quest* for truth.”

Bible-believing Christians ought to know that there are no scientific philosophical objections today which prohibit the use of the Bible for explaining the facts of nature (creation science). The fundamental concepts of the Bible are God's revelation, a source which far surpasses human reason and comprises a solid rock foundation. A scientist

who is predisposed to evolution (see evolutionary assumption E1) can present his models as hypotheses only, which — according to Popper — stand on unstable marshy ground.

2. *From creation research:* Questions of origin can only be answered when an a priori revelation is available (see assumption C6). We agree with W. Pauli, winner of the Nobel prize in physics, who said that all scientific methods fail when questions of origin are involved. Biblical enunciations thus have a wider range of applicability than scientific statements. The present author has discussed this question fully in [G2, p. 21–24].

When we creation scientists describe nature convincingly and consistently, our model will not be acceptable to some people, because it implies the living God's existence and assumes the truth of the entire Bible. This is not surprising, for science is completely secularized, and theology is largely liberalized. Popper holds the plausible view that a competing theory is best vindicated if it survives the most stringent tests. If this criterion is applied to the acceptance of creationism, its rapid growth should be significant.

3. *From theistic evolution:* Proponents of theistic evolution relegate the Bible to a subordinate role. When the Bible is quoted, the purpose usually is to read other meanings into the Scriptures, namely those required by evolution. Many contemporary scientists and believers have unfortunately been led astray to a false understanding of the Holy Scriptures.