

How Did We Get Here?

Today we continue our series on worldviews, primarily focusing on the Biblical worldview. A worldview is the core set of beliefs you have that affects how you view all of life. One of the key questions that any worldview attempts to answer is: how did we get here? How did the universe come into existence and how did life originate? The answers to these two fundamental questions establish the foundation of your world view.

There are three basic choices for how the universe came into existence. The first choice is that the universe is eternal. It has always existed. The second choice is that the universe came into existence out of nothing. The third choice is that something caused the universe to come into existence.

Many scientists used to believe that the universe was eternal. This tended also to be the belief of Pantheists because in their world view God and the universe are one and the same and so if God has always existed, so must the universe.

A number of scientific discoveries led the vast majority of scientists to reject the eternal universe theory and to conclude that the universe began at a moment in time in a theory called the Big Bang Theory. Scientists found supporting evidence for this theory in cosmic microwave background radiation, the red-shift in observing stars which indicated the universe is expanding, and other observations. To date, this theory of the origin of the universe is well supported by the evidence and widely accepted by scientists.

The Big Bang Theory states that all the matter of the universe began as a single point of almost infinite temperature and density condensed into the size maybe of a period at the end of a sentence. Within a second the universe rapidly expanded and continues to expand today. I've greatly simplified the theory, but the key thing to note is that the Big Bang Theory does not explain what produced the matter out of nothing, but only explains what happened to it once time began. Most scientists agree that at time zero matter, time and all dimensions came into existence.

So the Big Bang Theory hypothesizes that at one point the universe did not exist and then in a defined moment it suddenly did as a highly compressed singularity that rapidly expanded. So, the Big Bang Theory is compatible with the Biblical world view that the universe was created out of nothing. So, that leaves us with the options that the universe came into existence out of nothing or that something caused the universe to come into existence.

Some scientists have suggested that the universe was caused by nothing. They say quantum mechanics apparently has demonstrated that there is a slight possibility that something can come from nothing through a quantum fluctuation. A quantum fluctuation is a change in energy at the subatomic level.

Gerald Schroeder in his book, *The Science of God*, explains why a quantum fluctuation is not a likely cause of the universe. He gives these reasons. First a quantum fluctuation is a law of nature, but it is unlikely that it exists without nature. How could you have a law of nature without any nature for it to describe? In other words, you would first have to have a universe before you could have a quantum fluctuation. Second, effects, like the universe, have to be separated in time from their cause, but if time did not exist until the universe came into existence, then again the quantum fluctuation could not have preceded the universe and been its cause. Finally, there

was no place for the quantum fluctuation to occur because there was nothing before the universe began.

The idea of the universe could spontaneously come into existence out of nothing is really as unbelievable as it sounds. I would say that belief requires much more faith than simply believing that an all-powerful God created the universe out of nothing.

The last option is the option that most religions choose. God or gods caused the universe to come into existence. Understand that once you accept the premise of an eternal, all-powerful God then there is nothing contradictory about the idea that such a being could create the universe out of nothing, because that is an example of what being all-powerful means. Such a being would necessarily have to be eternal because if he was not eternal then something would have to create him and that being would have to be eternal. If you don't have an eternal universe then you necessarily have to have a cause of the universe that is eternal.

Two thousand years ago, the apostle Paul made the argument that the existence of the creation was sufficient evidence to prove God's eternal power. Look at Romans 1:18-19 on your sermon outline. Read. Notice the two divine attributes that Paul mentions in verse 19, eternal power. According to God, people suppress the truth about God that is clearly revealed in creation and they are without excuse. An honest evaluation of the evidence should cause a person to conclude that God exists and that he is eternal and all-powerful. There is evidence for God's existence and it is everywhere around you so that no one has an excuse not to believe in God. If they don't believe in God, it is because they are suppressing the truth in unrighteousness.

The first words of the Bible are: In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. Genesis chapters 1 & 2 describe God's creation of the universe and of life. The Bible establishes from the very beginning that God created everything, including all living things. We are here because of God. He created us and we belong to him. These truths affect and influence everything else in our Biblical world view.

Before I move on to life itself, I will point out that there is supporting evidence that God created the universe and that he specifically designed Earth for life. More and more, physicists are discovering that the universe and Earth are uniquely designed to support life. Listen to these examples.

Professor Weinberg in an article in Scientific American (October 1994) stated that life in the universe would be impossible without the fine tuning of several physical constants. He mentioned that the energy of the Big Bang had to be tuned exactly to one part in 10 to the 120 power for life to exist anywhere in our universe. Michael Turner, an astrophysicist said that degree of accuracy would be like throwing a dart across the entire universe and hitting a bullseye one millimeter in diameter on the other side. And we're supposed to believe that just "happened" without intervention from God?

Hugh Ross in his book *The Creator and the Cosmos* lists 33 physical constants such as galaxy type, planet age, axial tilt that have to be just right in our galaxy and solar system and Earth for Earth to be able to support life. Albert Einstein was no orthodox believer but he felt a "rapturous amazement at the harmony of natural law, which reveals an intelligence of such superiority that compared with it all the systematic thinking and acting of human beings is an utterly insignificant reflection." He went on to say, "God does not play dice with the cosmos," which was a criticism against those who think the universe can be explained by materialistic, random processes alone.

Why do some scientists see evidence for design in the universe and others don't? It all has to do with their world view. If you have as your starting point that nothing exists except the material universe, then you cannot entertain any evidence that might suggest otherwise.

Let's talk about life on the Earth. Two main theories exist to explain the existence of life on the Earth. One is Evolution, the theory that all life descended from a single organism through the natural selection of random mutations. The other theory is special creation. There is a kind of mediating theory called Theistic Evolution which basically says that God is behind the existence of all life, he still in some way directed it, and evolution is the way he did it.

Evolution by its very nature is naturalistic. Evolutionists repeatedly say that evolution is undirected. It is a totally random process. Whatever happens is due to chance alone. Most evolutionists would reject Theistic Evolution as being a hopeless contradiction in terms. You can't both have God directing something and have an undirected, random process. The two concepts are mutually contradictory. I would agree with that analysis. I think you really only have two choices: Creation or Evolution.

Genesis 1 presents God creating plant and animal life and man. God's creative work is intentional and purposeful, the exact opposite of what the Theory of Evolution asserts. Genesis 1 does repeatedly state that God created animals after their own kind and that they reproduce after their own kind. Now, we don't know precisely what taxonomic level a kind represents. In Biology you have a classification system that organizes every living thing according to taxonomic levels such as Kingdom (plant, animal or protist), Phylum (animals with a backbone or no backbone), Class, Order, Family, Genus and Species. So, for example a modern dog would be in the Family of Canidae (all four-footed dog-like creatures), the Genus of Canus (wolf-like creatures), and the Species of Familiares (modern dogs). Which taxonomic level does a kind represent?

Here is where there could be some harmony between evolution and creation depending on what a "kind" is. If a "kind" represents the taxonomic level of family or a genus then it allows for the possibility that God created maybe the dog family but that through natural selection, population drift, and other natural processes that doglike creatures evolved into wolves, coyotes, foxes etc. We would call this microevolution because there is not a lot of change in the animal's basic structure, mainly changes in size and shape.

The vast amount of transitional fossils that have been found are at these lower levels of taxonomy. The overwhelming gaps in the fossil record occur at the highest taxonomic levels such as kingdom, phylum and class where the vast amount of structural and biological changes have to occur. In these gaps you would expect to find the most transitional fossils because many more transitional fossils would be required to bridge the gaps, but the fossil record shows the exact opposite. The evidence is missing for the biggest gaps such as moving from invertebrates to vertebrates, from class to class like fish to amphibians, amphibians to reptiles, reptiles to birds or mammals. Animals appear fully formed with no transitional forms preceding them at the higher levels. The fossil record does not support macroevolution.

Let's talk about some of the evidence for creation. Let's begin with the cell and DNA. DNA is the coded information contained within the chromosome that determines every aspect of the organism's body. Here is a description from Carl Sagan's book, The Dragons of Eden. Read. The information content of a single chromosome represents the information contained in four thousand books. Since we have forty six chromosomes you multiply 46 by four thousand to get roughly 180,000 books. That's staggering. That's almost unbelievable. And what completely blows my mind is that someone like Sagan, who knew all that still thought that those

chromosomes came about by chance alone. Let me ask you, how many of you think you could write 180,000 books? I doubt that any of us with our intelligence could master that feat and yet Sagan thinks that unthinking, unknowing natural processes could produce error free volumes given enough time. That's like thinking you can put a monkey in a room with a computer and expect that in four billion years of random hitting of the keyboard that he can produce about 180,000 readable novels. Too me that's absurd and requires much more faith than belief in God.

Consider the human brain. It has 100-500 trillion nerve synapses connecting throughout the brain. It is millions of times more powerful than the most powerful supercomputer of today noted Dr. Henry Markram of the Human Brain Project. If men tried to recreate a working human brain it would require the same megawatts to run an entire town in the middle of winter. Whereas our brains run on the equivalent of about 20 watts of energy or the energy needed for a small light bulb. If you were walking in the woods and came into a clearing and there sat a supercomputer, how would you explain how it got there? Would you say that over billions of years, through random natural processes that supercomputer self-assembled? Or would you guess that some intelligent being placed that computer in the woods? Naturalistic evolution is intuitively nonsense. The complexity of life, even the complexity of a single cell, screams intelligent design.

How can intelligent people believe that blind natural processes produced life? I quote Dr. Michael Ruse from the Canadian National Post, May 13, 2000.

“Evolution is promoted by its practitioners as more than mere science. Evolution is promulgated as an ideology, a secular religion, a full-fledged alternative to Christianity, with meaning and morality. I am an ardent evolutionist and an ex-Christian, but I must admit that in this one complaint-the literalists are right. Evolution is a religion. This was true of evolution in the beginning, and it is true of evolution still today.”

I would use the word, worldview, rather than religion, but essentially he is correct.

Dr. Scott Todd, Kansas State University, stated in Nature 401; Sept. 30, 1999, “Even if all data point to an intelligent designer, such a hypothesis is excluded from science because it is not naturalistic.” Chuck Colson in his book How Now Shall We Live cites Harvard Geneticist Richard Lewontin as saying, “in the struggle between science and the supernatural,” we “take the side of science...Because we have a prior commitment to materialism.”

What each of these men are saying and which can be easily demonstrated by others is that the philosophy of naturalism or materialism has taken over the Scientific establishment and even if there is scientific evidence for intelligent design it will be discarded, reinterpreted, or ignored because it is not compatible with naturalism or the belief that nothing exists outside the material world.

Why does science have to be wedded to naturalism? It doesn't. Historically it wasn't. All the earliest scientists like Boyle, Faraday, Newton, and Pascal were all Christian theists. They looked for natural explanations, but they did not rule out the existence of God. In fact they assumed that the very order and natural laws they were studying were only possible because an intelligent, orderly Creator had created the universe and therefore it could be studied. Science works because nature is not random. It is highly ordered so that you can discover and formulate natural laws, you can repeat experiments and the results stay the same, one scientist can copy another scientist's methods and get the same results. Science can only function because of order and design in the Universe and yet naturalists want to deny the only explanation for that order and design.

What are the logical consequences for believing evolution and believing creation? Let's begin with evolution and naturalism. I quote from Dr. William Provine, Professor of Biological Sciences, at Cornell University:

“Let me summarize my views on what modern evolutionary biology tells us loud and clear ... There are no gods, no purposes, no goal-directed forces of any kind. There is no life after death. When I die, I am absolutely certain that I am going to be dead. That's the end for me. There is no ultimate foundation for ethics, no ultimate meaning to life, and no free will for humans, either.”

He's correct in his analysis. Some of the consequences of naturalism and Evolution are no gods, no purpose in life, no life after death, no meaning to life, and no free will. I would add some others. You have no intrinsic value because you are simply the lucky roll of the dice. There is no final judgment to hold you accountable and to ensure justice. There's no real reason to choose good over evil especially if you can personally benefit more from committing evil. There is no reason for Doctor Provine's students not to cheat on his exams and no reason for his fellow professors not to steal his ideas and present them as their own. Man is the source of morality.

Chuck Colson in his book, *How Now Should We Live*, cites Berkeley Law Professor, Phillip Johnson.

“I have found that any discussion with modernists about the weaknesses of the theory of evolution quickly turns into a discussion of politics, particularly sexual politics.” Why? Because modernists “typically fear that any discrediting of naturalistic evolution will end in women being sent to the kitchen, gays to the closet, and abortionists to jail.”

Colson comments:

“In other words, most people sense instinctively that there is much more at stake here than a scientific theory—that a link exists between the material order and the moral order. Though the fears Johnson encounters are certainly exaggerated, this basic intuition is right.”

Your belief about how you got here will affect your morality.

People want to frame the debate as being between Science and religion but it is really between naturalism and theism.

What are some of the consequences of choosing creation over naturalistic evolution? There is a God who is responsible for my existence. I belong to him. He has a moral code which I am required to follow. There is a reason for my existence and a purpose for my life. I have value because I am created by God. All other people also have value because they are created and loved by God. I am supposed to treat all other people with respect regardless of their beliefs, nationality, religion, race, or mental competence, because they belong to God. God holds me accountable for my actions. Life continues after death because this material world is not the total reality.

Our world view determines how we understand the universe and ourselves.

I want to close by reading to you an excerpt from the book, *The Magician's Nephew* by C.S. Lewis. CS Lewis was a great apologist for the Christian faith as well as a great writer. He describes the creation of Narnia as a parable of the creation of the earth. In his story Aslan the great Lion, who represents Jesus, sings the world into existence, but there is one who refuses to believe that Aslan is creating Narnia. He is Uncle Andrew. He refuses to believe what he sees and hears until finally he sees and hears only what he believes. Read *The Magician's Nephew*.

May you and I have eyes that truly see and ears that truly hear. Close in prayer.