

## THERE WAS EVENING — AND THERE WAS MORNING

By Richard G. Korthals

Lt. Colonel, U.S.A.F. Academy, Colorado

“In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth. And the earth was without form and void and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters, and God said, ‘Let there be light.’ And there was light, and God saw that the light was good, and God separated the light from the darkness. God called the light day, and the darkness He called Night. And there was evening and there was morning, one day.” (Genesis 1:1-5)

“Away out there alone, above,  
Without a thing to make it of,  
The world was made without a flaw,  
Without a hammer or a saw.  
Without a bit of wood or stone  
Without a bit of flesh or bone,  
Without a board or nail or screw,  
Or anything to nail it to.  
Without a foothold or a trace  
Of anything at all but space.  
The only thing the Lord could do  
Was simply speak a word or two  
And if the story told is true,  
The world came boldly into view.”

And if the story told is true . . . Two centuries ago the mere hint that this story could possibly be false would have been sufficient to brand the speaker a heretic. Today the acceptance of this story of the creation as true can result in the word “fool” being attached to your name. Why has this almost violent change in attitude taken place — and who, if anybody, is correct?

The why can probably best be answered by quoting a recent Life Nature Library publication entitled “Evolution.” The following is written on page 10 concerning evolution: “Darwin did not invent the concept. But when he started his career, the doctrine of special creation could be doubted only by heretics. When he finished, the fact of evolution could be denied only by the abandonment of reason. He demolished the old theory with two books. One published in 1859, he titled ‘On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life.’ The second, published in 1871, he called ‘The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex.’

The books did not so much undermine the old, comfortable order of things as simply overwhelm it; nobody had ever bothered to try documenting the other side — instantaneous creation — with such a painstaking built structure of evidence. At two strokes Darwin gave modern science a rationale, a philosophy, an evolutionary, and thereby revolu-

tionary, way of thinking about the universe and everything in it, and incidentally established himself as the Newton of biology. But at the same time he dealt mankind’s preening self-esteem a body blow from which it may never recover, and for which Darwin may never be quite forgiven. For it is one thing for man to be told (and want to believe) that he was created in the literal image of God. It is quite another for him to be told (and have to accept) that he is, while unique, merely the culmination of a billion years of ever-evolving life, and that he must trace his godhood down a gnarled and twisted family tree through mammals and amphibians to the lowly fish and thence to some anonymous, if miraculous, Adam molecule.

Was Darwin right? Is the world, and its inhabitants, the result of a cosmic accident? Are we the descendants of some lower order of mammal, and as such then constantly evolving into a more perfect form of mankind? If we realize that Darwin was a scientist, committed to the method of science, *and if we accept this method*, then we must answer yes to the question regarding evolution. It is very evident in studying history that Darwin was a product of his time, a time when science came into its own. Had Darwin not developed the concept of evolution, then somebody else would have. Therefore, if I must think as a pure scientist, committed only to using the methods of science, then I must agree with him — I really have little choice.

Should our church then re-examine its position on creation? Are we justified in having people research Biblical documents line by line, word by word, letter by letter, looking for hidden and obscure meanings which would enable us to re-interpret the first Chapters of Genesis? Is a well known Bible Study course correct when it spends an entire lesson on the discussion of the various forms of Biblical writing, namely historical, poetical, personification, fable, allegory, imagery, and symbolism, a discussion which is carried out in order that this question can then be asked concerning Genesis 2 and 3: “What literary medium do we find here, historical event in poetic form, imagery/personification? Whatever our findings, barring a wooden literalism, our conclusions on the overarching message of this portion of scripture will be the same.”

Must we continue in our attempt to modify scriptural interpretation so as to bring about agreement with scientific theories, changing days to eons, miracles to modified natural events? Perhaps theologians — or you as Christian Day School teachers — may disagree, but my answer to all of these questions, my answer as a layman with a strong belief in

religion, is a resounding no. I feel a conservative position — a literal interpretation — on creation and miracles is as justified today as it was centuries ago. I can see no reason for a change.

I imagine that if I could examine each of your minds right now I would find this thought present: “Well — here is a real two-faced individual — a true middle-of-the-roader, fence-riding type. First he says it is, and then it ain’t — first that evolution is true, and then that the literal interpretation of Genesis is true. Come now, it must be one or the other.”

I agree with you, it must be one or the other. If you are puzzled, then it is because you missed the fact that I prefaced my statements of agreement with the method of analysis being used. In the one case it was scientific, in the other religious. This question of methodology, and the implications it carries is, in my estimation, the crux of the entire problem. To explain why, I would like to review something which you are already familiar with, but which is so important to our understanding that we should have a common ground from which to start. This is the definition of what many outstanding philosophers feel are the three main kinds, spheres, or domains of knowledge. These are philosophy, science, and religion. Let us begin by defining science, and describing its limitations.

If we were looking for one word which would best describe the methods of science it would be “investigate.” All sciences look into things and discover data which are not a part of the common experience of mankind. Now what do I mean by this “common experience of mankind”? By this I mean the experiences that you and I, our ancestors, our children — men of all times and ages have in common — experiences we have simply by being awake, not looking for anything, not observing any method. If I clap my hands, snap my fingers, drop a book, you know subconsciously what has happened, even if you didn’t witness the event. We have all seen and heard a storm, seen things grow and die, observed changes in nature, watched things move. These are simple experiences which everyone has had — they are the common experiences of mankind.

If you stay with the common experiences of mankind you will never develop sciences. Science deals with that which is on the periphery — outside the common experiences of mankind. It investigates using telescope, microscope, photographic emulsion, or nuclear reaction. A scientist forms a hypothetical theory as to why something happens, and then set out to prove it is correct by conducting experiments, using special equipment such as mentioned previously. The experiences which he has are generally limited to a small number of people, they are uncommon — or unique — experiences.

If we were then to define the tools, or the methods, of science, we would say they are observations which

affect the senses of the observer — senses such as sight, smell, touch, or hearing — causing sensations which he must then analyze and formulate using his power of reason. Because this is the method of science, then it is limited to describing — not *explaining why*, but *describing how*. Science by its method stays on the surface of reality, dealing with the apparent or phenomenal, and as a result there are a host of questions which it cannot answer.

Take a very simple question in which you may be interested as teachers, one concerning knowledge. What are the different kinds of knowledge — what does it mean to know? How do you know? What is knowing in itself? We could investigate from now till the end of time and not answer these questions. You can answer them by thinking, but not by looking.

Neither can science answer questions which require placing a value on something. It cannot tell you whether your occupation is good or bad, whether a society is exemplary or corrupt. And science will never develop to the extent where it can answer these questions. These are questions which are beyond the competence of scientific inquiry — the method used is inadequate, it is not appropriate.

This is not to say that science is bad, for this would be far from the truth. Science is extremely useful, but its utility lies in his ability to produce — the production of goods and services which contribute to the mastery of the physical world. Because of this ability science is powerful, but it is a tremendous power that by itself cannot and does not tell us where to go, or what to do.

Philosophy, on the other hand, produces nothing physical, and yet it also serves a high purpose — a good — in that it can answer many of the questions which science cannot touch. The philosopher makes use of the common experiences of mankind in attempting to describe the reason behind all events. Philosophy and philosophical inquiries are not investigative. The philosopher needs no data, no special instruments. He is an armchair thinker who can sit in a dark room and contemplate the common experiences of mankind. His question is not how things operate, but rather what they are — and why they are as we find them. At first it would appear that he has little value, since nothing physical comes out of this room — he doesn’t make anything. However, if we use this line of reasoning, then there are many things which have no value. As an example, consider a road map. It contains knowledge, yet it never makes anything. Yet that map can become our most precious possession when we are in strange territory — for it directs us where to go (if we can read it).

Science is concerned with phenomena — philosophy delves into the what, the why of things — the underlying existence. In science reason serves sense. In philosophy sense serves reason — the main work

is done by reason, not sense. Because of this the very questions science cannot answer, philosophy can. As an example, suppose you all ask yourselves this question: "What is the difference between science and philosophy?" You can agree with what I have said, or you can say that all this is wrong and instead give some other answer. But if you give any answer to that question at all, then you do it as a philosopher, not a scientist. There is no method whereby you can scientifically answer that question. Just pause and think for a moment. Could you possibly — by any means of investigation, experiment, or laboratory research — discover the difference between science and philosophy? Obviously not!

Philosophy can solve the questions which require the establishment of values. The philosopher can answer questions concerning human happiness, whether a form of government is good or bad — a war just or unjust — your job beneficial or harmful to mankind. He can demonstrate that democracy is, in terms of justice, the only perfectly just form of government. These are questions that are philosophical, but totally untouchable by the methods of science.

So much for science and philosophy, their methods and equipment, usefulness, and limitations. Now where does the third realm of knowledge — namely, religion — fit into this picture. What is its method — its usefulness? If there is religion, distinct as a body of knowledge, practically and speculatively, then what would it be like? There is no distinction possible between religion on one hand and science and philosophy on the other, unless that distinction is made in the separate realms of faith as opposed to reason. Allow me to explain to you what I mean. Over here, science and philosophy are both knowledge, obtainable by the exercise of man's faculties, his mind, his senses, and his reason. Whatever man obtains is gotten through his own efforts. He observes, analyzes, invents techniques, and performs experiments — acquiring knowledge through his own hard work — using his natural faculties.

If religion is nothing but some other form of inquiry using natural means, then it can be reduced to these two. For religion to be distinct it must consist of knowledge which man receives — but does not acquire by his own efforts — and is this not the definition of revelation? A true religion claims to say something which could not possibly be said if it had not been revealed by God. They do not claim to know it by investigation, historical analysis, or historical research. They claim to know it as a gift from God. The knowledge is literally handed to them.

Religion, having this revelation, this gift from God, is enabled through this means to answer questions which the scientist and philosopher cannot begin to solve. I could, as examples of these questions, take the Christian doctrines of the Trinity or

the Incarnation — but I don't want to. Instead I would like to take a doctrine which you may feel does not belong in this class, the doctrine of creation. Neither philosopher nor scientist can tell with the slightest degree of certainty whether or not the world had a beginning. As a Christian, however, you have an answer. You know the world began — it had a beginning — for God has chosen to reveal to you the answer. That answer is found in the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." It is an answer which is impossible to prove by reason or investigation. If you have an answer to that question, then you have it on the basis of your religion — and your religious faith.

This means that a body of knowledge can be properly classified as a religion only if this faith is present. If you do not admit to faith, then forget religion. Following Christ as a great moral leader and teacher, even imitating his exemplary character, is not religion. You might as well follow the moral teachings of Socrates, for all you have is a moral philosophy.

Three bodies of knowledge, each separate and distinct, each with a method, each with a purpose, each with limitations. On the basis of this common understanding let us now go back and re-examine the questions asked earlier — and the answers given.

What about the statement made to the effect that if we realize that Darwin was a scientist, and if we accept his method, then we must agree with him? Did we not just agree that only religion could answer questions concerning the beginning of the world? Yes, this is true, for Darwin was stepping out of his field of competence in attempting to answer this question — science was overstepping its boundaries. Then doesn't agreement with Darwin and those following him indirectly acknowledge acceptance of the unbiblical theory of evolution? Yes it does — if, and please notice this key phrase — *if we accept the application of his method to this question*. Let me explain why.

I would like to have your full cooperation during the next several minutes. This may prove extremely difficult — but please make the attempt — try to the greatest extent possible. Try to cleanse your mind of all previous ideas and concepts, and for a moment imagine that you are a pure scientist, committed to using only the methods of science. This will mean using only observable data — and your senses and reason to interpret it. You have never heard of the Bible — and even if you did, your method forbids the use of this knowledge. As you are sitting in your seat you let your thoughts stray, and you begin to think and wonder about the origin of the world and its inhabitants. You know you must depend upon data and reason, but this doesn't trouble you, for you are well trained, highly intelligent, and have a wealth of data at your disposal.

And so you start correlating facts — forming hypotheses — making assumptions. You look at the world's inhabitants around you, noting differences and similarities — seeing the effects of mutations, the results of hybrids. You see dairy cattle producing twice as much milk as their ancestors — blocky beef cattle as opposed to the rangy Texas Longhorn — all changes which have been brought about because of selective breeding. You see horses of sturdier stock, chickens which lay only large white eggs, children who are larger than their parents. Suddenly the thought comes to you that everything is improving, is evolving from some lower and less perfect form — suddenly you have the key, a hypothetical answer to the question of the origin of life. You see with clarity that everything seen on earth today has evolved from some lower form of life. But where do you start? You, as a scientist, can only use the laws of nature present around you, and using these you extrapolate back through time to the only place where you can stop — a single cell — formed by pure chance. You — restricted to using only the methods of science — have no choice.

You have formed your hypothesis — your theory or idea — now you must substantiate it. First, you realize that the process you are visualizing and proposing is extremely slow, therefore the world must be billions of years old. How can you show this? Well, if you say that the earth was formed as a smooth, homogeneous ball, then you can look at the Grand Canyon, and calculate the millions of years it took the Colorado River to carve this chasm from the smooth surface. Your estimate is made using the present measurable erosion rates as your yardstick.

You also realize that you must show that a common tie exists between various forms of animal life. You notice that there is a similarity between some bone structures — for instance the two bones present in the forearms of many animals. Backbones are similar, as are the fetal forms in some instances. You propose that this is evidence demonstrating that the animals — including man — must have a common ancestor. Ancient fossil remains are found in rocks. In some cases you use the rocks to establish the age of fossil remains — in other cases, where there is an apparent discontinuity in the rock structure, the fossil establishes the age of the rocks. You use these fossils as evidence that at one time this was the only form of life which existed — and therefore everything must have evolved from it.

So you — in your own mind — using only your reason to evaluate data — gradually develop your theory. True, there are many gaps in your observations, ideas which you cannot substantiate with actual evidence — but as you go along you make what you feel are reasonable assumptions — and complete the picture using to a certain extent your imagination. With the pattern developing, you de-

cide to consolidate your thoughts by putting them in writing. Then, at your friend's persuasion, you write a book — which is eagerly read by all who have been looking for a solution for this particularly difficult problem dealing with origins. Soon other books are written — some by pseudo scientists who popularize your complex theory in a paperback version — and who in the process somehow have forgotten to put in the "ifs" which you so carefully included. So suddenly the assumptions you made — the guesses and the musings, the dreams and the imaginations suddenly become fact, and anyone who doesn't believe them is either obstinate or biased. You find yourself a celebrity, acclaimed by all for having found the answer to the mystery surrounding the question of man's origin.

"But," you say, "I don't want to go back that far. I will base part of my theory on Biblical knowledge, and will assume that at least man was created." How can you — for remember our initial agreement? You are a pure scientist, utilizing only the methods which that body of knowledge can use. Therefore you cannot stop at that point in time — you have no justification for such an assumption — no valid reason. You must go back to a single cell, because your reason tells you—after evaluating available evidence—that man could not instantaneously be created out of nothing. There are no scientific data to substantiate this — nor is there an experiment which you can perform which will duplicate it. It is against every law of nature in existence today — and these laws are the tools of your trade, immutable laws which you use to project present day findings into the past. The very idea is unreasonable and incomprehensible.

This is true not only with respect to the question of the origin of life; you must also assume that the earth started out as a homogeneous sphere, smooth and untarnished, with all elements in their most basic form. You really have no choice, for where else can you start? Could you say that the Grand Canyon was 1000 feet deep when the world was formed — or 1627 feet deep — or that it had a depth of 2369 feet? You must start somewhere — and that somewhere must be a smooth surface if you are to substantiate your arguments.

So now do you see why the methods of science dictate an evolutionary theory? Reason, senses, and observable data all tell us there can be no other way. If you were all scientists I would stop right here, for though you may have different ideas concerning the details, yet the basic concept is one you would accept and uphold.

But you are not scientists, you are people with religious beliefs — people who not only use reason, but also have faith in God's revelation to us. As such you are told in the revealed Word that the earth was created by God — and that He created us in His image — breathed into our nostrils the breath of

life. As a result of this knowledge a struggle exists in your mind, a mental conflict which says you should accept one or the other idea, but not both. Which will it be?

Much hinges on the validity of scientific claims — the amount of truth which can be attached to the theories presently being advanced. Let me state now that the theory of evolution will never — in my estimation—be completely disproved. In fact, “evolution” or variation does take place—we can see it in nature around us. God did not necessarily create all the varieties of dogs, cats, and even humans which are present in the world today. Most of these “evolved.” But I firmly believe that He did create the various kinds—biologically speaking. The theory that things evolved from a single source, and that the rattlesnake, butterfly, eagle, whale, and man all have the same common ancestor is far from proved. This is evidenced by the fact that scientists themselves have trouble finding a theory which is agreeable to all.

I have neither the time today — nor the ability to present all the arguments against single source evolution. I am neither a biologist, a geologist, or a paleontologist. If you want specific facts, then I would like to refer you to two excellent books on this subject. One is entitled “Darwin, Evolution, and Creation,” edited by Dr. Paul A. Zimmerman and published by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. The other is “The Genesis Flood” by Henry Morris and John Whitcomb, and published by Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing House. However, as an engineer familiar with scientific methods, I would like to explain to you several general weaknesses.

First let us examine the question of assumptions. How can these lead us astray? Let me give you a very simple example. Suppose we are going down an interstate highway in the middle of the desert, miles from nowhere, at 11 o'clock in the morning, and come upon a car which has just run out of gas and is standing deserted. The question arises as to how many hours the man had been driving since his last gas stop, since it is considered a violation to impede traffic. You are a scientist, so you look at the gas tank and determine it has a 20 gallon capacity. The car is exactly like yours, and you know you have been getting 15 miles per gallon. The speed limit is 60 miles per hour, and almost everyone drives at this rate, so your car has been consuming 4 gallons per hour. Using this data you estimate then that he must have driven 5 hours since his last stop.

You get into your car, and pretty soon encounter the driver trudging down the road. Anxious to demonstrate to your partner the validity of your assumptions and the wisdom of your scientific analysis, you stop, roll down your window, and ask the disgruntled and footsore hiker how long he had been driving before running out of gas. “Thirty minutes,”

he angrily shouts back. “Next time I’m going to fill up the gas tank when I stop, and not only put in 3 gallons — and I will check the gas lines for leaks.” You turn your embarrassed countenance toward your partner who is chuckling over your error — and admit you made a mistake — not in calculations — but in assumptions. Yes, your assumptions which seemed so valid and factual when you made them, were wrong.

The theory of evolution is based upon many assumptions. The first and foremost is that there was no special creation. It is also based in part upon the assumption of uniformitarianism, unchanging rates. But allow me to make another assumption — the assumption that God created the world and all its inhabitants in 6 days. And now let us imagine that Adam was a scientist interested in determining the age of the earth. He starts his research on the 8th day after creation, in and around the garden of Eden. He looks at himself and Eve, and realizing that they are both mature individuals, states that they and the earth are at least 20 years old. He cuts down a tree in order to build a fire, and counts the growth rings. According to this, the earth is at least 139 years old. He and Eve stroll down to the river banks, where he notices the deep channel cut by the stream. By carefully measuring the erosion rate, he estimates and concludes that 5,000 years have gone by since the stream started as a tiny trickle. They pause and marvel at the magnificent mountains in the distance, watching the sun as it slowly sinks beneath the peaks. He knows that internal pressures within the earth are slowly pushing these mountains higher — and using the present established rate, he calculates that the mountain range is at least 1.5 billion years old. The next day they explore a canyon started 750,000 years ago by a river, and marvel at the layers of rock, some formed almost 3 billion years in the past, according to his geological time scale which is based upon rock formation phenomena. He sees fossils imbedded in some of the rock — and wonders what conditions on this earth were like 1 billion years ago when this was the only form of life which was present. They stumble upon a cove, and find bones which a carbon check shows are 10,000 years old. He taps a rock with his hammer until it breaks, and finds therein a mixture of uranium and lead. A quick radiological test and he knows that at least 1 billion years have elapsed since this rock was formed . . . And so Adam, the scientist, determines the age of the world upon which he is living — a world which according to his reasoning, observations, calculations, and assumptions, is at least 3 billion years old — yet it is a world which was created just 8 days earlier.

“Absurd,” you say, “you are prejudiced and biased. Why should God create a world in that condition?” Is it? Not everything I said may be true, and much of it such as the fossils in the rocks, and

bones in the cave, we have reason to believe were deposited during the cataclysm known as Noah's Flood and later on in major upheavals of nature. Indeed many of the layers of stratified or sedimentary rock were deposited during this period, thus giving the appearance of great age. But the idea is the same and God indeed might have created a world exactly as it looks now with every appearance of great age. Only by His revelation do we know that many of the earth's features are not part of his original creation. This assumption of a built in apparent age may not be reasonable according to our senses — but it certainly can be true. It is just as valid to make this assumption as it is to assume that the earth was formed in a "big bang" and that all life evolved from a chance encounter between the right atoms.

The only way that this assumption can be disproved is for science to prove their theory without a shadow of a doubt, and this will never be done. It would take an eye witness account to prove that the creation theory is wrong — and yet strange as it may seem all written history indicates otherwise. The material evidence which we do have to work with can be shaped and interpreted to prove almost any theory you would care to advance. This fact is quite evident when we see the number of theories which do exist.

As an example, consider current theories concerning the origin of the universe. One group vigorously upholds Lemaitre's Big Bang idea, while the other group vehemently claims this is wrong, and adheres to the Steady State Universe of Hoyle and his colleagues. Allan Broms, a scientist, in his book "Our Emerging Universe," comments on the latter and says: "He does not tell us how new matter comes into being, but asks us (at least for the time being) to bake its continuous creation on faith (scientific faith, that is), which of course means that we will take it all back the instant any positive fact gives us the slightest excuse. Furthermore, he does not explain why this accumulation of new matter should push the older matter more and more apart to give us the expanding Universe, but again asks for another bit of scientific faith, subject to the same proviso. And when we look dubious over taking so much on faith, he properly reminds us that we ourselves have no way of explaining how matter otherwise came to be (even originally, suddenly, and in a lump), and that we are taking the Big Bang itself very nearly on faith." . . . And we say it takes too much faith to accept Genesis One literally?

The same can be said about the origin of life. Here you must accept the philosophy of uniformitarianism. Physical processes both on earth and in the earth are thought to be subject to unchanging natural laws, and therefore more or less continuous and uniform over the past — hence the word "uniformitarianism." Once the assumption is accepted,

one can study actual processes and extrapolate these into the geological past to interpret our factual findings, forming them into a genetical, historical picture. The implications of uniformitarianism in the search for the origin of life on earth are clear. You look for natural causes of the same character as are in operation at the present time. You do not — and cannot — envision some sudden event which caused life to appear all at once as a full fledged phenomenon in every corner of the earth. Rather, the origin of life will have covered an enormous time span if measured against human standards. During this period development will have been slow, almost beyond imagination.

How firm is this theory — this assumption? Allow me to quote from a book written by M. G. Rutten, a professor of Geology, entitled "The Geological Aspects of the Origin of Life on Earth," a book published in 1962. He writes: "So on the one hand we geologists have the possibility of studying the evolution of life on earth, of paleontological research, with a wealth of factual data. Although the gaps in the paleontological records are so large that anyone with a bias can still make a case against natural evolution, the development of paleontological research clearly points towards its general acceptance. Many gaps in the records have been lately filled by lucky finds, and we feel sure what this research is leading up to.

"On the other hand, there is the problem of the origin of life on earth. Here the data are extremely poor. The time elapsed is so enormous that it is difficult to prove anything at all, because the records are not only incomplete in the extreme, but also often changed beyond recognition by younger events. Moreover, such research implies a doubt toward popular views on creation and thereby provokes criticism on immaterial grounds from the side of church people: criticism which cannot be effectively answered owing to lack of data." . . . And we are at times ashamed and apologetic of our faith in Genesis One?

Neither are historical dates firmly established. C. W. Ceram, in his book "Gods, Graves, and Scholars," writes this: "How far the scholars of the West have departed from Manetho's chronology is shown by the following array of dates assigned, through the years, by different authorities to the unification of Egypt by King Menes, an event that marked the real beginning of Egyptian history and may be taken as the earliest happenings of dynastic significance: Champollion, 5867 B.C.; Lesueur, 5770; Bokh, 5702; Unger, 5613; Mariette, 5004; Brugsch, 4455; Lauth, 4157; Chabas, 4000; Lepsius, 3892; Bunsen, 3623; Eduard Meyer, 3180; Wilkinson, 2320; Palmer, 2224. Recently the date has been pushed back again, Breasted dates Menes at 3400, George Steindorff at 3200, and the newest research at 2900. It is significant that all dates become more difficult to determine the farther back

one goes into history.” . . . And we struggle to find a means whereby we can logically change the meaning of the word “day” in Genesis One?

I could go on for hours citing similar examples — how Hooton in his book “Up From the Ape” devotes an entire section to explaining the tremendous significance of the Piltdown Man — a fossil we now know to have been a fraud — how White in “The Warfare of Science with Religion” flagrantly misinterprets the significance of the Chaldean cuneiform, using them to prove the Bible is a myth, when actually they substantiate the Bible. But I feel I have shown you enough to make you realize that the scientific theory of the origin of the universe and the life it holds has not been proven — and furthermore will never be proven on this earth. It is a theory which must be accepted on faith — faith in science and its method.

But why, do you ask, is this theory so readily accepted, while religious faith is scoffed at? The answer lies in the dominant role played by science in our lives today, and in the philosophy which is accepted and adhered to by most people. The philosophy is that originated by David Hume, and is called positivism. This doctrine claims that the only knowledge that has any accessible validity is the knowledge obtained by the positive — or empirical and experiential — sciences. It asserts that science gives us this positive knowledge — and denies that we can have any other knowledge but this. Reason, not faith, is the key word. Therefore religious beliefs are automatically false, since we cannot conduct a controlled experiment to prove them. To many — science is the only knowledge — serving in addition as a philosophy and religion. It can provide the answer to the common question of our times — namely “Show me.”

So today to question science is almost tantamount to being labeled a heretic. Question their theories — and your beliefs are ridiculed — your faith in other forms of knowledge made to appear groundless and foolish. In some circles to be unscientific is to be automatically wrong. The Church, subjected to an almost overwhelming intellectual pressure, starts to look for methods of obtaining relief. The first avenue explored is that of modifying doctrine and interpretation to make it more reasonable — to appeal to reason — to agree with science and its theories. You, as teachers, are subjected to this temptation probably more than anyone else — since you, of necessity, teach both religion and science.

Where do we start to modify? At what appears to be our most vulnerable point, of course, the doctrine of creation. After all, what difference does it make if I believe the earth is 4 billion years old? Isn't evolution also a form of creation, evidence of the power and wisdom of Almighty God? Since evolved man is constantly improving, he could never have been perfect and sinless, therefore Genesis 3

becomes a poetical way of explaining why things aren't perfect today . . . The flood? Well, you know how events magnify when told and retold. After all, Moses had to rely on stories handed down from generation to generation. In the process a small local inundation becomes a world-wide flood. Reason tells us there just isn't enough water to cover the entire earth . . . God leading the children of Israel in a pillar of cloud and fire? What reasonable explanation can be found for this? Well, the Israelites, in their fear, wanted to believe God was near, so they imagined this, and the writings of Moses reflect the people's imagination and impression. Actually, the smoke and fire came from a distant volcano — they just thought it was leading them, and God was using a natural phenomenon to help them . . . The waters of the River Jordan parted? Now this could have happened if, for instance, a large rock slide upstream had temporarily held back the waters. True, God caused the avalanche, but Joshua got carried away in his description. He omitted the real facts.

And so we make the Bible reasonable — changing our interpretation to what we feel is acceptable to the public — using as our excuse the fact that none of these changes are affecting beliefs necessary to salvation. We never give to God the almighty power so rightly His — the power to act in ways different from His usual ones, that is, miraculously — because we feel our people will never accept this. *But where do we stop?* Are the doctrines of the Trinity — the Immaculate Conception — the Virgin Birth — the dual nature of Christ — the Resurrection — the Ascension — salvation by grace through faith — are these doctrines reasonable? How do you tell someone to have faith in these doctrines, when you have trained him to use his reason throughout the rest of the Bible? How do you explain to him that in one case we accept the literal translation, and in the next we modify? Would it not appear to the outsider that the church is itself unsure of what to believe?

The argument is often advanced that we must “stay with the times” — we must revise our teachings if we are to appeal to the modern man. There is a tendency to react to this philosophy in a manner symptomatic of our times, we try to make it easy for a potential member to join — or our members to believe — asking little of them by way of mental effort. We try to make everything reasonable — instead of appealing to their faith — instead of taking the time and effort to go through a logical explanation. We are afraid we might turn *away* a prospect by unreasonable demands — so every effort is made to make the instructions “easy to swallow.”

In the process we try to bring God down to man, rather than taking man up to God — we try to give him a God whose action and power can be understood. We feel we are helping — and yet are we not actually depriving? For I want a God whose wisdom, power, attributes, and might are so great that

my frail human mind cannot begin to understand Him. I want a God who fills me with such wonder and awe that I feel compelled to fall on my face and worship Him. I want a God so all-knowing and powerful that He can reverse the forces of nature, if necessary, to protect me. I want a God so loving that He will forgive me again — and again — and again.

To have this kind of God I must have faith — a faith which He gives me — using as His instruments the pastors, teachers, and members of His Church. Are we doing all we can to aid in instilling this faith in our people today? Faith, not works — was the battlecry of the reformation. Faith, not reason — should be the watchword of tomorrow. Thank God our church has adhered to a sound, fundamental, and conservative doctrine in the past, a doctrine based on faith. Pray God that she may continue to do so in the future.

A question you may rightly ask concerns how this applies to you. Does this all mean that you should ignore reason in your instructions? Should we, for instance, forbid the teaching of the evolution theory in our parochial school system? No — for reason is the tool of science and philosophy, one they will certainly be called upon to use as they continue their education. Evolution, for instance, should not only be mentioned, it should be taught as a required subject, in my way of thinking. Unless we do this, the student will feel we are trying to suppress the truth, and will be all the more prone to accept the theory for fact in advanced education courses. But when it is taught include all the “ifs” and the “buts” — and the “whys” and “therefores.” If the textbook you use makes theory sound like fact — and almost all elementary texts will — then supplement your reading with others more truthful. In fact, I think there is a crying need today for a small handbook which briefly explains the weaknesses in the evolutionary theory in layman’s language — and I hope that the Creation Research Society, in which I proudly claim membership, will soon publish one.

Reason or Faith — which will you emphasize when you return to your school? Reason — which tells us that there must be a Supreme Being who established the order in nature, who wound the clock which runs the universe, and who now sits back and watches it run without interference — or faith, which tells us we have an all powerful God who not only created the world and its inhabitants, but who still today guides, controls and directs it . . . Reason, which tells us that man evolved from lower mammals, and is better in all respects today than he ever was in the past — or faith, which tells us that man was created by God in His image, righteous, in perfect communion with God. Man, who chose to sin, and who today pays the penalty. Man, who from the moment of conception is in need of a Savior . . .

Reason, which gives to God a human form, and which then tells us that He could not possibly be at all places in the same instant — or faith, which tells us that He is Omnipresent, always close to us, always guarding, guiding, and protecting . . . Reason, which tells us that God sits back and watches the world, indifferent to our individual problems — or faith, which tells us our God is omniscient, He knows our thoughts, our troubles, our joys, He stands by ever to help us, no matter how deserted we may feel . . . Reason, which tells us that God must be a stern judge constantly condemning us for breaking impossible laws — or faith, which leads us to know God as a kind and loving Father, who cherishes us as His children, who sacrificed His Son that we might live, who forgives us when we sin, who loves us with a love incomprehensible to human understanding.

What will be the predominant theme in your classroom in days to come — faith in man’s ability, in his reason — or faith in the almighty power of a God who has revealed Himself to us. Choose reason if you want to take the easy — the popular route. Choose reason if you want to be in tune with the times, if you want to impress the scientific community, if you want to have popular appeal. But choose faith if you are concerned about the eternal welfare of the children in your charge. Choose faith if you want to give them that peace which we cannot understand. Choose faith if you want them someday to say: “I shall be forever grateful to that parochial school teacher I once had.”

I have, during the past hour, attempted to show you that science depends on reason, religion on faith — that science is forced, by its method, to adopt a theory such as evolution, and that this theory has many serious weaknesses. My examples of these have been few — I ask you to accept my word that there are others. I would like to share with you, however, my beliefs after a lengthy study of scientific and religious books. I believe that God created this world and its inhabitants in a period of six days. I believe that God created man in His image, and that my desire to sin is a result of the fall of one man, a man named Adam. I believe that the miracles of the Bible occurred as described, that God used His power to suspend the forces of nature which He once set into being, I believe that I am a child of God — not because of my works, but because Christ has atoned for my sins — an atonement which the Holy Spirit has led me to accept. I believe that I can go through life confident in the knowledge that God is in control, allowing only those things to happen which will ultimately be for my good. I believe that this faith will be challenged severely in the years to come, years in which science and reason will become more prominent, years in which apparent proofs will arise to support existing theories. But I believe that God will keep that faith

ever present in me — and that someday that faith will be justified — the day when the cloudy lid shall be removed from my eyes and I shall know all things — the day when I stand before my Father, my God, my King, in heaven.

Prejudiced? Perhaps. Biased? Yes, I guess I am. A fool? If this means believing that very apparent physical evidence can be misinterpreted, then the accusation may be just. You, too, may be the recipient of such titles. If such should happen, and if as a result you feel insecure, then why not turn to St. Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, in the first chapter, where his inspired words tell us: "For the word of the cross is folly to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God. For it is written, 'I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and the cleverness of the clever I will thwart.'

Where is the wise man? Where is the scribe? Has not God made foolish the wisdom of the world? . . . For the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men."

There was evening, and there was morning . . . And if the story told is true, the world came boldly into view . . . Faith — or reason? Which will it be? As you go to your respective congregations I would like to have you take seven words with you — words I have repeated so often in the past — words which I hope you will learn to use in the future. The words, in the form of a prayer, are these — *Lord, I believe, help thou my unbelief.*

Lt. Colonel Richard G. Korthals  
Quarters 6452D  
USAF Academy, Colorado