

## Creation Denies Process

The effort to reconcile science and religion is almost always made, by scientists. Theologians are smart enough to see that the two things are entirely antagonistic.

Biblical creationists make too much noise about Darwinian evolution, believing that if they can discredit Darwin, they can discredit evolution. It's too late; the genie is out of the bottle.

First, we need to clear up some of the language confusion about the word, *evolution*. *Evolution* has two meanings. In one context, it defines a seamless process. Everything-and I mean *everything*-in the universe is in motion at some level and consequently in *process* of change. It is impossible for one thing to change without affecting something else.

This is not a speculative theory; it is one of the best known facts in modern science. From the tiniest atomic particle to the largest super nova, absolutely everything is in a state of flux. The word scientists use to describe this flux is *chaos*. What we humans see as *order* is in a state of *>dis-order* at unseen levels.

In the second context, *evolution* means *history*, or what the process looks like at any period in the past. Forensic scientists, biographers, archeologists, historians, geologists and cosmologists, to name a few, all face the same daunting problem of reconstructing past events with only fragments of information.

Now we can examine the falsity of the anti-Darwinist argument which states that because there are gaps in the history of biological evolution, there was no process of biological evolution.

If we apply anti-Darwinist logic to other subjects, for example, it would mean there is no history because historical records are incomplete; or that there are no crimes whenever forensic evidence is incomplete; or that there was no geological evolution because geologists can't trace all the steps.

The religious view held until contrary evidence poured in. Fossil discoveries tell us that organic-living-systems started out as simple chemical proteins and grew more complex. Archeological discoveries give us evidence that modern civilization once had a primitive past. Even in medicine, doctors have found that some strains of bacteria have developed a resistance to antibiotics, though they can't trace the steps.

And the fact that fossil evidence is fragmented-and admittedly sometimes wrong or misleading-does not mean there is no evolutionary process. If there is change, there is process. If there is process, there is evolution.

Even the Bible went through a process of evolution before it reached its final form. But if we apply anti-Darwinist logic, it would mean that because so little is known of the Bible's authorship, was produced in one instant. There is an enormous amount of biblical text for which there is no evidence. Worse, most it contradicts the scientific evidence.

To sum up, the precise events leading to human evolution are irrelevant to this argument about evolution verses creation. Though some of the evidence may be fragmented and speculative, the process of evolution is a well proven fact backed up by an abundance of evidence and a legion of scientists. To deny process is to deny nature.

By comparison, Creationism rests on the premise that a supernatural being communicated some bits of knowledge to a few unknown priests in their dreams (revelation) thousands of years ago. The only proof creationists offer is the convictions of their conceit.

The Church has a long inertia going for it and has amassed a good deal of wealth and supporters. But now that it has been stripped of its military and police powers, it has to market itself like any other corporate business. An important question to ask then, is how well are sales doing?

Well, there are some facts which suggest sales have been declining for the last couple hundred of years. 1) A couple of hundred years ago, there were more clergy than scientists; now there are more scientists than clergy. 2) Atheism has become the dominant belief system today. It is so dominant that it outnumbers all of the worlds' religions put together. Only it's not called atheism; it is called science.

Science and religion are as incompatible as fire and ice. Science is completely atheistic in that the God factor can't explain nature. Science is apolitical because arguments from authority do not hold up as a proof of truth.

Religion serves no useful purpose that could be better accomplished by accepting reality on its own terms. Conversely, it's almost impossible to be religious and deny science. As hard as some theists may try, the biblical world view never existed. They can't go back. In the story of Sodom and Gomorrah, when Lot's wife looked back, she turned into salt. Religion faces the same fate.