

Beginnings – ORIGIN *(Where did we come from?)*

- **Only Two Choices**
- **Realize the Significance**
- **Is it Faith or Science?**
 - LAB - Lookable, Accessible, Breakable
- **Guess at the Evidence**
- **Inspect the Evidence**
 - Universe = "Decay"
 - Age of the Earth = "Can't Say"
 - Origin of Life by Chance = "No Way"
 - Evolution of Species and Man = "Lacks Genes and Tweens"
- **No Compromise**

DON'T - Death, Orders of Creation, Names in genealogies, Ten Commandments refer to seven-day week

Intent of Life – LIFE *(Why are we here?)*

- **Love - GOD and MAN**
- **Increase - GROW**
- **Faithfulness - Time, Talent, Treasure**
- **Eternity – Past, Present, Future**

Authority – POWER *(Who's in charge?)* A God Who is:

- **Personal and Loving**
- **Omnipotent**
- **Wise and All-Knowing**
- **Everywhere and Eternal**
- **Righteous and Reliable**

Standards – RULES *(What are the rules?)* God's rules are:

- **Revealed supernaturally, not derived by reason**
- **Universal and apply to everyone, everywhere, all the time**
- **Loving**
- **Enforced**
- **Steadfast**

Two Categories of Science

We need to distinguish between two general categories of what is called "science":

- **Operational Science** – This is the study of how things operate and function and the development of new technologies and ideas based on what we observe. This meets the definition of true science, and nearly everyone can agree on the potential usefulness and value of operational science research and development.
- **Origins "Science"** – This is the study of how the world originated and got to be in its present state. This falls outside the realm of science since theories about what happened in the past are not observable, available, or disprovable.

	Operational Science	Origins "Science"
Based on:	The senses (we assume they are reliable)	Assumptions about the past
Research method:	Experiments	Extrapolation -assuming the past was like the present
Deals with:	The present	The past
Results in:	Repeatable conclusions, technology	Non-repeatable stories about the past

Just like the adults in the children's story The Emperor's New Clothes, we're afraid to say "the emperor has no clothes" or "science can't prove anything about the past" for fear of ridicule. But the fact is that unobserved events in the past are no more a suitable topic for scientists than an explanation of DNA structure is a suitable topic for historians. Perhaps you think that I'm ignoring the many elegant theories put forth by scientists to explain how events happened in the past. We'll get to those theories, but the point I'm making here is that ***these theories fall outside of the realm of science***. Since we can't look at, study, or experiment on those origin events they are not scientifically provable or disprovable.

Origins happened in the past, and the past is not observable today.

Here's an illustration. Let's say you found what looked like a hubcap in the ditch beside a road. If you asked the question "how did the hubcap get here," how could we use science to get the answer? We would probably assume that it fell off of a car. We could call in experts who could try to compute the speed, age, model, and direction of the car that lost the hubcap. They could give us general averages and tendencies for this type of hubcap and research how many similar hubcaps have ever been found in ditches like this one. But what do we really KNOW about how that particular hubcap got there? The hubcap could have been tossed out of the back of a pickup, dropped from an airplane, spontaneously generated from chemicals in the ditch, carried there by a giant packrat, planted there by aliens, or be the fossil remains of a primitive auto plant. We can make an educated guess, but unless a reliable witness steps forth and explains what he observed we can't KNOW how it got there.

So, is this a cop-out? Is this an attempt to avoid the scientific evidence and say that everyone can believe what they want and we're all okay?

No. We have minds and we need to use them. There is evidence in the world today that we can examine to see if it is consistent with our belief. The point we're making here is that none of us can say we've "proved" creation or evolution via science. Once we've established that fact, we can approach the evidence we see in the world as "seekers" and see how well the evidence matches up with our beliefs.

The man who believes in the Creator can take heart from the first chapter of the book of Romans:

For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities--his eternal power and divine nature--have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse.

Romans 1:20

This tells us that there is enough evidence of the Creator in the creation so that no one can miss it. The man who denies the Creator has to deny this evidence and look for other answers.

The Bias of Naturalism and Materialism

One major assertion of those who oppose the concept of creation is that true science is limited to naturalistic and materialistic explanations. They point out that any supernatural explanations such as God are not scientific. To some extent that is true - God can't be tested according to scientific principles.

But the fallacy in this assertion is the ridiculous notion that the limit of science is also the limit of truth.

The statement "God is not scientifically verifiable" is a very different proposition than the statement "only scientifically verifiable explanations can be true." At that point science becomes religious. A man may choose to say that he wants to consider only ideas that he can examine scientifically, but that has nothing to do with truth. It is important for Christians to realize that truth and science are not equivalent terms (real science may reveal truth, but there is truth that can't be revealed by science).

We can sum up this faulty naturalistic/materialistic line of thinking as follows:

- Everything that exists is natural and material
- We exist, so we must have come from a natural/material source
- Special creation is not natural/material so it must be false even if the evidence today supports this theory
- Evolution (molecules to man) is natural/material so it is probably true even though the evidence doesn't support it