

accidental result of impersonal, random processes of nature. We have a personal Creator who was directly involved in the formation of the natural world – a truth to which the evidence of science clearly points.

On this rational and scientific foundation, our ethical development can mature in a positive direction – with a greater sense of responsibility to our Creator and to the welfare of others, as well as the reassurance of His existence and concern for us.

In addition, we can celebrate human diversity without having to sacrifice human equality or dignity.

To conclude, it is difficult to understand what all the fuss is about – why the teaching of Intelligent-Design/Creationism is viewed as some kind of sinister deviation from truth. Instead, we should resolve to bring this teaching to light in our educational institutions; and by so doing, offer upcoming generations the kind of sound ethical and scientific principles that will better guide them through the challenges of the future.

Educationalists are justifiably concerned about non-rational viewpoints in science teaching. In the process, however, “the baby sometimes gets thrown out with the bathwater.” Throw out superstition, yes, but keep a proper understanding of the role of our supernatural Creator in the formation of the natural world – not just for ethical considerations, but also, because such understanding is genuinely scientific.

“Truth has to be repeated constantly, because Error is also being preached all the time, and not just by a few, but by the multitude. In the Press and Encyclopedias, in Schools and Universities, everywhere Error holds sway, feeling happy and comfortable in the knowledge of having Majority on its side.” - *Johann Goethe* (1749-1832)

Meditation

Who or what the Creator is stretches far beyond what our human minds can ever comprehend. But if He does exist, and if He cares for the human race, would it not seem right that He should come to us in human form? Then we can know what He is like and what He desires from us (our love for one thing, as well as our loving interactions with others)... Indeed, that is who Jesus Christ was and what He showed to us human beings during His sojourn in our earthly realm.

Prayer

Dear God. I know I need Your presence in my life. And if it’s true that Jesus Christ was the expression of Your love to us, and the One who rose from the dead, then I invite His Spirit to enter my heart and life.

And let this be the start of an exciting, fulfilling, love-filled journey as I venture forth into Your Heavenly Realm... here and now, and in the Afterlife. Amen.

To learn more on this fascinating subject (about “Our Lost Heritage”), visit www.eduorigins.org/indepthstudy/

*

Counsel/advice? visit www.activated.org

Origin of the Natural World: Divine Intervention? Evolution? Or Both!

A hotly debated issue among scientists and educationalists: How should they explain the origin of the natural world? Did it come into being by Divine intervention or natural processes? Nowadays, in the name of advanced scientific thinking, we tend to belittle the role of a Creator, seeing that as a sort of throwback to primitive superstition.

But what do we learn from advanced scientific knowledge?

DNA genetics: Our body cells contain coded information, directing how our bodies grow and develop. Now, wherever we encounter information, it would be foolish to think that it got there by itself... especially by a random process. Anything that conveys information – whether it be this morning’s newspaper, ancient hieroglyphics, a textbook, or the code in a software program – requires the material medium, of course, but can only be arranged into something that makes sense if there is an intelligent author behind it. And likewise, the coded information in our bodies’ cells reveals that there had to be an Intelligent Author who structured it.

Puzzling, isn’t it, that we so often invoke “science” to deny God’s hand in Nature, even though “science” so easily proves the opposite – that God had to have a hand in the formation of the natural world.

But then, we may ask, “What about missing-link fossils? Don’t they prove our descent from apes rather than a Divine creation of human beings?” Much misunderstanding surrounds this subject... due to the widely held assumption that we humans have evolved from

a primitive stage (**MACRO**-evolution). Understandably, this preconceived notion (so deeply ingrained in the modern mindset) has made it difficult for scientists to interpret their evidence from any other point of view.

So what about the fossil evidence? In one case (Java Man), human and ape bones, being found close together, were assumed to be part of the same skeleton until scientific investigation proved otherwise. In another case, Piltdown Man appeared in textbooks for 40 years as a human ancestor until modern science finally got to work in the 1950's and exposed it as a hoax. In more recent times Australopithecine fossils were thought to be our ancestors. After the initial excitement died down, scientists examined the bones, using updated computer analysis techniques. The conclusion? Although slightly different from modern apes, these were still apes – extinct yes, but unrelated to human beings.

Charles Oxnard (PhD, DSc), expert in anatomy who conducted the tests, remarked candidly, *“All of this should make us wonder about the usual presentation of human evolution in introductory textbooks, in encyclopedias and in popular publications.”* (*The Order of Man: A Biomathematical Anatomy of the Primates*, pg. 332)

Although it overturns the commonly accepted viewpoint of our day, we cannot close our minds to where science is pointing – that we humans have a Divine Origin and are not descended from apes. (See James Perloff's essay “Time Magazine's New Ape Man” for more information.)

Of course, we do share many common design features with apes... and whales, dogs, and many other creatures. Similar to how an architect may use the same structural features in many different types of buildings, God used similar design features in the structural formation of different

classes of organisms – common design, not common ancestry. Our ancestors? Fictional, ape-like creatures? No. They were created as fully formed human beings (Adam and Eve).

At this point it should be acknowledged that a certain amount of evolution does happen. This natural process does operate and is better known as **MICRO**-evolution. It allows for variation and adaptability in the natural world – what Darwin called diversification of species and natural selection.

Trouble is, like the blind men trying to explain the elephant, if we insist on this natural process as the only explanation for the origin of the natural world, then we are apt to miss something; and we end up with a limited, lopsided explanation.

Yes, there is room for variation and adaptability – yet without disturbing the basic order of the natural world; that is, without changing the basic gene structures of us human beings and of the various classes of plants and animals. For example, consider how many *canis* breeds there are; yet, whether it be a Chihuahua or a Great Dane, the underlying gene structures are the same. A dog will always be a dog.

Another example of how this order in Nature works is the barrier of sterility between unrelated classes of animals. How confusing the natural world would become if, for example, your pet cat and dog could mate and produce a cat-dog!

Regarding the issue of macro-evolution, Darwin himself admitted, *“As by this theory, innumerable transitional forms must have existed. Why do we not find them embedded in the crust of the earth? Why is not all nature in confusion instead of being, as we see them, well defined species?”* (*Origin of Species*, chapter 6)

Why? Because that's how the Creator designed it – allowing for variation and adaptability, yet maintaining order in the natural

world.

The great emphasis nowadays on macro-evolution theory (e.g. ape changing its complex genetic machinery to evolve into human form) lacks scientific basis; advanced science (in DNA genetics) offers plenty of confirmation - as does also the glaring absence in the fossil record of “missing link” transitional species between unrelated classes of organisms.

Macro-evolution theory exercises a subtle, negative influence on our philosophical orientation. This became tragically evident during the 20th century in Adolph Hitler's genocide campaigns, the philosophical underpinnings of which were rooted in macro-evolution theory; it rationalized the cruel policy of eliminating other races in the climb towards evolutionary supremacy. And who knows how this philosophy may influence the politics and policies of future generations?

Because this theory of origins tends to minimize the role of the Creator in the formation of the natural world, it easily leads to conclusions in impressionable minds that their lives have no meaning or accountability (since God seems so far away). If we believe that we are descended from animals, and that the Creator has very little to do with us (or doesn't even exist), then who needs to worry about right or wrong? Everything is just a struggle for survival-of-the-fittest anyway, so go ahead and fend for yourself.

Like it or not, in macro-evolution thinking, there is no escape from the conclusion that some human beings must be at a lower rung on the evolutionary ladder. No surprise then that this kind of pseudo-science has spawned a good many prejudicial attitudes and injustices in human society.

But we human beings are not some kind of