

CREATION OR EVOLUTION — OR BOTH?

—The Rev. Richard R. Losch

Saint James' Episcopal Church, Livingston, Alabama

The issue at hand today is the conflict between Evolution and Creationism. Before we delve into this question, however, we need to define our terms and clear up some common misconceptions. Many of you may disagree with my scientific interpretations, and many with my religious interpretations — all I ask is that you open your minds and judge objectively and intelligently. First of all, the doctrine of Evolution simply posits that all living things came into being through a vast continuous process of change and improvement. It makes no attempt to explain how this happened, or even how it began. Evolution and creation are not contradictory terms, and evolution and natural selection are not synonymous terms. Darwin's hypothesis of Natural Selection is simply one of many possible explanations of Evolution. Creationism, on the other hand, proposes that everything in the universe was created by God. Creationism, like Evolution, does not attempt to explain how this was done, but simply that it was done by an act of God. The Creationist believes that the universe and all that is in it, especially man, is designed and exists for a purpose. The Evolutionist believes that the universe and mankind appeared as the result of a series of changes and adaptations that slowly resulted in their present forms. The two are not necessarily contradictory, and are certainly not mutually exclusive. They are only contradictory and mutually exclusive among those Creationists who say that it happened virtually all at once, and those Evolutionists who say that it was purely by chance.

The Bible gives an account of the creation of the universe in Genesis 1:1-19, and it presents two somewhat contradictory accounts of how God created all living things: one in Genesis 1:20-2:1, and another in Genesis 2:4-9. In the first account, God created light and darkness on the first day; the sky to separate the waters on the second; the plants on the third; the sun, moon and stars on the fourth; marine animals on the fifth; and on the sixth day He crowned it with the creation of the land animals and lastly man (male and female). On the seventh day, of course, He rested. In the second account He created a man on barren ground, then He created the plants, and then the animals to keep the man company; only when all this was done did He create the woman from the man's rib. Now, if the Bible is the absolute and irrefutable Word of God, to be taken literally and unquestioningly, then we have a real problem here. But if it simply tells a great truth, then we should have no diffi-

culty with either account: the great truth is that God created the heavens and earth and all that therein is — let Him worry about how. Once we accept that He did it, from there on the only reasonable topic of discussion is His technique, and that falls more into the realm of the scientist than the theologian.

It is totally unnecessary to play at scientific semantics by begging the issue with such moot questions as, "what does the Bible really mean by the term 'day'?" I suspect that the writer(s) of Genesis meant nothing more profound than 24 hours. If the story is an allegory, then the length of a day is unimportant. If you have a particular interest in physics, you should read Jerrold Schroeder's *Genesis and the Big Bang*. This book, by an eminent nuclear physicist and theologian, makes a powerful case that the Big Bang and the Genesis account of creation are consistent with each other in the light of Einstein's Theory of Relativity. It does not require a knowledge of physics or an understanding of the Theory of Relativity to grasp the gist of what he is saying.

Some Creationists accept the Biblical explanation of creation literally — the proper term for them is "Literalists." "Fundamentalist" is not the correct term. A Fundamentalist is a person who endeavors to restore to his religion the principles that it held in its formative years. While most Christian Fundamentalists are also Literalists, not all are. Many Creationists believe in Evolution. I am one of these. Creationism simply says that God was the First Cause of all creation. A Creationist Evolutionist, then, believes that life evolved on earth over the course of thousands of millions of years, and that God guided and supported that evolution. That is my personal belief.

I believe wholeheartedly that the Bible is the inspired word of God — but I do not believe that it was personally dictated by Him, that there is no truth outside of it, or that He demands that we accept it literally. The Bible is a library of many writings of many wise and holy men, gathered together over a period of many centuries. It contains all the truth we need to obtain salvation; all the wisdom we need to learn to know and love God and one another; and all the inspiration we need to continue to grow spiritually. However, it does not contain *all* truth, *all* wisdom, or *all* inspiration. When God created us, one of His greatest gifts to us was intelligence and curiosity. He expects us to use these attributes to learn more and more about the universe which He gave us; and He expects us to seek out our origins, to learn to use the

things of the world around us, and as a result to grow. The better we know His creation, the better we can know Him.

Whether God created the universe in six days or in fifteen thousand million years is totally irrelevant if we accept the essential truth that He did it. All that matters is what He accomplished, not His means of accomplishing it. The technique is of great importance both to the scientist and to the wealth of human knowledge; but from a theological point of view, it really doesn't matter whether God created man on the sixth day or by guiding a process of evolution over the course of the three and a half thousand million years that life has existed on earth. All that counts is that "In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth." In fact, we can distill this down to an even more critical truth, "In the beginning, God."

The real problem is that so many people confuse science and theology, seeing them as mortal enemies; they either see the theologian as a superstitious shaman or they perceive the scientist as an atheistic materialist. In truth they are in no way opposed to one another. Science, philosophy and theology are three sisters working together, not against each other. Science is concerned with the *what* and *how* of the universe, philosophy with the *why*, and theology with the *meaning* of creation, and our relationship to God and the rest of His creation. Only intertwined as an intellectual trinity can these three disciplines make any sense of it all.

Another problem is that many people seem to think that if we give a scientific explanation to something then we are removing God from it. Not at all! We can scientifically explain many of the miracles of the Bible, but this does not make them any less of miracles. A miracle is nothing more or less than an intervention of God into history or our lives. Miracles are not some great act of magic or supernatural showmanship. They usually occur quietly and unobtrusively, and are rarely accompanied by thunder and lightning or trumpet blasts. God established the natural laws of the universe, and when He functions in His creation, He obeys His own laws — not because He *has* to be bound by them, but because He has *chosen* to bind Himself to them. He operates *within* nature, not *in spite of* it. Science can easily explain the dividing of the Red Sea and the rushing back together of its waters — it happens every few decades (this is frequent, as the span of history goes) — but for it to happen just at the time the Israelites needed it, now that's a miracle! The Divine intervention wasn't in the violation or revocation of nature's laws, but in the timing. The theologian cares *that* it happened, and what this means to us as creatures of God; the scien-

tist cares *how* it happened, including the natural cause-and-effect relationships of the step-by-step process; and the philosopher cares *why* it happened, and what it means as it is perceived by the human mind. There is no reason in heaven or earth why the theologian, the scientist and the philosopher could not be one and the same person looking at the same phenomenon from three different points of view. Many great scientists are also devout believers in God. A striking example is Jerrold Schroeder, the author of *Genesis and the Big Bang*, who is a world-renowned nuclear physicist and also an eminent Orthodox Jewish Rabbi. Unfortunately, many scientists are outspoken atheists. Harlow Shapley, an atheist and one of the greatest astronomers of the 20th century, was a friend of Albert Einstein, one of the greatest physicists. Shapley once asked Einstein, "Einstein, how can you possibly look out at that vast universe and believe that there is a God behind it?" Einstein's reply was, "Shapley, how can you possibly look out at that vast universe and believe that there is not a God behind it?" One of Einstein's most quoted sayings is, "Science without religion is lame; religion without science is blind." Science and religion are both searches for truth, and must work together if they are to find it. When they are in conflict, they both degenerate into superstition.

The question of the conflict of Creation and Evolution, then, is really meaningless unless we are willing to accept either the premise that (a) God gave us an intellect and curiosity and now expects us not to use them, or that (b) God had nothing to do with any of it, and our intellect and curiosity are the result (as Bertrand Russell would have it) of a random "fuss in the mud and stir in the slime." I, for one, am unwilling to accept either premise. If we accept the former, then there is no need to examine the possibility of evolution (or to do anything else intellectual). If we accept the latter, then random chance is responsible for everything, and there is no need for theology, and very little hope for man's destiny.

On the other hand, if we accept neither of the above premises, the scientific question becomes far from meaningless. God gave us the curiosity to seek the truths of this world as well as to seek eternal spiritual truths, and He gave us the intellect to gather evidence toward finding these truths. Having given us these gifts, I believe that He expects us to use them to the fullest. As I see the evidence, I cannot conclude that the God who created such a magnificently complex yet orderly universe (and gave us the means to understand it at least partially) would have reduced the act of creation to such a simplistic thing as the Genesis concept. Evolution is such a marvelous paral-

lel to the spiritual growth and development which we can observe in our own life, that it seems to me to be the only logical conclusion.

Let me offer one more thought — if God is powerful enough to have created the entire universe in six days, it certainly can not have been beyond His power to have created it instantly, by a sheer act of will. Why, then, did He spread the process out over a six day period, building step upon step in a developing or evolutionary process leading up to the climax, the creation of man? Even if we accept the Genesis account literally, it is fair to say that God created the universe and mankind through an evolutionary process. The only question is in the time involved — six days, or fifteen thousand million years? Creation in six days by divine command, or a divinely caused Big Bang? In the beginning, God. That's all that really matters. We must also consider that it is by an evolutionary process that mankind, and we as individuals, came to know God. When we were small children and first learned of God, we had a primitive and childish concept of Him — the old man sitting on a cloud, doing wonderful or scary things with a wave of His hand. As we matured, our understanding came to be more and more complex. This process of learning and understanding will continue to our death. Likewise, mankind's understanding of God evolved over the millennia as God revealed more and more of Himself to us. Whether the earth is 6000 years old or 4 thousand million years old, our understanding of God today is quite different from that of the days when He first revealed Himself to mankind. His revelation has been a slow and growing process, first revealing Himself simply as a power beyond ourselves, then as the only God that matters, then as the only one that exists; first as powerful, demanding, and vengeful, then showing His mercy, then His love, and finally revealing himself (at least as Christians believe) as the redeeming savior and the Holy Trinity. This is evolution of revelation.

Now, having established that I do believe in evolution, I must also say that I do not accept Darwin's hypothesis of Natural Selection. It may surprise some that I reject Natural Selection not because I was trained as a theologian, but because I was trained as a mathematician, statistician, and natural scientist. Consider for a moment three amazing and incredibly complex things that are relatively common in physical creation — the eye, the wing, and the brain. For a fuss in the mud and a stir in the slime to have evolved even into even an insect's eye or a bird's wing by random natural selection would take three and a half thousand million times three and a half thousand million years. To produce a human brain by random

changes would take unimaginable eons. You have heard, I am sure, the proposition of the monkeys and the typewriters. If you were to place 100 monkeys in a room with 100 typewriters, it is statistically possible that eventually, by the random hitting of the typewriter keys, one of them would type Shakespeare's 11th Sonnet. However, if we consider the statistical probability of this, it is likely that it would take a thousand million years before it occurred. The odds against the random evolution of an eye, a wing, or a brain, let alone a frog or a human being, are mind-boggling. Statistically, the likelihood of that happening at random approaches zero.

Please don't misunderstand me — I am not saying that there is no such thing as natural selection. It is a very real and very active force in nature. What I am saying is that while it affects populations, there is no compelling evidence that it affects species. For instance, I am sure you have all heard the account of the light and dark moths during the industrial revolution. In case you haven't, let me recount it briefly. In the eighteenth century in the regions of northern England there was a species of common moth that was a light gray — almost white — and which also came in a dark mottled gray form. The dark moths were quite rare. With the advent of the industrial revolution, pollution from the burning of peat and coal left a filthy gray coating on everything. Within a very few years the light moths became very rare, and the dark ones became common. The explanation for this phenomenon is simple. When the landscape was clean, the dark moths were more visible to birds than the light ones. When the landscape became sooty, the light ones stood out more, so they birds ate them, and did not see the dark ones as well. That event is a convincing argument for Darwinian natural selection — it would appear that the fittest survived in each of the different environmental situations. The argument falls apart, however, when we recall that there was no mutation or genetic change involved in it. Both types of moths were already present throughout the changing times — nothing more happened than that as conditions changed, one type was favored over the other — a population was affected by environmental pressures. That is, I suppose, an example of survival of the fittest, but it is poor evidence in support of Darwinism, which presumes a change in the genes themselves. Similarly, all of Darwin's observations on the Galapagos Islands represented *intraspecies* changes — changes within existing species, not the generation of new species. These represented natural forces that are entirely similar to the artificial forces exerted by dog breeders in eliminating or emphasizing specific traits in order to produce a new or superior breed of

dog. The Great Dane and the Chihuahua are man-made forms of dogs, generated by selective breeding over countless generations. However, they are both *canis familiaris*, the common dog, and are genetically almost identical. Genetically, they differ no more than a blond differs from a brunette. This is intraspecies variation, and does not by any stretch of the imagination lead to new species. This is also seen in the evolution of the white-tailed deer in America. From the writings of the early settlers we can plainly see that the white-tailed deer today is significantly faster, larger, and more intelligent than the deer hunted by the early colonists. The reason is simple — over the centuries, hunters consistently killed the slowest, weakest, and stupidest deer, leaving only the superior ones to contribute their genes to future generations. This was recognized by the American Indians long before Darwin, in their proverb, “The deer feeds the wolf, and the wolf strengthens the deer.” Another example can be seen in the dreaded possibility of a nuclear holocaust that wipes most of life off the earth. Science believes that after that event the dominant class of creatures on the earth would be the insects, because most of them are immune to radiation. They, being the fittest under those conditions, would be the prime survivors. That does not support Darwin’s interpretation of Natural Selection, however, because these creatures already exist — all we are dealing with, again, is environmental pressure selecting one existing population over another.

I am sure that you are all familiar with the Scientific Method. This is a process that essentially requires four steps: (1) the observation of some phenomenon; (2) the formulation of a hypothesis to explain it; (3) the development of experimental means of testing the hypothesis; and (4) the confirmation or rejection of the hypothesis, depending on the results of the experiments. If the hypothesis is confirmed and the test results can be repeated in the laboratory with the same results time after time, then it is fair to call the hypothesis a theory. A theory is *not* a fact! It is simply a satisfactory empirical explanation of observed phenomena. To the scientist, nothing can be called a fact, because in human experience, confirmed “facts” are all too often found to be completely false. A thousand years ago, no one, not even those who recognized that the earth is round, would ever have challenged the “fact” that the sun and stars revolve around the earth, which is the center of the universe. Not even the wisest and best educated of men would have questioned that disease is the result of an imbalance of the body’s “humours and vapours.” Once thought to be indisputable facts, these ideas now seem to us to be childish and primitive.

Having considered this, we should take a more careful look at some of the terminology that is so often used. By no scientific definition whatsoever can evolution or natural selection be called facts. They do not even qualify as theories — they are merely hypotheses, possible explanations of observed phenomena. The only laboratory in which they can be tested is the universe over the course of its entire history, and thus the results of an “experiment” can never be duplicated. Evolution and Creationism are both good and (at least on the surface) reasonable hypotheses, but that is all they are — hypotheses. That puts us in a position of having to rely on faith and reason, not provable facts, in order to decide which hypothesis we choose to espouse. No one, therefore, has the right to be so arrogant as to say that either hypothesis is true or false — only that his faith and reason lead him to espouse one or the other. One of the problems in modern thinking is that many scientists and the most of the media consistently talk about the “fact” of evolution and natural selection. Even Thermodynamics, Quantum Physics, and Relativity, all of which have been proven time and again in thousands of experiments over the years, claim only to be theories, not facts. Natural selection, which cannot be tested or proven, can hardly claim the status of theory, and certainly not fact. Nevertheless, the constant touting of the “fact” of natural selection in school textbooks and in the media has caused our society to consider anyone who questions it to be at best an ignoramus, and at the worst a wild-eyed fanatic extremist.

The current language, not only of biologists but of the media in general, seems to assume that Darwinian Evolution is a “fact.” It is not at all a fact, but merely a hypothesis, and not a particularly sound one in the light of modern scientific and statistical evidence. Darwinists accept it as a fact because they have no other choice. They believe that random genetic changes produced the eye and wing and brain not because there is any evidence of it, but because their guiding philosophy does not allow for any other explanation. The only alternatives are that the genetic changes were random, or that there was a guiding force behind them. The absence from the cosmos of any Creator, therefore, is essential to the Darwinists — otherwise the whole hypothesis breaks down.

In the middle of the 19th century the German biologist Ernst Haeckel proposed the hypothesis that embryonic development, from the fertilized ovum to the birth of the juvenile, exactly copies evolutionary development from a single-celled creature to man. The phrase he used became a byword of evolutionists, “Ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny.” Haeckel’s hypothesis was the basis for Darwin’s thinking, and it

was accepted as fact well into the twentieth century. By the early 20th century it had been pretty thoroughly rejected by science, because it simply does not bear up under modern scientific scrutiny. In the light of modern science, it is no more compelling an argument than to say that porpoises are fish because they are shaped about the same. Nevertheless, it was so ingrained in people's minds as an incontrovertible fact, that I was taught it in college as late as 1952, fifty years after most of science had discarded it. Only a few months ago I heard it presented as evidence in a PBS show about the so-called "fact" of evolution. The idea that "ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny," although it was the basis for Darwin's argument, carries no weight today as an argument for evolution. It does carry weight, however, as an argument that there is a common element among species — in my view, that common element is the creative hand of God, guiding an evolutionary process through the ages.

When Darwin and Wallace formulated their hypotheses of natural selection, knowledge of genetics was primitive at best. They did not understand that for a change in a creature to take place, exactly the right genes had to be present in exactly the right place on exactly the right chromosomes. Nothing was known of the structure of the DNA molecule, and it was generally accepted that through random changes and natural selection, plants and animals had an unlimited capacity to adapt to new environments. As genetic knowledge increased, Darwinists had to add the assumption that genetic changes took place through random mutations over eons of time. Some of these mutations were harmful and were selected out of the gene pool, but some were beneficial and were selected to survive and prosper. Modern molecular science proves that this is actually highly unlikely. Dr. Lee Spetner, who taught information theory for a decade at Johns Hopkins University and the Weizman Institute, spent years studying mutations on a molecular level. In his book *Not by Chance: Shattering the Modern Theory of Evolution*, he writes, "In all the reading I've done in the life-sciences literature, I've never found a mutation that added information. . . . All point mutations that have been studied on the molecular level turn out to reduce the genetic information and not increase it."

Why is this a problem for evolution? Because if Darwin's thesis is correct, and all life began as a single organism, then chance mutations must have produced nearly every feature of life on Earth, from the remarkable sonar system of the dolphin to the retina of the eye and the valves of the human heart. Yet mutations always delete or corrupt — never add — information to the genetic code. And what are muta-

tions actually observed to cause in human beings? Among them are hemophilia, sickle cell anemia, Tay-Sachs disease, cystic fibrosis, Down's syndrome, sterility, and death. The genetic code is designed for the perfect running of an organism — mutations corrupt information from the code, causing defects. Darwinists have long supported their argument by the fact that mutations sometimes make bacteria resistant to antibiotics. If that is so, they argue, then mutations must also be able to produce other beneficial changes to organisms. Dr. Spetner points out that this is based on a misunderstanding of antibiotic resistance. The way that antibiotics destroy bacteria is that they attach themselves to certain cellular components called ribosomes. Mutations sometimes cause a structural deformity in ribosomes. Since the antibiotic cannot connect with the corrupted ribosome, it cannot carry out its effect of destroying the bacterium. But even though this mutation turns out to be beneficial, it still constitutes a loss of genetic information, not a gain. No "evolution" has taken place. The bacteria are not "fitter." In fact, under normal conditions, with no antibiotic present, they are weaker than their non-mutated cousins. Ernst Chain, who shared a 1945 Nobel Prize for isolating and purifying penicillin, wrote, "To postulate that the development and survival of the fittest is entirely a consequence of chance mutations, or even that nature carries out experiments by trial and error through mutations in order to create living systems better fitted to survive, seems to me a hypothesis based on no evidence and irreconcilable with the facts."

Biochemistry also poses countless problems for Natural Selection. An example is a process that seems simple and basic — the clotting of blood when we cut ourselves. This process is, in fact, extraordinarily complex. It requires numerous steps in which proteins are activated by enzymes; these proteins then release other enzymes, which activate other proteins, and so on. Ultimately, proteins form long fibrous chains that make up the clot. Most of the proteins and enzymes involved have no other known purpose but the clotting of blood. Now we have the old question of which came first, the chicken or the egg. If the enzyme came first, why did it survive when there was no protein yet mutated for it to activate? If the protein came first, why did it survive when there was no enzyme to activate it? If mutations produced both came at the same time, why did they survive when all the other protein-enzyme combinations were not also there to complete the process? The probability of all the proteins and enzymes appearing at the same time by random mutation would, by comparison, make it likely that the monkeys at their typewriters would produce a Shake-

spearean sonnet in a few days.

Physics and chemistry also present a problem to those who believe that evolution is the result of the natural selection of random changes. All life as we understand it is based on the carbon atom. No other element, even silicon, is capable of forming such a vast variety of compounds, and therefore without carbon there could be no life. By all known laws of physics, however, carbon should be an extremely rare element in the universe, yet it is very abundant. It requires a triple collision of helium atoms under exactly the right conditions. If the conditions are not just right oxygen is formed instead of carbon. The astrophysicist Fred Hoyle, originally an atheist, spent many years researching the carbon atom, particularly with regard to why an element that should be so rare is actually so common. His research led him to a belief in God. He wrote, "A common sense interpretation of the facts suggests that a superintellect has monkeyed with physics, as well as with chemistry and biology, and that there are no blind forces worth speaking about in nature. The numbers one calculates from the facts seem to me so overwhelming as to put this conclusion almost beyond question."

There is a principle almost universally accepted by scientists, the second law of thermodynamics, known as the Law of Entropy. This states that in nature, unless something is done to prevent it, all systems over the course of time will tend to become less and less organized. In recent years this has been better known as Chaos Theory. You can see a simple example of entropy if you drop a pebble into a perfectly still body of water. The concentric rings will expand from the point where the pebble entered, and as they bounce off other objects and interact with each other they form beautiful, intricate patterns. Very soon, however, these patterns break down into random ripples and disturbances on the surface of the water, with no identifiable organization to them at all. Even the most sophisticated computer programs, while they can predict for a while the system of the ripples, will eventually recognize the breakdown of the system into random forces. The Law of Entropy is a powerful argument against Darwinian Natural Selection. Darwin posits that random genetic changes were selected or rejected by nature depending on whether they helped or hindered the creature. This is "survival of the fittest." If he were correct, this would mean that over the course of time genetic systems have become increasingly organized and complex. This is in direct contradiction to the Law of Entropy. However, the Law of Entropy does allow an increase in organization if there is also a force that tends to overcome the degeneration into chaos. I call that force God.

Yet another problem stands in the way of an acceptance of Darwinian Natural Selection. Ironically, it is the very fossil record that so many Darwinians call upon to support Darwin's hypothesis. It is true that we have recovered only an infinitesimally small portion of the fossils that are probably preserved in the earth. Nevertheless, it is statistically reasonable that what we have recovered should represent a random sample of all that is actually there. Such a sample should represent, even if only in bits and pieces, the whole continuum of evolutionary development from the most primitive creatures to modern complex plants and animals. In fact, this is not at all the case. The common wisdom is that amphibians evolved from fish, reptiles from amphibians, and mammals and birds from reptiles. There is no satisfactory fossil evidence to substantiate the claims of a linkage between these taxonomic classes. Rather than a continuum of gradual changes, the fossil evidence indicates a great many mass creations, in each of which vast numbers of brand new species suddenly erupted upon the earth. And between these mass creations were events of mass extinction, when equally vast numbers of species suddenly and often inexplicably disappeared. The most familiar of these events is the mass extinction of the dinosaurs, after which there almost immediately appeared countless new species of mammals and birds which, according to the fossil record, had never before existed. Each of these new species may be traced back to an earlier one, and there may well be some relationship — such as the fact that birds are very similar to certain dinosaurs — but they appeared much too rapidly for there to be any argument that they simply evolved through the natural selection of random accidental genetic changes. The only rational conclusion to which I can arrive is that these new creations represent the hand of God, causing new species to arise from the old. This idea is in no way contradictory to the Genesis account of creation. In that account, God did not create man from nothing, but brought him forth from that which He had previously created, the clay of the ground. Likewise, He did not create the woman from nothing, but from the flesh of the man. This is entirely consistent with the concept of His creating the birds from the flesh of the dinosaurs by guiding a genetic mutation. The bottom line is that the creatures of the earth came into being as the result of divine intervention according to a divine plan, and not simply as the result of an accidental "fuss in the mud and stir in the slime." Perhaps rather than paying so much to the concept of *survival* of the fittest, we need to concern ourselves more with the *arrival* of the fittest. Where did all these surviving species and forms come from? Statis-

tically, the probability that they appeared randomly is almost zero.

All life on earth is a part of a complex, interwoven web, in which every form of life has some effect on every other form. I do not find it at all unreasonable to believe that what we consider the higher forms of life are also therefore interwoven with the lower forms, and are all part of the magnificent fabric which God wove, and is continually weaving. The fact that we are at the top of that web of life is a gift of God to us, not an entitlement that comes from our superiority. I am not the least bit offended by the idea that the ape and I came from a common ancestor. On the contrary, I am honored that God has seen fit to give me, who is nothing more than a naked ape, an immortal soul and His everlasting love and forgiveness. Most people who are unhappy about being cousin to an ape are unhappy about it because it offends their pride. But is that any more humiliating than having been formed out of the mud of the earth?

There is no reason for there to be a conflict between science and religion, as they both have a common goal — the discovery of truth. Sadly, whenever a conflict develops, it tends to polarize the two camps until each considers the other fanatic. A fanatic is a person whose extreme, unreasoning enthusiasm for a cause or belief closes his mind to any argument that is not completely consistent with his existing faith system. There are religious fanatics, who are so convinced that they have the absolute truth that they have only contempt and detestation for anyone who disagrees with them. These people do great harm to religion. There are also scientific fanatics, who are so convinced that they have the absolute truth that they have only contempt and detestation for anyone who disagrees with them. These people do great harm to science. Until intellectual and spiritual curiosity can prevail, and we can work together in the quest for truth, we will continue to stand in the way of God's promise that he would lead us into all truth.