

LORD OF ALL

Developing a Christian World-and-Life View

D. JAMES KENNEDY
JERRY NEWCOMBE

CROSSWAY BOOKS

A MINISTRY OF
GOOD NEWS PUBLISHERS
WHEATON, ILLINOIS

Lord of All

Copyright © 2005 by D. James Kennedy and Jerry Newcombe

Published by Crossway Books
a ministry of Good News Publishers
1300 Crescent Street
Wheaton, Illinois 60187

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher, except as provided by USA copyright law.

Cover design: Josh Dennis

Cover photo: Photonica

First printing, 2005

Printed in the United States of America

Unless otherwise indicated, Scripture quotations are taken from *Holy Bible: English Standard Version*, copyright © 2001 by Crossway Bibles, a ministry of Good News Publishers. All rights reserved. Used by permission.

Scripture quotations indicated as from NIV are taken from the *Holy Bible: New International Version*®. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984 by International Bible Society. Used by permission of Zondervan Publishing House. All rights reserved. The “NIV” and “New International Version” trademarks are registered in the United States Patent and Trademark Office by International Bible Society. Use of either trademark requires the permission of International Bible Society.

Scripture quotations indicated as from KJV are taken from the *King James Version*.

Scripture quotations indicated as from NKJV are taken from *New King James Version*, copyright © 1982 by Thomas Nelson Publishers. Used by permission.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Kennedy, D. James (Dennis James), 1930-
Lord of all : developing a Christian world-and-life view / D. James
Kennedy and Jerry Newcombe.
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 1-58134-677-8 (tpb)

1. Christianity—Philosophy. 2. Christianity and culture—United States.
3. Church and state—United States. 4. Ideology—Religious aspects—
Christianity. I. Newcombe, Jerry. II. Title.

BR100.K465 2005

230'.01—dc22

2004026607

Q	15	14	13	12	11	10	09	08	07	06	05			
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

INTRODUCTION

THE CHRISTIAN WORLD- AND-LIFE VIEW

For from him and through him and to him are all things. To him be glory forever. Amen.

ROMANS 11:36



The Christian world-and-life view. That is not a phrase, probably, that is intimately familiar to you. Perhaps you know it by the German term, *Weltanschauung*. No? That is no more familiar, is it? In fact, less? What is a world-and-life view—a *Weltanschauung*? Well, let me tell you first of all, you have one. Everybody has one. Many people just sort of absorb it as they go through life. They have not critically examined it; it has just become what they believe in.

A world-and-life view is a set of assumptions or presuppositions that determine the way we look at the world and our place in the world. These then largely determine how we consider everything that comes down the path.

What is your world-and-life view like? Is it a Christian world-and-life view, or is it a non-Christian/anti-Christian view? There is a Christian world-and-life view, and there are a number of other world-and-life views that are all arrayed against the Christian view. Chuck Colson and Nancy Pearcey ask, “What is the major challenge today? In the broadest categories, the conflict of our day is theism and naturalism.”¹

In an editorial for *The American Prospect*, Clinton’s Secretary of State Robert B. Reich also wrote about the importance of worldview.

Note who he lumps in with whom (namely, believers of all kinds are lumped in). Suddenly the Salvation Army becomes the equivalent of the Taliban.

The great conflict of the 21st century may be between the West and terrorism. But terrorism is a tactic, not a belief. The underlying battle will be between modern civilization and anti-modernist fanatics; between those who believe in the primacy of the individual and those who believe that human beings owe blind allegiance to a higher authority; between those who give priority to life in this world and those who believe that human life is no more than preparation for an existence beyond life; between those who believe that truth is revealed solely through scripture and religious dogma, and those who rely primarily on science, reason, and logic. Terrorism will disrupt and destroy lives. But terrorism is not the only danger we face.²

Reich is so wrong on many fronts. But consider this: Who has proven to be the great killer of all time? Atheistic states.³ The Fascists and the Communists killed tens of millions of human beings, and they claimed to believe in science and not religion. Reich is correct about one thing though—the root of the conflict concerns which worldview will prevail.

NATURALISM

Naturalism has nothing to do with wildlife or vitamins. It has to do with the idea that nature is all there is—that there is nothing in the universe except matter (materialism). That is one worldview. The fact is, Colson says, that this, indeed, is what we use to explain most everything else. What is the most fundamental question? What does the universe consist of? Is it only matter? Is ultimate reality God or the cosmos?

You remember Carl Sagan, a very rabid evolutionist and naturalist, and his famous ten-part series *Cosmos* that aired on educational TV a number of times. In his first sentence he made this clear statement: “The cosmos is all that is or ever was or ever will be.”⁴ That is a worldview—a purely naturalistic, materialistic, evolutionary, atheistic worldview.

I say it is a worldview because it is an assumption. It is not the result of any scientific test. Sagan never saw that there was never anything besides the cosmos. He did not know that there was nothing beyond it. He most certainly did not know that there was no God, no supernatural element. What is the ultimate reality? Is it matter and the cosmos, or is it God and His revelation?

Those two views have been in direct conflict for the last several centuries and are in our own time.

Chuck Colson and Nancy Pearcey in their book *How Now Shall We Live?* state:

A debilitating weakness in modern evangelicalism is that we've been fighting cultural skirmishes on all sides without knowing what the war itself is about. We have not identified the worldviews that lie at the root of cultural conflict—and this ignorance dooms our best efforts. The culture war is not just about abortion, homosexual rights, or the decline of public education. These are only skirmishes. The real war is a cosmic struggle between worldviews—between the Christian worldview and the various secular and spiritual worldviews arrayed against it. This is what we must understand if we are going to be effective in evangelizing our world today and in transforming it to reflect the wisdom of the Creator.⁵

A worldview, said Colson and Pearcey, “is simply the sum total of our beliefs about the world, the ‘big picture’ that directs our daily decisions and actions.”⁶ A worldview needs to be carefully considered and decided upon. Otherwise we will be subconsciously directed into making decisions and may not know why we are making them.

May I point out that every worldview is based upon faith. It is based upon some kind of assumptions or presuppositions that we probably have never proved. Many of them *cannot* even be proved. As one writer said, “Every human being has faith in something which affects his understanding of everything.” Scientists operate by faith. Some have had the candor to admit it; others would deny it vehemently.

We have seen in the last several centuries, since the French Enlightenment in the 1780s, the rise of rationalism. That is not to say anything about reason. We should be rational and reasonable, but rationalism is the idea that reason is the *only* source of knowledge and understanding, and it rules out entirely faith in God or in His Word. Rationalism, naturalism, materialism, and atheism are all based upon evolutionism.

Though the Enlightenment existed fifty years before Darwin, philosophers had struggled to get some kind of worldview together, but not with great success, until Darwin's *The Origin of Species* provided for them a comprehensive worldview that made atheism palatable for the first time and something that could be talked about in public. This view has been promulgated in Western society for the last 150 years like few things have ever been.

SECULARISM

At its core this worldview is atheistic, evolutionary, relativistic, materialistic, and secularistic (in that it is only of this world). The word *secularism* comes from the Latin word *secularis*, which means “the present world” or in other words, “life as conceived without any relationship to eternity or to God.” That is secularism. The Western world has become almost 99 percent secular. Listen to any talk show on television. This smoked plastic dome that has settled down upon the city of man does not allow him to see past death into the future. Is there a heaven? Is there a hell? He cannot know. Is there a God? “The dome is too smoky. I cannot see up to God. I cannot see out into the future.” That is secularism, and this nation and the Western world have been overwhelmingly secularized in a Darwinian, atheistic, materialistic life.

This view is being promulgated in virtually all of the public schools in this nation, from kindergarten through graduate school. John Dunphy, in *The Humanist*, said some time ago:

The classroom must and will become an arena of conflict between the old and the new—the rotting corpse of Christianity, together with all its adjacent evils and misery, and the new faith of humanism, resplendent in its promise of a world in which the never-realized Christian ideal of “love thy neighbor” will be finally achieved.⁷

He says that a teacher must become as zealous as the most fundamental evangelist in propagating this faith to every student. Oh, they may learn about God and heaven in Sunday school, “but five days a week we have them right here in our schools.” That is the idea.

HUMANISM

Maybe you didn’t know you had a fundamentalist-evangelist-teacher propagating atheistic humanism in your schools. What is this never-realized ideal of Christian love? What has it produced? It has produced not only the Enlightenment worldview that spawned the French Revolution, but in the twentieth century it also produced World War I, World War II, and Communism, which, according to the U.S. Congress killed 135 million people during peacetime—more than all of the wars of history. It has also produced behaviorism, Nazism, and Fascism. All of these are squarely based upon the evolutionary, atheistic view of humanism. That is the marvelous goal they supposedly are bringing to the world. It is not pretty, to say the least.

Someone like Robert B. Reich, quoted above, may disavow this, but the facts speak for themselves. Ideas have consequences.

Humanism is just another way of talking about atheism. There was a time, years ago, when it was not politically expedient to be an atheist, and so, instead of that, they switched to humanism. Atheism says, “down with God”; humanism says, “up with man.” But in the end it is the same. Man is up there in the place of God, and God is down here, abased.

This worldview probably got its initial impetus from the pre-Socratic philosopher Protagoras, who made one statement that has been reverberating for over two millennia. He said, very simply, “Man is the measure of all things.” That seems to be very innocuous, but millions of people have died because of it, because ideas have consequences. That last statement seems more true with every passing year.

Christians have always believed that God is the measure of all things, that God tells us what is good and what is bad and what is right and what is wrong. God tells us where to go and how to get there. But that is rejected by humanism, in which man becomes the judge of all things. Man decides what is moral and what is immoral, what is virtuous and what is not, what is evil and what is good, what is right and what is wrong. That has led to catastrophic consequences in our world.

The Enlightenment period began with two ideas—great ideas, if they were true. The first one was the inherent goodness of man, and the second was the inevitability of moral progress—progress of every sort in the world. That was to lead to the Golden Age. At the beginning of the twentieth century, many were saying, “The Golden Age is upon us. It is coming. Every day in every way we are getting better and better.” Then came World War I, and the blood flowed in the trenches of France; then World War II—with Iwo Jima, Bataan, Corregidor, and all the rest. Then came the Cold War, and Communism spread across the world like a blight, killing millions.

THE DEATH OF HUMANISM

Among the deaths was the death of the idea of the inherent goodness of man. How could such inhumanity to man possibly be true in a world where there is no bad boy and no bad man? If the torture chambers of the Nazis and the Gulag weren't enough, in our day and age we can go to the Near East and visit one of Saddam Hussein's torture chambers. Consider how people who displeased him were tossed into shredders and vats of acid. Man's inhumanity to man.

The inevitable progress ended in a fiery crash, and the Golden Age turned

into a bloody age, and the marvelous, romantic picture of humanism died. In his book *Thinking Straight in a Crooked World*, Gary DeMar describes well the humanistic mentality of Western man since the Renaissance—this belief in the inherent goodness of man and the inevitability of his progress.⁸

But the shocking revelations of the twentieth century pretty well burst that bubble. That was especially true in the latter half of the twentieth century, when it was apparent that the once proud dogmas of optimistic humanism were dead and buried and had been replaced by a mood of cynicism and despair. H. G. Wells, just before his death in 1946, wrote a book, *The Mind at the End of Its Tether*, in which he stated: “The end of everything we call life is close at hand and cannot be evaded.”⁹ Things looked very, very bleak, to say the least.

Why is this? Because “modern man has simply come to realize the logical implications of his foolish autonomy,” said Gary DeMar, “and is beginning to pay the price.”¹⁰ Jean-Paul Sartre, the French existential philosopher, was right. This fact of the logical consequences of man’s foolish flight from God ought, indeed, to make man happy, gay, and joyous. That was the promise. But what was the reality? Even the unbeliever Sartre observed, “[It] ought to give him nausea.”¹¹

REAPING WHAT IS SOWED

Do you remember the Death of God Movement? That too is part of this. It is interesting that man didn’t realize that when he was throwing things at God, he was throwing boomerangs that would come back and hit him in the head. God is very much alive, but non-Christian man is in a state of morbid decay and despair. He comes closer and closer to nihilism and despair as he becomes more self-conscious of the logical consequences of his view. Author Gary DeMar put it this way:

There is at the present time then, a radical disintegration of the non-Christian man as he reaps the harvest produced by the seed he has sown. After many years the crop is approaching full maturity, and the ingathering is proving a most unpleasant time. He has laid up treasures on the earth, and the sphere of his ultimate values, the place of his only reward and enjoyment. His values are dead on the vine, being merely the dictates of social and personal convenience. The ethic of evolution, the survival of the fittest, has yet to take its full toll. The world has still to see the full maturing of Marquis de Sade’s “natural behaviour” based on the principle of

“what is” is right. The simple equation—matter plus time plus chance—has yet to reveal and yield its full horror.¹²

The Bible says, “All who hate me love death” (Proverbs 8:36). In a non-Christian world today, a culture of death has been developing. It is not God who has died; He is very much alive. Rather, it is man who is dying. The facts of history are very discouraging, and the logic of materialism is crushing him.

THE DEATH OF HOPE

Modern man longs for death. We have in many of our schools in America today classes on suicide. The French philosopher Albert Camus said that the only philosophical idea worth consideration today is suicide.¹³ Ernest Hemingway embraced it, Camus endorsed it, and thousands have followed in their train. Preoccupation with death is a distinguishing mark of our time. Indeed, when you have the death of hope—and materialism and humanism are hopeless views of life—that leads directly to the hope for death. Many people have discovered that life in the humanistic world, the atheistic world, is not worth living.

Samuel Beckett, the playwright, said:

How am I, an a-temporal being imprisoned in time and space, to escape from my imprisonment, when I know that outside space and time lies Nothing, and that I, in the ultimate depths of my reality, am Nothing also?¹⁴

How far removed this is from the Christian view that we have been made in the image of God, that God has placed eternity in our hearts, that God has given His own Son to redeem us from our sin and has prepared for us a place in paradise forever and ever. We have a glorious calling in this life: “to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever” and to be coworkers of Christ in the redemption of the world. Life has meaning, and life has purpose. Life has a glorious future, while none of the godless worldviews offer anything but despair at the end.

The director of the British Humanist Association (note well—this is not some Christian minister’s opinion. This is the opinion of one of the world’s leaders of the humanist movement), H. J. Blackham, said that “the most drastic objection to humanism . . .” is what? I would love to ask a bunch of college students that question, wouldn’t you? Remember the glorious picture of what humanism was going to produce over against the “rotting corpse of

Christianity”—the new, the glorious, the vibrant picture of humanism was to captivate the minds of people. Well, here’s what one of the world’s leading humanist says: “The most drastic objection to humanism is that it is too bad to be true.”¹⁵ Wow!

Bertrand Russell summed that up very eloquently when he said:

That man is the product of causes which had no prevision of the end they were achieving [evolution]; that his origin, his growth, his hopes and fears, his loves and his beliefs, are but the outcome of accidental collocations of atoms; that no fire, no heroism, no intensity of thought and feeling, can preserve an individual life beyond the grave; that all of the labour of the ages, all of the devotion, all of the inspiration, all the noonday brightness of human genius, are destined to extinction in the vast death of the solar system, and that whole temple of Man’s achievement must inevitably be buried beneath the debris of a universe in ruins—all these things, if not quite beyond dispute, are yet so nearly certain, that no philosophy which rejects them can hope to stand. Only within the scaffolding of these truths, and on the firm foundation of unyielding despair, can the soul’s habitation henceforth be safely built.¹⁶

There is the humanist’s world-and-life view of the world. It’s not a pretty sight, to say the least. The most powerful objection against humanism, says the humanist, is that it is just too bad to be true.

THE TRUTH OF GOD

I have heard a particular objection many times when I have proclaimed the gospel; people have said to me, “Oh, that’s just too good to be true.” What a marvelous contrast that is to “too bad to be true.” But *mirabile dictu*, marvelous to tell, the gospel, as glorious and wonderful as it is, is true. It is truth itself. It is the truth of God. It has been established by all manner of empirical evidences, and it stands against all of the onslaughts of unbelievers.

SIX GREAT SPHERES

Theologian Hermann Dooyeweerd once talked about God’s sovereignty in terms of different spheres of existence. God is sovereign over different aspects or spheres of life. With thanks to Mr. Dooyeweerd for this concept, we want to look at different spheres of life.

We want to explore in this book a Christian world-and-life view by con-

sidering six great spheres that every Christian should be vitally interested in and should be working to Christianize. They are:

- the world,
- humanity,
- the nation,
- the school,
- the church,
- the family.

Every Christian church should be endeavoring to do what it can to strengthen each of these great spheres.

JESUS IS NOT TO BE EXCLUDED FROM ANYTHING

Listen to what the great Dutch theologian Abraham Kuyper had to say about Christ's sovereignty over all the spheres of life—not just spiritual things. He believed in the sovereignty of the Triune God over the whole of the cosmos in all of its spheres and kingdoms; the Triune God is sovereign over everything—not merely over the church but over every sphere of life. Here are Kuyper's own words about the second person of the Trinity:

The Son is not to be excluded from anything. You cannot point to any natural realm or star or comet or even descend into the depth of the earth, but it is related to Christ, not in some unimportant tangential way, but directly. There is no force in nature, no laws that control those forces that do not have their origin in that eternal Word. For this reason, it is totally false to restrict Christ to spiritual affairs and to assert that there is no point of contact between him and the natural sciences.¹⁷

Thus it all belongs to Him. This is my Father's world. He is Lord of all.

CONCLUSION

What is your worldview? Have you embraced Christ? Have you invited Him into your heart as Lord and Savior of your life? Do you know why you are here and what you are to do and where you are going? Do you have an everlasting certainty and hope in your heart of paradise, or are you looking at nothing but the darkness of the grave? The Christian world-and-life view is glorious beyond our full understanding. I hope it is yours.

PART I

THE SPHERE
OF THE
WORLD

INTRODUCTION TO THE SPHERE OF THE WORLD

In British Columbia, 500 miles northeast of Vancouver, the Fraser River divides into two streams. One flows eastward to the Atlantic Ocean; the other flows westward to the Pacific Ocean. The fork in the river is known as The Great Divide. Six inches after the division takes place, the river's future course is unchangeably fixed.

The evolution-creation controversy is just such a juncture in human thought, and it has tremendous impact on the value of human life. Is evolution just some sort of theory taught in high school biology classes with no further ramifications? No. It has influenced every part of our life. I am sometimes saddened that so few Christians seem to be able to grasp the significance of that.

We need to Christianize the world. That is not a small task. In the next several chapters we want to explore two foundational issues—both of which are related.

- What is our origin? Why are we here? Are we just the product of time and slime, or are we specially designed creatures, set here on this planet for a purpose?
- Do we have value as human beings? This question flows out of the first one, because our opinion of who we are flows out of our understanding of where we came from and why we are here.

THE ROOT OF THE PROBLEM

Where is the one who is wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the debater of this age? Has not God made foolish the wisdom of the world?

1 CORINTHIANS 1:20



Recently I preached a sermon called “The Root of the Problem,” and my wife asked me the day before, after hearing the message title, “So, what is it?”

I replied, “What do you think it is?”

She said, “Why, sin, of course.”

My wife is a very perceptive lady, and I said, “Honey, that’s right. If you go to the etiology of mankind’s whole problem, eventually you get back to sin.”

But I was also thinking of something more recent, a more modern human construct that is indeed the root of nearly all of the problems we face today, in fact for the last century and a half. It would be interesting to have all of you readers guess your answer. I’m sure some of you would get it right. I fear others of you would not.

I also think that when I tell you what I think it is, many of you will not believe me. I trust that before we finish this chapter, you will see why I say what I do. The root of the problem of most of the great ills that have afflicted society and do afflict it today are caused by the teaching of evolution. It has been called “The Big Lie.” It has deceived hundreds of millions of people and has probably brought about more deaths than any other view in the history of the world.

EVOLUTION

Evolution simply says that the whole universe is made up of nothing but matter; that matter, time, and chance—the trinity of materialism—have brought all things into existence that exist. Therefore, there is no God. One scientist (John Lenczowski) said he was confident that if you interviewed social scientists at our elite universities across the country, and if they were willing to be honest about the matter, you would find out something surprising. He said you would find that perhaps 99 percent of them would not be willing to sign the Declaration of Independence.¹

Why? They do not believe in a Creator; they do not believe we have been created equal or any other way. They do not believe that we have been endowed with certain inalienable rights by this Creator. They believe none of that, and if they were honest, they would not sign the document that made us Americans.

He says, “Parents can work hard to educate their children to be patriots and morally upright citizens. But four years of college of the kind I experienced—where I was surrounded by a culture of drugs, sexual libertinism, political radicalism and little homework—can destroy the efforts of the best parents in America.”

If that doesn’t do it, he says, a couple of years of graduate school are almost certain to destroy any vestige of belief in God, moral absolutes, morality, Americanism, patriotism, or any other of our values. That is due to evolution. Evolution has made our public schools and universities and colleges like the one he attended a mortal danger to the lives and souls of young people—with tragic consequences.

Dr. Ernest Gordon, dean emeritus of the Princeton University Chapel, also the hero and author of the book *Bridge Over the River Kwai*, is a fascinating and godly man. (Unfortunately, the movie totally ignored the Christian aspects of the story.) Anyway, Dr. Gordon said:

During the late [1950s] I was invited to address the senior class of an English department in a city high school. When I arrived at the school, I introduced myself to the assistant headmaster, whose office was at the entrance. He guided me to the appropriate lecture hall.

Twenty years later, I was invited to the same school for the same purpose. I again presented myself to the same office, but it was no longer the habitat of an educator. It was the command post of a police inspector. Corridors and classrooms were monitored by police officers who reported regularly to the inspector. The reasons for the change were obvious: violence, assault, rape, drug-induced madness.

I interpret this scene as evidence of the end times of a civilization that had once benefited from the Christian worldview, one that exalted creation and people and provided ideals essential for an authentic education. I recognize that civilization does not create Christians. However, the community of faith created and still creates the civility that is evidence of civilization. The demoralized school is the tragic consequence of society's rejection of the biblical worldview that provided the intellectual dynamic of Western education.²

At the heart of all that is the doctrine of evolution that, first of all, got rid of God—since there is no Creator, there is no God. Since evolutionists believe that all life arose spontaneously from matter, there was no need for a God to create anyone.

Another of the fruits of evolution has been the proliferation of atheists. Do you realize that before Darwin, an atheist was as scarce as a hen's tooth? Oh, there were a few around, but very, very few. Do you know why? Because if you said you were an atheist, all I had to say to you was, "Look around, buddy. Where did all of this come from?"

And the atheist would say, "Ah . . . bu . . . da . . . I don't know."

Then came Charles Darwin. One evolutionist said, "The greatest contribution of Charles Darwin was that he made atheism respectable." For that, this atheistic evolutionist was forever grateful—or at least for whatever few years he had left in this world, until the day of the Great Judgment, which will come for all of us.

So evolution got rid of God, or at least thought it did. Does this make any difference in our current society? Yes, it does. I was talking to an expert in legal affairs who has often appeared before the Supreme Court, and he told me that the main problem in the Supreme Court is very simple: Six of the judges are evolutionists, and three are not. Have you wondered why they vote the way they do when it comes time to decide:

- whether or not God should be taught in the classrooms? No.
- whether or not prayer should be directed to God? Nope.
- whether or not the Bible should be taught? No way.
- whether or not the Ten Commandments can be posted in a public classroom? We cannot have that.
- whether or not it is legal to abort a child? Of course.
- whether or not it is legal for a man to marry a man and a woman a woman? Some of the courts of this land have accepted same-sex marriage.

If there is no God, there are no moral absolutes. As an evil, atheistic char-

acter in Fyodor Dostoyevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov* says, "everything is permitted . . . since there is no infinite God, there's no such thing as virtue either and there's no need for it at all."³ Think about it. That statement is true.

Because of evolution, man has lost his significance. In Western civilization, it has always been held that man is a creature with a great purpose, He has been created in the image of God to fulfill His purposes in this world, and he has an everlasting life ahead of him. But now . . .

THE IMPACT OF DECISIONS

Indeed, we have seen in the courts in the past four decades four very significant decisions that have ushered us into this secular apocalypse. First of all, the Supreme Court ruled prayer out of our schools. Then they ruled the Bible out of schools. Next they ruled the Ten Commandments out of the schools. Now they have voted against the balanced treatment of creation along with evolution in the schools. So we have seen banished from the thought of our young people the idea that they have been created by anyone or that there are any laws or moral absolutes they should obey. By the way, the Supreme Court's decision against allowing the Ten Commandments to be posted on the walls of the schools in Kentucky, said, ". . . lest looking upon them from day to day, the students should be moved to obey them."⁴

If there is no Judge, then there is no one to whom we are accountable or responsible. Therefore, if God is dead or absent from both ends of the process of life, then it is true that, as the Dostoevsky character said, "Anything is permissible." And that is one of the basic motivations that lies behind the belief in evolutionism.

NO PURPOSE

Today students are taught that man has no purpose, because teleology, the science of purposes, is the *bête noire*, the black beast, of evolution. Evolutionists cannot stand for anything to have purpose. Teleology must go. Therefore, everything is not preplanned by a divine intelligence and a beneficent God who providentially provides for His creatures. It all happens purely by chance, with no forethought of what the end might be. Therefore man has no purpose; consequently he has no significance.

"ACCIDENTAL TWIG"

Stephen J. Gould was the most influential evolutionist in America, a professor at Harvard University for twenty years—and then he had a great awak-

ening: He died recently, and he met the Creator face-to-face. That must have been a horribly shocking event, to say the least. Overnight he became a creationist.

However, in one article by him he said: “Man—or even woman—as the crowning achievement of some grand cosmic plan? What mortal conceit.” To Gould the idea of the creation of man was merely a mortal conceit. “We are but an afterthought,” said Gould. “We are a little accidental twig”⁵—the kind you would pick up off the lawn of your backyard and throw into the garbage. That is what our students are learning in our colleges: They are nothing but dried-up, little accidental twigs of no significance and no purpose.

So man lost all of his divinely bestowed significance and importance with the onslaught of evolution. The results of that have been staggering. Among them is the fact that suicide is the second largest cause of death among college students in America. As of this writing, there has been a rash of suicides at the very place I earned my Ph.D., New York University. When life has no meaning or purpose and no future, then why not? Tune out. Tune in. Live a life of drugs, alcohol, sex. Life really doesn’t have any meaning after all, because it has been “demonstrated scientifically” that evolution is a “fact,” and you have to get used to it. Students are told it is a fact that is believed by all scientists. How many times have we heard that?

WHY WAS EVOLUTION ACCEPTED SO READILY?

I remember listening a few years ago to a television broadcast on public television in which a young lady was interviewing Sir Julian Huxley. He was the grandson of Thomas Huxley, who popularized evolution during Darwin’s day. Darwin was too meek and mild to get out and defend his own theory, but he had a bulldog, Thomas Huxley. His grandson was Sir Julian, and he was, a few years ago, the most important evolutionist in the world—even knighted by the king. He was also the president and founder of UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization). He was a world ambassador for evolution. If Sir Julian spoke, that was the law, the last word. The lady interviewing him asked, “Why do you think evolution caught on so quickly? Why do you think the scientists leaped at *The Origin of Species*?”

I remember exactly where I was sitting while watching this public broadcasting television station and Huxley’s response, verbatim. The greatest living evolutionist in all of the world, Sir Julian Huxley, said, “We all jumped at the *Origin* because . . .” I would love to ask a college class of seniors in the science department that question: “Why did scientists leap at the *Origin*?”

They would say that Charles Darwin presented such unimpeachable evidence that proved the fact of evolution that we, in our scientific integrity, could not help but accept his conclusions. That is what virtually every student in our public schools is taught. But what did the greatest evolutionist on earth, Sir Julian Huxley, say? He said this: “[I suppose the reason] we all jumped at the *Origin* was because the idea of God interfered with our sexual mores.” Remember: If there is no God, everything is permissible.

By the way, that is not a lone opinion. Aldous Huxley, author of *Brave New World* and the brother of Julian, was one of the great agnostic evolutionists of the twentieth century, also following in the footsteps of his grandfather, Thomas Huxley. He said the same thing. He believed in the meaninglessness of the world, which Darwin taught, because, he said, “We objected to the morality, because it interfered with our sexual freedom.”

Such statements from various highly placed evolutionists could be quoted. What was evolution really all about? Science? Evidence? . . . No. Sex. It unleashed *The Kinsey Report*, the sexual revolution, feminism, divorce, homosexuality, and all of the rest of those ills. Does evolution really make a difference in our world? Believe me, it does. The people I am quoting to you are not merely evolutionists—they are the world’s greatest evolutionists, and what they often say to each other, they don’t say to the public.

I further will say that 95 percent of what you read here, you have never read in the newspaper. They will say, “But evolution is a fact, and therefore we must live with it, adjust to it.” That is what many people have tried to do because they have been told it is a fact. It’s not a theory, we are told—it is a fact.

NOT A FACT

But in truth, evolution is *not* a fact; it isn’t even a scientific theory. Evolutionists say, “Evolution is not a theory; it’s a fact.” However, the greatest authority in the world says it’s not a theory, it’s not even a hypothesis, it’s metaphysics. It’s basically theology. We will focus in a later chapter on how evolution is crumbling in our time.

Others will say, “All scientists believe in evolution, and therefore we must believe it.” I would say the most persuasive argument used in our colleges and high schools as to why students ought to believe in evolution is that all scientists believe it. You have probably heard that statement made. There’s just one problem . . .

IT'S NONSENSE

In actuality, evolution has failed at every point. All of the major pillars of evolution have collapsed in the last twenty years. For example, the idea that the amazing and almost unbelievable complexity of a cell could have risen by chance. Sir Fred Hoyle, of Cambridge University and Oxford, one of the greatest living astronomers, developer of the Steady-State theory of creation, said that the idea that a cell could have risen by chance “is evidently nonsense of a high order.”⁶

What children are being taught in every public school as scientific fact in America is “nonsense of a high order.” Yes, outstanding scientists have said there is no basis and no real evidence for evolution at all. It is not even a theory, much less a fact.

Hitler was a devout evolutionist and a follower of Nietzsche and Haeckel, and he taught evolution to his troops. He gave them a copy of Darwin's book and Nietzsche's book, which talked about evolution of the god-man, of our becoming God. He was absolutely determined to create a super race by getting rid of the inferior races.

For example, Hitler said, “At this point someone or other may laugh, but this planet once moved through the ether for millions of years without human beings and it can do so again some day if men forget that they owe their higher existence, not to the ideas of a few crazy ideologists, but to the knowledge and ruthless application of Nature's stern and rigid laws. Everything we admire on this earth today—science and art, technology and inventions—is only the creative product of a few people and originally perhaps of one race. On them depends the existence of this culture. . . . All the human culture, all the results of art, science, and technology that we see before us today, are almost exclusively the creative product of the Aryan. This very fact admits of the not unfounded inference that he alone was the founder of all higher humanity, and therefore representing the prototype of all that we understand by the word ‘man.’”⁷ And so, because of his view of evolution, he believed the Aryan was superior to other races (including the Jews, the Gypsies, the Slavs, and so on).

Because of this, Hitler was adamant that Aryans should not breed with non-Aryans: “The stronger must dominate and not mate with the weaker, which would signify the sacrifice of its own higher nature. Only the born weakling can look upon this principle as cruel, and if he does so, it is merely because he is of a feebler nature and narrower mind; for if such a law did not direct the process of evolution then the higher development of organic life

would not be conceivable at all.”⁸ So who are you, asks Hitler, to question the marvels of evolution? Hitler tried to speed up evolution, to help it along. And millions suffered and died in unspeakable ways because of it.

RACISM—AN EVOLUTIONARY CONCEPT

Racism is basically an evolutionary concept. The word *race* is never even used in the Bible, except for a foot race. But all of the nineteenth-century evolutionists were strong racists, including Darwin, who said that the inferior races at some time in the future would all be destroyed by the superior races. Hitler and others set out to do so. We also know that Margaret Sanger, the founder of Planned Parenthood, set out to get rid of “the human weeds,” as she called them, so that the superior stock might prevail.

Also, you may know that Karl Marx, the founder of Communism, felt that evolution was exactly what he needed as a pseudo-scientific foundation for that Godless worldview. He even wanted to dedicate *Das Kapital* to Charles Darwin. Darwin’s wife had a fit, and Marx said he wouldn’t do it because he didn’t want to cause unhappiness in his family. Darwin also hoped his wife would let go of his nose. She was much more conservative than her husband, to say the least.

Communism is based upon evolution, as are Nazism and Fascism. The Communists have killed more people in peacetime than all those killed in all religious wars combined. According to *The Black Book of Communism*, “rough approximation, based on unofficial estimates” finds that the “total [killed by the Communists] approaches 100 million people killed.”⁹ The Communists killed, according to the Senate Committee of the United States of America, 135 million people in peacetime. They are the greatest mass murderers of all time—Stalin and Mao and Pol Pot and all the rest—and all of that compliments of evolution. As a Dutch Marxist said in 1912, “If we turn to Marxism we immediately see a great conformity with Darwinism.”¹⁰

Author Ian Taylor says that Fascism and Communism were two sides of the same coin in that evolution provided the basis for both—therefore human life was cheap. “Fascism or Marxism, right wing or left—all these are only ideological roads that lead to Aldous Huxley’s brave new world, while the foundation for each of these is Darwin’s theory of evolution. . . . The result is that both Fascism and Marxism finish at the same destiny—totalitarian rule by the elite.”¹¹

Therefore, we can conclude with a statement made by a very famous evolutionist, Sir Arthur Keith, at one time the number-one evolutionist in Great

Britain. At the end of World War II Keith said that what we had just seen for the first time in history was a modern secular technological state that had based itself entirely upon the principles of evolution. He was horrified. He had written twenty books defending evolution, and then he saw it in Nazi Germany and the Holocaust—and he was appalled. Keith also said this:

Meantime, let me say in conclusion, I have come to this: The law of Christ is incompatible with the law of evolution . . . as far as the law of evolution has worked hitherto. Nay, the two laws are at war with each other; the law of Christ can never prevail until the law of evolution is destroyed.¹²

Again, this comes from Sir Arthur Keith, at one time a leading evolutionist in Great Britain.

CONCLUSION

Some are predicting that by the middle of this century, evolution will be known simply as a small religious sect of the twentieth century. Paul Lemoine, director of the National Museum of Natural History, was an atheist, but a critic of evolution nonetheless. He said, “Evolution is a kind of dogma which its own priests no longer believe, but which they uphold for the people.”¹³ Another Frenchman, Jean Rostand, a biologist and member of the Academy of Sciences of the French Academy, once wrote, “Evolution [“Transformism”] is a fairy tale for adults.”¹⁴

I pray that the Lord will topple this whole monstrous edifice, which has brought more death, more evil, more vice, more vileness into the world than any other human theory ever promulgated. I pray that the law of Christ will prevail and that this One who came and commanded us to care for the weak, not destroy them, to help those who are sick and the poor and not let them die, that His views will prevail, though they are the very antithesis of evolution. I pray that His love and mercy and grace will cover the world. I also pray that the collapse of this horrible edifice may come soon and may come completely and totally. I pray that the wondrous effects of Christ’s ethical, moral, and spiritual teaching will once more prevail in our nation and in the world.

“THIS IS MY AMOEBA’S WORLD”

O Timothy, guard the deposit entrusted to you. Avoid the irreverent babble and contradictions of what is falsely called “knowledge,” for by professing it some have swerved from the faith. Grace be with you.

1 TIMOTHY 6:20-21



Over the centuries the attacks upon the Christian church have changed, and they have increased both in intensity and in comprehension. For example, there was a time when the attacks focused upon the literal or allegorical interpretation of Scripture—a time when critics or skeptics fixed their attacks on some of the miracles of the Bible. Then they progressed to attacks upon the Virgin Birth or the bodily resurrection or the Second Coming of Christ. Following those were attacks upon the deity of Christ and His atonement.

But today the basic assault upon Christianity is total and all-encompassing. The basic attack is upon the very existence of God Himself—the foundation for all religion and all spiritual life.

This attack, of course, is coming to us in the form of a scientific dogma—the dogma of evolution. If it had its way, this dogma would rid the world of the last vestiges of any belief in God.

We are told today that we have not been wonderfully and marvelously fashioned by the hand of God, but rather we are the product of a clever and cunning amoeba. I’m sure that some of us will be moved to a spirit of adoration when we think of such a thing. “This is my amoeba’s world. I rest me in the thought, that he has produced all things.” I think it would be only appro-

priate that every morning all of us would get down on our knees and give thanks and praise to the amoeba that has created us. Well, in case you think that's not what some believe, let me read you a poem by Arthur Guiterman, an evolutionist. Though this is somewhat tongue-in-cheek, nevertheless it contains the real element of what they believe. This "Ode to the Amoeba" is a hymn or paean of praise to our creator—the great god, Amoeba.

*Recall from Time's abysmal chasm
That piece of primal protoplasm,
The First Amoeba, strangely splendid,
From whom we're all of us descended.
That First Amoeba, weirdly clever,
Exists today and shall forever,
Because he reproduced by fission;
He split himself, and each division
And subdivision deemed it fitting
To keep on splitting, splitting, splitting;
So whatso'er their billions be,
All, all amoebas still are he.
Zoologists discern his features
In every sort of breathing creatures,
Since all of every living species,
No matter how their breed increases
Or how their ranks have been recruited,
From him alone were evolved.
King Solomon, the Queen of Sheba
And Hoover sprang from that amoeba;
Columbus, Shakespeare, Darwin, Shelley
Derived from that same bit of jelly.
So famed he is and well-connected,
His statue ought to be erected,
For you and I and William Beebe
Are undeniably amoeba.¹*

That essentially is the religion of many modern people today. The idea is that we have naturally arisen out of some concatenation of amino acids and some primordial slime and have crawled and slithered onto the banks of some muddy edge of some ancient pond, and from there, into the trees and back down again. We have shed our tails and most of our fur, and here we are, worshipping the living myth we've created—called God.

Martin Luther said that we need to fight where the battle is the hottest.

Though we may be ever-so faithful to fight somewhere else, if we’re not there where the battle is most fierce, we are indeed traitors to the cause of the King.

Well, here is the battle, and here is the most all-encompassing attack that Christianity has ever faced. Today we live in a time when a number of things have been happening simultaneously. There has been a tremendous renaissance and revival of the teaching of creationism. Simultaneous to that has been a collapse of many of the basic pillars upon which evolution has stood—attacks that are multiplying. These attacks are made not merely by creationists but by evolutionists themselves, and more and more of the basic pillars of evolution are crumbling. We will see that point by point in the next chapter.

“EVOLUTION IS SCIENTIFIC—CREATIONISM IS RELIGIOUS”

Several laws requiring equal time have been passed by various states. In 1981 Arkansas passed a law requiring a fair and balanced treatment. That law was struck down by a higher court in 1982. Louisiana then passed a “balanced treatment act” that was struck down by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1987.

Let’s look at the matter. U.S. District Court Judge William R. Overton, when he threw out the law in Arkansas, did it on this basis: he said in effect, “Evolution is scientific. Creationism is religious. Therefore, religion cannot be taught in the schools; e.g., creationism must go.” Very interesting. Do you remember the Scopes Trial in 1925? At that time, the only thing that was allowed to be taught was creationism, and the evolutionists, led by atheist Clarence Darrow and the ACLU—which could be called the *Anti-Christian Liberty Union*—went to court to overthrow that law. Darrow said, “[I]t is bigotry for public schools to teach only one theory of origins.”²

Well, well, now isn’t that interesting?

The same ACLU today is doing its very best, sending their lawyers to Arkansas, to keep only one theory of origins (now that it’s evolution) taught in our schools. It seems like the bigotry is now on the other foot. They do that wherever evolution is even slightly challenged. In recent years in Ohio, the ACLU and their allies tried to prevent a measure that mandated that if Darwinian evolution were to be taught, the schools should also teach the scientific problems with Darwinism. (Nothing about creationism or divine design.) This is only science vs. science. Yet the ACLU even tried to stop that. Thankfully, they have been unsuccessful in that particular case.

Evolution is scientific; creationism is religious, it is claimed. We hear that said over and over again, *ad nauseum*. But how true is that? The fact of the mat-

ter is, neither evolution nor creationism fully meet the rigorous demands of science. The basic tenets of science are: It must be observable, testable, repeatable, and falsifiable. The fact is, neither evolution nor creation is any of those. Therefore, the issue of origins does not really fall into the realm of strict science.

We can set up two models. We can look at all of the evidence and see whether it points to one or the other, see what predictions they make, and then conclude which belief is true.

METAPHYSICS

Dr. Karl Popper is the greatest living philosopher of science in the world today. He has been described by a Nobel prize winner as the greatest philosopher of science who ever lived. Dr. Karl Popper said not only that evolution is not a fact—it is not even a theory. And not only is it not a theory, it is not even a scientific hypothesis, because it cannot be falsified. Every scientific hypothesis must be able to be proved wrong. Evolution cannot. There is no way anyone has ever conceived of being able to prove evolution wrong. When they prove one part of it wrong, evolutionists simply change the theory to make it fit another part.

It is, he said, at best a metaphysical research program. Now, metaphysics is a lot closer to religion than it is to science, which is to say that evolution really isn't scientific. In fact, most of the evidence points away from the evolutionary model and points to the creationist model.

EVOLUTION IS RELIGIOUS

We are told that evolution is scientific and not religious. Is that true? Or is evolution religious? Well, I believe that evolution is not only religious, it is more religious than creationism. That may startle some people. On what do I base that statement? First, more religions in this world are based upon evolution than on creation, including Hinduism, Buddhism, Taoism, Confucianism, Unitarianism, Scientology, and Science of Mind. Liberal Christianity was born with the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species*. Neo-orthodoxy is rampant in virtually every mainline Protestant seminary in America. Much of Roman Catholicism, especially the followers of Teilhard de Chardin in many of the Catholic parochial schools, teaches evolution. These and many more facts show that vast numbers of religions are based upon evolution, including the religion of secular humanism, which declares itself to be a religion and has been declared by the Supreme Court to be a religion.³ It is founded upon evolution.

Therefore, to say that evolution is not religious is utterly inconceivable. It is incredible that any intelligent person could make such a statement as that.

Furthermore, evolution is not only the basis of numerous religions, it, in itself, is based upon faith. Hundreds of statements by evolutionary scientists could be called forth to indicate that. The head of the Department of Anatomy at an Australian university said that evolution is a time-honored tenet of faith. He said that evolution is therefore a matter of faith on the part of biologists, and it takes faith to believe that biogenesis did occur—that cells came into existence in that way. Evolution is based upon faith, and it's the same kind of faith that is seen in religion.

Dr. Arthur Field points out that evolution is based upon belief in the reality of the unseen—belief in fossils that cannot be produced, belief in embryological evidence that does not exist, and belief in breeding experiments that refuse to come off.

H. S. Lipson pointed out: "In fact, evolution became in a sense a scientific religion; almost all scientists have accepted it, and many are prepared to 'bend' their observation to fit in with it."⁴

Further, Dr. John Howett of London said that evolution is based and accepted on faith alone, for three quarters of the record is nonexistent, and there are gaps that cannot be covered.

Did you know that we can find statements from scientists who actually declare that evolution is their god? Not merely a tenet of their religion or the pillar of their religion, but their god itself. May I quote you one? Charles Darwin referred to natural selection as deity: "I speak of natural selection as an active power or Deity."⁵ And numbers of other scientists have also said that evolution is virtually their god.

So we see that evolution is not merely scientific, it is not even good science, and it is certainly religious.

IS CREATIONISM RELIGIOUS?

Well, what about creationism? Let's make one thing clear: You can teach either biblical creationism, or you can teach scientific creationism. They are quite different. Biblical creationism is certainly religious. The first several chapters of Genesis teach it. That portion of Scripture talks about God creating the heavens and the earth in six days—creating all that there is, creating man, and woman out of man, then resting on the seventh day. It talks about the great deluge of Noah and of other major events.

That is precisely what the scientific creationists do not want taught in our

schools. What they want taught is scientific creationism, which never mentions Genesis, which never mentions the Bible, which doesn't even mention God, though, of course, there is nothing basically wrong with mentioning God or the Creator in school. If there were, it would be unconstitutional to read the Declaration of Independence, which says that Americans have been "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." It has a number of other references to God and to the Creator. And the Supreme Court has said there is nothing unconstitutional in mentioning God in our schools. But some overzealous teachers have gone too far in censoring any mention of God—like the public schools in Maryland at Thanksgiving time 2004, encouraging their students to give thanks to anyone—anyone but God.

But scientific creationism does not deal with Genesis or the Bible. It deals with things like biology, cytology (the origin of the cell), anthropology, chemistry, and physics. It deals with embryology and with astrophysics and all sorts of subjects like this that are not found in the Bible at all. It deals with merely scientific evidence that points to one of the two models. Did life arise, as evolutionists say, gradually? Or did it arise abruptly? If you look at the fossil records, you will see that there is a record of an abrupt rise. Every single phylum of invertebrate fossils are found in the oldest rocks, the Cambrian rocks. They suddenly appear. It has been observed that 75 percent of the record is gone, from the very beginning. Evolution is already 75 percent completed before we find the first fossil, and here we have all of these extraordinarily complex fossils found in the very earliest rocks. We will see this more clearly in the next chapter when we talk more about the fossil record and the Cambrian Explosion.

CHRISTIANITY AND SCIENTISTS

We had a debate at our church many years ago, and an evolutionist-scientist made the incredible claim that not only is creationism not scientific, but, he went on to say, creationists are therefore not scientists. Can you imagine the unmitigated gall of any person making a statement like that? The truth is that creationists gave the world science. Creationists invented science. Without creationists, there wouldn't be any science, and for that man to stand up and say that creationists aren't scientists is utterly astounding.

Let us take a little deeper look. First of all, who invented science? It was Sir Francis Bacon, who is credited with having been the inventor of the scientific method—that combination of induction and deduction, of hypothesis and proof (empirical proof). Bacon was a devout Christian. He believed in

God, he believed in Christ, he believed in the Bible, and he believed in creation. Here is what he said: "There are two books laid before us to study, to prevent our falling into error; first, the volume of the Scriptures, which reveal the will of God; then the volume of the Creatures, which express His power."⁶ This from the founder of science. He wasn't a Christian? Think again.

Who was the greatest scientist who ever lived? A poll taken of scientists just a few years ago concluded that the greatest scientist who ever lived was Sir Isaac Newton. If you read a list of the things he discovered, it is awesome. The mathematical laws of gravity are just one piece of that huge puzzle from this gigantic intellect. He was also, among other things, the co-discoverer of calculus. Sir Isaac Newton believed in God, he believed in Christ, he believed in the Bible, and he believed in creation. To the utter chagrin of modern evolutionary scientists, he wrote more books on theology (not all of which were necessarily orthodox) than he did on science. And yet he became the greatest scientist who has ever lived, according to modern scientists themselves.

CHRISTIAN SCIENTISTS

If the scientific method was invented by a Christian, and the greatest scientist who ever lived was a Christian, what about the people who gave us all of the various branches of science? Who were they? Let me tell you about them. They were all men who believed in God, believed in Christ, believed in the Bible, and believed in creation. There was not an evolutionist among them. Who were they?

The inventor of antiseptic surgery was Joseph Lister (1827-1912), who was all of the above. (It is from his name we get the name of the germ-killing mouthwash Listerine.) Lord Lister said, "I am a believer in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity."⁷

The pioneer of bacteriology was Louis Pasteur (1822-1895). His biographer, Rene Vallery-Radot, writes about Pasteur's religious views: "Absolute faith in God and in eternity, and a conviction that the power for good given to us in this world will be continued beyond it, were feelings which pervaded his whole life; the virtues of the Gospel had ever been present to him."⁸

Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1727) developed the disciplines of calculus and dynamics. He said, "I have a foundational belief in the Bible as the Word of God, written by men who were inspired. I study the Bible daily."⁹ Newton also said, "Atheism is so senseless. When I look at the solar system, I see the earth at the right distance from the sun to receive the proper amounts of heat and light. This did not happen by chance."¹⁰

Celestial mechanics and physical astronomy were developed by Johannes Kepler (1571-1630), who said that science was “thinking God’s thoughts after Him.” He observed, “we astronomers are priests of the highest God in regard to the book of nature,” doing all this study to “the glory of God.”¹¹

Oxford professor Robert Boyle (1627-1691) is the father of chemistry and gas dynamics. He left a large sum of money in his will so that a series of lectures would be taught in his university in England defending the Christian faith. These were called the Boyle Lectures. An unbeliever? Hardly.

Comparative anatomy and vertebrate paleontology were founded as scientific disciplines by the Frenchman Georges Cuvier (1769-1832). He was a devout Lutheran. Author Ian Taylor says of Cuvier: “His theory of creation withstood the theory of evolution in France for almost the entire nineteenth century.”¹²

Computer science was developed by Charles Babbage (1791-1871) (with input from another Christian scientist, Blaise Pascal). According to biographer H. W. Buxton, “Mr. Babbage regarded the phenomena of the Cosmos as the immediate and direct consequence of an eternal decree of the Divine intelligence. . . .”¹³ The whole world was like a giant machine, and God was the Programmer.

Electromagnetics and field theory were developed by Michael Faraday (1791-1867), who had about twenty-two honorary doctorates. He was once given a huge award by the king at a banquet on a Wednesday night. After the banquet, the people talked awhile, and then he was called up to receive his award. But he had slipped out to go to a prayer meeting.

Energetics and thermodynamics were developed by Lord Kelvin (1824-1907), a great Christian who once said, “With regard to the origin of life, science . . . positively affirms creative power.”¹⁴

Gregor Mendel (1822-1884) pioneered studies of genetics. He was a humble Catholic monk in Czechoslovakia. Ian Taylor, author of *In the Minds of Men*, notes that if Mendel had known about Darwin’s theory before he did his genetic experiments with peas, he might never have conducted his research. Furthermore, because Darwin’s theory began to gain influence in academic circles, there was a reluctance to initially accept Mendel’s pro-creation conclusions. Taylor writes, “Since Mendel’s genetics challenged the Darwinian idea of natural selection, it is just possible that any interest shown in his work was actively discouraged.”¹⁵

Glacial geology and ichthyology were studied by Louis Agassiz (1807-1873) of Harvard, a great Christian man. Ian Taylor notes that Agassiz was among those scientists who “were convinced of the historicity and univer-

sality of the Noachian Flood.”¹⁶ This is no minor point, because those days were filled with skepticism about the Flood in academic circles.

James Simpson (1811-1870) of Edinburgh, Scotland, developed gynecology. He also pioneered the use of anesthesiology for childbirth. He defended his practice before his critics by appealing to Genesis 2 in the Bible, when God put Adam to sleep for the “surgery” in which He removed his rib.

Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519) is the father of hydraulics. Humanistic in some respects, nonetheless da Vinci created some great Christian works of art, including the definitive version of Christ’s Last Supper.

Matthew Fontaine Maury (1806-1873) is the father of both hydrography and oceanography. He derived some of his scientific ideas from the Scriptures. How could a man of science do that? Maury defended his actions thus in a public address he once gave: “I have been blamed by men of science, both in this country [the U.S.] and in England, for quoting the Bible in confirmation of the doctrines of physical geography. The Bible, they say, was not written for scientific purposes, and is therefore of no authority in matters of science. I beg your pardon: the Bible is authority for everything it touches.”¹⁷

Hydrostatics was developed by Blaise Pascal (1623-1662). Scientists are very concerned about proof. Note what he says about proof and God: “Jesus Christ is the only proof of the living God. We only know God through Jesus Christ.”¹⁸

Systematic biology was pioneered by Carl von Linnaeus (1707-1778). He created a labeling system for natural science—a labeling system he ultimately got from the Bible. Each organism was given a Latin name in two parts: the genus and the species. This method is known to us as the binomial nomenclature system. Examples include “*homo erectus*,” “*Homo sapiens*,” and so on. These classifications are so commonplace that we don’t even realize how revolutionary and how important the innovation was. He gave the world a mechanism by which we could name new species. His mechanism—again based on the Bible—is still at work today.

Historians Will and Ariel Durant wrote that Linnaeus “mapped the teeming world of life with the care and devotion of a scientific saint.”¹⁹ Even the late atheistic Harvard professor of science Stephen Jay Gould acknowledged that Linnaeus’s contribution to biology came about because of his Christian faith. Gould explained that Linnaeus “proclaimed that species are the natural entities that God placed on earth at the creation. They are His, not ours—and they exist as they are, independent of our whims.”²⁰ On the campus of Oxford University there is a pro-evolution museum; this was the

same place where the infamous debate was held between Thomas Huxley and Bishop Samuel Wilberforce, a debate that was a turning point in favor of evolution. Throughout the building are life-size statues of various scientists throughout the ages. Many of them are mentioned in this book. The statue of Linnaeus shows him holding a large book with a cross on it—a Bible, no doubt.

In addition to all these scientists are numerous other Christians who were scientists who pioneered specific studies. These include:

- Dimensional analysis and model analysis were developed by Lord Rayleigh (1842-1919).

- James Clerk Maxwell (1831-1879) was the father of electrodynamics and statistical thermodynamics.

- Ambrose Fleming (1848-1945) was the father of electronics.

- Entomology of living insects was developed by Jean-Henri Fabre (1823-1915).

- The study of fluid mechanics was created by George Stokes (1819-1903).

- William Herschel (1738-1822) was the father of galactic astronomy.

- Studies in isotopic chemistry were pioneered by William Ramsay (1852-1916).

- The study of non-Euclidean geometry was pioneered by Bernhard Riemann (1826-1866).

- David Brewster (1781-1868) was the father of optical mineralogy.

And other scientific studies were also pioneered by Bible-believing Christians, including:

- Paleontology—John Woodward (1665-1728).

- Pathology—Rudolph Virchow (1821-1902).

- Reversible thermodynamics—James Joule (1818-1889).

- Stratigraphy—Nicholas Steno (1638-1686).

- Thermokinetics—Humphrey Davy (1778-1829).²¹

And on and on it goes. These men were all Christians, all believers in creation. The evolutionist who declared that anyone who believes in creation is not a scientist had better go back and read a little of his own history to find out if that is true. He will find what we have just shared.

WHO ARE THE REAL CENSORS?

The attempt to suppress all of the scientific evidence for creationism and the scientific problems with evolution is a form of censorship. It is exceedingly

ironic that the ACLU, People for the American Way, and others like that who cry constantly against censorship are in the forefront of this attempt to censor out scientific information.

Keep in mind that creationists are not trying to get rid of evolution. They are trying to have a balanced statement, even as Darwin said there must be if there would be fairness.

Of course, when all of the evidence on one side is presented and all the evidence on the other side is repressed, this is not education. It is no less than brainwashing. Scientific pedagogical studies have shown that students learn better under testing, and it has been shown that they learn better when both models are presented—when the evidence for each side is given, and they are able to make up their own mind.

ANTI-CHRISTIAN BIGOTRY

Finally, may I say that at its base what this amounts to is anti-Christian bigotry. Now call again to mind the words of Clarence Darrow, who said it is the height of bigotry to teach only one view of origins. Furthermore, when you read the statements of leading evolutionists you see, as has been documented in a number of books and writings on the subject, that these men, nearly all of the leading evolutionists, were motivated by a tremendous antipathy and hostility toward the Christian message, God, and the Bible.

For example, Jean-Baptiste Lamarck (1744-1829) predated Darwin by a few decades and was one of the earliest evolutionists. It has been pointed out that Lamarck's philosophy amounted to a hatred for the tradition of the Flood and biblical creation. Indeed, in reaction to everything that recalled the Christian theory of nature, Darwin himself was very subtly undermining Christianity. He had come to reject Christianity, he said. He came to reject the Bible as no more valuable than the writings of the Hindus or the most barbaric pagans. He was undermining the Christian view, but he was doing it very, very subtly. In a letter that Darwin wrote to one of his friends, he said that Charles Lyell (another early evolutionist, 1797-1875) had shown that it was much more successful to undermine Christianity without attacking it directly, and that the attacks of people like Voltaire, in spite of the fact that Voltaire's writings were filled with wit and tremendous genius, had produced little lasting good: Real good seems only to follow the slow and silent side attacks. The real good, as Darwin says, is the undermining of Christianity, and it must be done insidiously. That is nothing other than anti-Christian bias and bigotry.

The same thing is true for all of the leading evolutionists of that time. Of Thomas Huxley, who was Darwin's bulldog, it is written that he had a life-long war with Christianity. He said we need a regiment of ironsides, men with unusual bravery, to fight against Christianity. Furthermore, consider Ernst Haeckel, the Huxley of Germany and the early leader of the evolutionary movement there. He was the founder of the idea that ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny—that the fetus in the womb goes through all of the states of the evolutionary process, which was accepted for many years but is totally repudiated today, and yet still appears in textbooks in high schools and colleges. But Haeckel described himself at first as an evangelical and a believer in orthodox Christianity, until he became involved with evolution. Then he came to have a strong hatred for Christianity and for everything for which it stood.

In our day, too, many of the leading evolutionists are on an anti-Christian crusade—men like George Gaylord Simpson or the late Steven J. Gould and Niles Eldridge, atheists and Marxists. The leaders of the evolutionary movement today and down through the years have been atheists, though many of the followers try to straddle the fence. Huxley said he looked with contempt upon those who tried to have one foot in each camp and tried to reconcile that which was unreconcilable. You cannot have a world governed by random chance and at the same time a world governed by Divine Providence. They just will not fit together. You have to make a choice.

Note what *Time* magazine once observed: "Charles Darwin didn't want to murder God, as he once put it. But he did."²²

CONCLUSION

There is a great, great deal involved in this struggle. Christians need to become informed, and Christians need to pray about this.

There is a God who has created you, a God before whom one day you must stand and answer for your life. You cannot evade or avoid that. You will come before Him with whom we each and all have to do. There is a God who has loved us enough to send His Son to die for our sins. You can do what Huxley did and what Darwin did—you can reject the offer of salvation that is offered to you in the Scriptures. But I assure you that one day you will stand before the great Judge of heaven and earth and give an account of that, and that account will be that you have believed a fable. You have believed a myth—a cunningly devised fable—a science falsely so-called, which many have followed and have erred concerning the faith. I would urge you not to

so err, but rather to seek the truth and embrace Christ by faith—to place your trust in Him as the living divine Savior and to know that God has given you purpose. He has created you with meaning and significance for your life, and that life is going to go on forever and ever. We do not have the hopeless, miasmatic emptiness that the evolutionist offers to mankind—a meaninglessness and emptiness to life that has made suicide the second greatest cause of death among young people in our country today because in their view life has no purpose or meaning.

Christ gives us that purpose. But the redemption of Christ is based upon the creation of God. He both made us and offers to remake us in His own image. May we, by His grace, accept that gracious offer.

THE COLLAPSE OF EVOLUTION

Claiming to be wise, they became fools, and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal man and birds and animals and reptiles.

ROMANS 1:22-23



In 1912 scientists discovered a human skull with a jaw like an ape. They named him Piltdown man. He was in the textbooks, encyclopedias, museums, and even the dictionaries. For example, a 1941 *Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* has an entry on Piltdown: "A prehistoric station in Sussex, England, yielding remains of an extinct species of man, Piltdown man (*Eaonthropos dawsoni*) characterized by a retreating, apelike chin and thick cranial bones, but a human-like cranium."¹ He was the answer to the Darwinists' prayer, if they pray ("To whom it may concern . . ."). Ah, here at last was the missing link. Well, I'm sure most of you know the rest of the story. In 1953 this was discovered to be a deliberate hoax. The mystery of who created it remains unsolved. The fact that men accepted it so readily—and allowed it to shape acceptance of human evolution for more than three crucial decades—points to their bias in favor of any shred of evidence they can find in favor of macro-evolution. I say crucial decades because Piltdown man helped evolution become more widely accepted. But Darwin's missing links are still missing.

The purpose of this chapter is to consider the fact that much of what we find in the scientific evidence today works against evolution, not for it. Many of the key pillars of evolution are collapsing, but because of the politically correct zeitgeist of our age, most people are not exposed to these facts.

TO BE FAIR, PRESENT BOTH SIDES

Evolutionists today have absolutely a conniption at the very thought of both sides of the origins debate being presented in school. They want evolution alone taught—and that dogmatically. They think it is terrible that anyone would suggest such a thing as presenting both sides. But as one writer said, “A fair result can be obtained only by fully stating and balancing the facts and arguments on both sides of each question.”² To present both sides of this argument is the only way, said he, to come to a “fair result”—presenting the facts for evolution and the facts for creation and letting people make up their minds. Obviously that was some sort of fanatical Christian making that statement, right? No. As a matter of fact that is found in the writings of Charles Darwin. He said it in his *The Origin of the Species*. But that has been conveniently forgotten in our time.

ICONS OF EVOLUTION

Recently Jerry Newcombe, coauthor of this book, interviewed Dr. Jonathan Wells for the television program, *The Coral Ridge Hour*. Dr. Wells has more than one earned Ph.D., including a Ph.D. in biology from the University of California at Berkeley. Dr. Wells has written a book that is devastating to the “evolutionist faith,” if we could call it that. It’s entitled *Icons of Evolution*. He points out that the major showpieces that evolutionists tout to prove evolution are fraudulent. But even though they are bogus, or there is sleight of hand involved, somehow these “icons of evolution” still make it into some of our science textbooks. Thankfully, because of Wells and others testifying at textbook hearings, some of these icons have been removed. Wells is a senior fellow with the Discovery Institute, based in Seattle, Washington, which has taken an active role in this fight. This is quite an uphill battle.

As we interviewed Jonathan Wells, he grabbed a modern volume and said, “I have here a typical example of a widely-used biology textbook. This book is used in thousands of schools around the country. By and large, it’s not bad, but when it comes to evolution, it distorts, exaggerates, or even fakes the evidence.”³

How so? By presenting as fact—

- Darwin’s “Tree of Life”
- Haeckel’s embryos
- the peppered moth
- Darwin’s finches—

and by omitting the Cambrian explosion. Let’s look at each of these.

DARWIN'S "TREE OF LIFE"

One of the most fundamental icons of evolution is Darwin's "Tree of Life." Wells notes, "[Darwin] called it that himself, 'the great tree of life'—and by that he meant the branching pattern you would get if all living things are descended from a common ancestor. So, this common ancestry claim is right at the heart of Darwin's theory. Things were not separately created. They all descended through ordinary biological processes from a common ancestor."⁴ All that was required was time and "descent with modification" for one common ancestor to gradually branch off into many different species. Wells continues, "You would expect, as Darwin himself said, thousands of intermediate forms—thousands—and yet *we have none*. Every one of these lines [pointing from one creature to another] are just his theory, but it's presented as though it were a fact."⁵

Instead of what is presented by the textbooks, what do we find in the actual fossil record? We find creatures at all levels, fully formed. We find no transitional forms. We find no evolution in progress. Christian attorney Wendell Bird has even proposed changing the name of creationism to "abrupt appearances" because 1) the courts rule against anything with a Creator, and 2) we find in the fossil record organisms appearing abruptly at every level of the strata.

Wells summarizes, "Almost all of the evidence that we would expect to see there is missing. Darwin himself acknowledged this. He called it a serious problem for his theory."⁶ Darwin said, "If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down. But I can find out no such case."⁷ But nearly 150 years after Darwin wrote *The Origin of the Species*, after the cataloging of more than 100,000,000 fossils in museums around the world, the findings have worked against Darwin's theory, not for it. The fossil record is so important that it's worth examining a bit further before we continue with the "icons of evolution."

In the 1980s a noncreationist, Michael Denton, wrote a book that was devastating to evolution. It was called *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*. Note what he said in that book about the fossil record as it relates to Darwin:

... the universal experience of paleontology ... while the rocks have continually yielded new and exciting and even bizarre forms of life ... what they have never yielded is any of Darwin's myriads of transitional forms. Despite the tremendous increase in geological activity in every corner of the globe and despite the discovery of many strange and hitherto unknown

forms, the infinitude of connecting links has still not been discovered and the fossil record is about as discontinuous as it was when Darwin was writing *Origins*. The intermediates have remained as elusive as ever and their absence remains, a century later, one of the most striking characteristics of the fossil record.⁸

A FANCY WAY TO EXPLAIN THE FOSSIL RECORD

If you are an evolutionist, how do you explain the inadequate fossil record—this lack of transitional forms? In 1940 Dr. Richard Goldschmidt, professor at the University of California at Berkeley, after spending years and years seeking the missing links in the zoological record of the fossils, came up with a theory. Now, not believing in God, which to him was unthinkable, he devised a new concept of evolution. What was it? He called it the “Hopeful Monster Theory.” Essentially it meant that one type of animal would lay an egg and another type of animal—a completely different species—would pop out. Since there appeared to be no evidence for gradual evolution in the fossil record, perhaps it happened quickly. Goldschmidt did not receive a warm reception for his proposal. But about thirty years later his idea was given new life.

A MAKEOVER OF THE HOPEFUL MONSTER THEORY

What happened in the succeeding decades since 1940 is that the evidence that had forced Goldschmidt to this conclusion pressed even more heavily upon the evolutionists. Enter two leading scientists—the late Dr. Stephen Jay Gould of Harvard University, who had been one of the most outspoken and prestigious evolutionists of recent times, and Dr. Niles Eldredge, who is the Curator-in-Chief of the permanent exhibition Hall of Biodiversity at the American Museum of Natural History in New York. These have been two extraordinarily prestigious gentlemen. They have come up with a new view (so they have called it) that they began to develop a couple of decades ago and presented at a world meeting of top biological evolutionists at the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago. What did they call this makeover of the Hopeful Monster theory? “Punctuated Equilibria.” Now, I think it is very obvious that “Hopeful Monster Theory” is not the language of science, is it? Not at all. I mean, a view with a name like that is certainly not going to play in Peoria, and it is certainly not going to fly at Dartmouth or Harvard. Therefore it was foreordained to fail. But Gould and Eldredge have certainly

given it a Madison Avenue redress and has come up with a title that has scientific pizzazz: “Punctuated Equilibria.” You see, that is scientific. And by scientific, it means that nobody knows what they are talking about—it’s one of the inside secrets of the scientists.

Well, “Equilibria” means that in the species, the separate species, there is a stasis, or equilibrium, or steadiness—they do not change. Gould said they may add a few more bumps or get a little bigger, but they stay just the same. “Punctuated” means that between the separate species there is a punctuation—a dash, a colon, a semicolon, a period—that separates these separate species, which remain fixed and separate. So what we need is this huge jump, the same type of thing that Goldschmidt was talking about in the Hopeful Monster Theory, now dressed up in new garb and scientific terminology. Still, at its most rudimentary level, an example of what this fancy theory means—in layman’s terms—is this: A reptile lays an egg, and out of the egg a bird pops out.

Again, Punctuated Equilibria was expressed at the Field Museum of Natural History to a world meeting of top evolutionists, the majority of evolutionists there accepted this theory. Furthermore, Gould, at that time and in his other writings, had very clearly demolished the concept that there ever have been any intermediate forms, transitional forms, missing links, between the species. Furthermore, Gould said that this new view is spreading throughout the whole world, and that virtually every evolutionist in the last decade or two of the former Soviet Union came to accept some form of punctuated equilibria.

Now, the point I want you to note is that hundreds of millions of students, for the last hundred years and more, have been taught that evolution was an absolute fact. The old textbooks stated that the best established proof and evidence of evolution was the gradual accumulation of micromutations, transitions from one species to the other. This has been the foundation of the whole evolutionary theory.

Now in light of that, hear what Dr. Stephen Jay Gould of Harvard University said in a speech at Hobart College, where he admitted that the fossil record offers no support for gradual change: “Everybody knows the fossil record doesn’t provide much evidence for gradualism; it is full of gaps and discontinuities. These gaps are all attributed to the notorious imperfection of the record, but this is not an adequate explanation. The fossil record shows one thing which cannot be attributed to its imperfection; most species don’t change. They may get a little bigger or bumpier, but they remain the same species. This remarkable stasis has generally been ignored. It if doesn’t agree

with your ideas, you don't talk about it . . . the fossil record doesn't show gradual change, and every paleontologist has known that ever since Cuvier."⁹

Gould said elsewhere, "New species almost always appeared suddenly in the fossil record with no intermediate link to ancestors in older rocks of the same region."¹⁰ Thus the fossil record offers no support for gradual change, and yet we have been told that the best evidence for evolution is to be found in the gradual change indicated in the fossil record, that evolution is based upon the intermediate forms that link the various species together. But Gould said these intermediate links do not exist. Nonetheless, Gould was the first to point out that even though this pillar of evolution had crumbled, evolution was still true. Said Gould, "But evolution, like gravitation, is a fact. I don't mean to be dogmatic about it, but it's as much a fact as anything in science."¹¹ The issue at stake is not whether evolution occurred, but rather how it took place. Let me translate: There is no evidence for evolution, but it is a fact nonetheless, or so he said.

"Punctuated Equilibria" has been catching on worldwide. Thus, to explain away the realities of the fossil record—the missing links are still missing—evolutionists have to resort to a theory along the lines that, for example, a lizard gave birth to a bird.

THE CAMBRIAN EXPLOSION

Have you ever heard of the "Cambrian explosion"? This is more evidence that the fossil record works against Darwin's theory and for creation.

According to evolutionists, the earth supposedly came into existence 4.6 billion years ago. Hundreds of million of years later, life just came to be. Some sort of spark in the primordial slime supposedly began the whole process. Then one form morphed into another form, etc. Again, what do we actually find? According to evolutionists themselves, life actually began during the Cambrian period. Supposedly, this era dates back to about 500,000,000 years ago. Suspend for one moment your opinion about the date of the earth. (I do not accept such old ages—4.6 billion years ago, 500,000,000 years ago, etc. The dating of the earth is always based on certain assumptions—none of which can be proven, all of which would have been thrown completely out of whack by a universal flood.) But again, withhold judgment on that date for the time being. Scientists say that during this Cambrian period, life exploded into being on Planet Earth at every level of the fossil record. There is no progression. There aren't the simple forms on the bottom, slowly evolving to the more complex forms on top. You find organisms and animals fully

formed and not transitioning from one type to another. The Cambrian explosion is sometimes called “Biology’s Big Bang.” It is a trade secret of the evolutionists.

A brilliant young geophysicist, another fellow with the Discovery Institute, Dr. Stephen Meyer, comments on this Cambrian explosion: “At that time, there was a sudden appearance of the majority of what are called the animal body plans, the new animal designs, the ways of organizing body parts, and you get all these brand new kinds of animals that come into the fossil record, very suddenly, without any discernable connection to the much simpler animal forms that existed before.”¹² This is why evolutionists have had to resort to unproven positions like the Hopeful Monster Theory or Punctuated Equilibria.

HAECKEL’S EMBRYOS

Returning to the theme of “icons of evolution,” Jonathan Wells alerts us to the drawings of embryos by the late-nineteenth to early-twentieth-century German evolutionist Ernst Haeckel. Says Dr. Wells: “Haeckel’s embryos are a set of famous drawings that are still found in many biology textbooks. They illustrate a point that Darwin himself considered to be . . . by far the strongest single class of facts in favor of his theory—namely, that vertebrate embryos, that is, the embryos of animals with backbones—look very similar in their early stages. . . . So, Haeckel made some drawings in the 1860s to illustrate this point. Unfortunately, he faked them.”¹³

In his book *Icons of Evolution*, Dr. Wells writes, “Haeckel faked his drawings; vertebrate embryos never look as similar as he made them out to be. Furthermore, the stage Haeckel labeled the ‘first’ is actually midway through development; the similarities he exaggerated are preceded by striking differences in earlier stages of development.”¹⁴

So the reality is that embryos in the early stages look quite different. We now have sonograms and pictures to prove it. Nonetheless, Haeckel’s false drawings make their way into textbook after textbook. Wells notes, “Typically, they tell students that these embryos look most similar in their early stages and that this provides good evidence for Darwinian evolution. And it’s simply false.”¹⁵

Even an evolutionist has been honest enough to admit this. The late Stephen Jay Gould admitted that Haeckel’s drawings were fake: “To cut to the quick of this drama . . . Haeckel had exaggerated the similarities by idealizations and omissions. He also, in some cases—in a procedure that can

only be called fraudulent—simply copies the same figure over and over again.”¹⁶ He also added, “We do, I think, have the right . . . to be both astonished and ashamed by the century of mindless recycling that has led to the persistence of these drawings in a large number, if not a majority, of modern textbooks.”¹⁷

THE PEPPERED MOTH

Another icon of evolution that Jonathan Wells addresses is that of the peppered moth. This famous little insect is trumpeted in textbook after textbook as a “textbook case” of evolution. Lo and behold, like just about everything else to do with evolution, it turns out to be a fraud. Bernard Kettlewell, a British naturalist, first proclaimed to the world how these peppered moths provided evidence for Darwinian natural selection. The moths allegedly changed color and adapted to their environment in order for their species to survive.

It’s interesting to note that even if the peppered moth case were true, it’s still an example of micro-evolution—small change within its own kind. You begin with a moth. You have a moth in the middle. You end with a moth. What’s the big deal? You don’t have a moth becoming some other species or on its way to becoming some other kind.

But even this example of so-called micro-evolution had to be deliberately manufactured—by human design. Like the skull of Piltdown man, somebody had to falsify the facts to try and prove some facet of evolution.

Dr. Wells elaborates: “The theory was that as pollution, soot, darkened the tree trunks, the dark moths were better camouflaged, and the light moths got picked off by birds. It’s a very plausible idea. If it were true, it wouldn’t bother me in the least.”¹⁸ What researchers later discovered, however, was that peppered moths do not normally rest on tree trunks at all.

Apparently, Kettlewell actually staged the photographs by pinning the moths on tree trunks of similar color. So Wells says, “These photos were faked, and they’re still there in the textbooks in the 1990s. They’re still there now in some textbooks in 2004. And I think this is an outrage. This is not what science is supposed to be, and this is with taxpayer money.”¹⁹

DARWIN’S FINCHES

Another icon of evolution is Darwin’s finches. In fact, the way the beaks of these little birds seemed to change and adapt to their natural circumstances was the germ of the idea of Darwinism in the first place. He visited the Galapagos Islands (off the shores of Ecuador, South America) aboard the

H.M.S. Beagle. He noticed that a particular species of finches survived drought because their beaks grew tougher, making them strong enough to eat tough seeds, the only food available. Because of this, Darwin's finches became a prime example of natural selection.

But what do the facts show? Dr. Stephen Meyer notes, "Darwin's finches actually show that the evolutionary change that we can observe is very limited, very modest, and it's cyclical."²⁰ Dr. Jonathan Wells says, "What the books normally don't tell students is that after the drought, when the rains came back, the average beak size went back to normal. So, there was no net change."²¹

The changes in the finches are another example of micro-evolution, small changes within species. If we can call it that, micro-evolution poses no threat to the Bible. It appears to be documented in different ways. What evolutionists essentially do is extrapolate from these small changes, which can be observed, to larger, broader changes, which can't be observed and haven't been preserved in the fossil record. Why have they not? Because they never happened. Evolution is a giant shell game.

APE TO MEN

A colossal example of an icon of evolution is the idea that man evolved from the ape—or really that man and ape evolved from the same ancestor, some sort of ancient hominid. We see this sequence all the time in different textbooks, showing apelike creatures walking in a sequence until the final one is modern man, *Homo sapiens*. Does this jibe with the facts? Jonathan Wells observes, "When we see pictures like this, a nice neat progression from some apelike creature to a modern human, these pictures are largely imaginary. The fossils, which are very fragmentary, don't give us the data, the information we would need to reconstruct these creatures and the data that we do have from the fossils don't justify this kind of nice, neat progression here. This is just a story. It's a story into which certain pieces of certain fossils are put to make the story sound scientific."²² The skulls and skeletons found are either ape or man. The missing links are perpetually missing. Dr. Wells has made a significant contribution to the debate through his wonderful book, *Icons of Evolution*.

The late Dr. Gould even admitted the lack of evidence for human evolution. He observed, "Look at human evolution. There is no evidence that the increase in size of the human brain is one of these slow and steady accumulative adaptive sequential advantageous changes, although I'm sure most of

you believe it.”²³ Again, this doesn’t mean he didn’t think that evolution happened; he was just honest enough to admit there was no evidence for it having happened. And we’re the ones accused of “blind faith.”

“DARWIN’S BLACK BOX”

The amount of scientific information Darwin had at his beck and call pales in comparison to what we know. Darwin wrote about the simple cell, assuming that it wasn’t too complex. We now know that the “simple cell” is anything but simple. Microbiologists such as Dr. Michael Behe, professor at LeHigh University in Pennsylvania and author of the book *Darwin’s Black Box*, have said that even the simplest cell that exists is so complex that it contains a great deal of information.

When Behe’s book first came out, the coauthor of this book, Jerry Newcombe, interviewed him for our radio station (WAFG, Ft. Lauderdale). Newcombe asked him to explain things in terms of how much information would exist if it were translated into volumes of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. How much information do we find not in the simplest cell of the human body, but in the simplest cell of the simplest organism? Dr. Behe said that even the simplest organism, a certain type of amoeba, contains at least one volume’s worth of information (again, using the *Encyclopedia Britannica* as the model). But how about the simplest cell of the human body? How much information do we find there? Behe said that the average cell of the human body has at least two to three dozen volumes worth of information. We are “fearfully and wonderfully made” (Psalm 139:14). We are not “accidental twigs.”

Michael Behe says, “It turns out that to Darwin and to nineteenth century scientists, the cell was a black box. They knew it was there; they knew it did wonderful things, like grow and metabolize and replicate, but they hadn’t the foggiest idea how it worked.”²⁴ Behe says the living cell is a masterpiece of design. It could not possibly have originated by chance: “In Darwin’s day, scientists were vaguely aware that there were things such as cells, but most of them thought that they were like little pieces of Jell-O, little microscopic pieces of protoplasm. And in the middle of the nineteenth century, some scientists even thought that cells and life could kind of ooze up from the ocean bottom, just spontaneously, because they thought the cell was simple, so they thought that simple processes could process life.”²⁵

Behe shows in his book how each cell contains such incredible complexity that it is like a mini-factory with microscopic machines, interactive

and interdependent parts, and assembly instructions. Each cell's nucleus contains lines of code or information we call DNA.

Stephen Meyer notes, "One approach is to try to explain the origin of information by chance, by the random shuffling of the parts of the DNA molecule. But that would be kind of like throwing Scrabble letters onto a table and hoping that they spelled out the Declaration of Independence. There's so much information in DNA that it's simply too improbable to think that purely random processes would produce the information that you need."²⁶

God has spoken to us through the complexity of the universe. The more scientists study it with an open mind, the more likely they are to come to believe in Him. We close this chapter with the story of a science professor who abandoned evolution when confronted with the evidence.

THE LATE, GREAT DICK LUMSDEN²⁷

To the late Dr. Richard Lumsden, former professor of biology at Tulane University and Medical School and the former dean of the graduate school, evolution was science, whereas creation was merely religion. He taught as much to his students.

Dr. Richard Lumsden stated, "What I would try to get across is that science is science. Science deals with the real world, with real phenomena. We don't bring into such discussions inferences of supernatural phenomena. Phenomena that would be above the natural—that would not subscribe to natural laws and so forth."

Dr. Lumsden, who studied at Tulane, Harvard, and Rice, couldn't believe it when the Louisiana state legislature passed a law (in the early 1980s) that if evolution were taught in the public school classroom, equal time had to be made for creation science. "My reaction to that was just total consternation. How in the world, first of all, could rational scientists seriously entertain this, again in my view then, supernaturalistic mythology, which had really no place in a science curriculum? Then, again, another point was: Who are these people telling us, Ph.D.-level scientists, how to teach and what to teach regarding science? So I just thought the whole thing was absolutely absurd and that it was an infringement of academic freedom. I was prompted at that point to give a lecture on the origin of life. The idea was to present an argument for the origin of cells, ergo life, and the evolutionist view is that chemicals were spontaneously generated in a primordial soup, if you will. And in the meantime, giving creation its due with as much mockery as I could summon."

So one day he gave a dogmatic lecture, waxing eloquent on behalf of the dogma of evolution. One of his remarks was, “Truly, in the beginning was the word, but the word was hydrogen.” After that class, one of his graduate students came up to him and said that was a great lecture, as always. Lumsden points out, “Well, that got my attention. Flattery always did. And she said, ‘but I have some questions.’ And indeed she did. She had a legal pad, and I could see line after line after line.”

So they made an appointment, which ended up lasting longer than anticipated. It was supposed to last twenty minutes, but it stretched out to three hours, with neither of them thinking about the time. The appointment also ended up changing Dr. Lumsden’s life.

She said to him at the outset, “Now I’m not here to challenge anything. I just want to get my science straight.”

“That’s fair enough.”

She said, “Last month you taught how mutations were genetic disasters. How, by natural selection, could they randomly produce new and better structures?”

He responded, “You’ve got a good point there. That’s a good question. Good question. I’ll probably have to think more about that.”

She asked, “Aren’t the odds of the random assembly of genes mathematically impossible?”

He said, “You’ve had your share of mathematics. Let’s see if we can’t figure that out. We wouldn’t predict it to happen, but that doesn’t mean it didn’t happen.” After calculating the odds, he paused, realizing that the probability of life just happening by chance was not merely unlikely but impossible. He regained his composure and said, “These are impossible numbers, but the fact remains: we’re here. And in reality, the only way we could have gotten here is through the evolutionary process. So the fact that we’re here really proves evolution, doesn’t it?” (Note the circular logic he used to make his point.)

She moved on to the next question, constantly probing, making him think through the logical implications of what he had been dogmatically teaching as fact. She asked, “Where exactly in the fossil record is the evidence for progressive evolution—the transitional forms between the major groups?”

Dr. Lumsden said, “You know, most of them, come to think of it, are fully formed kinds in their own right. They’re not really transitional. Well, Darwin said we’d find them or his theory is kaput.”

She continued with the pleasant grilling. “The law of thermodynamics

has things continually becoming more disorganized. So how does evolution go the other way?"

Puffing on his pipe, he tried to finagle his way out of that one too.

She probed, "How does evolution fit with the fundamentals of information theory?"

He said, "Hmmm. You know, I've had a problem with that myself."

Looking back on this pleasant but embarrassing confrontation, Dr. Lumsden said, "I could buffalo a student when I felt myself getting a little bit in trouble. I had had a few years experience at this. It's a trade secret, but for the first time maybe in my life in explaining various facets of evolution theory, I began to listen to what I was saying, and what I was saying wasn't making very good scientific sense. Not only were we talking about a mathematical impossibility, we were talking about a physical and chemical impossibility, which gave me pause. This conversation with the young lady went on for approximately three hours, during which time I'm answering, I'm listening to my own responses (and trying not to betray this to the student), I was rapidly concluding that this is not making good scientific sense. What I'm telling this young lady, and what I told the students this morning is not good science.

"It dawned on me right then and there that evolution was bankrupt as a scientific theory. Well, if that were so, if life did not originate by naturalistic, materialistic, spontaneous process, what was the alternative explanation? 'Oh, my God.' And I said it then, not in blasphemy, but in awe. What happened that afternoon was first of all a mortal embarrassment to me as a professor. Professing to be wise, the professor was made a fool. And then, secondly, with the realization that, 'Hey, God exists and God created' was that experience of fear. Now, that's enough to turn a corner in anyone's life. I conversed with many of my colleagues in biology and chemistry and played the devil's advocate to them, just as this young lady had stuck it to me, as it were. And they were no better at explaining these observations than I had been to the young lady."

After much study and soul-searching, Dr. Lumsden became a creationist first and then a Christian. "One event led to the other, and the culmination was finding myself before a saving altar on my knees, that stiff-neck broken in obedience, asking Jesus to come into my life to be my Lord and personal savior." And so Dr. Richard Lumsden, former evolutionary professor, became a committed creationist—because of the scientific evidence. He has since openly debated evolutionists. He feels that in light of the great advances of science in the twentieth century, evolution is no longer tenable: "The evidence

of science—the best in paleontology, the best in biochemistry, the best in genetics, and so on—is all compelling for creation. Creation theory does not rest on some purely metaphysical principles. It rests on the same science that evolution theory would rest on, except that the better explanation is creation, not naturalistic, materialistic, stochastic (or random) evolutionary process.”

CONCLUSION

Where is the evidence for evolution, the scientific evidence? Ask people to marshal it, and chances are, they will bring forth an example of micro-evolution—some small insignificant change that is meaningless. Chances are also good that they will bring forth some sort of example that has already been disproved—they will bring forth what Jonathan Wells calls an “icon of evolution.” A truly Christian world-and-life view can see through bogus science, which is what evolution is.

A NOBLE ORIGIN, A NOBLE DESTINY

When I look at your heavens, the work of your fingers, the moon and the stars, which you have set in place, what is man that you are mindful of him, and the son of man that you care for him?

PSALM 8:3-4



Think about it: “Either we are accidental byproducts of a purposeless process, or we are created in the image of God, deliberately, by design.”¹ So says scientist Dr. Jonathan Wells. What are we? Your starting point determines your concluding point. If man is ultimately the by-product of time and chance and random forces, then no matter how some fancy talkers may sugarcoat the picture, we are worthless. But if humankind is some unique creation, designed by a loving Creator for a specific purpose, then we are special. What are we—man or ape?

THE WAR ON TELEOLOGY

Evolution from the beginning has been at all-out war with teleology. (“Teleology” means “the study of purpose”—the view that anything has an end for which it was made or created.)

Keep in mind what our Declaration of Independence says: God has created us equally, and our Creator has endowed us with inalienable rights. Without a Creator, there are no inalienable rights. We would have only those rights that are bestowed by the state. And the state that bestows them with one hand can withdraw them with the other, as every tyrannical state down through history has demonstrated.

The Western Christian view of man has always held that man is here for a purpose. The Christian view has been summed up in the first question of the Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Confession of Faith: “What is the chief end of man?” The answer is: “Man’s chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever.” The evolutionist would not question whether that is the chief end of man or some other end, but would say there is no end or purpose in any man’s life at all, which is precisely what the evolutionary view of life has produced.

If life has no purpose, it has no meaning, and consequently it has no significance. Many in our culture are choosing to be perpetually entertained—lest they think through the implications of a meaningless life. When life has lost its purpose, meaning, and significance, be prepared for an epidemic of suicide, drugs, alcoholism, and maybe even a plunge into some form of Eastern mysticism, where a person might find some sort of irrational significance for life, or at least a feeling that will make the drabness of a meaningless existence bearable for a time.

As we continue to explore a Christian world-and-life view, we come next to the question of origins as it relates to the value of human life. Do we have a noble origin and therefore a noble destiny? Or an ignoble origin with an ignoble destiny?

THE COLLEGE QUESTIONS

Do you remember the old college questions: Where did I come from? Why am I here? How should I live? Where am I going? Who am I? Those are some of the most important questions any person is ever going to have to answer—in or out of college. If you have never wrestled with them, then God apparently wasted a brain on you, because if a person doesn’t examine such tremendous questions as those, what is he living for at all?

There are today basically two different sets of answers to those questions—diametrically antithetical one to the other. Consider the answers given by the person who believes in creation—the creationist.

- *Where did I come from?* I came from the heart and mind of the almighty and omnipotent and omniscient God. I have been made a little lower than the angels.

- *Who am I?* I am a child of the King, a prince of the royal realm.

- *Why am I here?* I am here to serve and glorify the Almighty and to enjoy Him forever.

- *How should I live?* I should live according to the commandments He

has given to me in His Word, which are designed for my good and my advancement.

- *Where am I going?* I am going to Paradise, which is beyond my comprehension. “What no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man imagined . . . God has prepared for those who love him” (1 Corinthians 2:9).

The Christian—the creationist—has a noble origin and a noble destiny. And in between, his life is crammed full of meaning, value, significance, and purpose.

But the other set of answers are those given by the adherents to evolution—those who trust in the system that is taught in almost every public school in this country, or practically in the world today—a set of answers that are being learned by nearly all of our students from kindergarten through graduate school.

I talked recently to a student who attends a college in Minnesota. He told how his biology teacher, from the very beginning, said that his purpose in the class was to show students that evolution was the way things are and the way things should be and that he was going to do his very best to persuade Christians to abandon their faith and to adopt the “faith” of evolution. Evolution is faith, not science, as many of the best-known evolutionists have admitted many times.

Dr. L. Harrison Matthews (a noted evolutionist), who wrote the “Introduction” in the 1971 edition of Darwin’s *Origin of the Species*, said: “The fact of evolution is the backbone of biology, and biology is thus in the peculiar position of being a science founded on an unproved theory—is it then a science or faith? Belief in the theory of evolution is thus exactly parallel to belief in special creation—both are concepts which believers know to be true but neither, up to the present, has been capable of proof.”²

Evolutionists have a very different set of answers to the questions, Where did I come from? Why am I here? Where am I going? Bertrand Russell, one of the twentieth century’s leading philosophers, was an atheist, an unbeliever, and an evolutionist. He wrote a book entitled *Why I Am Not a Christian*. (He failed to mention in his book his multiple adulteries, his repeated fornications, his seduction of the daughters of his hosts, and many other sins too numerous to mention, which are the real reason he wasn’t a Christian.) Russell gave these answers to the college questions: “We started somewhere, we don’t know where; we are here, we don’t know why; we are going to some great oblivion, we know not whither.”³

Those are the answers to the basic questions of life that Russell has given

to us. And yet, in spite of the fact that evolutionists have nothing to offer, they have completely dominated our world today.

IS THE ISSUE SIGNIFICANT?

Is the doctrine of creation, as opposed to evolution, important? Well, the very first phrase in the first sentence of the first chapter of the first book of the Bible says that it is: “In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth” (Genesis 1:1). That is where God began, and that is where all of life and theology and action ultimately have their beginning. Ernst Mayr, professor at Harvard and one of our country’s leading evolutionists, has written: “Man’s worldview today is dominated by the knowledge that the universe, the stars, the earth, and all living things have evolved through a long history that was not foreordained or programmed.” What is evolution, according to Mayr? It is “man’s worldview today.”⁴

Rene Dubos, in *American Scientist* magazine, says: “Most enlightened persons now accept as fact that everything in the cosmos—from heavenly bodies to human beings—has developed and continues to develop through evolutionary processes.”⁵

Another scientist said that evolution is the totality of reality. The totality of reality is God, and for such adherents as these, evolution is their God—Darwin himself, one time, candidly admitted.

What kind of a view of man is given to us by evolutionists? Is man a noble creature with a noble origin and a noble destiny? Here is what the evolutionists say:

- “Man Is A Machine” (French philosopher Julien Offray de la Mettrie).⁶
- “. . . the outcome of accidental collocations of atoms” (British atheist Bertrand Russell).⁷
- Man is no more significant than “a baboon or a grain of sand” (Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.).⁸

This is what man is to them. Next to nothing at all. Yet this is what students are being indoctrinated with from kindergarten all the way through graduate school.

A man by the name of Charles Potter started a Humanist church. Where one might expect to find a cross or crucifix, he erected a statue entitled “The Chrysalis.” A chrysalis is that from which the butterfly emerges, but here the statue consisted of a naked man emerging chrysalis-like from an ape-skin.

As evolution continues to be taught as fact, it is no wonder students today are plagued with so many problems and doubts. It is no wonder self-worth

has gone right down the tube, and millions of students are trying to discover some sort of worthwhile self-image. Believing you are nothing but an accidental happening in the slime doesn't create much self-worth. Yet this is what our students are being told over and over. Thus the honorable place that had been given to man is quickly aborted, and man is dragged down into the slime.

Author Erwin Lutzer said, "an evolutionary view of man leads to frightening conclusions."⁹ If you think this is just a theory in a biology classroom, let me say that it applies not only to every academic discipline but to everything else, including international relations.

For example, all the tyrannical dictators of the twentieth century were ardent evolutionists. Every one of them! This includes Mao Tse-tung, who was responsible for the killing of at least 55,000,000 Chinese. Some estimates put the number at 72,000,000. Either statistic gives Mao the dubious honor of being the greatest mass-murderer in history. He outdoes Stalin and Hitler too.

In his classic novel *1984*, George Orwell said of the future of man if then-present totalitarian trends continued (namely, Stalinism): "If you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face—forever." Not a very pretty picture. But when God is removed, and man follows only an evolutionary view of man, we lose our freedom.¹⁰

What we believe about man has very real consequences and will generally affect how we treat our fellowman. May I say that the view of evolution was directly responsible for about 200,000,000 deaths in the twentieth century alone. This is an issue of tremendous significance.

THE PERFECT MURDER

Two young men were born with silver spoons in their mouths—both the sons of millionaires. They were students at the University of Chicago and thoroughly Nietzschean, which means they were evolutionary as well. They believed in Friedrich Nietzsche's concepts of the superman. In fact, they believed they were it—at least one of them thought the other was the superman. They decided to do the type of thing students in universities do to show their intellectual superiority. Did they decide to make A pluses? No; they decided to commit the perfect murder—to find a fourteen-year-old boy and kill him . . . because, after all, what is life? Nathan Leopold was very disappointed to discover that his friend Richard Loeb was not Nietzsche's superman, as he had thought him to be. The two were caught, tried, and sentenced

to life in prison. Loeb was even murdered in prison about a decade later. Following Nietzsche was a disaster for them.

Here is how author Hal Higdon put it in his suspenseful book on the case, *The Crime of the Century*: “Maremont [a fellow student] frequently argued philosophy with Leopold, particularly with ideas of the German philosopher Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, who died in 1900, but whose ideas had become faddish on college campuses in the twenties. In Nietzsche’s philosophy, the goal of the evolutionary struggle for survival would be the emergence of an idealized superior, dominating man. Leopold thought his friend Richard Loeb came as close to being that man as anyone he had met. ‘Leopold believed Nietzsche literally,’ Maremont would recall. ‘He was convinced Loeb was a superman.’”¹¹

What is human life worth to an evolutionist? It is nothing but junk. As Wolf Larsen, an evolutionist, said, “Life? Bah. It has no value. Of the cheap things, it is the cheapest.”¹² It is disposable.

BELIEFS DETERMINE ACTIONS

How we believe and what we believe about our fellowmen will determine how we act toward them. We wonder about many decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in the twentieth century. One of our Supreme Court Justices (and by no means the only one), Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., highly regarded, said, “I see no reason for attributing to man a significant difference in kind from that which he belongs to.”¹³

You are just not worth anything at all, folks . . . no more than a grain of sand, which can be taken up by the handfuls and thrown away. That is what evolutionists have been doing throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries—just taking human life by the handfuls and throwing it away because it has no real value. Our mighty brain, which Zig Ziglar has pointed out is capable of containing more information than the millions of volumes in the Library of Congress, if it were built by human beings would be larger than the Empire State Building and would require more electricity to run than would power a city of thousands and cost billions of dollars; and yet this man-made brain would not be able to originate one single thought—which we can do in the blink of an eye.¹⁴

But the evolutionist view disagrees. As the late Harvard behavioral psychologist B. F. Skinner, one of the leading movers and shakers of human thought in the last century, said, “Thought is, so to speak, a ‘secretion of the brain,’ as bile is a secretion of the liver.”¹⁵ You see, it is not nearly as signifi-

cant as you thought it was. Skinner's book is titled *Beyond Freedom and Dignity* because, you see, you have no freedom and you surely have no dignity.

"Life, bah. . . . Of the cheap things, it is the cheapest." Do you wonder how people can do the kinds of things they do to other people? It is because of what they have been taught and what they have come to believe. "For as [a man] thinks in his heart, so is he" (Proverbs 23:7, NKJV).

Dr. Francis Schaeffer summed up the evolutionary view of life when he said, "The concept of man's dignity is gone. We are in the post-Christian world. Man is junk. If the embryo is in the way, ditch it. If the old person is in the way, ditch him. If you're in the way . . ."16

Evolution can only create an environment of meaninglessness for life and worthlessness for man. Life has no purpose. It is just an accident that took place in the slime or in the clay. You are just not worth much of anything at all. How different that is from what God offers.

Fortunately, some have been honest enough to admit how they feel about all of that. Skeptic W. O. Saunders, an evolutionist and unbeliever, said this about the materialist or unbeliever:

For him there is only the grave and the persistence of matter. All he can see beyond the grave is the disintegration of the protoplasm and psychoplasm of which his body and its personality are come. . . . But in this material view I find no ecstasy or happiness. Is this the end and all of human life and endeavor? . . . Therefore, would I try to convey to your mind and heart something of the wistfulness and loneliness of the man who does not believe in God.¹⁷

That is what unbelievers have to offer. And we wonder why so many young people are killing themselves?

In the first chapter, we alluded to a remark from Albert Camus, a famous French author. He said, "There is but one truly serious philosophical problem [in the twentieth century]." Only one? There's only one philosophical problem, only one question that you should be directing your mind toward? Would you like to understand what is at the pinnacle of the whole evolutionary-atheistic view of life? It is not merely the most important—it is the only significant question of our time, said Camus. "It is," he said, "suicide."

Have you been studying "the only significant question" as you should? Let me assure you that students in school are. In our public schools, students are being taught how to write suicide notes. They are being shown a variety

of methods of committing suicide and given recommendations about which ones are preferable. They are told about and taught and indeed build models of their coffins. The Bible says that those who hate God love death, and that is what all of this is: just death and more death—the death of human aspirations, the death of human dignity, the death of human meaning, the death of significance, and the death of all future hopes. As Dante warned those entering hell: “Abandon all hope, ye who enter here.”¹⁸ The fruit of evolution is hopelessness, which is a characteristic of hell.

Probably this has never been more eloquently expressed than by one of the great unbelievers of the early part of the twentieth century, Robert Ingersoll, the leading atheistic evolutionist and skeptic of his day. His brother, whom he loved probably more than anything in this world, suddenly died, and his brother was an unbeliever, so no clergyman could be called. How does an atheist have a funeral? Well, extraordinarily eloquent Robert, standing beside his brother’s grave, preached the funeral sermon himself. His words are probably some of the most poignant and saddest I have ever heard:

Whether in mid-sea or among the breakers of the farther shore, a wreck must mark at last the end of each and all. And every life, no matter if its every hour is rich with love and every moment jeweled with joy, will, at its close, become a tragedy, as sad, and deep, and dark as can be woven of the warp and woof of mystery and death. . . . Life is a narrow vale between the cold and barren peaks of two eternities. We strive in vain to look beyond the heights. We cry aloud, and the only answer is the echo of our wailing cry.¹⁹

CONCLUSION

This is what unbelief offers to man. I thank God that in His Word we read: “[W]hat is man that you are mindful of him? . . . Yet you have made him a little lower than the heavenly beings. . . . You have given him dominion over the works of your hands; you have put all things under his feet” (Psalm 8:4-6). What is man? He is a prince in a royal realm. His origin is from the heart and mind of God, and his destiny is in paradise forever. “. . . nor [has] the heart of man imagined, what God has prepared for those who love him” (1 Corinthians 2:9). This is the glorious origin and destiny of all who trust in Christ. When you consider the choice, it seems as if there is only one logical option. When you consider further that the evidence for evolution, as we have seen in the previous chapter, has been collapsing of late, it seems like an easier choice still.

Because of the widespread acceptance of evolution, we see how life has become cheap. For the next several chapters, we want to explore life and death issues from a Christian perspective. As we attempt to Christianize the sphere of the world, we need to not only reclaim a biblical understanding of origins and the sciences, but we also need a biblical understanding of the value of human life itself.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

1. Charles Colson and Nancy Pearcey, *How Now Shall We Live?* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1999), 20.
2. Robert B. Reich, "The Last Word: Bush's God," *The American Prospect*, June 17, 2004.
3. For example, Paul Johnson, the great historian, says the twentieth-century state has "proved itself the great killer of all time." *Modern Times* (New York: Harper and Row, 1983), 729.
4. Quoted in Gary DeMar, *Thinking Straight in a Crooked World* (Powder Springs, GA: American Vision, 2001), 19.
5. Colson and Pearcey, *How Now Shall We Live?*, 17.
6. *Ibid.*, 14.
7. John J. Dunphy, "Religion for a New Age," *The Humanist*, January/February 1983, 26.
8. See Gary DeMar, *Thinking Straight in a Crooked World*.
9. H. G. Wells, quoted in *ibid.*, 50-51.
10. Gary DeMar, *War of the Worldviews* (Powder Springs, GA: American Vision, 1994), 19.
11. Jean Paul Sartre, quoted in *ibid.*
12. DeMar, *ibid.*, 31.
13. Albert Camus, in *ibid.*, 20.
14. Samuel Beckett, quoted in Richard Coe, *Samuel Beckett* (New York: Grove Press, 1964), 18, quoted in *ibid.*, 18.
15. H. J. Blackham, quoted in DeMar, *War of the Worldviews*, 17.
16. Bertrand Russell, *Why I Am Not a Christian* (New York: Clarion, Simon and Schuster, 1957), 107.
17. Abraham Kuyper, *You Can Do Greater Things Than Christ*, trans. Jan H. Boer (Jos, Nigeria: Institute of Church and Society, 1991), 74. This comes from the first volume of Kuyper's book, which was first published as *Pro Rege, of Het Koningschap van Christus* in 1911.

CHAPTER 1: THE ROOT OF THE PROBLEM

1. John Lenczowski, "The Treason of the Intellectuals: Higher Education, the Culture War and the Threat to U.S. National Security," *Policy Counsel* (Fall 1996), 45.
2. Ernest Gordon, et al., "Is Baer Right?" *Christianity Today*, February 17, 1984, 18.
3. Fyodor Dostoevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov*, trans. Andrew H. MacAndrew (Toronto: Bantam Books, 1970), Book XI, Chapter 8, 760.
4. Justice William Brennan, for the majority, U.S. Supreme Court, *Stone v. Graham*, 1980.
5. Elizabeth Mehren, "Humans a Mere Afterthought, Evolutionist Says," *The Cleveland Plain Dealer*, December 17, 1989.
6. Fred Hoyle, *The Big Bang in Astronomy*, 527, quoted in Henry M. Morris, *Evolution in Turmoil: An Updated Sequel to the Troubled Waters of Evolution* (San Diego, CA: Creation-Life Publishers, 1982), 29.
7. Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971), 288, 290, quoted in *The Christian News* (New Haven, MO), October 23, 1989, 11.
8. Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, trans. James Murphy, Chapter XI, "Race and People," <http://gutenerg.net.au/ebooks02/0200601.txt>.
9. Stephane Courtois, Nicolas Werth, Jean-Louis Panne, Andrzej Paczkowski, Karel Bartosek, and Jean-Louis Margolin, *The Black Book of Communism*, trans. Jonathan Murphy and Mark Kramer (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1999), 4.

10. Anton Pannekoek, *Marxism and Darwinism*, trans. Nathan Weiser (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company, 1909/1912); www.marxists.org/archive/pannekoek/works/1912-dar.htm.
11. Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men: Darwin and the New World Order* (Toronto: TFE Publishing, 1984), 411.
12. Arthur Keith, *Evolution and Ethics* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1947), 15.
13. Paul Lemoine, *Encyclopedie Francaise*, 1950s, Vol. 5, quoted at www.talkorigins.org/faqs/ce/3/part12.html.
14. Jean Rostand, *Age Nouveau* (a French periodical), February 1959, 12, quoted in *ibid.*

CHAPTER 2: "THIS IS MY AMOEBA'S WORLD"

1. Arthur Guiterman, "Ode to the Amoeba," reproduced at www.anagrammy.com/literary/rg/poems-rg11.html.
2. Clarence Darrow, quoted in Norman L. Geisler (in collaboration with A. F. Brooke II and Mark J. Keough), *The Creator in the Courtroom: "Scopes II"* (Milford, MI: Mott Media, 1982), 11.
3. This is found in a footnote of the U.S. Supreme Court decision of *Torcaso v. Watkins*, 1961.
4. H. S. Lipson, "A Physicist Looks at Evolution," *Physics Bulletin* (Vol. 31, 1980).
5. Charles Darwin, *On the Origin of the Species*, 1859, in William J. Federer, ed., *Library of Classics*, 2002, a CD-ROM.
6. Quoted in Henry Morris, *Men of God—Men of Science* (San Diego: Master Books, 1984), 35.
7. *Ibid.*, 89.
8. Rene Vallery-Radot, *The Life of Pasteur*, trans. R. L. Devonshire (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Page and Company, 1923), 462.
9. Quoted in *Heroes of History*, Vol. 4 (West Frankfort, IL: Caleb Publishers, 1992), 36.
10. *Ibid.*, 34.
11. Morris, *Men of God—Men of Science*, 34-35.
12. Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men: Darwin and the New World Order* (Toronto: TFE Publishing, 1984), 49.
13. H. W. Buxton, *Memoirs of the Life and Labours of the Charles Babbage ESQ. F.R.S.*, Vol. 13 (Cambridge, MA and Los Angeles: The MIT Press & Thomas Publishers, 1988), 316.
14. Morris, *Men of God—Men of Science*, 56.
15. Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, 160-161.
16. *Ibid.*, 350.
17. Frances Leigh Williams, *Matthew Fontaine Maury, Scientist of the Sea* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1963), 340.
18. James M. Houston, ed., *The Mind on Fire: An Anthology of the Writings of Blaise Pascal* (Portland: Multnomah, 1989), 147.
19. Will and Ariel Durant, *The Age of Voltaire; The Story of Civilization*, Vol. 9 (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1965), 561.
20. Stephen Jay Gould, *Dinosaur in a Haystack: Reflections in Natural History* (New York: Harmony Books, 1995), 422.
21. For this list of Christian scientists, we are indebted to Henry Morris, *The Biblical Basis for Modern Science* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984), 463-465.
22. "Iconoclast of the Century: Charles Darwin (1809-1882)," *Time* magazine, December 31, 1999, quoted in Lee Strobel, *The Case for a Creator* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2004), 24.

CHAPTER 3: THE COLLAPSE OF EVOLUTION

1. *Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, Fifth Edition (Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam, 1941), 753.
2. Charles Darwin, Introduction, *On the Origin of the Species*, 1859, in William J. Federer, ed., *Library of Classics* (St. Louis: Amerisearch Inc., 2002), a CD-ROM.

3. Transcript of an interview with Jonathan Wells on location in Seattle, WA (Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Coral Ridge Ministries-TV, March 2004).
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. Darwin, *On the Origin of the Species*, Chapter VI, under the subheading “Modes of Transition,” CD-ROM.
8. Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (Chevy Chase, MD: Adler and Adler, 1986), 162, quoted in Strobel, *The Case for a Creator*, 56.
9. Stephen Jay Gould, quoted in “Evolution of Evolution,” *The Bible-Science Newsletter*, July 1981, 5.
10. Stephen Jay Gould, “Evolution’s Erratic Pace,” *Natural History*, May 1977.
11. Ibid.
12. Transcript of an interview with Stephen Meyer on location in Seattle, Washington (Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Coral Ridge Ministries-TV, 2004).
13. Interview with Wells, Coral Ridge Ministries-TV.
14. Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution: Science or Myth? Why Much of What We Teach About Evolution Is Wrong* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, 2000), 82-83.
15. Interview with Wells, Coral Ridge Ministries-TV.
16. Stephen Jay Gould in a response to Michael Behe (*New York Times*, August 13, 1999), in *Natural History* magazine, March 2000. Quoted in Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, 108.
17. Gould, quoted in *ibid.*, 109.
18. Interview with Wells, Coral Ridge Ministries-TV.
19. Ibid.
20. Interview with Meyer, Coral Ridge Ministries-TV.
21. Interview with Wells, Coral Ridge Ministries-TV.
22. Ibid.
23. Stephen Jay Gould, February 15, 1980, quoted in “Evolution of Evolution,” 6.
24. Interview with Michael Behe, on location in Bethlehem, PA (Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Coral Ridge Ministries-TV, 1998).
25. Ibid.
26. Interview with Meyer, Coral Ridge Ministries-TV.
27. All quotes from Richard Lumsden come from an interview and segment on Dr. Lumsden’s testimony (Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Coral Ridge Ministries-TV, September 1996).

CHAPTER 4: A NOBLE ORIGIN, A NOBLE DESTINY

1. Transcript from an interview with Jonathan Wells on location in Seattle, Washington (Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Coral Ridge Ministries-TV, March 2004).
2. L. H. Matthews, “Introduction,” Charles Darwin, *Origin of Species* (London: J.M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., 1971), x-xi, quoted in Luther D. Sunderland, *Darwin’s Enigma: Fossils and Other Problems* (San Diego, CA: Master Books, 1984), 30-31.
3. Bertrand Russell, quoted in Oliver R. Blosser, “Why Creation Is Superior to Evolution in the Education of Children,” *CEA Update* (Pine River, WI: Creation Education Association), January/February 1990.
4. Ernst Mayr, “Evolution,” *Scientific American* (Vol. 239, September 1978), 47.
5. Rene Dubos, quoted in *ibid.*
6. Julien Offray de la Mettrie, quoted in Erwin W. Lutzer, *Exploding the Myths That Could Destroy America* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1986), 52.
7. Bertrand Russell, *Why I Am Not a Christian* (New York: Clarion, Simon and Schuster, 1957), 107.
8. Oliver Wendell Holmes, quoted in Lutzer, *Exploding the Myths*, 55.
9. Lutzer, *Exploding the Myths That Could Destroy America*, 42.
10. George Orwell, 1984, quoted in John Whitehead, *The End of Man* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1986), 201.

11. Hal Higdon, *The Crime of the Century: The Leopold and Loeb Case* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1975), 20.
12. Wolf Larson, quoted in *ibid.*, 29.
13. Quoted in John Whitehead, *The Second American Revolution* (Elgin, IL: David C. Cook, 1982), 52.
14. Zig Ziglar, *See You at the Top* (Gretna, LA: Pelican, 1977), 57.
15. B.F. Skinner, quoted in *ibid.*, 135.
16. Francis Schaeffer, *Back to Freedom and Dignity* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1972), p. 23, quoted in *ibid.*, 144.
17. W. O. Saunders, quoted in Earle Albert Rowell, *Prophecy Speaks: Dissolving Doubts* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1933), 112-113.
18. Technically, it states: "All hope abandon, ye who enter here." Dante, *Inferno*, Canto III, Line 9, quoted in John Bartlett, *Familiar Quotations*, 1020. In another translation, it states: "No room for hope, when you enter this place."
19. Robert Ingersoll, quoted in Rowell, *Prophecy Speaks: Dissolving Doubts*, 112-113.

CHAPTER 5: THE BIBLE AND LIFE

1. Mother Teresa, "Whatsoever You Do . . ." Speech to the National Prayer Breakfast, Washington, DC, February 3, 1994, www.priestsforlife.org/brochures/mtspeech.html.
2. www.inthefaitth.com/archives/001330.php.
3. Warren Throckmorton, "I Had An Abortion," August 15, 2004. www.townhall.com/columnists/GuestColumns/Throckmorton20040815.shtml.
4. Helga Kuhse, cited in Rita Marker, *Deadly Compassion: The Death of Ann Humphry and the Truth About Euthanasia* (New York: William Morrow, 1993), 94.
5. www.punkvoter.com/guest/guest_detail.php?GuestColumnID=17.
6. Cal Thomas, *Uncommon Sense* (Brentwood, TN: Wolgemuth & Hyatt, 1990), 5.
7. William J. Brennan, *The Abortion Holocaust* (St. Louis: Landmark Press, 1983), 123.
8. Byron White, dissent in *Roe v. Wade*, U.S. Supreme Court, January 22, 1973.
9. Transcript of an interview with Michael Farris on location in Washington, DC (Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Coral Ridge Ministries-TV, 1996).
10. Norma McCorvey with Gary Thomas, *Won by Love* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1997).
11. Transcript of an interview with U.S. Representative Charles Canady on location in Washington, DC (Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Coral Ridge Ministries-TV, 1996).
12. Transcript of an interview with Brenda Shafer on location in Las Vegas, Nevada (Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Coral Ridge Ministries-TV, 2000).
13. *Ibid.*
14. Transcript of an interview with U.S. Representative Thomas Coburn, M.D., on location in Washington, DC (Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Coral Ridge Ministries-TV, 1996).
15. Transcript of an interview with U.S. Representative Bart Stupak on location in Washington, DC (Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Coral Ridge Ministries-TV, 1996).
16. Interview with Shafer, Coral Ridge Ministries-TV.
17. *Ibid.*
18. *Ibid.*
19. *Ibid.*
20. *Ibid.*
21. *Ibid.*

CHAPTER 6: LESSONS FROM THE NAZIS REGARDING HUMAN LIFE

1. Adolf Hitler, quoted in Tom Dowley, gen. ed., *A Lion Handbook: The History of Christianity* (Oxford, England: Lion, 1977, rev. 1990), 589-590.
2. Heinrich Himmler, quoted in *ibid.*, 600.
3. William L. Shirer, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1960), 240.
4. Adolf Hitler, quoted in Armin Robinson, ed., *The Ten Commandments: Ten Short Novels*