

Why Evolution is Not a Viable Theory

INTRODUCTION

The first verse of the Bible is the foundation for everything else that follows in Holy Scripture. In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth! The opening statement of the Bible declares a personal God who directly created the universe of his own volition and for his own purposes. This simple statement clearly refutes the idea of pantheism and atheism.

You will recall that pantheism is the belief that no personal God exists to whom we are accountable. Rather, it is the idea that the universe itself is *god*. The idea that man, along with the rest of the universe, is a part of the divine forms the basis of ancient Hinduism and the modern day New Age spirituality. The basic drive of this worldview is that man needs to somehow discover his divinity. Self-realization is the goal and is defined as the journey to regaining the lost understanding that man is one with the universe, and thus divine. Pantheism is a web of deceit. It is dangerous in as much as it opens adherents to a world of darkness called the occult. Genesis 1:1 refutes this lie.

You will recall that atheism also teaches that no personal God exists to whom we are accountable. While pantheism leaves the door open to an impersonal spirit world, atheism is fully committed to the idea that no supernatural exists at all. Pure atheism is compelled to cling to the belief that nothing exists but the material universe. Thus, atheism denies the reality of any dimension of existence other than this physical, material universe. The foundational doctrine of atheism is evolution. Since the material universe does exist there must be an explanation for how it came to be in the first place. Atheism staunchly embraces its ever changing theory of evolution as the answer to origins. However, as we shall discover in this unit, our atheist friends are building on a foundation of sand and their theory is crumbling like the proverbial house of cards! The straight forward statement of Genesis 1:1 clearly refutes atheism and its darling doctrine, evolution.

In light of the very precise opening statement of Genesis, one is made to wonder why any professing Christian would be tempted to compromise in any way with the unbelief of atheism and its foundational doctrine of evolution. While the doctrine of special creation by a personal, transcendent, eternal God begins in Genesis 1:1, it by no means ends there. This doctrine is interwoven through-out the pages of Scripture in such a way that to compromise its validity is to undermine the veracity of the entire Bible! The compromise of the church with the lie of evolution has served only to undermine the authority of the book we are called to preach. The church stands in need of repentance. We must ask the Lord God to forgive us for compromising his unchanging word with an unbelieving world.

You will notice that the statement of Genesis 1:1 clearly states that the material universe is not eternal. It had a beginning. This is a significant point for those who cling to atheism or some form of pantheism. If the universe is not eternal, then we are compelled to answer the question as to how it got here to begin with! Known science now confirms without question that the universe *cannot* be eternal, thus we are faced with the question of how the universe and life began. Genesis 1:1 gives the only legitimate answer.

3.1 The Law of Causality

As stated in the introduction to this unit, the universe is not eternal. It had a beginning. (We will deal with the scientific reason for this reality in lesson 3.2 with a discussion on the first and second law of thermodynamics). Since the material universe had a beginning, it logically follows that there was a *first cause* that is responsible for the existence of the universe. After all, everything we observe in our world is consistent with the law of causality, or the law of cause and effect. To believe that this vast universe *spontaneously generated* itself by pure chance is a direct contradiction of what we observe to be true in countless examples from observational science. The idea that *nothing* is responsible for *everything* violates the known law of cause and effect.

The law of cause and effect observed in our experiences could be stated as follows: *for every effect there is a corresponding cause greater in quantity and qualitatively superior to the effect*. For example, the computer that was used to create this document is the result of a certain *cause*. The computer did not spontaneously generate itself out of nothing. Rather, it is the result of careful design and research based upon accumulated knowledge in the minds of learned men! The *cause* (in this case the minds of men) is greater than the effect (the resulting computer).

The automobile is another example of cause and effect. Like the computer, the finished automobile is the effect of a manufacturing process that creates interconnected and interacting parts that function as a whole and provide a means of transportation. Obviously, the cause is the intelligence of learned men who designed a functional automobile. Again, the automobile is not capable of assembling itself. It must first be designed and then a manufacturing process brings it into existence. The cause is greater than the effect.

As we investigate the incredible complexity of the universe and life itself, the existence of such complexity begs the question as to *who* is the *cause* of this effect. We are compelled to logically conclude that the source of such life (*the first cause*) is personal and possesses infinite knowledge and power! A belief in the God of the Bible, who transcends his creation as the infinite God of eternity, is

most certainly consistent with the known law of cause and effect. However, the underlying premise of *random chance* as the cause for all that we see in this mighty universe is not consistent with the known scientific principle of cause and effect.

REVIEW ACTIVITIES

*Please give the definition of the law of cause and effect *Why is the idea that “nothing” is responsible for “everything” a contradiction of the law of cause and effect? *Why is the belief in the God of the Bible consistent with the law of cause and effect?

3.2 Evolution Contradicts the First and Second Laws of Thermodynamics

The next scientific reason one should reject evolution as a viable theory of origins is connected to the study of thermodynamics. Thermodynamics is defined in the American Heritage College Dictionary as follows: *the branch of physics that deals with the relationships and conversions between heat and other forms of energy*. Observational science has confirmed several laws of thermodynamics. However, for our discussion we are only concerned with the first two laws of thermodynamics.

The first law of thermodynamics states that the total energy and matter that exists in the universe is a constant. *Energy cannot be created or destroyed by natural processes*, but can only be converted from one form to another. Thus, natural processes cannot account for the origin of the material universe.

The second law of thermodynamics states that in any closed system a process proceeds in a direction such that the unavailable energy (the entropy) increases. In simple terms this means that things progress naturally from *order to disorder*. The usable energy in a closed system diminishes as work is done. Eventually, no energy is available for work. At this point, the system is said to experience a “heat death.” Since there is no more available energy, no more work can be done. The second law states that the reverse cannot be true! Unavailable energy cannot be turned into available energy!

Now consider the entire universe as one huge closed system. Since energy is constantly being changed from available to unavailable (example: the stars are hot but cooling down), the universe is

actually winding down like a gigantic clock. The “clock” is ticking down and losing available energy. Now go backwards to a time in the past when the “clock” was first wound up. We can theoretically go back to a time when all the available energy was there. This would correspond to “the beginning!” The second law of thermodynamics brings us face to face with the fact that the universe had a beginning. The universe therefore cannot be infinitely old. One can only conclude the universe had a beginning that was caused by someone or something that operates outside the known first and second laws of thermodynamics. The point is this: *what we know to be true about the universe from these two testable, observable laws is consistent with a belief in the transcendent God revealed in Scripture.*

In contrast, the idea of evolution is in direct contradiction of these known laws of science. Evolution demands an *upward* movement from disorder to order. However, the observable universe says just the opposite! Evolutionary theories cannot counteract the above arguments for the existence of God!

REVIEW ACTIVITIES

*What is the definition of “thermodynamics? *Please write out the definition of the first and second laws of Thermodynamics *How is a belief in the God of the Bible consistent with these two laws? *How does the theory of evolution contradict these two laws?

3.3 Evolution Contradicts the Known Law of Biogenesis

Life is truly amazing! Our world contains a wide variety of living organisms from the microscopic to the larger members of the reptile world. The animal kingdom consists of many creatures that fascinate us with their beauty and unique characteristics. And of course, mankind stands apart from all other creatures. He possesses a quality of life that is clearly superior to and quite different from all other life forms.

There is a well established law in science that is the result of observing the various life forms in our world. It is the law of *biogenesis*. This law states that living organisms develop only from other living organisms and not from nonliving matter. Anything that is alive came from something else that is alive! This law states that life did not come from “dead” chemicals. There is not one example from observational science of anything “dead” producing life of any kind. Random chemical processes do not

produce *life*.

The chasm that exists between “living” organisms and nonliving matter is a gulf that the theory of evolution is utterly powerless to span! Yet evolutionists refuse to let their theory go. Evolutionists persist with their theory based upon the *assumption* that long ago in the unknowable past some kind of chemical reaction occurred that resulted in the first living cell. According to their embellished story, supposedly from just one instance when life *spontaneously generated* from nonliving matter all plant life and animal life was able to evolve. Such a position is clearly a *belief system* about the past that is not consistent with what we know to be true.

Evolutionists would have you believe, as Dr. Henry Morris put it, that “*unknown chemicals in the primordial past . . . through . . . unknown processes which no longer exist . . . produced unknown life forms which are not to be found but could through . . . unknown reproduction methods spawn new life . . . in an . . . unknown atmospheric composition . . . in an . . . unknown oceanic soup complex . . . at an . . . unknown time and place*”^{*} and thus explains the origin of life! But such a belief contradicts what we know to be true, namely that only life produces life. The law of biogenesis is clearly another insurmountable hurdle for the theory of evolution.

However, the Biblical record of special creation is consistent with the law of biogenesis. God, who alone has life in himself, is the life giver. Furthermore, consistent with the law of biogenesis is the Biblical teaching that *kinds* only produce life within their *kind*. This is exactly what we observe to be true in the real world around us. Another important observation from this law is the fact that man is *not* the descendent of an animal. One *kind* cannot evolve into another *kind*. Thus man is unique just as the Biblical record indicates.

^{*}From *Unlocking the Mysteries of Creation*, page 67, Dennis Petersen

REVIEW ACTIVITIES

*Why is the theory of evolution a contradiction of the law of biogenesis?

3.4 Evolution is Mathematically Impossible

Evolutionists assume that an age of 15 to 20 billion years is enough time for the random interaction of atoms and molecules to generate life. However, besides the fact that no amount of time can enable evolution to bridge the chasm that exists between nonliving matter and living organisms, more than one scientist has clearly demonstrated from probability studies that the theory is also mathematically impossible.

The probability of random chance processes producing the building blocks of life is dependent upon a trial and error process of combining the various elements available until a working combination is accidentally found. At that point, another trial and error process supposedly occurred adding more upward movement in development. However, consider the following information compiled by Dr. Jobe Martin in his book, *"The Evolution of a Creationist,"* page 47:

"If the entire universe were crammed with electrons (electron particles), the maximum number of these little particles would be ten to the power of 130. If each particle could do one hundred billion-billion events (steps in ever onward and upward evolution) every second for 3,000 billion years (100 times older than anyone says the universe is), then in the span of history of the universe, ten to the 170th power events could possibly happen. But to get a series of even 1,500 events to happen in order (and without God's help), events that might be moving from non-living chemicals to a living cell, there is only one chance in ten to the power of 450! This means that the probability of godless evolution even getting started is zero."

Of course, the supposed random process of evolution would require many hundreds of thousands of "events" in order to produce the complexity of life we observe in our world. However, even if we allow 3,000 billion years of time for evolution to occur it is not enough time for it to even get started, much less proceed to the levels of complexity that exists in the simple cell.

The point that needs to be understood here is the fact that the probability of life arising by mere chance is so astronomically high that, in effect, it is zero! Stated another way, *evolution is impossible*. Sir Fred Hoyle, famous British astronomer and cosmologist put it this way: *"The probability that life arose by random processes is equivalent to believing that a tornado striking a junkyard would reassemble the trash and leave a completed, assembled, and functioning Boeing 707 there."*

REVIEW ACTIVITIES

* Explain in your own words what you have learned from the information in this lesson.

3.5 The New Science of Information Shatters the Theory of Evolution!

The theory of material evolution faces yet another impossible hurdle. The new science of information relegates material evolution to the realm of pure fantasy!!

We now know that life depends upon complex *non-material* language structures contained in the DNA of the cell. The coded information contained in DNA represents a category of reality *distinct* from matter and energy. Information is *not* material in nature. Where then did it come from? Furthermore, the theory of evolution requires the addition of *new* information to be *inserted* along the way to facilitate a supposed upward evolutionary process. Again, the requirement of non-material information relegates material evolution to the realm of pure fantasy!!

Dr. Andrew McIntosh, holder of several degrees including a B.S. in mathematics and a Ph.D. in the theory of combustion, comments on the problem facing evolution as posed by the new science of information. He writes:

“The major obstacle to evolutionary theories as to origins is that information cannot be defined in terms of physics and chemistry. The ideas of a book are not the same as the paper and ink which constitute the book. Indeed, those same words and thoughts can be transmitted through an entirely different media (such as a computer CD-ROM, floppy disk, or a tape recorder). The chemicals do not define the message they carry. Meaning cannot spontaneously arise, since meaning presupposes intelligence and understanding.

One of the greatest discoveries was that of DNA by Francis H. Crick (UK) and James D. Watson (USA) in 1953. This molecule was found to be the universal storage medium of natural systems . . . The DNA string is like a sequence of dots and dashes in a coded message. The coded information using the letters (ACG, GUC, CAU, etc) rides on the complicated chemical molecules, but is not defined by it. Information does not equal energy or matter . . . What is paramount in this discussion is that information (that is the setting of the rules, the language, code, etc.) has been there from the beginning. To argue that this came by chance is scientifically preposterous. As Professor Gitt has stated, “No information can exist without an initial mental source. No information can exist in purely statistical processes.”

Scientists call DNA the “language of the cell.” All scientists agree that language requires intelligence. Since language is information, and information is non-material in nature, there must be an *intelligence* that is the *source* of that information. The logical conclusion we should draw from the fact that thousands and thousands of pages of coded information exists in the DNA of all living organisms is that

it was placed there from the mind of One who is infinite in His wisdom!! The God of the Bible certainly qualifies as the logical source for the unbelievably complex information contained in DNA. On the other hand, material evolution is rendered utterly impossible by the existence of non-material information we now know exists in the DNA molecule.

REVIEW ACTIVITIES

* Why does evolution have no explanation for the coded information that exists in DNA?

3.6 Evolution Cannot Overcome the Problem of Irreducible Complexity

As we are discovering, evolution is not a viable theory for a number of reasons. Among those reasons is another problem which is referred to as *irreducible complexity*. Simply stated, this means that any system of interdependent parts cannot function unless the minimum of all necessary parts are present at the same time.

The theory of evolution proposes that over very long periods of time a random process of impersonal chance occurred in such a way that simple forms of life were transformed into more complex forms of life. The idea is that more “parts” were added along the way to simple forms of living systems until more complex forms of life appeared. However, with the new knowledge gained through the advances of observational science, the theory of evolution faces an impossible hurdle presented by the incredible complexity of life discovered within the single cell.

All scientists understand that there is no life without cells. Functional life begins at the cellular level. We now understand that even a single cell organism is *not* a simple form of life! We now know that at a microscopic level life is so complex that it consists of millions of interdependent parts! Dr. Jerry R. Bergman writing in the book “In Six Days: Why Fifty Scientists Choose to Believe in Creation” says:

“The problem for evolution caused by the enormous complexity required for life is quite well recognized, and none of the proposals to overcome it are even remotely satisfactory . . . Naturalism must account for both the parts necessary for life and their proper assembly. For life to persist, living

creatures must have a means of taking in and biochemically processing food. Life also requires oxygen, which must be distributed to all tissues, or for single-celled life, oxygen must effectively and safely be moved around inside the cell membrane to where it is needed, without damaging the cell. Without complex mechanisms to achieve these tasks, life cannot exist. The parts could not evolve separately and could not even exist independently for very long, because they would break down in the environment without protection . . . Even if they existed, the many parts needed for life could not sit idle waiting for the other parts to evolve, because the existing ones would usually deteriorate very quickly . . . For this reason, only an instantaneous creation of all the necessary parts as a functioning unit can produce life.”

Thus, life had to begin *instantaneously*, not by some *gradual* process. Parts necessary to a functional cell cannot be added over time since each part must be present simultaneously for the cell to live. This scientific fact demonstrates that the theory of evolution is utterly impossible for even the single cell, much less for the many life forms that consist of trillions of cells working together to produce life as we know it. While evolution cannot account for the complexity of life, such life is a testimony to the existence of an all wise, all powerful, infinite God!

REVIEW ACTIVITIES

*What do we mean by the term *irreducible complexity*? *How does evolution explain the complexity of life as we know it to be? *Where does functional life begin? *How many parts are known to be in a single cell? *Why could life not exist while these “parts” supposedly evolved?

3.7 Evolution Cannot Account for Human Language

The existence of human language is another witness against the viability of evolution. As noted in the discussion of DNA in a previous section, language communicates information that is *non-material* in nature. Dr. John Baumgardner notes in his essay that appears in the book, “In Six Days: Why 50 Scientists Choose to Believe in Creation:”

Language involves a symbolic code, a vocabulary, and a set of grammatical rules to relay or record thought. Many of us spend most of our waking hours generating, processing, or disseminating linguistic data. Seldom do we reflect on the fact that language structures are clear manifestations of non-material reality.

This conclusion may be reached by observing that the linguistic information itself is independent of its material carrier. The meaning or message does not depend on whether it is represented as sound waves in the air or as ink patterns on paper or as alignment of magnetic domains on a floppy disk or as voltage patterns in a transistor network. The message that a person has won the \$100,000,000 lottery is the same whether that person receives the information by someone speaking at his door or by telephone or by mail or on television or over the Internet.

*Indeed, Einstein pointed to the nature and origin of symbolic information as one of the profound questions about the world as we know it. **He could identify no means by which matter could bestow meaning to symbols.** The clear implication is that symbolic information, or language, represents a category of reality distinct from matter and energy. Linguists today, therefore, speak of this gap between matter and meaning-bearing symbol sets as the “Einstein gulf.” Today in this information age there is no debate that linguistic information is objectively real. With only a moment’s reflection we can conclude that its reality is qualitatively different from the matter/energy substrate on which the linguistic information rides . . . If something as real as linguistic information has existence independent of matter and energy, from causal considerations it is not unreasonable to suspect that an entity capable of originating linguistic information is also ultimately non-material in its essential nature.”*

The language capacity of the human race is a testimony to the fact that man is not simply a collection of physical elements. Rather, as Scripture indicates he possesses an *immaterial* nature (soul/spirit) that is the result of bearing God’s image. Since human language is non-material in nature a strictly material evolutionary process cannot account for it. On the other hand, the Biblical record of mankind possessing the ability to communicate with language from the very beginning is again consistent with what we observe in the real world. Evolution simply cannot account for the existence of human language.

REVIEW ACTIVITIES

* Are “thoughts” material or non-material in nature? * What is the “Einstein gulf”? * What does mankind’s language ability teach us about the nature of man? * Read Genesis 11:1-9. According to this passage, when did the diversity of human language appear?

3.8 Evolution is Not Viable Because the Fossil Record Does Not Support the

Theory

One of the anomalies of planet earth is the existence of billions and billions of dead creatures that at some time in the past were fossilized in the crust of the earth. We can observe this phenomenon from the North Pole to the South Pole and on every continent and ocean floor.

Evolutionists postulate that this fossil record is the result of a process known as *uniformitarianism*. This is the idea that present processes are responsible for the formation of the geological features we now see on the earth. The rates of current processes are so slow it is believed it took many millions of years to lay down the fossil record and the other geological features of the earth. Evolutionists proceed to say that the fossil record should document and provide proof of evolution over those millions of years. After all, if evolution occurred over millions of years, then it seems logical to conclude that *transitional forms* of life be found in the fossil record. **However, no true transitional forms are found in the fossil record!**

Professing evolutionists themselves admit to the necessity of a fossil record that supports the theory if it is to be taken seriously. One such man stated, *"While many inferences about evolution are derived from living organisms, we must look to the fossil record for the ultimate documentation of large-scale change. In the absence of a fossil record, the credibility of evolutionists would be severely weakened. We might wonder whether the doctrine of evolution would qualify as anything more than an outrageous hypothesis."* Again this man admits, *"The known fossil record fails to document a single example of phyletic evolution accomplishing a major morphologic transition and hence offers no evidence that the gradualistic model can be valid."* (Stephen Stanley, *Macroevolution: Pattern and Process*, pg. 332)

Not only does the fossil record fail to document the necessary transitional forms that evolution requires, but it provides ample evidence that the whole concept of uniformitarianism is false. How could slow events over very long periods of time bury billions and billions of dead creatures all over the world? The fossil record actually provides clear evidence for just the opposite scenario! The evidence for catastrophes that resulted in the *rapid* burial of vast numbers of creatures in huge fossil graveyards is now well documented.

While the fossil record is now an embarrassment for the theory of evolution it is exactly what we would expect to find on the earth if the global flood of Noah's day actually occurred. The upheaval of the world-wide flood certainly can explain how billions of dead creatures were rapidly buried and how the present geological features of the earth were formed. Again what we observe in the real world is consistent with the Biblical record, whereas the real world evidence once again contradicts the theory of evolution.

REVIEW ACTIVITIES

* What is a “transitional form?” * Why do evolutionists expect to find them in the fossil record? * What conclusion should we come to if there are no transitional forms in the record? * Read 2 Peter 3:1-6. What does Peter say the world is “willfully ignorant of?”

3.9 Evolution Requires Vast Ages for the Earth Determined by Unproven Assumptions

A very old earth and universe is an essential part of the theory of evolution. However, evolutionists themselves know that there are serious problems with the accuracy of the dating methods used to speculate about an old earth. For example, note the admission in the following quote:

*“The troubles of the radiocarbon dating method are undeniably deep and serious. Despite 35 years of technological refinement and better understanding, the underlying “assumptions” have been strongly challenged, and warnings are out that radiocarbon may soon find itself in a crisis situation. Continuing use of the method depends on a “fix-it-as-we-go” approach, allowing for contamination here, fractionation there, and calibration whenever possible. It should be no surprise, then, that fully half of the dates are rejected. The wonder is, surely, that the remaining half come to be “accepted”. . . No matter how “useful” it is, though, the radiocarbon method is still not capable of yielding accurate and reliable results. There are “gross” discrepancies, the chronology is “uneven” and “relative,” and the accepted dates are actually “selected” dates.” (Robert Lee, “Radiocarbon, Ages in Error,” *Anthropological Journal of Canada*, vol. 19, no. 3, 1981, pp. 9-29)*

Everyone needs to fully understand that the whole theory of evolution is built upon *assumptions*. Not the least of these, are the assumptions that underlie an old age for the earth. All radiometric dating methods have at least three assumptions that influence the dates assigned to rocks by scientists: 1) No original daughter element, 2) a closed system, and 3) the same decay rate throughout all time. So just how do the rock-dating experts arrive at millions or billions of years? Dr. Richard Mauger, Ph.D. in Geology, puts it this way:

“In general, dates in the “correct ball park” are assumed to be correct and are published, but those in

disagreement with other data are seldom published nor are the discrepancies fully explained.” (Dr. Richard Mauger, Contributions to Geology, vol.15(1), 1977, pg. 37, University of Wyoming)

Since evolution is not possible without millions of years, dates determined by questionable processes are calibrated to render vast old ages and “assumed to be correct!” It is important to understand that no scientist has ever proved the earth to be millions of years old. Dates for an old earth and universe are embraced out of necessity in spite of the fact that there are numerous indicators from real observational science that point to a young earth. Evolutionists remain fully committed to a belief in millions of years because without vast ages their theory is obviously impossible.

REVIEW ACTIVITIES

*What is an “assumption?” *If scientists use assumptions to establish old ages for the earth and universe, can the dates be trusted? *If the concept of millions of years contradicts the history of the Bible, how should we react? *Visit the *Answers in Genesis* website and collect two examples of known observational science that points to a young earth.

3.10 The Religious Nature of Evolution

Evolution is a philosophical belief system about the past. It is clearly built upon *assumptions* that are outside the realm of observational science. Therefore, it is *religious* in nature and should never be equated with science! As a matter of fact, in this unit ten examples from observational science are presented that clearly demonstrate the utter impossibility of molecules to man evolution. Those who cling to evolution in spite of the known facts of science do so with an incredible, fanatical, and irrational religious fervor!

The case against evolution is summed up by Berkeley University law professor Philip Johnson, who makes the following points: (1) evolution is grounded not on scientific fact, but on a philosophical belief called naturalism; (2) the belief that a large body of empirical evidence supports evolution is an illusion; (3) evolution is itself a religion; (4) if evolution were a scientific hypothesis based on a rigorous study of the evidence, it would have been abandoned long ago. (*Philip E. Johnson, Darwin on Trial/Washington, DC:Regency Gateway, 1991*)

Evolution is not based upon the scientific method (open mindedness, readiness to accept new facts, a desire to make careful observations, coming to proper conclusions based upon data drawn from repeatable and observable tests). It is therefore a *faith system*. Of course, this means it is just as “religious” as belief in special creation! The debate over origins is not one of “science” versus “religion.” Rather, it is a choice between two opposite faith systems!! The debate should be in terms of which faith system is actually supported by real, observational science. Or stated another way, *which faith system is true to the way things are*.

A faith system that constantly contradicts the known facts of real science is not rational. It should be rejected as simple myth. Such is the case with the empty rhetoric of evolution, which masquerades as science when in reality not one shred of real scientific data exists to support its claims! It may surprise you to understand why so many continue to embrace the theory of evolution, in spite of its obvious deficiencies.

Dr. Richard Lewontin, a geneticist and leading promoter of evolutionary thought, sums it up this way: *“We take the side of science . . . in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a prior commitment, a commitment to materialism. It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our “a priori” adherence to material causes . . . Moreover, that materialism is an absolute, for we **cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door** (emphasis mine; Richard Lewontin, “Billions and Billions of Demons,” The New York Review, January 9, 1997, p. 31).*

This is an obvious admission of adherence to a *blind faith* determined to reject the knowledge of God at any cost! Standing in stark contrast is the conviction of Biblical Christianity with its foundational doctrine of special creation. Yes, we exercise faith because we were not there in the beginning to witness the creation. But we have the Word of One who was there and who cannot lie. Furthermore, upon intense examination of the world around us the validity of faith in the Word of our Creator is vindicated over and over again as His Word is confirmed by what we know to be true. Our faith is not a *blind faith*, but rather it is rational and reasonable in light of repeated confirmation by observational science.

REVIEW ACTIVITIES

*Why is evolution a religion, or *faith system*? *According to Dr. Lewontin, why do evolutionists cling to their theory? *Read Romans 1:18-28. How have evolutionists changed the truth of God into a lie? * According to Romans 1:28, what are evolutionists guilty of?