

Building Our Faith Five Things Evolutionists Don't Want You to Know!

Intro: Few people today understand the power that Darwin's theory of evolution has had on society and religion in the past one hundred years. Several years ago Time magazine in an article called "Iconoclast of the Century: Charles Darwin" discussed among other things the impact of Darwin's theory of evolution on faith. The article suggested that "*Darwin didn't want to murder God, as he once put it. But he did*". Moreover it was suggested that "*Darwinism remains one of the most successful scientific theories ever promulgated*".

Many scientists have offered their hearty "amen" to these statements. Consider for example, the words of Michael Denton, the Australian molecular biologist and physician: "*As far as Christianity is concerned, the advent of the theory of evolution...was catastrophic. The decline in religious belief can probably be attributed more to the propagation and advocacy by the intellectual and scientific community of the Darwinian version of evolution than to any other single factor*" ("*The Case for Faith*", p. 89).

Those statements clearly affirm the power of evolutionary thought to undermine faith in God. Today people still commonly contend that since evolution explains life on earth, it is not necessary to resort to faith in a creator as the explanation of our existence. In a word, God isn't needed anymore.

What few people realize however is how successfully and deceptively some of the scientific community and their supporters in the media have covered up the facts, in order to keep evolution the dominant theory of origins. The issue is not science vs. religion. The issue is science vs. science.

Today I want to tell you about some of those things—things evolutionists don't want you to know! Through the years I've been routinely scolded for teaching "science" from the pulpit; but if we are to succeed in refuting those who rely upon science, we must give them answers from science along with Scripture. So with that in mind let's proceed.

Evolutionists don't want you to know that...

No reasonable answer can be given as to how life arose by chance.

Darwin's theory begins by postulating that life arose from nonliving matter as a result of some purely naturalistic, completely mechanistic, and equally mysterious process on a pre-biotic Earth. He believed that living cells were relatively simple organisms that could be formed relatively easy given enough time and the right combination of chemicals. He was wrong about that!

But someone asks, "Haven't scientists already created life in a test tube?"

People today still erroneously spout the popular myth that scientists "created life in a test tube." The reference is to the work of Stanley Miller who many years ago did a controlled experiment in which ammonia, methane, and hydrogen were isolated in a closed system in which electricity was passed through them. Stanley identified a few amino acids that resulted from the experiment. The effort was greeted with enthusiasm since amino acids are the building blocks of proteins, which in turn are the building blocks of a living cell. However NASA scientists now affirm that earth's early atmosphere consisted of water and inert gases like nitrogen and carbon dioxide. I.e. the Stanley Miller experiment has largely been discredited as stacking the deck without proof to get the necessary outcome. Now molecular biologists understand the complex sequencing that must take place in order for amino acids to become proteins.

Today the scientific community is at a "dead end" on the problem of origins. They've explored options like random chance, chemical affinity, self-ordering tendencies, seeding from outer space, vents in the ocean, and life from clay, all with the same results causing biochemist Klaus Dose, an expert in this field to say,

"More than thirty year of experimentation on the origin of life in the fields of chemical and molecular evolution have led to a better perception of the immensity of the problem of the origin of life on Earth rather than to its solution. At present all discussion on principle theories and experiments in the field either end in stalemate or in a confession of ignorance."

No provable answers exist as to how evolution took place.

Virtually all the classical Darwinian proofs of evolution have been eliminated as viable explanations of evolution.

Darwinian proofs included proofs from homology (comparative anatomy and comparative embryology). He cited vestigial organs in the body as examples of body parts that were needed by our evolutionary ancestors but not us. He observed natural selection in moths resulting in the passing on of qualities that made them fittest for survival.; and erroneously believed the Lamarckian concept that these adaptive characteristics are passed on to the next generation.

What evolutionists don't want you to know is that:

Comparative studies have not proven common descent.

The many vestigial organs of the body (at one time over 100) have been pared down to a handful.

And that natural selection can be shown to bring about

microevolution, but not macroevolution. The fact that microevolution occurs does not prove that macroevolution does.

Swedish biologist Søren Løvtrup observed:

Micromutations do occur, but the theory that these alone can account for evolutionary change is either falsified, or else it is an unfalsifiable, hence metaphysical, theory. I suppose that nobody will deny that it is a great misfortune if an entire branch of science becomes addicted to a false theory. But this is what has happened in biology.... I believe that

one day the Darwinian myth will be ranked the greatest deceit in the history of science. When this happens many people will pose the question: How did this ever happen?

The current position of evolutionary science is that evolution has occurred by sudden evolutionary “miracles” that have left no trace in the fossil record! (punctuated equilibrium)

The fossil record does not support the most obvious prediction of evolutionary theory—numerous missing links!

Darwin predicted that future science would discover in the fossil record numerous transitional forms—plants and animals in the process of evolution, animals with half-formed organs, animals in the in-between stages of one animal and another.

Science has tried in vain to find even one such transitional fossil! One of the most commonly cited is Archeopteryx, a supposed dinosaur becoming a bird.

Sir Richard Owen, the curator of the British Museum of Natural History, published his own description of this bird, saying it was

“unequivocally a bird—a peculiar and distinctive bird, but a bird nevertheless.”

Evolutionist Alan Feduccia stated:

“Paleontologists have tried to turn Archaeopteryx into an earth-bound, feathered dinosaur. But it’s not. It is a bird, a perching bird. And no amount of ‘paleobabble’ is going to change that”.

The geologic strata do not present a gradual formation of life-forms from the simplest to the most complex.

In the lowest fossil strata of the earth appear a creature called the “trilobite”; but even this simple fossil animal has numerous complex features.

One of the great difficulties in the geologic strata is an explosion of numerous life forms in the so-called Cambrian strata that have no fossils in the pre-Cambrian layer. The implication is the sudden creation of these life-forms. Even Richard Dawkins, the one who I told you last month called believers "unsophicates" confessed:

The Cambrian strata of rocks, vintage about 600 million years [evolutionists are now dating the beginning of the Cambrian at about 530 million years], are the oldest in which we find most of the major invertebrate groups. And we find many of them already in an advanced state of evolution, the very first time they appear. It is as though they were just planted there, without any evolutionary history. Needless to say, this appearance of sudden planting has delighted creationists”.

That the facts of science are compatible with the Biblical explanations of life on earth.

In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. (Gen. 1:1)

If indeed the origin of life is God, then we would expect that there is no natural explanation available that will adequately explain the rise of life from non-living matter. So far, there is none! Instead there is an emerging body of scientists who in their investigation of what they now term the "irreducible complexity" of cell biology are more convinced than ever that life could not have come into being by accident and are now scientific advocates for what is being called "intelligent design."

Nothing in the creation account gives the impression that God's creation of animal life took place over millions of years.

And God created the great sea monsters, and every living creature that moves, with which the waters swarmed after their kind, and every winged bird after its kind; and God saw that it was good. (Gen. 1:21)

And God made the beasts of the earth after their kind, and the cattle after their kind, and everything that creeps on the ground after its kind; and God saw that it was good. (Gen. 1:25)

If indeed God created all these kinds at the same time not separated by millions of years, what would the fossil record show? The existence of major animals groups together!

"God made the beasts of the earth after their kind"

If indeed God created ordered groupings--mechanisms for "kinds" of animals to reproduce and placed genetic barriers which prevent reproduction to form new "kinds," what would the fossil record show? No transitional forms and animals in fully functional form!

So what is it that evolutionists don't want you to know? That there is a scientific theory that harmonizes best with the facts of science—the theory of creationism!

Conclusion: How is it possible that a theory popularized over a century ago has remained the primary answer to the origin of man in spite of its obvious difficulties? The answer is very simple: The only other reasonable answer is that God created man in his own image; and many who want to choose their own way of life find that unacceptable.

Macroevolution as an explanation of the origin of all things and as an alternative to God's creation is not a harmless theory. If macroevolution has taken place there are implications that I think are unbearable for human beings. William Provine of Cornell University suggested these five:

There's no evidence for God

There's no life after death

There's no absolute foundation for right and wrong

There're no ultimate meaning for life

There's no such thing as free will.

Of course, if macroevolution remains unprovable as an explanation for life without God, then the opposite is true:

God exists!

There can be life after death.

*There is an absolute foundation for right and wrong.
There is ultimate meaning to life.
There is human free will.*