

EVOLUTION
as
RELIGION

From a Creationist Perspective

By Michael Weeks

2022

EVOLUTION as RELIGION

From a Creationist Perspective

By Michael Weeks

2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Evolution versus the Bible	3
2. Evolutionist Religious Talk	11
3. Why It Matters	17
Appendix – Christian Evolutionists	25
Endnotes	31

Bible references are from the King James Version

Chapter 1

Evolution Versus the Bible

There is a war raging in the world of science. The war has many names –evolution against the Bible, science against religion, faith against fact, and so forth. This is a serious war, and it is escalating. Secular scientists often portray this war as the creationist’s flimsy faith against the evolutionist’s solid facts. Secular authors of all breeds continue to criticize anything from the Bible, but their biggest criticism, of course, is about the creation account in the Bible. Evolution has disproven the Bible, and anyone who believes the Bible is deluded. Or so they say. However, evolutionists now have their own creation story, their own prophets and doctrines, and their own sense of spirituality. The theory of evolution has become a religion, in every sense of the word. That changes the real nature of the war.

Most evolutionists will deny that evolution is a religion, especially if they are atheists. Atheists shun the word “religion” like water repels oil. If you happen to be an atheist, I ask you to continue reading. You may find this enlightening. I will try to show, in a respectful way, that evolution in its totality is a secular religion. It may rest upon scientific facts, but it can venture far beyond the facts into matters of faith and inspiration. This first chapter will explain the conflict, the second chapter will highlight religious words used by evolutionists themselves, and the third chapter will delve into why it matters. Is this worth talking about? Creationists do think it is worth talking about, because all these things are so obvious to the observant person. I am a young-earth Christian who accepts the Bible as the one and only Word of God. I also love science. I have studied geology and paleontology all of my life and am well-read on these subjects. I have read as many books by evolutionists as I have by creationists, including *On the Origin of Species*. I have read the full spectrum, and I will try to share some of what I’ve seen.

In this essay I will define biological evolution as classic, Darwinian evolution as it is taught in our universities. Creationists will accept microevolution and speciation, but Darwinian evolution is about the origin of life, creatures evolving into different kinds of creatures, and apes evolving into humans. On a larger scale, evolution could apply to the formation of the entire universe. The evolutionary sciences are completely naturalistic; anything non-physical (like the God of the Bible) is never allowed. Anything that could hint at something non-physical is quickly censored. Secular evolutionists oppose intelligent design proponents (who do not use the Bible) just as much as they oppose biblical creationists. Almost without exception, if a scientific approach is not naturalistic it is strongly opposed and censored by evolutionists. No dissension is allowed.

Why are evolutionists so opposed to any critique of their theory? The answer is simple: Dissenters are critiquing their religion, and people are very sensitive about their religion. Secular scientists are supposed to be open to new ideas and methods, but they refuse to consider anything that could be against their religion. Ultimately, this is a clash between two very different religious

worldviews – secular evolution and biblical creation. No other religions of the world will enter the picture.

This war began with the book that evolutionists consider their Bible, *On the Origin of Species*, by Charles Darwin. His book was the declaration of war. Darwin tried to show that the creative power in nature was natural selection over great lengths of time. In his early life Darwin became a deist. This meant God may be some kind of creator, but He will not get involved in the creation. Deism opened up Darwin's mind to the self-creation needed for evolution.¹ Later in life Darwin became an agnostic and viewed his book as a liberator from the established religions of his day.² His theory changed the world; if God was no longer needed in nature, He was no longer needed for anything. Most followers of Darwin are called Darwinists in nearly the same sense that followers of Christ are called Christians. Darwinists are devoted to Darwin and celebrate both his birthday in 1809 and the appearance of his book in 1859.

After the publishing of his book Darwin rapidly gained a following in England, Germany, and America. Perhaps his greatest ally was Thomas Huxley. Huxley was agnostic and was the one who invented that word. Huxley is often called "Darwin's Bulldog" because he was English and fiercely loyal to Darwin. Darwin was reserved in public, but Huxley was outgoing. He became an evangelist for Darwin and could be likened to the apostle Paul. According to modern evolutionist Michael Ruse, Huxley had a similar conversion experience, except it was a conversion to Darwinism. He spent the rest of his life lecturing about Darwinism to both laypeople and scientists.³ He felt compelled to spread the message. Although he was agnostic, he was not anti-Bible, because he supported the moral teachings of the Bible. Huxley's lectures are available today in a book titled *Lectures and Lay Sermons*.

Sir Julian Huxley, the grandson of Thomas Huxley, was agnostic and was also a famous evolutionist. In the twentieth century the theory of evolution was the reigning scientific paradigm, and Huxley took it even farther. He turned it into something religious. In his mind Christianity was obsolete, but people still needed to believe in something, like the potential of human beings. People don't need Christianity to feel the sacredness of things. In 1957 he wrote *Religion Without Revelation* to promote his humanistic views. The subtitle of the book says,

One of the twentieth century's greatest scientists and philosophers goes beyond skepticism to affirm a humanistic faith based on man, intelligence, and the scientific method.

His faith flowed from the theory of evolution rather than Scriptures. Huxley wrote, "The *Origin of Species* is to-day a good deal more profitable as theology than the first chapter of Genesis..."⁴ Why profitable? Perhaps because it replaced the God of the Bible. In humanism man can become his own god and seek his own promotion. Huxley wrote that humanity's sacred duty is to promote the evolutionary process and, especially, to promote the evolution of human possibilities.⁵ Huxley ended his book with these words:

*My grandfather, in the famous essay in which he defined agnosticism, stated as self-evident that 'every man should be able to give a reason for the faith that is in him.' My faith is in the possibilities of man: I hope that I have here succeeded in stating some of my reasons for that faith.*⁶

Evolution is similar to Christianity in that there are core beliefs but many varieties and opinions. Some modern evolutionists will disagree with Huxley's humanist faith. Still, many evolutionists do hold to some kind of progress in the natural world that can be projected onto humanity. If animals are becoming more advanced, then human societies should become more advanced. There is a look to the future. We can build better humans and a better world. Of course, modern evolutionists would renounce Hitler and his superior Aryan race, but progress has several possibilities.

On the other hand, for many more, the current emphasis seems to be going in the other direction. Instead of being gods, humans are mere animals with little value. Indeed, while evolutionists claim that all creatures are equal in value because of their natural kinship, evolutionists seem to devalue humans. An endangered mouse can be more important than an unborn human baby. Instead of looking to the future, these evolutionists will look to the past to find how humans are related to apes. Christians will show that humans bear the image of God (Gen. 1:26,27). Evolutionists will try to show that humans bear the image of primates, or fish, or even protozoa. Humans have been linked to all three in evolutionary writings. Even these things can arouse religious feelings. Evolutionists can gain a spirituality from this connection to nature and its assumed evolution. They have mentioned this connection many times.

Perhaps surprisingly, modern atheists and agnostics often feel a reverence for nature. Although this essay is about evolution, by extension it can be about atheism and agnosticism. They are intimately woven into the fabric of evolution. If evolutionists refuse to bow the knee to God, they will still do so to nature. For example, consider the words of Carl Sagan. Sagan was an American astronomer, author, and the creator of the popular television series *Cosmos* (1980). Sagan was an agnostic, if not an atheist. One of his books is *The Demon-Haunted World* (1996), in which he wrote of his "reverence and awe" of Nature (he capitalized nature).⁷ Sagan freely used the word "spiritual," although he asserted that spiritual feelings come from matter and not from an immaterial soul:

*"Spirit" comes from the Latin word "to breathe." What we breathe is air, which is certainly matter, however thin. Despite usage to the contrary, there is no necessary implication in the word "spiritual" that we are talking of anything other than matter (including the matter of which the brain is made), or anything outside the realm of science. On occasion, I will feel free to use the word. Science is not only compatible with spirituality; it is a profound source of spirituality. When we recognize our place in an immensity of light-years and in the passage of ages, when we grasp the intricacy, beauty, and subtlety of life, then that soaring feeling, that sense of elation and humility combined, is surely spiritual.*⁸

Evolutionary biologist and author Jerry A. Coyne has said similar things. Coyne is a professor at the University of Chicago and is an atheist in the same vein as Richard Dawkins and Christopher Hitchens. One of Coyne's goals is to keep religion out of science. Two of his books are *Why Evolution is True* (2009) and *Faith vs. Fact* (2015). Although he denies the existence of the soul, in both books he admits to feeling spiritual about nature. Coyne wrote,

If emotion, awe, wonder, and yearning are considered “spirituality,” then call me spiritual, for I often feel the same “frisson in the breast” described by Richard Dawkins, a die-hard atheist, as his own form of spirituality. But emotionality isn’t the same as religious belief in the divine or the supernatural...⁹

As a Bible-believing creationist, and as a writer, I find the comments by Sagan and Coyne rather strange. They are trying to create a non-spiritual spirituality. In truth, spirituality always describes the yearnings of the soul, and the soul is immaterial. Spirituality can be pagan, Hindu, Native American, Christian, and a host of other things, but it always refers to the soul. At this point I will not distinguish between the spirit and the soul; my point is that spiritual yearnings cannot arise from atoms and matter. Atoms cannot feel reverence and awe or think in any way, they can only obey the physics of the situation, like oxygen and hydrogen bonding to form water. My answer to Sagan is that it doesn’t matter what the Latin word means, the spiritual reality originates from something beyond matter. In *Webster’s New World Dictionary*, the first definition of spiritual is “of the spirit or the soul as distinguished from the body or material matters.”¹⁰ Words have meanings, and the meanings should stay.

When atheists and others feel a reverence for nature, they are expressing their religion. Almost every human has some kind of religious feeling. God has created humans in His image. Since He is spiritual, humans are spiritual in a general sense, and they must express that spiritual nature in some way. Perhaps evolutionists could invent new words to describe their feelings, in place of “spiritual,” but even those new words would be describing their religion. Even militant atheists feel there is something out there beyond themselves that awakens their emotions. Everyone believes in an absolute reality; something that exists in and of itself. That reality can then become a creative force, whether it wants to be or not. Someone or something must be a creator. Those who deny the Creator will ascribe the same creative powers to natural processes and great lengths of time.

I can testify to this. As a young geology student in the early 1970s I collected Lower Cambrian fossils far out in the California desert. At that time, I was not a Christian. The area itself was very barren and primeval looking. The fossils were trilobites from a time when life was said to be barren and primeval. I was taught the fossils I was finding were 600 million years old, the earliest forms in the great progression of life. 600 million years is a very, very long time. After being trapped in stone for all that time, I was the one who set them free. As I sat on that ancient ground, looking at the beautiful fossils in my hands, a profound spiritual feeling came over me. I felt a connection, not only to the creatures, but to the millions of years stretching back to them. This is what most evolutionists will feel today, and I understand what they feel. I disagree with them, but I understand. The experience of evolution can be a personal, religious experience, and it is defended like any other religion.

Although secular sciences are supposed to be naturalistic in their methodologies, that is not the main reason God is excluded. God is excluded because God is not wanted. It is a personal choice, not a professional choice. Such scientists, and the public they influence, must find something to replace the God of the Bible. Some possibilities include the following:

- The wonders of the entire natural world, resulting in some kind of nature worship.
- Something specific in nature, like the alleged big bang. One example comes from Robert M. Hazen, evolutionist, professor of Earth Sciences, and author of *The Story of Earth* (2012). In his book, Hazen made this comment about the evolutionary big bang:
*That moment of creation remains the most elusive, incomprehensible, defining event in the history of the universe. It was a singularity—a transformation from nothing to something that remains beyond the purview of modern science or the logic of mathematics. If you would search for signs of a creator god in the cosmos, the Big Bang is the place to start.*¹¹
- Natural selection and the processes of evolution. Just like the big bang, natural selection is considered a creative force that eliminates the need for God. Evolutionary philosopher Michael Ruse (2009) wrote,
*Darwin’s mechanism of natural selection offers an alternative to the god hypothesis. It is agreed that the living world is designlike, but it is argued that this is because of natural selection rather than God. No longer is the best explanation the Christian god.*¹²
- Science itself. Many unbelievers look to science the way that Christians look to God. Secular science offers them a creation story and an authority to seek. It can answer the same questions the Bible answers, albeit in very different ways. In short, it tries to replace God. Thomas Huxley spoke about this right after the *Origin of Species* was published in 1859. He was experiencing opposition to evolution from English parsons, or pastors. In response, Huxley wrote,
*Theology and Parsondom...are in my mind the natural and irreconcilable enemies of Science. Few see it but I believe we are on the eve of a new Reformation and if I have a wish to live 30 yrs, it is to see the God of Science on the necks of her enemies.*¹³

I have quoted these people exactly, and you will notice they often refuse to capitalize the God of the Bible. Regarding Huxley’s quote, modern evolutionists tend to be more subtle, but the sentiment remains the same. Evolutionists continually predict the defeat of the Bible. Huxley used some very religious imagery in his statement. He deified science by capitalizing it, he wanted a new Reformation to replace religion, and he may have copied Romans 16:20, where Satan is subdued underfoot by God’s people (“And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly...”). Both Thomas Huxley and Romans 16:20 are describing a warfare between primal enemies.

The Bible, however, is not against science as a system of learning. Creationists are very much in favor of proper science, after all, it was Bible-believing Christians who gave birth to the world of science. Scientists like Kepler, Newton, Pasteur, and many others pursued science with great passion, all to the glory of God. Their science brought them closer to God, not away from Him. The Bible is not the enemy of science, it is the friend of science. The Bible inspires science. The error of evolutionists is confusing the pursuit of science with the theory of evolution. Christians can do the one without the other, but secular evolutionists cannot. Evolution fills their world.

My point about the Bible is worth emphasizing. The Scriptures compel people to use their minds and study the creation. Indeed, the Bible is the book of the mind. Before the creation, God existed as the eternal Mind – in completeness, wisdom, and holiness. Whatever else He may have

been, He was Mind. By the power of His mind, He spoke everything into existence. Then He spoke to his people in clear, rational revelations. There was no slow evolution of language and thought. Right from the beginning, people could relate to God with their minds. Even after the entrance of sin into the world, people could still find God if they sought Him with their hearts and minds. The Scriptures say we can *know* God (e.g. Jer. 9:23,24, Jn. 17:3), and to know is to use the mind. Furthermore, we can know His creation through the pursuits of science. God created us with the compulsion for science – we are always curious and always reaching. Hence, as we learn more of creation, we learn more of Him. Science depends on phenomena that are orderly and consistent, and those are only possible with the God of the Bible. A random self-creation could only create randomness. Jonathan Sarfati, a creation scientist with Creation Ministries International, put it this way:

*The historical basis of modern science depended on the assumption that the universe was made by a rational Creator. An orderly universe makes perfect sense only if it were made by an orderly Creator...*¹⁴

When Christian scientists study nature they glorify God; they thank Him for His power, His love, and His infinite creativity. Who do secular scientists glorify when they study nature? They seem to glorify everything except the Creator. Often, they glorify science, that is, *their* science, and *their* efforts, but to glorify science is to glorify themselves. How sad that unbelievers who enjoy the wonders of creation refuse to thank their Creator. Something of God can be seen in every facet of His creation, yet they refuse to thank Him. How very sad.

Evolutionists often complain about the faith of Christians, as opposed to the facts of secular science. Atheist Jerry A. Coyne emphasized this in his book *Faith vs. Fact – Why Science and Religion Are Incompatible* (2015). Coyne defines faith as believing something without verifiable evidence.¹⁵ In his mind nothing in the Bible is verifiable, while everything in secular science is based on evidential facts and solid reason. Atheist Richard Dawkins makes similar accusations about Christians. Creationists, especially, will hear this one: Christians believe whatever they want to believe. In great contrast, according to Dawkins, atheists have no faith whatsoever.¹⁶ They claim to be ruled by unassailable truth.

There are several ways, however, in which evolutionists are mistaken. They exercise faith all the time. Scientists can study life in the present, and they continue to make exciting discoveries, but they cannot study past life in the same ways. They can study fossils, but fossils require interpretation and guesswork. The past is one domain where evolutionists must exercise faith, in the way they define faith. Past events cannot be observed, tested, or repeated. No evolutionist can explain the origin of life, although many have tried. No evolutionist can explain the origin of photosynthesis, the origin of eukaryote cells, the origin of animal cells and the utilization of oxygen, the origin of sexual reproduction, the origin of metazoans, the Cambrian explosion, the origin of flight, the origin of flowers and their pollinators, the origin of warm blood (endothermy), the origin of consciousness, and a great many other events in the history of evolution. Evolutionists believe a myriad of things happened in the past, yet they have no verifiable evidence to support those beliefs. Many evolutionary beliefs are accepted because they are necessary, not because they are verifiable.

Space prevents me from elaborating on the previous list, but I may write about them in a future paper. That list could be much longer. Evolutionists can say when these events appear in the fossil record, but they cannot explain how and why they evolved. One thing is obvious as I study evolution – the core story of evolution is primary, while the evidence is secondary, or even unnecessary. Indeed, the evidence continually changes with new discoveries and new theories, but the story remains intact. Evolutionary belief always precedes evidence. I call that faith.

A great example is the naturalistic origin of life. From Charles Darwin to the present, scientists have tried to prove the origin of life. Countless attempts have been made in the laboratory. Despite claims of progress from the faithful, nothing has been created that can lead to a living, replicating cell. Most evolutionists are honest about this. In addition, NASA is spending billions of dollars to try to find an origin of life elsewhere in the solar system. To a creationist, the evolutionary community appears desperate in their attempts to justify their faith. Evolutionists Jeffrey L. Bada and Antonio Lazcano study the origin of life in the tome called *Evolution – The First Four Billion Years* (2009). They write,

Although there have been considerable advances in the understanding of chemical processes that may have taken place before the emergence of the first living entities, life's beginnings are still shrouded in mystery. Like vegetation in a mangrove swamp, the roots of universal phylogenetic trees are submerged in the muddy waters of the prebiotic broth, and how the transition from the non-living to the living took place is still unknown.¹⁷

That sentiment remains unchanged. Some evolutionists will say we may not know about the origin of life now, but given enough time and research, we will know in the future. Evolutionists are optimistic about the future, but that also is an expression of faith. Once again, they are certain of something they cannot prove.

Other evolutionists will use molecular clocks to study evolutionary relationships. By comparing DNA sequences evolutionists will claim that certain animals split off from a common ancestor at a certain time in the past. For instance, they claim that humans and chimpanzees both split from a common ancestor about 6 million years ago.¹⁸ Evolutionist authors often propose the existence of a last common ancestor. The problem is that evolutionists cannot identify that last common ancestor. It is always unknown in the fossil record. Thus, common ancestors are expressions of faith.

I will offer only more. Atheists state emphatically there is no God. No matter how they word it, that is what they say. What is their evidence? No atheist can prove there is no God. They might say I can't prove there *is* a God (which I feel I can), but that is not the point. To claim there is no God is an expression of faith. They make their claim without any verifiable evidence. It means they have not explored every option for God in the whole realm of human experience, thought, and science. As I have briefly shown, unbelievers of all breeds have their own kind of faith and their own kind of religious fervor.

There are many things, I must say, that I admire about evolutionists. They have made great discoveries and have vastly increased human knowledge. One example is the wonders of DNA. However, discoveries can stir up strange interpretations, such as the claimed ability of DNA to

create itself in the first place. Exaggerations from the secular media can compound the problem. Still, the public trusts scientists. Secular scientists have gained an authority in the world that is greater than any established religion. For that trusting public, the lab coat of the scientist has replaced the robe of the priest. Even within many churches, the theory of evolution has replaced the Bible, and people now look to secular science for truth and guidance. Evolutionist Mary Midgley wrote about things like this in her book *Evolution as a Religion* (1985). She wrote about Jacques Monod, an atheist biochemist, and his desire to replace religion with evolutionary science. Monod wrote his well-known book about evolution, *Chance and Necessity*, in 1971. When Monod spoke of replacing religion, he was referring to Christianity and the influence of the Bible. Midgley wrote,

*In effect, Monod is proposing that objective scientific knowledge should replace religion, not only as a source of knowledge of the world, but also as a source of authority which determines the whole of man's being, even his innermost feelings and aspirations.*¹⁹

Whether evolutionists are atheists or just secular, they hope to supplant the Bible and make their science our only authority. Evolution is found everywhere: it is in printed media, on television and in cinema, in our educational systems, in our museums, on signs in our national parks, on the Internet, and in our court systems. Sometimes evolution is even preached inside so-called Christian churches. As we all know, any critique of it will start a new battlefield. It has become a worldwide religion, even if it has no real god. Religions don't need deities; they just need something sacred to inspire reverence and awe. Religions give people a sense of belonging and a loyalty that drives them on in life, and people are loyal to whatever created them. Furthermore, religions impart a feeling of safety, and nothing feels safer than escaping the holy God of the Bible. The next two chapters will further emphasize the religious nature of evolution and how it affects our world.

Chapter 2

Evolutionist Religious Talk

Evolutionists who write books about evolution will sometimes criticize both creationists and the Bible. For some reason they consider themselves experts on the Bible. They say the Bible is a primitive book about a Bronze Age deity, or they say Jesus Christ did not rise from the grave. At the same time, evolutionists will insert religious words into their writings; words which Christians often use to describe their faith and life. That is, secular evolutionists will borrow words from Christians, and they use these words in a natural and sincere way. Consider the following quotes. The following examples are either from well-known evolutionists or those closely associated with them. I will show the words in context, rather than merely listing the words. I try to be accurate and respectful in quoting these people.

1. BORN AGAIN. Lance Gregorchuck wrote *Born Again Atheist* (2012). His is a vitriolic book that tries to paint a dark picture of the Bible. He condemns Israel's conquest of Canaan and defends evolution as the explanation for everything. He even criticizes Christ for wanting to forgive sinners.²⁰ He writes,

*The only people who have the right to claim any sort of born again status are Atheists.*²¹

Atheists will criticize Israel's conquest of ungodly nations after the Exodus, but they will also ignore the many millions of people murdered by atheistic regimes during the twentieth century. Gregorchuck is not the only atheist to call himself born again.

2. DOCTRINE. Thomas Nagel is a Professor of Philosophy at New York University. He, also, is an atheist, but he is very respectful. In his book *Mind and Cosmos* (2012), Nagel is an evolutionist, but he criticizes naturalistic Darwinism. He writes about the standard view of evolution as a popular doctrine:

*Whatever one may think about the possibility of a designer, the prevailing doctrine – that the appearance of life from dead matter and its evolution through accidental mutation and natural selection to its present forms has involved nothing but the operation of physical law – cannot be regarded as unassailable. It is an assumption governing the scientific project rather than a well-confirmed scientific hypothesis.*²²

3. DOGMA. Nick Lane is a popular evolutionist and Professor of Evolutionary Biochemistry at University College London. He wrote *Power, Sex, Suicide* (2018), which is a book about mitochondria in eukaryote cells. Lane refers to Francis Crick, who was co-discoverer of the structure of DNA in 1953. Lane writes:

*The information encoded in DNA spells out the molecular structure of proteins. This, said Crick, is the 'central dogma' of all biology: genes code for proteins...Proteins are the crowning glory of life.*²³

Another evolutionist worth quoting is G. A. Kerkut, who wrote *Implications of Evolution* in 1960. Kerkut was professor of Physiology and Biochemistry at the University of Southampton. The old evolutionists were more open about the religious nature of evolution. In his book, Kerkut playfully addresses the typical college student's allegiance to evolution:

*He also would take it rather badly when I suggest that he is not being very scientific in his outlook if he swallows the latest scientific dogma and, when questioned, just repeats parrot fashion the views of the current Archbishop of Evolution. In fact he would be behaving like certain of those religious students he affects to despise. He would be taking on faith what he could not intellectually understand and when questioned would appeal to authority, the authority of a "good book" which in this case was The Origin of Species.*²⁴

4. GOD. Many secular scientists believe that evolution has replaced the Creator in the Bible. They will give the universe the attributes of God and will claim that natural selection and other processes have creative powers. Evolutionist Stuart A. Kauffman writes about this in his book *Reinventing the Sacred* (2008). He is a director of the Institute for Biocomplexity and Informatics and a professor at the University of Calgary. Kauffman denies the Creator but retains the name of God for the emerging creativity of nature. Evolution becomes God. In this position Kauffman goes far beyond what other evolutionists have said. He then becomes evangelistic and calls on everyone to adopt his view. The theme of his book is shown in the following:

*Is it, then, more amazing to think that an Abrahamic transcendent, omnipotent, omniscient God created everything around us, all that we participate in, in six days, or that it all arose with no transcendent Creator God, all on its own? I believe the latter is so stunning, so overwhelming, so worthy of awe, gratitude, and respect, that it is God enough for many of us. God, a fully natural God, is the very creativity in the universe. It is this view that I hope can be shared across all our religious traditions, embracing those like myself, who do not believe in a Creator God, as well as those who do. This view of God can be a shared religious and spiritual space for us all.*²⁵

5. HOLY SITES. There are fossil sites around the world that are considered very special to paleontologists. British paleontologist Richard Fortey talked about one in his book with the simple title of *Life* (1997). The site is the town and area of Ludlow in Wales, as Fortey refers to the evolution of life from water to the land:

*There are some places which are considered holy sites for palaeontologists. The town of Ludlow in the Welsh Borderland is one of these shrines: it was in the vicinity of Ludlow that many of the important stories concerning the conquest of dry land by plants and animals were constructed from clues found in the Late Silurian rocks.*²⁶

Another such site is the Burgess Shale quarry in British Columbia, where beautiful Cambrian fossils are found. The public is allowed to visit on paid, guided hikes, but only the select few evolutionists may enter to stay and collect fossils.

6. PIOUS. Simon Conway Morris is a British scientist and professor at the University of Cambridge. He is a Christian evolutionist who opposes both creationism and atheism. He wrote

Life's Solution (2003), wherein he comments on the outspoken atheist, Richard Dawkins. Conway Morris refers to certain atheists as ultra-Darwinists:

Third, as has often been noted, the pronouncements of the ultra-Darwinists can shake with a religious fervour. Richard Dawkins is arguably England's most pious atheist. Their texts ring with high-minded rhetoric and dire warnings – not least of the unmitigated evils of religion – all to reveal the path of simplicity and straight thinking. More than one commentator has noted that ultra-Darwinism has pretensions to a secular religion, but it may be noted that, however heartfelt the practitioners' feelings, it is also without religious or metaphysical foundations.²⁷

7. PRIESTS. Jane Hawking was the wife of British physicist Stephen Hawking and wrote about her life with him in *Music to Move the Stars* (2000). She could be described as a liberal Christian, although her opinion about evolution is unclear. She experienced firsthand the scientific world of her husband and has this to say about the secular scientists she knew:

The complexity of their calculations and the admiration their discoveries have attracted have led some of them to fall into the trap of believing that science has become a substitute for religion and that, as its great high priests, they can claim to have all the answers to all the questions. However, because of their reluctance to admit spiritual and philosophical values, some of them do not appear to be aware of the nature of some of the questions.²⁸

Sometimes a particular person is called an evolutionary priest, for whatever reason. Evolutionist Michael Ruse wrote about Thomas Huxley and his lay sermons to the masses. Using his “scientific priesthood,” Huxley competed against the Salvation Army for credibility.²⁹ More recently, paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould has been very popular. British evolutionist Richard Fortey writes about Gould, saying, “If palaeontology has a priesthood, then Steve Gould is the pontiff.”³⁰

8. TREE OF LIFE. The Bible has a tree of life featured prominently in Eden (Gen. 2:9) and in heaven (Rev. 22:2). Evolutionists have their own tree of life to illustrate how life evolves and spreads out over many branches. All evolutionists try to contribute to an understanding of the evolutionary tree of life. Michael Ruse mentions this in *The Evolution-Creation Struggle*:

Following earlier biologists in adapting a Christian metaphor for his own use, Darwin's picture of evolution was of a tree of life, reaching ever upward.³¹

9. TRUTH. Secular evolutionists, as the new priests, are trying to introduce new truth to replace the Word of God. Julian Huxley wrote about this in *Religion Without Revelation*:

Another postulate of modern thought is that truth is not revealed once and for all, but has to be progressively discovered. This is itself a scientific discovery, and one of the first magnitude. It is also an inevitable consequence of our basic hypothesis of evolutionary naturalism; and the fact that modern science has resulted in the progressive discovery of new and more truth is a confirmation of that hypothesis.³²

Huxley was referring to more than scientific knowledge; he was referring to who we are and how we should live as human beings. He was trying to promote a new, humanistic religion.

10. WORSHIP. Jane Hawking travelled the world with her famous husband and witnessed firsthand the zeal of both secular scientists and students. Most of them were firm evolutionists, especially concerning the formation of the universe. In her book she recalls the scene at the California Institute of Technology, or Caltech, where Stephen Hawking was speaking in 1974:

*Caltech is par excellence a temple where devotees come to worship at the altar of the gods and goddesses of science, particularly physics, to the exclusion of all else.*³³

And so forth. These items are the tip of the iceberg for the religious expressions of evolutionists. They use religious words and thoughts all the time. Even the new atheists like Richard Dawkins and Jerry Coyne use religious words. In *The Greatest Show on Earth* (2009), Dawkins wrote about the need for radioactive dating methods, or clocks, to calculate the deep time ages of rocks. He says, “And, praise be, nature has provided us with just the wide range of clocks that we need.”³⁴ “Praise be” is religious talk. I don’t know who an atheist praises, but not even creationists talk that way.

I have not used any quotes by creationists or proponents of intelligent design, but they refer to evolutionists in much the same ways. Creation and intelligent design scientists – who are the dissenters – have even used religious words to describe how they are treated by the evolution establishment. Here are a few things that dissenters have said:

- Evolutionists are the *true believers* (in evolution).³⁵
- Dissenters are considered *heretics* by evolutionists.³⁶
- In academia, hesitation about Darwinism is considered the *unpardonable sin*.³⁷
- In academia, an evolutionist professor can conduct a *witch hunt* against a dissenter.³⁸
- In academia and industry, unrepentant dissenters may be reprimanded or discharged. Several books have been written on this subject of evolutionary retribution.

Some evolutionists might object to all this by saying their faith is different. If they have a faith in evolution, it is a personal faith. They might say evolution is not an organized faith like Christianity. Really? If that were true the points made in the last paragraph would not need to be written, either by those authors or by me. I have observed the following:

- Christians are more tolerant of criticism than evolutionists. In the world it is acceptable to criticize Christianity, but not evolution.
- Evolutionary institutions have their own brand of doctrinal statements that professors, employees, and students must adhere to, whether written down or not.
- Evolution, and not Christianity, controls the educational and court systems of the world. Evolution has more authority in governments and academia than the Bible.
- The evolutionary establishment has more solidarity than Christianity has at present. Evolutionists often communicate with each other through conferences and publications.
- Evolution institutions, like our educational systems and NASA, are funded by taxpayers.
- Evolutionists can display an unreasonable zeal. They will label creationists and intelligent design proponents as “anti-evolutionists” and “anti-science.” In addition to that, many evolutionists, in unison, will mock creationists without mercy.

The theory of evolution is more than science; it is a secular religion. It has many of the characteristics of religion and its followers act religious. Julian Huxley said, “I find myself driven to use the language of religion.”³⁹ Most evolutionists feel the same way. We could say they believe in evolutionism, but many evolutionists reject that word because it sounds too philosophical. One might even say that evolution has its own denominations. Some evolutionists view evolution as completely chemical and unintentional, some view it as having the qualities of a mind that is intentional, some view it as pantheistic, and some view it as theistic. Yet they will all, somehow, hold to a naturalistic interpretation of nature.

Most evolutionists of 2022, if they read this study, will naturally become angry and protest vigorously. Classical, Darwinian evolution is supposed to be against all the traditional concepts of religious faith. It is supposed to *liberate* people and give them new, secular identities. Some evolutionists would say the quotes I refer to are old and irrelevant today. My response is that most of my quotes are not that old, and they come from well-known and respected people in their scientific fields. I can also say that evolutionists quote each other all the time, going even farther back than I have. Sometimes they agree and sometimes they disagree, but they quote people just as often as the dissenters.

This study cannot consider the beliefs of every person; it is intended to give a wide view of evolutionists as a community. Perhaps some secularists are completely void of any religious sentiment, but I doubt that is true. Everyone has a worldview that controls their interpretations and feelings. We all feel the same emotions and the same sense of worship, even though we worship different things. We all have a belief system that can be called a faith. There is a Christian faith and an atheist faith. For example, there is an interesting statement by George Klein, author of *The Atheist and the Holy City* (1990). (The city is Jerusalem.) Klein was a microbiologist, an evolutionist, and a Jew who lived through the horrors of World War II. He was also an atheist. A Christian once told him that God’s nonexistence cannot be proven, so he should call himself an agnostic. This was Klein’s reply:

*I am not an agnostic. I am indeed an atheist. My attitude is not based on science but rather on faith, just as you have your faith. The absence of a creator, the nonexistence of God is my childhood faith, my adult belief, unshakable and holy. My faith is based on my experiences that have convinced me of the power of wishful thinking, our inability and aversion to accept hard facts, our desire to find extenuating circumstances.*⁴⁰

Evolutionist John C. Greene wrote about the religious nature of evolution in his book *Debating Darwin* (1999). He was a friend of Ernst Mayr, a popular advocate of the Neo-Darwinism school of thought in the latter part of the twentieth century. Greene saw similarities between Julian Huxley and Mayr:

*Mayr upholds a world view similar in many ways to Huxley’s, but different in important respects. Like Huxley, he looks to science, and especially to evolutionary biology, to loosen the grip of traditional religions and idealistic philosophies on modern thought and to provide a scientific basis for a new ethics, a new secular faith, and a new image of humankind.*⁴¹

Ernst Mayr was an atheist who wasn't afraid to call himself religious. Mayr felt that religion is not about God, necessarily, it is simply a person's basic belief system. In 1989 Mayr wrote, "And every scientist I know, no matter much of an atheist he may be, has religion."⁴²

I conclude with a quote by Michael Ruse, who is an evolutionist, an agnostic, and a Professor of Philosophy. Ruse is no friend of creationists; he has testified in court against creationism and intelligent design. At the same time, Ruse has been very open about the religious aspects of evolution. He has written books on the subject, such as *The Evolution-Creation Struggle* (2005), *Darwinism as Religion* (2017), and *A Meaning to Life* (2019). That last one is almost devotional in nature. In 2000, Ruse commented on this subject and referred to Duane Gish, a popular creationist author and debater:

*Evolution is promoted by its practitioners as more than mere science. Evolution is promulgated as an ideology, a secular religion – a full-fledged alternative to Christianity, with meaning and morality. I am an ardent evolutionist and an ex-Christian, but I must admit that in this one complaint – and Mr Gish is but one of many to make it – the literalists are absolutely right. Evolution is a religion. This was true of evolution in the beginning, and it is true of evolution still today.*⁴³

It is true of evolution still today. In the next chapter I will explore various ramifications of the religious aspects of evolution.

Chapter 3

Why It Matters

In the domain of evolution, creationists and intelligent design proponents are the dissenters. Dissenters are usually thought of as intruders who have no business trying to gain an entrance into the disciplines of science. Dissenters are told to keep out and stay out. Nevertheless, all evolutionists have personal beliefs that control their scientific endeavors and writings. Creationists do also. Some people call evolution a philosophy, but this study refers to it as a secular religion. There may be exceptions, but evolutionists tend to be just as devout as Christians, in their own ways. But why does it matter if evolution is religion? Why not relax and accept things as they are? The following will show why the impact of evolution has become so important across the world, and why evolution is held to different standards than Christianity in our world today.

Throughout this study I have been referring to evolutionists primarily as *secular* evolutionists. There are, of course, theistic evolutionists. They claim to believe in both evolution and God, although in public they keep God out of their sciences and hold to naturalistic interpretations. Christian evolutionists are the minority in the world of evolution. The appendix will address these Christians, but secularists are the main concern here.

We begin with the most obvious issue, which is the separation of church and state. In public places Christianity is often prohibited, yet evolution is allowed or even mandated. It is required by our educational systems. This is a worldwide issue. In America people will claim this is a constitutional issue, but the words “separation of church and state” are not found in the Constitution. They come from a letter Thomas Jefferson wrote to the Danbury Baptists in 1802. Jefferson’s intent was to protect the church from the state, not the state from the church. When America was young there was never an intent to prohibit Christianity or the Bible in public affairs. On the contrary, the Bible was part of the American educational system until the 1960s. The First Amendment of the Constitution prohibits the establishment of a national religion but allows freedom of religion among the people. Many people consider the establishment of a national religion to mean a national *church*, like the Church of England.

Has evolution become our national religion? In my opinion it hasn’t gone that far, but only because of opposition from Bible-believing Christians. Some people might say that communist nations hold to evolution as their unofficial religion and their final authority, and many Western countries are following along. As a secular religion, evolution is certainly treated differently than Christianity in our public schools. If creationist dissenters offer any scientific alternatives to the standard evolutionary curriculum those dissenters will be censored, or if they are teachers, severely reprimanded, even if they do not mention God in their alternative views. Nothing is more protected than Darwinian evolution. A scientific challenge is considered a religious challenge and is quickly condemned. At the same time, agreeing with any evolutionary evidence is considered a sign of faithfulness to the standard doctrines of evolution. Agreement guarantees the favor of the

evolutionary community, as well as the favor of donors who pay for grants and projects. This is the current state of affairs in our educational systems.

Dr. Jerry Bergman, a creation scientist, wrote a revealing book on the subject called *Slaughter of the Dissidents* (2008). He documents how both students and teachers are persecuted for dissenting on evolution. Many high school students would like to know more about the controversy, but they are forced to learn about Darwinian evolution as the only option. Put another way, evolutionists will accuse creationists of indoctrinating young people, yet public school students are forced to learn the standard evolutionary curriculum. No critique is allowed. Sometimes students are even forced to accept evolution as truth if they want to pass a course. Students who are not loyal evolutionists might experience things like the following:

- They might receive lower or failing grades, even if they are honor students.⁴⁴
- They might be denied degrees.⁴⁵
- They might be banned as masters and doctoral candidates.⁴⁶

Teachers and professors can experience worse things:

- They might experience censorship of their writings and even their speech.⁴⁷
- If they are discharged, they might be blacklisted and unable to secure another position.⁴⁸
- They might be attacked in the media and on the Internet.⁴⁹
- They might be heckled by an evolution crowd.⁵⁰
- They might receive death threats.⁵¹
- And so forth.

Dissenters to evolution can experience all kinds of religious and ideological bigotry, even when their purpose is to advance scientific knowledge. This is a violation of the First Amendment of the Constitution. The First Amendment also guarantees our right to free speech. Today evolution is unofficially our national spiritual foundation, dissenters are prohibited a free exercise of their religion, and dissenters' freedom of speech is suppressed in public places. Compare those items with the First Amendment: *Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech...* No evolutionist has ever spoken out against this kind of injustice.

Most evolutionists think dissenters are trying to sneak creation science into the educational systems. In addition, some evolutionists think creationists are demanding "equal time" in education, which is not true. That might have been true in the 1970s, but not today. There is no hidden agenda in creationism. Answers in Genesis, which is very prominent in this debate, has never lobbied for creation to be taught in our schools.⁵² Most creationists don't want creation to be taught in public schools because we know it would be taught by evolutionists. This is similar to religious studies in universities, which are usually taught by unbelievers or liberal Christians. As an example, Bart D. Ehrman is the New Testament scholar at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and he is an agnostic. He has also written influential books about the Bible from an agnostic perspective. One can only wonder how many young people have been swayed by his teachings. Since most universities are unfriendly to Christianity, this tactic is now a fact of life. Even if creation science could be taught, which would refer to the Bible, the situation would be

the same. However, creationists *do* want students to know the truth about evolution. We want an open discussion in public places. If evolution is shown to be untrue, everyone knows what the alternative would be – biblical creation.

In a way, the evolution establishment is like the religion of Islam in other countries. Both evolution and Islam are monolithic, and both forbid any mention of the Bible. They demand that only their voices be heard. In America creationists are silenced while evolutionists are given free reign. They control everything and suppress everything, all in “the land of the free.”

What are the fruits of evolution? If the theory of evolution is so essential for the world, it should be good for the world. Is it? I grew up in the 1950s, when even “heathens” in town respected churches and the local pastors. It was a different world back then; America was more Christian and more peaceful. My generation has witnessed many changes through the years, with the banning of the Bible in schools and the takeover by liberal scholars, the “God is Dead” movement of the 1960s, and the public replacement of Christianity by evolution. As an eyewitness, I can attest to the results – our society has become more violent and more despairing. Today, public school shootings are commonplace, suicides are seen in the news, and crime runs rampant across the land. Evolution does not liberate people from God as evolutionists had hoped, it only chains people down to their own sin and their own vain imaginations.

The apostle Paul wrote a passage of Scripture that captures this transformation brilliantly. This passage in the book of Romans is well-known but it bears repeating:

Because that, when they knew not God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.

Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools,

And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things...

Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen. (Rom. 1:21-23, 25)

The greatest concern about Darwinian evolution is that it takes the glory due to God and gives it to the creation. Evolution may be science, but it is also nature worship, plain and simple. This rebellion is the “gospel” that evolutionists preach to the world. Evolution has its own prophets, creation story, believers, idols, and worship, but they are all hidden under the veil of respectable science. And if nature is God, the law of the jungle rules. Consider the following questions about evolution:

- If people don’t believe in an afterlife, or in a holy God they must answer to, how do you expect them to act?
- Or if people believe that humans have no more value than the animals they evolved from, how do you expect them to act?
- Or if people believe in the evolutionary doctrine of “the survival of the fittest,” how do you expect them to act?

- Or if people believe that humans are not created in the image of God, how do you expect them to act?

What we believe about each other determines how we treat each other. I could easily highlight the crimes of atheist regimes, or the slaughters promoted by Adolph Hitler. Instead, I will mention one event that was inspired by both Hitler and evolution, which is the shooting at Columbine High School on April 20, 1999. The young shooters chose that date because it was Hitler's birthday, and they wanted to honor his evolutionary ambitions. They were also motivated by the Darwinian principles they acquired in their educational culture. One of the shooters even wore a shirt emblazoned with the phrase "Natural Selection." They intended to kill 500 students with bombs and bullets, but the bombs didn't work. 15 people were dead, including the two shooters, and 21 were wounded. As we all know, there have been many public school shootings since Columbine. The problem is out of control, but it is more than a gun problem. In a 2006 interview, creationist Ken Ham summarized the morality of the shooters in this way:

*We're reaping the consequences right now in this culture of generations that have been taken through a public education system and taught a Darwinian view; taught that you can explain life by natural processes, and therefore, ultimately, your morality is whatever you want to make it to be.*⁵³

This does not imply the Columbine shooters represent other evolutionists; most evolutionists will condemn what happened at Columbine High School. But evolutionists need to realize a fact of education: What students are taught now can have consequences later. Furthermore, the Lord Jesus Christ, who is the Prince of Peace, is banned from the public school classroom. A true imitation of His life should have a civilizing effect on any culture.

Evolutionists might counter my claim by saying that Europe has the same evolution education as America and yet has fewer mass killings. This is worthy of further study, but Europe is not as peaceful as Americans think. Europe has had its share of killings by guns, knives, and even bow and arrows. In Europe knives are the most common weapons. I do believe guns are a problem in America, but this is ultimately not a weapons-issue. The issue is how any society will change, whether in America or anywhere else, when the Bible is suppressed and evolutionary thinking takes over.

Some evolutionists claim that evolution can adequately explain the morality we have today. Somehow, morality arose from cooperation and the social needs of primates. Of course, there is no way to prove how morality could evolve or how it could become inherited by descendants. It is true that altruism has been observed among some creatures, but that is better explained by a benevolent Creator than by the mindless forces of nature. Atheist Richard Dawkins wrote about this in *River Out of Eden* (1995), which refers to the flow of DNA in nature. According to Dawkins, living things are merely survival machines, rather than moral entities.⁵⁴ Nature neither knows nor cares about the welfare of life. As Dawkins says,

In a universe of blind physical forces and genetic replication, some people are going to get hurt, other people are going to get lucky, and you won't find any rhyme or reason in it, nor any justice. The universe we observe has precisely the properties we should expect if there is, at bottom, no

design, no purpose, no evil and no good, nothing but blind, pitiless indifference. As that unhappy poet A. E. Housman put it:

*For Nature, heartless, witless Nature
will neither know nor care.*

*DNA neither knows nor cares. DNA just is. And we dance to its music.*⁵⁵

If an evolving nature is in control, why not live by the law of the jungle? Why not? Why do we even think about good and evil, if as Dawkins suggests, there is only blind, pitiless indifference? The answer should be obvious: We all think about good and evil because we all live in God's world, and there is no indifference with God. Even atheists live in God's world. Humans bear the image of God, and every soul has a sense of good and evil. Nearly everyone knows the difference between the right and the wrong, and that knowledge doesn't come from the atoms and chemicals within us. That knowledge comes from God. If evolutionists claim to do anything good, they should thank God for that impulse.

Are Christians better than secular evolutionists? No one suggests that Christians are flawless or without blame. Every group has its bad apples. Still, I encourage an honest comparison of the overall effects of Christianity with any other group of people. A life with God is better than anything else. Byron R. Johnson, a distinguished professor at Baylor University, has shown the benefits of religion. In his book *More God, Less Crime* (2011), he reveals detailed studies of prisoners and their interactions with prison ministries and churches. Christian efforts have kept people from committing crimes, ministered to people who are in prison, and helped them when they are released from prison. Can evolutionists make similar claims? My only disagreement with Johnson is that he tries to lump Islam and Judaism in with Christianity when he describes religion,⁵⁶ because his studies are of Christianity. According to Johnson,

*These studies show what any sensible person would have expected: that religious people commit fewer crimes. In sum, the best available data confirms that the faith factor has a significant and beneficial influence on youth and adults.*⁵⁷

To emphasize this point, consider that Christian leaders have written many books over the years exhorting their readers to be good. A sampling includes *Charity and Its Fruits* (1738) by Jonathan Edwards, *Sermons Principally Designed to Illustrate and to Enforce Christian Morality* (1813) by Thomas Gisborne, *The Way To Do Good* (1836) by Jacob Abbott, *Improving Your Serve – The Art of Unselfish Living* (1981) by Charles Swindoll, and *A Love Worth Giving – Living in the Overflow of God's Love* (2002) by Max Lucado. There are no similar books among evolutionists and secularists. Christian goodness is built upon the foundation of the Lord Jesus Christ, and there is no true goodness apart from Him.

Evolutionists will continue to fight against the influences of Christianity and the Bible. The evolutionary community is at war with God, and they care little for the rubble that remains. Evolution offers no love, no foundation for goodness, and no meaning to life. Michael Ruse is probably the evolutionist who has given more study to the non-scientific aspects of evolution. In 2019 he wrote an interesting little book titled *A Meaning to Life*, in which he tried to address some

of the obvious questions about a life without God. For evolutionists like Ruse, meaning is found in family and friends. He also finds meaning in a creative imagination, either within the sciences or within the arts.⁵⁸ Perhaps people with loving families will feel this way, but not the forgotten crowd. What of people with no family love and no career satisfaction? Even Ruse senses that something is missing. He writes:

*We are on our own! We are on our own! God and the soul don't protect us. Nor does it help to turn nature into a meaning generator. We are on our own! Is this just a counsel of despair? ...For meaning, we must search within ourselves, and we must do it in the light of Darwinian evolutionary theory, both the fact that we are animals and that this is a bleak world indeed.*⁵⁹

If this world seems bleak, it is because unbelief has made it so. With unbelief, all is vanity. It is hard to find meaning if we are equal to any lowly animal, with no God or soul to protect us. Faith in Christ, on the other hand, creates a life of meaning, joy, and anticipation. This is what the Bible offers, and this is what secular evolutionists oppose to the very end. They want to replace the Bible in the minds of the masses, but they replace it with nothing of lasting value. The religion of evolution fails to meet the deepest needs of the human heart. The evolutionary community's science is now questionable, and so is their contribution to humanity. Evolutionist Philip Kitcher, who is no friend of creationists, wrote,

*For the benefits religion promises to the faithful are obvious, and obviously important, perhaps most plainly so when people experience deep distress. Darwin doesn't provide much consolation at a funeral.*⁶⁰

Christians will continue to bring the Word of God to a lost world. We may lose a few social battles here and there, but the Word of God will prevail. The Bible *does* provide consolation at a funeral, for those who belong to Christ. Of course, there is no consolation for those at war with God. The Bible illuminates God's justice against the unbeliever's sin and rebellion; they will get what they deserve. If evolutionists preach against God, a day of reckoning will come. In great contrast, those who belong to Christ have a glorious future ahead of them. This is not wishful thinking, but a certainty purchased by Christ on the cross and confirmed by His resurrection. For the Christian, to live is Christ, and to die is gain (Phil. 1:21). Only the One who conquered death can tell us what lies ahead. Only the One who conquered death can give us true assurance (Jn. 11:25).

Evolutionists will speak of their reverence for nature. They write of their awe and wonder. That all sounds impressive, until we realize their praise of nature falls on deaf ears. Nature doesn't receive anyone's worship. People can worship nature all they want, but nature doesn't care. Nature worship is a one-way affair. Compare that to the Creator in the Bible. Our worship of God is a two-way affair, where God receives our worship and interacts with us. This is why we have minds, so we can have a rational relationship with our Creator. We can know Him, study His creativity, and learn from Him. We will never know Him completely, since He is infinite in nature, but we can know enough to appreciate Him. He is the fountain of life from which everything flows. Realizing that should cause anyone to worship Him.

Consider the following comments from Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758). Edwards was probably America's greatest Christian leader, and he loved the natural world. He saw evidence of God in everything, in the gentle butterfly and the awesome thunderstorm. Everything he saw prompted meditations about God. When he was only 21 years old, Edwards wrote,

*When we are delighted with flowery meadows and gentle breezes of wind, we may consider that we only see the emanations of the sweet benevolence of Jesus Christ; when we behold the fragrant rose and lily, we see his love and purity. So the green trees and fields, and singing of birds, are the emanations of his infinite joy and benignity; the easiness and naturalness of trees and vines [are] shadows of his infinite beauty and loveliness; the crystal rivers and murmuring streams have the footsteps of his sweet grace and bounty... That beautiful light with which the world is filled in a clear day is a lively shadow of his spotless holiness and happiness, and delight in communicating himself.*⁶¹

While many people focus on the bad things in nature, such as parasites, they still recognize the immense grandeur and beauty of nature. Everything in nature fills our senses; we can see, hear, touch, smell, and taste things of nature. Those senses were not created by an impersonal natural selection, with no thought or foresight. There are no true designs in a naturalistic world, since design implies a designer. Those senses were created by a personal God who knew exactly what He was doing when He created us. More than that, He gave us minds that can comprehend it all and connect everything to Him. When we look at nature, God is communicating something of Himself, just as young Edwards wrote. We should be able to see the Artist behind the art. How sad that so many turn their heads from Him and refuse to acknowledge what should be obvious – in the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth.

Everything in the universe declares the majesty of God. Since only angels and humans can sin, everything else naturally gives Him the glory He deserves. For example:

- The heavens declare the glory of God. (Ps. 19:1, Ps. 97:6)
- The heavens will rejoice, the earth will be glad, and the sea will roar at the return of Christ. The whole creation will share in God's joy. (Ps. 96:11-13, Ps. 98:7-9)
- In Psalm 148 the entire creation is called on to praise the Creator. Intelligent creatures like angels and humans praise Him, but so do animals and inanimate things like the sky and the hills. This chapter is not related to any particular event in God's plan; rather, it is a natural response of the creation to the Creator.
- And so forth.

Do animals know they praise the Lord? They do not share in the image of God as humans do, but they may still have some sense of the beauty of life. Indeed, there are times when creatures seem to celebrate life – the eagle soars and the dolphin leaps – so there may be a creaturely connection to the giver of life. That celebration is evidence of the Creator. Nothing in evolution can explain the urge to play and celebrate life. Only with the biblical Creator do we find happiness in the creation. Creation scientist Henry Morris put it this way:

*For those with ears to hear and eyes to see, praise is everywhere being offered up to our great Creator and faithful Sustainer, by the very creation itself.*⁶²

If this present world, which is cursed by the sin of Adam, has its moments of happiness, imagine what things will be like when God redeems the creation in the future. Scripture reveals a creation where the lion will live peacefully with the calf. No longer will animals eat each other, they will be restored to God's original intention. To simplify this, I will not discuss the timing of events, such as the millennial kingdom and the eternal state that follows. Christ redeems all people who receive Him, and He will also redeem all of creation in the future, including a new heaven and a new Earth (Col. 1:19,20, 2 Pet. 3:12-13, Rev. 21:1). Creationist Gary Bates said, "God actually cares about redeeming His entire creation, not just humanity."⁶³ Our present world now yearns for that future redemption (Rom. 8:20-22). Nature's redemption is aptly described in Isaiah 11:6-9 and 65:25. The following is from Isaiah 11:

6 The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them.

7 And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together: and the lion shall eat straw like the ox.

8 And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice's den (adder's den).

9 They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the LORD, as the waters cover the sea.

That time of restoration is coming. The religion of evolution is about death and decay; it is about the extinction of species, the Earth, and the universe. There is no happy ending for Darwinian evolution. The Bible, on the other hand, is about life and restoration. Things can only get better. Christians agree that we should care for our present creation, but we also have the larger picture in view. The Bible is about new beginnings, both for believers in Christ and for the creation. To call that a happy ending is an understatement, and it is happy, to a large extent, because everything comes full circle back to God. The redeemed will finally be with God.

If an unthinking creation glorifies God, thinking men and women should glorify Him even more. Scientific pursuits should compel us to thank God for the wonders we see, whether in the stars or our own bodies. Everything testifies to a wonderful Creator. This essay is a call to worship our real Creator, the God of the Bible.

O come, let us worship and bow down: let us kneel before the LORD our maker.
(Psalm 95:6)

Appendix

Christian Evolutionists

The acceptance of Darwinian evolution is growing among many professing Christians, theologians, Christian publishers and media, parachurch ministries, and Christian universities. They believe God created all things through evolution and deep time, starting with the postulated big bang of the universe. Christian evolutionary science looks almost the same as secular science, except Christian evolutionists believe certain things are inevitable, like the appearance of humans. Secular evolutionists believe nothing is inevitable because of the randomness of natural processes. Christian evolutionists will take the same evolutionary story and try to infuse it with divine purpose, although this is meaningless to secularists. This appendix will briefly explore the claims of Christian evolutionists and show why those claims are both unscriptural and illogical.

Christian evolutionists claim to believe the Bible and try to act like orthodox believers. They will stress their love for Jesus and their desire for all Christians to love and accept each other. Often that need for acceptance includes their evolutionary science. They feel young-earth creationists are too judgmental and divisive. Of course, at the same time, Christian evolutionists refuse to accept young-earth creation science. In their attempt to gain a hearing in the church, many Christian evolutionists are now calling themselves “evolutionary creationists,” rather than theistic evolutionists.⁶⁴ They say this puts the emphasis on the Creator rather than on evolution. This is a warning sign to young-earth Christians, because “evolutionary creationists” are trying to redefine creationism. Creationism has always referred to the work of the Creator apart from Darwinian evolution, so people should be skeptical of evolutionary creationism. Most young-earth creationists accept speciation within a kind (usually at the family level), but not deep-time evolution into different kinds of creatures. Young-earth creationists do not accept apes evolving into humans, while Christian evolutionists do.

I should emphasize that Darwinian evolution relies on unguided processes.⁶⁵ Evolution relies on *natural* selection, not God selection. There are Christian evolutionists who acknowledge this, although most will try to add God to the picture. Mainstream secular science, however, will never add God to the picture. Darwinian evolution is completely naturalistic. Nothing is gained by trying to add God to a worldview opposed to the Creator. Jerry A. Coyne, a popular atheist and evolution professor, added that alleged interventions by God cannot be scientifically tested or verified. In *Faith vs. Fact*, he said,

*That is why, though eagerly embraced by the American public, theistic evolution has been completely rejected by scientists.*⁶⁶

Essential to any old-earth Christian view is an adherence to two books of revelation. Christian evolutionists and other old-earth proponents say God revealed Himself in the written Word of Scripture and the natural world revealed by science. God speaks through both books. Some will even call nature the 67th book of the Bible. Old-earth Christians will commonly say that “all truth

is God's truth." In their minds, if secular scientists claim a fossil ape-man is our ancestor, that should be considered a revelation from God. God is telling us how He created. Furthermore, that secular science then determines how we should interpret God's written Word.

There are serious problems with this two-book philosophy. First, old-earth proponents are making the Word of God subservient to secular science. They will deny my observation, but they do put secular science first. For Christians, God's Word should have authority over everything else in life. God's written revelation is inspired by the Holy Spirit; secular science is devised by people who often have no regard for God or for what is true. They just want to promote their own secular religion. In addition, secular science is in a continual state of change. As every scientist knows, what is true today may be untrue tomorrow. Second, nature does not speak. Nature does not make rational statements the way the Scriptures do, so it should not be considered any kind of book or revelation. Romans 1:18-20 does say that nature reveals something of God, but only enough to drive us to the written Word of God. There is only one book, and that is the Holy Bible.

Because Christian evolutionists consider Scripture subservient to science, most will consider the beginning of Genesis a myth. They often make the claim that Genesis 1-11 was influenced by Ancient Near Eastern cultures around Israel when Genesis was written. Christian evolutionists and other old-earth proponents will try to draw parallels between Genesis and the creation stories of those ancient pagan cultures. Dr. Jason Lisle, an astrophysicist and young-earth creationist, has carefully refuted claims of parallelism in Genesis. Lisle's responses can be found in his Biblical Science Institute website (Oct. 2021-Jan. 2022). In his article on *The Historical Adam*, Lisle writes:

First, the genre, the style of literature of Genesis, is historical narrative. It is the same style as any other historical book. There isn't much in the way of symbolism, or poetic/literary devices. This contrasts sharply with the style of Near Eastern myths.

Furthermore, nearly all pagan origin myths begin with a primordial chaos monster that must be defeated in order for the world to become good and for humanity to flourish. As examples, we have the Babylonian myth of Marduk slaying Tiamat, and the Greek myth of Zeus defeating the Titans. The common theme is a world that begins or has eternally existed in a state of chaos until the chaos is defeated by a hero resulting in the good world of today. Life comes from death/chaos in all these tales. Genesis is the opposite in that it starts with a good, transcendent, living God who created things good at every step and all very good at completion; then human beings corrupted that world by sin which introduced death/chaos.⁶⁷

These myths usually start with an eternal, chaotic creation of some kind. The gods arise out of this chaos and then create from something already there.⁶⁸ In contrast, the God of the Bible is all that is eternal. He spoke everything into existence, out of nothing (ex nihilo), resulting in a true creation. Dr. Lisle also shows that Ancient Near Eastern myths are polytheistic, whereas Genesis is monotheistic. Genesis introduces the triune, monotheistic God to the world. God is the eternal, uncreated Creator, and is different in every way. No imagined god compares to Him. In Isaiah 43:11, God speaks and says, "I, even I, am the LORD; and beside me there is no saviour." The God of the Bible stands alone, and His self-revelation stands alone.

Dr. Lisle brought up the issue of death in his article, and this issue is a major source of disagreement between young-earth creationists and old-earth proponents. Evolutionists accept suffering and death as essential to their evolution story. At the same time, secular evolutionists criticize Christian evolutionists for connecting suffering and death to a good Creator. Even hardened atheists make this observation. They do not believe in God, but they recognize the problem. Atheists like Richard Dawkins and Jerry Coyne, both famous evolutionists, have spoken about this. Coyne's *Faith vs. Fact* criticized Christianity in general, but he also criticized theistic evolution in his chapter on "Why Accommodationism Fails." He wrote:

*Does evolution pose further problems for theology? Yes, and big ones. There is no obvious explanation, for instance, why an omnipotent and loving God who directed evolution would lead it into so many dead ends. After all, over 99 percent of the species that ever lived went extinct without leaving descendants. The cruelty of natural selection, which involves endless wastage and pain, also demands explanation. Wouldn't a loving and all-powerful God simply have produced all existing species de novo, as described in Genesis?*⁶⁹

This is exactly what young-earth creationists have been saying all along. God created de novo, meaning from the new, or from the beginning. Everything was created in the beginning. When the Lord Jesus spoke of Adam and Eve, He said they were created "at the beginning" (Mt. 19:4). This refers to more than the beginning of marriage, it refers to the overall creation in Genesis. They were created in a world without death, pain, or eons of cruel evolution. Young-earth ministries have covered this topic in detail, but here are the essentials:

1. God created a very good creation in the beginning (Gen. 1:31).
2. Both animals and Adam and Eve ate only plants before the Fall (Gen. 1:29,30). Plants are not sentient beings; they are not alive in the same sense as animals.
3. Before the Fall, there was no death of air-breathing animals (nephesh chayyah).
4. Adam was the head of all creation. His fall caused the fall of all creation (Gen. 3:17-19, Rom. 8:19-23). Only then do we see death, pain, disease, predation, parasites, poisons, thorns, forest fires, and so forth.
5. When Adam sinned, sin entered the world, and has passed on to every person (Rom. 5:12). Nothing else can explain our universal tendency to sin against God.
6. Adam is the first Adam, and Christ is the last Adam. Christ will save what Adam lost. "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. 15:22).
7. When the biblical genealogies after Adam are counted, they come out to 4,000 years before Christ, giving an age for the creation at around 6,000 years ago. The genealogies are of real people that were known in Israel's history.

Theistic evolutionists will deny most of these points, if not all. The same can be said of other old-earth views like progressive creation or intelligent design. If Genesis 1-11 is a myth, then when does biblical truth begin? Genesis 12? The Gospels? If the Son of God spoke of Adam and Noah, was He mistaken? Or was He simply accommodating Himself to the legends of the day? As a Bible-believing Christian, I hold to the conviction that all Scripture is inspired by God and profitable for all of us today (2 Tim. 3:16). God's Word is true from the beginning (Ps. 119:160).

Nothing in the Bible is myth; rather, it is a historical account of the acts of God through time. Christians should never compromise the Word of God with the ideas of secular scientists.

This appendix is only intended to highlight some of the key issues. For more information on this topic I recommend *The Genesis Account* (2015) by Jonathan Sarfati, *Creation, Evolution, and Intelligent Design* (2017) by Gundry and Stump, *Should Christians Embrace Evolution?* (2009) by Nevin, and *Four Views on the Historical Adam* (2013) by Gundry, Barrett, and Caneday. In addition, young-earth creation ministries offer many pertinent articles on their websites, including scientific responses to evolutionary claims. Christian evolutionists will say they are evolutionists because of the physical evidence, but young-earth scientists have shown counterevidence that is more convincing. No one should be afraid of accepting the biblical view of creation.

I will conclude with the most important issue, which is the biblical record of Adam and Eve. Any Christian evolutionary position must either deny or ignore the historicity of Adam and Eve. Doing so attacks both the inspiration of Scripture and the relationship between Adam and Christ, as we shall see. We will spend more time on this one because of its importance and complexity.

Christian evolutionists accept the secular order of apes evolving into modern human beings. The current theory says both chimpanzees and humans split from a common ancestor around 6 million years ago. No one knows what that common ancestor is; it exists in the imagination but not in the fossil record. Furthermore, there is no explanation why one species would split into two different species. This is common in the evolution story, with one species splitting into two, but there are no rational explanations for why or how those splits occurred. In spite of the lack of evidence for common ancestors, they are accepted as fact.

Evolutionists believe they have proven the kinship of chimpanzees and humans by comparing their DNA sequences. They claim that chimp and human DNA sequences are 98.5 to 99 percent similar, thus proving the evolutionary connection of apes to humans.⁷⁰ This has become a standard dogma of the evolutionary community, and to question it is heresy. Christian evolutionists accept this similarity because it is the majority view among scientists.

The secular order places the appearance of true humans, *Homo sapiens*, close to 200,000 years ago in a population of several thousand.⁷¹ The concept of an initial couple is foreign to evolution, since evolutionists think of a species existing as a large population. Christian evolutionist Dr. Kathryn Applegate has written about this. She is program director for BioLogos, an organization that promotes evolution among Christians. She wrote:

*The common ancestry of humans with other species raises immediate questions about biblical interpretation. Doesn't the acceptance of evolution require the rejection of the Genesis account of human origins? Indeed, it is hard to reconcile evolution with the traditional understanding of Adam and Eve as the first (and only) parents of the human race. But evolutionary science is silent on whether Adam and Eve were historical figures; it merely states that there was never a time when just two people walked the earth.*⁷²

Some Christian evolutionists will say that Adam and Eve never existed, while others suggest that God chose them out of the human population for a special relationship. Any old-earth

Christian model must make Adam and Eve very old, perhaps even reaching to the evolutionary beginning of *Homo sapiens* at 200,000 years ago. Other Christian evolutionists will say they don't know what to think about Adam and Eve, but it doesn't matter. What's important is that Christ came to save sinners.

However, it *does* matter. The truth about Adam and Eve is vitally important, because it explains *why* Christ came to save sinners. Even atheists know this. It is ironic that atheists and their kin recognize the theological problems, while Christian evolutionists do not. One atheist, G. Richard Bozarth, stated it this way:

*Christianity has fought, still fights, and will fight science to the desperate end over evolution, because evolution destroys utterly and finally the very reason Jesus' earthly life was supposedly made necessary. Destroy Adam and Eve and the original sin, and in the rubble you will find the sorry remains of the son of god. Take away the meaning of his death. If Jesus was not the redeemer who died for our sins, and this is what evolution means, then Christianity is nothing.*⁷³

A historical Adam answers many theological questions:

1. How were humans created?
2. What is our distinction from other creatures?
3. Where does the image of God in humans come from?
4. How did sin originate?
5. How are we united to Adam?
6. Why is there suffering and death?
7. Why do we need Jesus Christ?

All of these are revealed in the beginning of Genesis. God created Adam and Eve in special ways, apart from evolution. He created one initial pair and bestowed within them His own image. We do not bear the image of apes; we bear the image of God. Sin originated with the first couple and not among the population over time. Christian evolutionists need to think about this: Without Adam, how do we know that all have sinned? If sin originates with the individual, how do we know everyone has made the decision to sin? What if part of the population remained sinless? If such is the case, there could be humans right now who would die in a state of sinlessness. What does the Savior offer them, if they are truly sinless? Of course, the Savior offers salvation to all, because all have the sin nature of Adam. That is part of being human.

Apart from theological considerations, young-earth scientists have challenged the dogma of a 99 percent similarity between chimpanzees and humans. Dr. Jeffrey P. Tomkins is a genetics scientist for the Institute for Creation Research. He wrote a groundbreaking book titled *Chimps and Humans – A Geneticist Discovers DNA Evidence That Challenges Evolution* (2021). His research proves there is only a similarity of 84 percent, or less, which destroys any evolutionary kinships between chimpanzees and humans. Evolutionists are now finding similar results, and the similarity may go as low as 66 percent, depending on the study involved.⁷⁴ Dr. Tomkins also shows that much of the past DNA work done by evolutionists was fraudulent, because they manipulated their data. As he puts it:

At first the task seemed intimidating, but the deeper I investigated the published scientific literature and even performed my own genetic analyses, the more it became clear that much of the human-chimp DNA similarity data had been filtered, manipulated, cherry-picked, and even obfuscated to measure up to an academic gold standard amounting to nothing more than political correctness in accordance with the religion of evolution.⁷⁵

I say again, Christians should never compromise the Word of God with the ideas of secular scientists. To claim to embrace both is like trying to mix water and oil. It doesn't work. The Holy Spirit of God inspired Moses to write exactly the right words for describing the creation. Genesis 1-11 is accurate, historical, and authoritative. It should have the final word. It was not just meant for ancient Israel; it was meant for all of us today. It is God's mind speaking to our minds, imparting light to our understanding. Our proper response should be gratitude, wonder, and worship of our loving Creator.

I end with an insightful quote from Dr. Wayne Grudem, a New Testament scholar and professor. He wrote *Systematic Theology*, edited *Theistic Evolution*, and served on the committee for *The English Standard Bible*. He is an old-earth Christian but still agrees with young-earth Christians about evolution:

Evolution is secular culture's grand explanation, the overriding 'meta-narrative' that sinners accept with joy because it allows them to explain life without reference to God, with no accountability to any Creator, no moral standards to restrain their sin, "no fear of God before their eyes" (Rom. 3:18) – and now theistic evolutionists tell us that Christians can just surrender to this massive attack on the Christian faith and safely, inoffensively, tack on God, not as the omnipotent God who in his infinite wisdom directly created all living things, but as the invisible deity who makes absolutely no detectable difference in the nature of living beings as they exist today. It will not take long for unbelievers to dismiss the idea of such a God who makes no difference at all...

I was previously aware that theistic evolution had serious difficulties, but I am now more firmly convinced than ever that it is impossible to believe consistently in both the truthfulness of the Bible and Darwinian evolution. We have to choose one or the other.⁷⁶

He said it well. We have to choose one or the other.

ENDNOTES

1. Michael Ruse, *The Evolution-Creation Struggle*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006), p. 69.
2. Ibid., p. 81.
3. Ibid., p. 90.
4. Julian Huxley, *Religion Without Revelation*, (New York: Mentor Books, 1957), p. 156.
5. Ibid., p. 194.
6. Ibid., p. 212.
7. Carl Sagan, *The Demon-Haunted World*, (New York: Ballantine Books, 1996), p. 29.
8. Ibid., p. 29.
9. Jerry A. Coyne, *Faith vs. Fact*, (New York: Penguin Books, 2015), p. 103.
10. *Webster's New World Dictionary -- Third College Edition*, (New York: Webster's New World, 1988), "spiritual", p. 1293.
11. Robert M. Hazen, *The Story of Earth*, (New York: Penguin Books, 2012), p. 7.
12. Michael Ruse, *Evolution – The First Four Billion Years*, "Natural Theology," (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009), p. 758.
13. Thomas Huxley, quoted by Ruse, *The Evolution-Creation Struggle*, p. 125.
14. Jonathan Sarfati, creation. com, Creation Ministries International, "The biblical roots of modern science," 2009.
15. Jerry A. Coyne, *Faith vs. Fact*, pp. xii, 252.
16. Richard Dawkins, *The God Delusion*, (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2006), p. 51.
17. Jeffrey L. Bada and Antonio Lazcano, *Evolution – The First Four Billion Years*, "The Origin of Life," p. 72.
18. Henry M. McHenry, *Evolution – The First Four Billion Years*, "Human Evolution," pp. 256, 257.
19. Mary Midgley, *Evolution as a Religion*, (Cambridge, UK: Methuen & Co. Ltd, 1985), p. 86.
20. Lance Gregorchuk, *Born Again Atheist*, (Monheim, Germany: Enlightened Books, 2012), p. 37.
21. Ibid., p. 175.
22. Thomas Nagel, *Mind and Cosmos*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 11.
23. Nick Lane, *Power, Sex, Suicide*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 14, 15.
24. G. A. Kerkut, *Implications of Evolution*, (London: Pergamon Press, 1960), p. 5.
25. Stuart A. Kauffman, *Reinventing the Sacred*, (New York: Basic Books, 2008), p. 6.
26. Richard Fortey, *Life*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997), p. 143.

27. Simon Conway Morris, *Life's Solution*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 315, 316.
28. Jane Hawking, *Music to Move the Stars*, (London: Pan Books, 1999), p. 200.
29. Michael Ruse, *The Evolution-Creation Struggle*, pp. 126-128.
30. Richard Fortey, *Life*, p. 97.
31. Michael Ruse, *The Evolution-Creation Struggle*, p. 77.
32. Julian Huxley, *Religion Without Revelation*, p. 187.
33. Jane Hawking, *Music to Move the Stars*, p. 265.
34. Richard Dawkins, *The Greatest Show on Earth*, ((New York: Free Press, 2009), p. 88.
35. Jerry Bergman, *Darwinism is the Doorway to Atheism*, (Spokane Valley, WA: Leafcutter Press, 2019), p. 184.
36. Matti Leisola and Jonathan Witt, *Heretic – One Scientist's Journey From Darwin to Design*, (Seattle, WA: Discovery Institute Press, 2018), theme of book, p. 45.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 175.
38. Eric Hedin, *Cancelled Science*, (Seattle, WA: Discovery Institute Press, 2021), p. 138.
39. John C. Greene, *Debating Darwin*, (Claremont, CA: Regina Books, 1999), p. 228.
40. George Klein, *The Atheist and the Holy City*, (Massachusetts Institute of Technology: MIT Press, 1990), p. 203.
41. John C. Greene, *Debating Darwin*, p. 181.
42. Ernst Mayr, quoted by John C. Greene, *Debating Darwin*, p. 235.
43. Creation.com, Creation Ministries International, quote by Michael Ruse in “Quotable Quotes.”
44. Jerry Bergman, *Slaughter of the Dissidents*, (Southworth, WA: Leafcutter Press, 2008), pp. 106, 107.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 125.
46. *Ibid.*, pp. 3, 103.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 60.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 235.
49. *Ibid.*, pp. 9, 143.
50. *Ibid.*, p. 90.
51. *Ibid.*, pp. 5, 89.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 64.
53. Ken Ham interview in *Darwin's Deadly Legacy* DVD, Hosted by D. James Kennedy, “Columbine” chapter, by Coral Ridge Ministries, 2006.

54. Richard Dawkins, *River Out of Eden*, (New York: Basic Books, 1995), p. 19.
55. Ibid., p. 133.
56. Byron Johnson, *More God, Less Crime*, (West Conshohocken, PA: Templeton Press, 2011), pp. 177, 183, 197.
57. Ibid., pp. 203, 204.
58. Michael Ruse, *A Meaning to Life*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019), p. 161.
59. Ibid., pp. 131, 133.
60. Philip Kitcher, *Living with Darwin*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 155.
61. Jonathan Edwards, quoted by George M. Marsden, *Jonathan Edwards*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), p. 100.
62. Henry Morris, *The Heavens Declare the Glory of God*, (Grand Rapids, MI: World Publishing, Inc., 1997), p. 30.
63. Gary Bates, *Creation Restored* DVD, Creation Ministries International, 2016.
64. Deborah Haarsma, *Old-Earth or Evolutionary Creation?*, (Downer's Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2017), pp. 9, 10, 20.
65. Stephen C. Meyer, *Four Views on Creation, Evolution, and Intelligent Design*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2017), p. 171.
66. Jerry A. Coyne, *Faith vs. Fact*, p. 138.
67. Jason Lisle, Biblical Science Institute website, "The Historical Adam – Part 1," Oct. 8, 2021.
68. Bruce Lawrence, Creation.com, Creation Ministries International, "Did God simply shape the world like a pagan god?," June 11, 2022.
69. Jerry A. Coyne, *Faith vs. Fact*, p. 147.
70. Jeffrey P. Tomkins, *Chimps and Humans*, (Dallas, TX: Institute for Creation Research, 2021), pp. 16, 23, 26.
71. Robert Stewart, *Old-Earth or Evolutionary Creation ?*, (Downer's Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2017), p. 10.
72. Kathryn Applegate, *How I Changed My Mind About Evolution*, (Downer's Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2016), p. 184.
73. G. Richard Bozarth, www.answersingenesis.org/99 Quotable Quotes.
74. Jeffrey P. Tomkins, *Chimps and Humans*, pp. 28, 40.
75. Ibid., p. 18.
76. Wayne Grudem, *Should Christians Embrace Evolution*, Edited by Norman C. Nevin, (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2009), p. 10.