

# **EVOLUTION AS A THREAT TO THE CHRISTIAN HOME**

by

**Bert Thompson, Ph.D.**

## **Copyright © Apologetics Press**

All rights reserved. This document may be printed or stored on computer media, on the condition that it will not be republished in print, on-line (including reposting on any personal Web sites, corporate Web sites, organizational Web sites, electronic bulletin boards, etc.), or on computer media, and will not be used for any commercial purposes. Further, it must be copied with source statements (publisher, author, title, bibliographic references, etc.), and must include this paragraph granting limited rights for copying and reproduction, along with the name and address of the publisher and owner of these rights, as listed below. Except for those exclusions mentioned above, and brief quotations in articles or critical reviews, or distribution for educational purposes (including students in classes), no part of this document may be reproduced in any form without permission from the publisher.

**Apologetics Press, Inc.**  
230 Landmark Drive  
Montgomery, AL 36117 U.S.A.  
334/272-8558  
800/234-8558



**[www.ApologeticsPress.org](http://www.ApologeticsPress.org)**

# EVOLUTION AS A THREAT TO THE CHRISTIAN HOME

by

**Bert Thompson, Ph.D.**

## INTRODUCTION

“In the beginning was matter, which begat the ameba, which begat the worm, which begat the fish, which begat the amphibian, which begat the reptile, which begat the lower mammal, which begat the lemur, which begat the monkey, which begat man, who imagined God. This is the genealogy of man.” So stated Charles Smith, former president of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism (1929). Yet some 3,500 years before he set pen to paper to write that statement, the prophet Moses wrote, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth” (Genesis 1:1).

Who is right? Is man the accidental product of a system that really did not have him in mind, as so many renowned evolutionists have stated? Or is man specially created “in the image of God” (Genesis 1:26)? Of one thing we may be certain—both cannot be true. Thomas H. Huxley (or “Darwin’s Bulldog” as he called himself [see Leonard Huxley, 1903, 2:62]) defended the doctrine of evolution with these words: “The doctrine of Evolution, therefore, does not even come into contact with Theism, considered as a philosophical doctrine. That with which it does collide, and with which it is absolutely inconsistent, is the conception of creation, which theological speculators have based upon the history narrated in the opening of the book of Genesis” (as quoted in Darwin, 1898, 1:556). Huxley even remarked that “the doctrine of evolution, if consistently accepted, makes it impossible to believe the Bible!” (as quoted in Thompson, 1977, frontispiece). G.R. Culp, in his work, *Remember Thy Creator*, placed the issue in its proper perspective when he stated: “We stand either with God and His teaching of creation, or we stand with the evolutionist in opposition to Him. The issues are sharply drawn; there can be no compromise. You are either a Christian or an evolutionist; you cannot be both” (1975, p. 163).

## DEFINITIONS OF EVOLUTION

Essentially, there are two fundamentally different, diametrically opposed, explanations for the world around us. Each of these explanations can be viewed as a cosmogony—i.e., an entire world view, or phi-

losophy, of origins and destinies, of life and meaning. One of these, known as the concept of creation, postulates that the Universe is here as the result of the purposeful, deliberate acts of a supernatural Creator Who—with wisdom, planning, design, and forethought—created the Universe and all animate and inanimate systems within it. An alternate and opposing world view, known as the concept of evolution, suggests that the Universe and all its animate and inanimate systems are here as the result of random, non-purposive, naturalistic forces operating by chance over eons of time.

In 1960, George A. Kerkut, the eminent British physiologist and evolutionist, authored a small-but-powerful volume, *The Implications of Evolution*, in which he defined not a single theory of evolution, but rather two different theories of evolution. One of those theories he labeled the **Special Theory of Evolution** (often referred to in the literature as “microevolution”), which suggests that minor changes, within narrow limits, can occur throughout all living things. While the Special Theory of Evolution allows for change **within** groups, it does not allow for change **between** groups. There is no controversy over this particular theory, which is accepted as correct by both creationists and evolutionists alike.

In addition to the Special Theory, however, Dr. Kerkut also defined and discussed what he labeled the **General Theory of Evolution** (often referred to in the literature as “macroevolution”). After discussing the Special Theory, he contrasted it with the General Theory in these words: “On the other hand, there is the theory that all the living forms in the world have arisen from a single source which itself came from an inorganic form. This theory can be called the ‘General Theory of Evolution’...” (1960, p. 157).

This is the idea commonly referred to as organic evolution, or simply “evolution.” Through the years, numerous investigators have defined evolution in a variety of ways. The same year that Dr. Kerkut offered his definitions, the renowned Harvard paleontologist George Gaylord Simpson wrote: “Evolution is a **fully natural** process, inherent in the physical properties of the universe, by which life arose in the first place, and by which all living things, past or present, have since developed, divergently and progressively” (1960, p. 969, emp. added). Previously, Dr. Simpson had defined the theory by suggesting: “First, there is the theory of evolution in the strict sense. This states that all living organisms have evolved from common ancestors in a gradual historical process of change and diversification. **The theory rejects the**

**notion that all organisms were designed and created at the beginning of time”** (1965, pp. 25-26, emp. added).

Notice the recurrent theme in the various definitions offered by evolutionists to explain their theory. First, evolution is regarded as a **fully natural** process. Second, no “external agent” (read “supernatural Creator”) is responsible for inanimate matter’s becoming animate; evolution “rejects the via that all organisms were designed and created....” The entire process allegedly progresses in an upward fashion via natural selection coupled with genetic mutations. God is completely missing. Or as Julian Huxley stated, “Darwinism removed the whole idea of God as the creator of organisms from the sphere of rational discussion” (1960, p. 41). Third, all life forms have descended (evolved) from a common source, which owes its own existence to inorganic matter. Fourth, evolution is a continual process of “change and diversification” which ultimately produces living organisms that develop “divergently and progressively.” In this paper, I will be dealing with the General Theory of Evolution as defined by Kerkut.

#### **IS BELIEF IN ORGANIC EVOLUTION POPULAR?**

Belief in organic evolution is very popular. R.L. Wysong stated in his book, *The Creation-Evolution Controversy*: “It is downright hard to find anyone who does not believe in evolution in one form or another” (1976, p. 63). Conway Zirkle once stated that “practically every educated man believes in evolution; evolution is incorporated in the thinking of our time” (1959, p. 19). And so it is. Today, belief in evolution is in vogue. There is hardly a science or philosophy department in any state-supported university in this country that is not devoted to the teaching of evolution. And, sadly, many Christian schools are following that same trend.

#### **WHY DO PEOPLE BELIEVE IN EVOLUTION?**

One of the most mind-numbing mysteries for those who do not believe in evolution is trying to understand the people who do. [Perhaps evolutionists feel the same exasperation in regard to creationists’ beliefs, but on that point I am less qualified to judge.] Such an observation is not intended to be derogatory, but is offered merely as a statement of fact. Many who believe in creation do so because they have seen the evidence that establishes the Creator’s existence. They understand that where there is a painting,

by necessity there must be a painter. Where there is a poem, there must be a poet. Where there is a law, there must be a lawgiver. Where there is design, there must be a designer.

Because the Universe is intricately designed, creationists find it not only difficult, but impossible, to believe that it “just happened.” To them, suggesting that purely natural forces are capable of explaining the size, complexity, and organization of the Universe, and the delicate intricacies of life found within it, is illogical; the only rational conclusion is that there must have been a Grand Designer. Further, those who believe in creation do so because they have examined the empirical evidence, and are confident that a reasonable *prima facie* case can be made to support their conviction. Creationists contend that the evidence points not to a Universe that is self-created or self-explained, but to a Universe that is the result of creation at the hand of an omnipotent Creator.

As one who writes and lectures often on the topics of creation and evolution, frequently I am asked the question: “Why do people believe in evolution?” Often the question is phrased in what are intended to be complimentary terms: “Why is it that so many **obviously intelligent** people believe in evolution?” Neither question is easy to answer because generally the querist wants a simple, concise answer. It is difficult for him to understand why people whom he accepts as “obviously intelligent” believe a concept such as evolution that he, personally, considers so unworthy of acceptance or recommendation by intelligent people. It has been my experience that rarely is there a singular response that can provide an answer to such a question, because rarely is there a singular reason that can explain adequately why a person believes what he does. Especially is this true in regard to belief in evolution.

At times, the controversy that centers on the topics of creation and evolution has generated more heat than light. This does not necessarily have to be the case, however. In an open society, the topic of origins, and the varying views that people hold on origins, ultimately will be discussed; in fact, they **should** be discussed. But because the subject matter has to do with deeply held convictions, emotions often run high. One good way to avoid emotional entanglement, and the “more heat than light” syndrome that often accompanies it, is to work hard to comprehend the other person’s position, and therefore to discuss it as accurately and calmly as possible in any given situation. That task is made easier if there exists—at the be-

ginning of the discussion—a basic understanding of **why** the person believes as he does. Again, especially is this true in regard to belief in evolution.

While it may seem somewhat of a truism to suggest that people believe in evolution for a variety of reasons, realization of this fact, and a legitimate exploration of the reasons people offer for believing what they do, can go a long way toward a better understanding of opposing views found within the creation/evolution controversy. With better understanding comes improved communication. And with improved communication comes increased opportunity for dialogue—which can set the stage for the presentation of other viewpoints that perhaps have not been considered previously (e.g., in this particular instance, persuading the evolutionist to consider the evidence for creation).

As we attempt to respond to the question, “Why do so many obviously intelligent people believe in evolution?,” we hope to be able to provide a better comprehension of the system of organic evolution, and of the people who accept it. Included among the reasons why people believe in evolution are the following.

### **Reason #1**

There can be little doubt that many today believe in evolution simply because it is what they have been taught. For the past century, evolution has been in the limelight. And for the past quarter of a century or more, it has been taught as a scientific fact in many elementary, junior high, and senior high schools, as well as in most colleges and universities. Marshall and Sandra Hall have offered this summary.

In the first place, evolution is what is taught in the schools. At least two, and in some cases three and four generations, have used textbooks that presented it as proven fact. The teachers, who for the most part learned it as truth, pass it on as truth. Students are as thoroughly and surely indoctrinated with the concept of evolution as students have ever been indoctrinated with any unproven belief (1974, p. 10).

In their book, *Why Scientists Accept Evolution*, Bales and Clark confirmed such an observation. “Evolution,” they wrote, “is taken for granted today and thus it is uncritically accepted by scientists as well as laymen. It is accepted by them today because it was already accepted by others who went before them and under whose direction they obtained their education” (1966, p. 106). People believe in evolution because they have been taught that it is true.

## **Reason #2**

To suggest that many people today accept evolution as true merely because they have been taught to believe it does not tell the whole story, however. Intellectual pride enters into the picture as well. Who among us does not want to present at least the appearance of being well educated? Over the last century, we have been led to believe that if we wish to be considered intelligent, we should believe in evolution, because intelligent people all over the world believe in evolution. As Henry Morris well stated the issue: "...the main reason most educated people believe in evolution is simply because they have been told that most educated people believe in evolution!" (Morris, 1998, p. 12).

Consider the hypothetical example of two college students discussing their professors and courses. One of the students, Joe, asks his friend, Mark, the following question: "Hey, Mark, do you believe in evolution? My professor says all smart folks do." Honestly, what is Mark supposed to say? If he says, "No, Joe, I don't believe in evolution," by definition he has admitted to being outside the sphere of all the "smart folks." On the other hand, if he says, "Yes, Joe, I do believe in evolution," he may be admitting to a belief based not on an examination of the evidence, but on the idea that he does not wish to be viewed by his peers as anything but "smart." Undoubtedly, many people today fall into this category. They do not accept evolution because they have seen evidence that establishes it as true. Rather, they believe it because doing so places them in the same category as others who are considered to be well educated and intelligent.

## **Reason #3**

Further exacerbating the problem is the fact that evolution has been given a "stamp of approval" by important spokespersons from practically every field of human endeavor. While there have been those from politics, the humanities, the arts, and other fields who openly have defended evolution as factual, in no other area has this defense been as pronounced as in the sciences. Because science has seen so many successes, and because these successes have been so visible and well publicized, scientists have been granted an aura of respectability that only can be envied by non-scientists. As a result, when scientists champion a cause, people take notice. After all, it is their workings through the scientific method that

have eradicated smallpox, put men on the Moon, prevented polio, and lengthened life spans. We have grown used to seeing “experts” from various scientific disciplines ply their trade in an endless stream of amazing feats. Heart surgery has become commonplace; organ transplants have become routine; space shuttles flying to the heavens have become standard fare.

Thus, when evolution is presented as something that “all reputable scientists believe,” there are many who accept such a statement at face value, and who fall in line with what they believe is a well-proven dictum that has been enshrouded with the cloak of scientific respectability. As philosopher Paul Ricci has written: “The reliability of evolution not only as a theory but as a principle of understanding is not contested by the vast majority of biologists, geologists, astronomers, and other scientists” (1986, p. 172). Or, as Stephen Jay Gould put it: “The fact of evolution is as well established as anything in science (as secure as the revolution of the earth around the sun), though absolute certainty has no place in our lexicon” (1987, p. 64).

These kinds of statements leave the impression that well-informed, intelligent people simply do not doubt the truthfulness of evolution. The message is: “All scientists believe it; so should you.” And many do, because, as Marshall and Sandra Hall have inquired: “How, then, are people with little or no special knowledge of the various sciences and related subjects to challenge the authorities? It is natural to accept what ‘experts’ say, and most people do” (1974, p. 10). The simple fact is, however, that truth is not determined by popular opinion or majority vote. A thing may be, and often is, true even when accepted only by the minority. Believing something based on the assumption that “everyone else” also believes it often can lead to disastrous results. As Guy N. Woods has remarked: “It is dangerous to follow the multitude because the majority is almost always on the wrong side in this world” (1982, 124[1]:2).

#### **Reason #4**

Without a doubt, there are many people who believe in evolution because they have rejected God. For those who refuse to believe in the Creator, evolution becomes their only escape. They generally make no pretense of believing it based on anything other than their disbelief in God. Henry Fairfield Osborn, one of the most famous evolutionists of the early twentieth century, suggested: “In truth, from the earliest



stages of Greek thought man has been eager to discover some natural cause of evolution, and to abandon the idea of supernatural intervention in the order of nature” (1918, p. ix). Henry Morris has noted: “Evolution is the natural way to explain the origin of things for those who do not know and acknowledge the true God of creation. In fact, some kind of evolution is absolutely necessary for those who would reject God” (1966, p. 98).

Sir Arthur Keith of Great Britain wrote: “Evolution is unproved and unprovable. We believe it because the only alternative is special creation, and that is unthinkable” (as quoted in Criswell, 1972, p. 73). Professor D.M.S. Watson, who held the position of the Chair of Evolution at the University of London for more than twenty years, echoed the same sentiments when he stated that “evolution itself is accepted by zoologists, not because it has been observed to occur or can be proven by logically coherent evidence to be true, but because the only alternative, special creation, is incredible” (1929, 123:233). These kinds of statements leave little to the imagination, and make it clear that those who say such things believe in evolution not because of any evidence, but instead because they have made up their minds, *a priori*, that they are not going to believe in God.

In his text, *Man's Origin: Man's Destiny*, the eminent United Nations scientist, A.E. Wilder-Smith, observed that “Darwinism and Neo-Darwinism, rightly or wrongly, have been used everywhere in the East and West, in the hands of the atheists and agnostics, as the main weapon against the biblical doctrine of origins” (1975, p. 31). For the person who stubbornly refuses to believe in God, belief in evolution becomes automatic. Similarly, opposition to God as the Creator, the Bible as His Word, and the system of origins the Bible describes become just as automatic. Whenever a person rids himself of God, he simultaneously (even if unknowingly) embraces evolution. By his disbelief, he has eliminated creation as an option regarding his origin.

#### **Reason #5**

Another reason people offer for their belief in evolution has to do with the fact that there is so much evil, pain, and suffering in the world. No rational, well-informed person can deny the widespread and unmistakable occurrence of “bad” things that happen, often engulfing those who seem undeserving of

such tragic events. To some, no explanation from religionists—regardless of how elaborately stated or elegantly defended that explanation may be—will ever provide an adequate answer to the conundrum of how an omnipotent, omniscient, omnibenevolent God can allow atrocities to fill His specially created world.

Evolution, on the other hand, provides what appears to be a perfectly logical explanation for such a scenario. According to evolutionary dogma, throughout the history of the world various species (including man) have been engaged in a struggle for survival and advancement. Charles Darwin, borrowing a phrase from the English philosopher, Herbert Spencer, referred to it as “survival of the fittest.” The evolutionist—by the very nature of his theory—is forced to view the Universe and everything within it as the end result of numerous purposeless accidents. All living things, man included, exist on the Earth not because of any Grand Plan, but because of fortuitous occurrences that resulted from chance happenings in nature. And, to survive, and thrive, in such a world may seem to justify a “might makes right/strong subjugates the weak/to the victor go the spoils” attitude. It is a jungle out there, and in the jungle it is the law of tooth and claw that prevails.

Since man is viewed as little more than a “naked ape” (to borrow the words of evolutionary anthropologist, Desmond Morris), why should he somehow be exempt from the perils that continually befall other species of animals? These animals live their entire lives with one eye looking over their shoulder, as it were, because they exist in a dog-eat-dog world with no set moral standard. Man, according to evolutionary theory, is no different. His claim to fame lies in the fact that (thus far) he stands on the last rung of the evolutionary ladder.

But nature confers on him no special rights, privileges, or protection. In a world where evolution is considered as true, and “survival of the fittest” is nature’s way of weeding out the weak, it should be no surprise that evil, pain, and suffering exist. In fact, from an evolutionary vantage point, whenever competition occurs for food supplies, adequate shelter, reproductive advantages, etc., humanity has to learn to cope with evil, pain, and suffering. Granted, at first this may sound harsh, but from the evolutionists’ perspective it is consistent, and offers an attempted explanation for the undeniable existence of “bad” things

in our world. Unfortunately, all too often the answers offered by religionists for the problem of evil, pain, and suffering have fallen short of the mark, and as a result people have accepted evolution as providing a legitimate explanation for a very real problem in their lives.

#### **Reason #6**

As unpleasant as it is to have to admit it, some people believe in evolution because they have heard about, witnessed, or experienced first-hand the mistakes of religionists through the ages. Whether it is the offering of young virgins to an imaginary deity, the burning of alleged witches at the stake, or the adultery of a highly visible televangelist, the truth of the matter is that on occasion believers in God have set a very poor example—one that sensitive, thinking people naturally would have difficulty following.

To some, the very history of religion makes it suspect from the outset. Attempts to force people to accept a certain religion (as in the Crusades), or misguided attempts to squelch open discussion of important issues (as in the Catholic Church's censure of Galileo), have left a bitter taste in the mouths of many. Add to that the hypocrisy of, or word spoken in anger by, a person who wears the name "Christian," and the damage may be such that even in a lifetime it cannot be repaired. The result is that those who have been offended want nothing whatsoever to do with the God of the Bible, and as they reject Him, they also reject His account of the creation of the world in which they live.

#### **Reason #7**

While it is undeniable that some reject creation because of inappropriate conduct on the part of those who advocate it, nevertheless it is true that some reject God, and creation, to excuse or legitimize their own inappropriate personal conduct. In other words, they believe in evolution because it allows them to avoid any objective moral standard of behavior. It keeps them "out of reach" of any deity. It provides a subjective climate of situation ethics where any and all behavior, no matter how absurd or perverse, is acceptable. It nourishes a "do your own thing" attitude that precludes rules and regulations, in a vain attempt to circumvent the guilt that inevitably comes from doing wrong.

In the evolutionary scenario, humans are merely the last in a long line of amoebas, crocodiles, and orangutans resulting from fortuitous cosmic accidents. In such an arrangement, it is futile to speak of

“personal responsibility.” There exists, in the grand scheme of things, no reason why one “ought” or “ought not” to act a certain way, or to do/not do a certain thing. Aldous Huxley stated the matter succinctly in his article, “Confessions of a Professed Atheist.”

I had motives for not wanting the world to have meaning; consequently, assumed it had none, and was able without any difficulty to find reasons for this assumption.... The philosopher who finds no meaning in the world is not concerned exclusively with a problem in pure metaphysics; he is also concerned to prove there is no valid reason why he personally should not do as he wants to do.... For myself, as no doubt for most of my contemporaries, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation. The liberation we desired was simultaneously liberation from a certain political and economic system and liberation from a certain system of morality. We objected to the morality because it interfered with our sexual freedom (1966, 3:19).

Were Huxley and his cohorts to abandon belief in evolution and accept the existence of God and the truthfulness of creation, it would have interfered with their “sexual freedom.” Realizing that, they freely chose instead to abandon belief in God. That left them with only one option—belief in evolution. It was not something they accepted because of the weight of the evidence. Rather, it was something they accepted because they wished to avoid any personal accountability to their Creator. Their actions belied their motives. As Guy N. Woods has remarked: “Convince a man that he came from a monkey, and he’ll act like one!” (1976, 118[33]:514).

### **Reason #8**

Lastly, we may state that some people accept evolution because they are convinced that it is the correct answer to the question of origins. They have examined the evidence and, on the basis of their examination, have concluded that evolution is the only plausible explanation for the Universe and all that it contains. These people generally are both sincere and open-minded. They are not attempting to rid themselves of the idea of God. They do not feel the need to be “intellectually correct.” They are not reacting to unkind treatment at the hand of religionists. They are not searching for a way to justify worldly behavior. They simply believe the evidence favors evolution, and thus have accepted it as the correct view of origins.

### **IS EVOLUTION A *FACT* OF SCIENCE?**

Stephen Jay Gould is well known to those in the creation/evolution controversy. Dr. Gould, the famed Harvard paleontologist, is one of the evolutionary establishment’s fieriest apostles. He is an inde-

fatigable crusader on behalf of organic evolution. He is a cogent writer, a gifted speaker, and a tireless worker for “the cause.” He also is one of the scientific community’s most prolific and best-read authors (along with his late colleagues, Isaac Asimov and Carl Sagan). In fact, the January 1983 issue of *Discover* voted him “Scientist of the Year.” Gould’s articles appear frequently not only in refereed scientific journals (*Science*, *New Scientist*, etc.), but in popular science magazines as well (*Discover*, *Omni*, *Science Digest*, etc.). All this being true, when Dr. Gould speaks, many people listen. To quote him directly: “When we come to popular writing about evolution, I suppose that my own essays are as well read as any” (1987, 8[1]:65). And therein lies the problem.

In the January 1987 issue of the popular science magazine, *Discover*, Dr. Gould authored a lengthy article titled, “Darwinism Defined: The Difference Between Fact and Theory.” In this particular article, he expressed his extreme agitation at the inability of certain people (who should know better, he said) to properly address evolution by its rightful designation—as a **fact**, not a theory. The specific cause for Gould’s disgruntlement was an article in the September 30, 1986 issue of the *New York Times* by Irving Kristol (“Room for Darwinism and the Bible”). Dr. Gould acknowledged both his dismay and dissatisfaction at the apparent inability of people like Mr. Kristol to distinguish (to use his own words) “the central distinction between secure fact and healthy debate about theory” (1987, p. 64). Gould then explained himself when he wrote:

Facts are the world’s data; theories are explanations proposed to interpret and coordinate facts. The fact of evolution is as well established as anything in science (as secure as the revolution of the earth about the sun), though absolute certainty has no place in our lexicon. Theories, or statements about the causes of documented evolutionary change, are now in a period of intense debate—a good mark of science in its healthiest state. Facts don’t disappear while scientists debate theories (p. 64).

Later, Gould commented that “evolution is also a fact of nature, and so do we teach it as well, just as our geological colleagues describe the structure of silicate minerals, and astronomers the elliptical orbits of the planets” (p. 65).

What could be clearer? Gould wants everyone to know that evolution is a **fact!** **How** evolution occurred may well be a “theory,” but **that** evolution has occurred is a fact not open for further discussion. Gould even commented: “I don’t want to sound like a shrill dogmatist shouting ‘rally ‘round the flag

boys,' but biologists have reached a consensus...about the fact of evolution" (p. 69). Gould is "miffed" because there are those who refuse to acknowledge that evolution is a fact. According to him, "Evolution is a fact, like apples falling out of trees" (1980). While reviewing the book, *The Blind Watchmaker*, by fellow evolutionist Richard Dawkins, Douglas Futuyma suggested:

In the last ten years or so, evolution has been under severe attack, especially in the United States. It is important here to recognize the distinction between the proposition that evolution has occurred and the theory that describes the causes of evolutionary change. That evolution has occurred—that diverse organisms have descended from common ancestors by a history of modification and divergence—is accepted as fact by virtually all biologists. "Fact" here means a proposition, like the proposition that the earth revolves about the sun [Does this begin to sound familiar?—BT], supported by so much evidence that to disbelieve it would require disbelieving a large, successful edifice of scientific achievement. The historical reality of evolution is doubted chiefly by creationists, mostly on doctrinaire religious grounds (p. 34).

Of course, renowned evolutionists like Gould and Futuyma will not even concern themselves with creationists. In fact, Dr. Gould commented:

I don't speak of the militant fundamentalists who label themselves with the oxymoron "scientific creationists," and try to sneak their Genesis literalism into high school classrooms under the guise of scientific dissent. I'm used to their rhetoric, their dishonest mis- and half-quotations, their constant repetition of "useful" arguments that even they must recognize as nonsense.... Our struggle with these ideologues is political, not intellectual. I speak instead of our allies among people committed to reason and honorable argument (1987, p. 64).

Gould's worry, he says, is about those people who are "committed to reason and honorable argument!" That, by (his) definition, rules out any and all creationists.

The purpose of the writings of Gould and Futuyma (and numerous other evolutionists) is to convince people to stop speaking of the "theory" of evolution, and to speak instead of the "fact" of evolution. But, in order to accomplish this feat, they have to redefine the word "fact" as it is used in science. [They are by no means the first to suggest so radical a ploy. George Gaylord Simpson, then of Harvard, attempted exactly such a redefinition in his biology text, *Life: An Introduction to Biology* (1965, p. 16), and ended his "redefining" section by claiming that theories "...may be just as certain—merit just as much confidence—as what are popularly called 'facts.' Belief that the sun will rise tomorrow is the confident application of a generalization. The theory that life has evolved is founded on much more evidence than supports the generalization that the sun rises every day. In the vernacular, we are justified in calling both 'facts.'"] Web-

ster's defines a fact as "an actual happening in time or space," or a "verified statement." With that standard-usage definition at hand, consider the following.

Charles Darwin, in his *Origin of Species*, stated: "Long before the reader has arrived at this part of my work, a crowd of difficulties will have occurred to him. Some of them are so serious that to this day I can hardly reflect on them without being in some degree staggered" (1909, 11:178). Theodosius Dobzhansky, the late evolutionary geneticist of The Rockefeller University, stated in his book, *The Biological Basis of Human Freedom*: "Evolution as a historical fact was proved beyond reasonable doubt not later than in the closing decades of the nineteenth century," but two pages later he stated that "there is no doubt that **both the historical and the causal aspects** of the evolutionary process **are far from completely known.... The causes which have brought about the development of the human species can be only dimly discerned** (1956, pp. 6,8,9, emp. added). Notice Dobzhansky's admission that both the **historical** (what Gould refers to as the "fact" of evolution) **and the causal** (what Gould refers to as the "theory" of evolution) are "far from completely known."

In other words, on the one hand evolution is declared to be a fact, while on the other hand it is acknowledged that the process is "far from completely known," the causes "only dimly discerned," and the difficulties "staggering." Evolutionist W. LeGros Clark wrote: "What was the ultimate origin of man?... Unfortunately, any answers which can at present be given to these questions are based on **indirect evidence** and thus are **largely conjectural**" (1955, p. 174, emp. added). G.A. Kerkut, evolutionist and author of the classic work, *The Implications of Evolution*, stated:

I believe that the theory of Evolution as presented by orthodox evolutionists is in many ways a satisfying explanation of some of the evidence. At the same time I think that the attempt to explain all living forms in terms of evolution from a unique source...is premature and **not satisfactorily supported by present-day evidence....** The supporting evidence remains to be discovered.... **I for one do not think that it has been proven beyond all reasonable doubt....** It is very depressing to find that many subjects are being encased in scientific dogmatism (1960, pp. vii,viii, emp. added).

After listing and discussing the seven **non-provable assumptions** upon which evolution is based, Dr. Kerkut then stated: "The first point that I should like to make is that these seven assumptions by their nature **are not capable of experimental verification** (1960, p. 7, emp. added). And he is not the only

scientist willing to rebuke those who view evolution as fact. W.R. Thompson, Director of the Commonwealth Institute of Biological Control in Canada, wrote in his "Introduction" to the 1956 edition of Darwin's *Origin of Species*:

Darwin did not show in the *Origin* that species had originated by natural selection; he merely showed, on the basis of certain facts and assumptions how this **might** have happened, and as he had convinced himself he was able to convince others. Darwin, was not able to produce palaeontological evidence sufficient to prove his views. ...**the evidence he did produce was adverse to them**; and I may note that **the position is not notably different today**.... The modern Darwinian palaeontologists are obliged, just like their predecessors and like Darwin, to water down the facts... (1956, pp. xii,xix, emp. added).

Charles Darwin himself wrote, in a letter (November 23, 1859) to his brother Erasmus, one day before the *Origin of Species* was published: "Concerning species, in fact the *a priori* reasoning is so entirely satisfactory to me that if the facts won't fit, why so much the worse for the facts, in my feeling" (as quoted in Francis Darwin, 1888, 2:29).

Evolutionists dogmatically assert that evolution is a fact, yet admit that it: (a) is based upon **non-provable assumptions** that are "not capable of experimental verification"; (b) bases its conclusions upon answers that are "largely conjectural"; (c) is faced with evidences that are "adverse" to the available facts; (d) must continually be found guilty of "watering down the facts"; and (e) has **both historical and** causal aspects that "are far from completely known." Little wonder, then, Dr. Kerkut stated concerning the **theory** of evolution that "the evidence that supports it is not sufficiently strong to allow us to consider it anything more than a working hypothesis" (1960, p. 157). Robert Millikan, Nobel laureate in physics, put it this way: "The pathetic thing is that we have scientists who are trying to prove evolution, which no scientist can ever prove" (1925). What a far cry from the harangues of Gould and his cohorts in the modern evolutionary camp.

Think about what is "unknown" in the evolutionary scenario. First, evolution cannot even get started, much less continue, without its fundamental concept of spontaneous generation (abiogenesis, biochemical evolution, etc.). Yet what evidence is there that life arose from nonlife? Robert Jastrow, founder and former director of the Goddard Institute for Space Studies at NASA, has noted:

According to this story, every tree, every blade of grass, and every creature in the sea and on the land evolved out of one parent strand of molecular matter drifting lazily in a warm pool. What concrete evidence supports that remarkable theory of the origin of life? There is none (1977, p. 60).



Simpson has commented that the spontaneous generation of life “does not occur in any known case” (1965, p. 261).

Second, while the inability of life to get started poses a serious problem, now the “where” of this supposed happening is in being called into question as well. Hoyle and Wickramasinghe have argued that life fell to Earth from space after having evolved from the warm, wet nucleus of a comet (as referenced in Gribbin, 1981, p. 14; see also Hoyle and Wickramasinghe, 1981). Francis Crick, co-discoverer of the DNA molecule, has suggested that life actually was sent here from other planets (1981). Meanwhile, back on Earth, Sidney Fox and colleagues have suggested that life began on the side of a primitive volcano on the primeval Earth when dry amino acids “somehow” formed there at exactly the right temperature, for exactly the right time, to form exactly the right molecules necessary for living systems. Evolutionists are fond of saying (remember Dr. Gould?) that there is no controversy over the **fact** of evolution; it is only the “how” about which they disagree. Not true. They cannot even agree on the “where”!

Of course, some evolutionists will argue that such matters should not be discussed as a part of the evolutionary process, and that evolution per se only applies to biological change (Gould himself has suggested exactly that). But note the statements of his colleagues. Theodosius Dobzhansky has stated that “evolution comprises all the stages of development of the universe: the cosmic, biological, and human or cultural developments. Attempts to restrict the concept of evolution to biology are gratuitous. Life is a product of the evolution of inorganic matter, and man is a product of the evolution of life” (1967, 55:409). Paul A. Moody, in his textbook, *Introduction to Evolution*, wrote: “Organic evolution is the greatest principle in biology. Its implications extend far beyond the confines of that science, ramifying into all phases of human life and activity” (1962, p. 1x). Attempts to restrict evolution merely to “the way that life forms change” are, to use the evolutionists’ own words, “gratuitous.”

Third, Gould, in his 1987 *Discover* article, discussed some of the “data” that he believes establish evolution as a fact (remember that according to him “facts are the world’s data”). An examination of these data, however, **disproves** the very thing that he is attempting to prove—the “factuality” of evolution. Gould suggested:

We have direct evidence of small-scale changes in controlled laboratory experiments of the past hundred years (on bacteria, on almost every measurable property of the fruit fly *Drosophila*), or observed in nature (color changes in moth wings, development of metal tolerance in plants growing near industrial waste heaps) or produced during a few thousand years of human breeding and agriculture (1987, p. 65).

He thus wants us to believe that such changes have “proved” evolution as a fact. Yet notice what he conspicuously omitted. He failed to tell his reader what he stated publicly in a speech given at Hobart College on February 14, 1980:

A mutation doesn't produce major new raw material. You don't make new species by mutating the species.... That's a common idea people have; that evolution is due to random mutations. A mutation is **not** the cause of evolutionary change (as quoted in Sunderland, 1984, p. 106).

On the one hand, Dr. Gould wants us to believe that bacteria and fruit flies have experienced “small-scale changes” via genetic mutations, and thus serve as excellent examples of the “fact” of evolution. Yet on the other hand, he tells us that mutations (“small-scale changes”) do not cause evolution. Which is it?

On March 4, 1982 Colin Patterson, senior paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History in London was on a British Broadcasting Corporation radio interview, during which he admitted candidly: “No one has ever produced a species by mechanisms of natural selection. No one has ever gotten near it and most of the current argument in neo-Darwinism is about this question.” If evolution does not occur by mutations, and it does not occur via natural selection, how, then, could anyone be expected to accept evolution as a fact? The only two alleged mechanisms have been admitted to be impotent in this regard.

Further, in his article Gould made the same pitiful mistake that Darwin had made 128 years earlier—extrapolating far beyond the available evidence to reach an unjustifiable conclusion. Darwin examined finches' beaks, and from small changes in those beaks, extrapolated to reach the conclusion that evolution from one group to another had occurred. Gould has examined changes in fruit flies or bacteria and reached exactly the same conclusion, all the while failing to tell the reader that the bacteria never changed into anything else, and the fruit flies always and forever remained fruit flies! If the “data” are the “facts,” and if the “data” actually **disprove** evolution, how it is that evolution can be called, in any sense of the word, a “fact”?

The dictionary standard-usage definition of a fact is something that is “an actual happening” or “verified statement.” Can any process be called “an actual happening” or a “verified statement” when the knowledge of how, when, where, what, and why is missing? Were someone to seriously suggest that a certain skyscraper had merely “happened,” but that the how, when, where, what, and why were completely unknown, would any sane, rational person be likely to call it a “fact”? Or instead, would they not more likely call it an unproved assertion? To ask is to answer.

Gould, Futuyma, Simpson, and others may wish us to believe that their unproven hypothesis somehow has garnered to itself the status of a “fact,” but if they do they will have to offer something based on evidence, not just intuition or wishful thinking. Merely trying to change, for their own self-serving purposes, the definition of “fact” will not suffice.

Pardon us for our incredulity, but when the best evolutionists can offer is a completely insufficient explanation for life’s origin in the first place, an equally insufficient mechanism for the evolution of that life once it somehow got started, and a fossil record full of missing links to document its supposed course through time, we will continue to relegate their “fact” to the status of a theory (or better yet, a hypothesis). Adulterating the definition of the word “fact” is a last-ditch effort by Gould (and colleagues) to lend credence to a theory that lacks any factual merit whatsoever. As the old saying suggests, a rose by any other name is still a rose.

### **LIMITATIONS OF THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD**

Evolution is not a fact of science, all the wishes of evolutionists notwithstanding. In reality, evolution is not even a “scientific” matter. As much good as science has done—in wiping out smallpox, reducing deaths from plague, and adding years to our life expectancy—it does not have **all** the answers. Harris Rall, in his book, *A Faith for Today*, provided an excellent description of science when he wrote:

Science stands for a way of study and an attitude of mind. To leave theories and prejudices to one side, to bring an open mind and ask only for truth, to study concrete facts with endless patience, to try to find an order of behavior in the world (natural laws) as indicated by these facts—this is the spirit and method of science (1936, p. 66).

The scientific method is limited in several ways.

(1) **The scientific method is limited to what can be observed with the five senses.** Paul Weisz, in his book, *Elements of Biology*, stated: “All science begins with observation, the first step of the scientific method. At once this delimits the scientific domain; something that cannot be observed cannot be investigated by science” (1965, p. 40). Douglas Marsland mentioned in his book, *Principles of Modern Biology*, that “the primary basis of all scientific thinking is observation” (1969, p. 12). George Gaylord Simpson stated in an article in *Science*: “It is inherent in any acceptable definition of science that statements that cannot be checked by observations are not really about anything—or at the very least they are not science” (1964, 143:769).

(2) **The scientific method is limited to the present.** In their famous work, *The Genesis Flood*, John Whitcomb and Henry Morris observed: “Since historical geology, unlike other sciences, cannot deal with currently observable and reproducible events, it is manifestly impossible ever really to prove by the scientific method any hypothesis relating to pre-human history” (1961, p. 213). Enno Wolthius, in his book, *Science, God, and You*, remarked: “Science seeks to explain the behavior of that which is, and to check its explanation by means of experiments. But this experimental requirement can be met only in the present time. The past, and especially the beginning of things, lies beyond the grasp of this method, and so science can only speculate about the origin and early history of this world” (1963, p. 50). Batsell Barrett Baxter, in *I Believe Because*, pointed out: “The whole realm of science is the study of things as they are. Science can examine and analyze present processes and materials, but science is not in a position to say how things actually came into existence.” (1971, p. 91).

(3) **Science is a-moral (non-moral).** There is nothing in the scientific method itself that can determine whether nuclear energy should be used to destroy cancer cells or entire cities. Science gives the facts. Decisions based on those facts do not fall within the scientific domain. As Wolthius commented: “Science has always concerned itself with the material world and its behavior as distinct from the spiritual realities of life.... Science is better suited to describe than to prescribe, and even when it describes, it is far from infallible” (1963, pp. 12,53). Albert Wells, an evolutionist, stated in his work, *The Christian Message in a Scientific Age*:

As knowledge of the universe expands and man's position within it becomes both more central and more critical, so increases the demand for meaning, as well as for effective means of moral and spiritual control of the achievements science has made possible. **Science cannot give us these.** The scientific task fosters integrity and character. A persistent and passionate devotion to truth cannot help but build trustworthiness in the man who engages in the quest. But science is not at all sufficient to itself. It is, after all, quite limited as far as being able to answer the real questions is concerned (1962, p. 72, emp. added).

Science is not equipped to deal with moral, spiritual, or ethical issues.

(4) **The scientific method is limited to telling us how a process works, not why.** As J.N. Hawthorne well stated in his book, *Questions of Science and Faith*: "Science can give us the 'know-how' but it cannot give us the 'know-why'" (1960, p. 4). Bettex, in his work, *Science and Christianity*, wrote that "the more learned the man, the better he knows how little it is really possible to explain" (1901, p. 238). Science deals with mechanism, not purpose. The truthfulness of this point was elucidated in an unusual book titled *The Encyclopaedia of Ignorance* (see Duncan and Weston-Smith, 1977). It was no joke, however. The encyclopedia, which dealt with questions that science cannot answer, was written by such men as Nobel Laureate Francis Crick of DNA fame, Linus Pauling, who holds two Nobel prizes (one in peace, one in biochemistry), Donald C. Johanson, the famous paleontologist, and many others. The title of the first chapter in the book is a single word—WHY! Science simply cannot tell us why.

(5) **The scientific method is limited in that it cannot deal with the unique.** Weisz stated: "One-time events on earth are outside science" (1965, p. 4). Science cannot deal with those things that are unique. Science can investigate only those things that are: (1) timeless; (2) repeatable-at-will; (3) universal; and (4) dependable. One of the most important things to you, personally, is not even "scientific." Consider your own birth. Was it timeless? No. Was it repeatable-at-will? No. Was it universal? No. Was it dependable? Ask your mother! No. You see, your birth is not even scientific, yet to you it is extremely important for without it you would not be here today. Most of the things we hold dear are not scientific. For example, the Magna Carta's signing in 1215, the drafting and signing of the Declaration of Independence in 1776, the forming of the Constitution of the United States of America in 1789 with its Bill of Rights in 1791, and the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863—are all events that we cher-

ish because they assure us of the freedom we treasure. Yet not a single one of them is “scientific.” Most of the truly valuable things in this world are not scientific.

Evolution is not scientific, and cannot be proven as a fact of science! Who was there 4.5 billion years ago (by the evolutionists’ timetable) to observe what happened? If evolution is to be considered as scientific, it must be repeatable-at-will. Is it? No. Whatever happened at the “moment of creation” is not testable or verifiable by science and its method. Thus, scientifically speaking, both evolution and creation must remain simply theories.

### **THE FRUITS OF EVOLUTION**

In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus declared: “the corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit” (Matthew 7:17). Nowhere has this eternal truth been demonstrated more tragically than in a survey of the evils resultant from the acceptance of organic evolution. George Bernard Shaw said that “the world jumped at Darwin” in hopes of ridding itself of the idea of God. Sir Julian Huxley (grandson of the famous Darwinian advocate, Sir Thomas Huxley) said that “Darwinism removed the whole idea of God as the creator of organisms from the sphere of rational discussion” (1960, p. 41). The fruits of such beliefs have been bitter indeed. And, as in so many other instances, the family has been hardest hit.

Parents awake one day to the realization that their children have been taught organic evolution in every class from social studies to physics. Their children are taught that no God is responsible for what we see around us; rather, everything is a result of natural forces at work in the Universe and man is an accident of a system that did not have him in mind in the first place. Evolution being true, and God by necessity being ruled out, young people are smart enough to figure out exactly what that means. NO GOD, NO LAW! As French existentialist philosopher Jean Paul Sartre well said, “Everything is indeed permitted if God does not exist, and man is in consequence forlorn, for he cannot find anything to depend upon either within or outside himself.... Nor, on the other hand, if God does not exist, are we provided with any values or commands that could legitimize our behavior” (1961, p. 485). And our young people don’t have to be eminent French philosophers to understand that simple fact.

Little Johnny comes up to the Bible school teacher one day and remarks, “Teacher, teacher! We were taught last week in school that men evolved from ape-like ancestors. Is that really true?” And the teacher turns and says, “Johnny, don’t you know that **the Bible says God did it**? Now, let’s get on with our lesson about Lot’s wife turning into a pillar of salt.”

Or, Johnny walks up to the Bible school teacher one day and remarks, “Teacher, teacher! We studied last week in school about how men evolved from ape-like ancestors. Is that really true?” And the teacher turns and says, “Don’t you know, Johnny, that we don’t talk about things like that in Bible class? Now, let’s get on with our lesson about faith, grace, peace, love, etc.” And so the child feels somewhat embarrassed for having asked a “dumb” question.

But one thing is for certain. Johnny will not have to look very far for the answers to such questions. There are thousands of unregenerated scientists, philosophers, historians, theologians, etc., who are anxious to teach Johnny the “fact” of organic evolution. While the Bible school teacher, preacher, elder, etc., is busy thinking up excuses for **not** having to bother with teaching creation, the Ph.D. in biology is looking for ways to work **more** of it into his chapter on man’s origin. The junior high science teacher is searching for ways to work **more** evolution into his class. The social studies teacher is trying to find a way to work **more** Darwinism into the social structure of America. And so on. While the people who should be teaching special creation are busy inventing excuses not to do so, the people who are teaching organic evolution are busy trying to incorporate more evolution into their classes so that Johnny is thoroughly indoctrinated with an atheistic, naturalistic world view.

Then, one day, Johnny announces to his mom and dad: “I’m not going to church with you anymore. I don’t believe in God like I used to.” As Johnny walks out, possibly never again to darken the door of the church building, mom and dad sit awestruck—questioning each other on what went wrong. At first, the parents may blame each other, but eventually the church will bear much of the blame for not providing a good Bible education or enough “wholesome activities.” The church makes an easy and convenient target. But one thing is for certain—**someone** did not provide the correct answers. And so Johnny went elsewhere for the answers that were not forthcoming in the home or Bible school setting.

## EVOLUTION AS A THREAT TO THE CHRISTIAN HOME

What effects will belief in evolution (or theistic evolution) eventually have on the family? First, eventually the family will neither desire nor tolerate religion. As Sir Julian Huxley put it: “The earth was not created; it evolved. So did all the animals and plants that inhabit it, including our human selves, mind, and soul as well as brain and body. So did religion” (1960, pp. 252ff.). Once convinced that religion evolved, it is but a short step to **no** religion—that which we call atheism. Since all of man’s ideas and institutions are the result of natural causes, what harm possibly could come from rejecting them? Once evolution is accepted, religion becomes a burden to be quickly abandoned. W. Harland Dilbeck stated the matter well when he wrote in the *Firm Foundation* under the title of “Theistic Evolution or Atheism?” that “the first step in making atheists is to make evolutionists” (1978, 95[49]:3). In the story above, Johnny’s parents experienced the bitter fruits of teaching evolution to their child. As Charles Smith, the late president of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism once said, “Evolution is atheism” (1929). Indeed, evolution is atheism. It is “a”—without; “theism”—God. Children quickly come to realize that organic evolution and the Bible cannot both be true. Thus, eventually they will be forced to make a choice. As Dilbeck observed:

If you doubt this, just study the technique of the atheist crusaders in our universities. They are bent on making disbelievers of their students. Some of these anti-God agitators teach biology, even in high school, some teach philosophy, some teach other subjects. In fact, they are likely to be found spread and stationed pretty thoroughly through all departments of our educational institutions. No matter what subject they teach, the technique is largely the same. Their propaganda for atheism consists largely of an adroit appeal and use of the “facts of evolution.” Apart from evolution, there is no way of explaining the universe and man without God. There is no foundation for the theory of everything as a result of chance. The “mechanistic” theory of evolution is the cornerstone of atheism (1978, p. 771).

Second, moral irresponsibility soon will follow. Adultery, fornication, rape, incest, and other vile and evil things are the logical result of the acceptance of evolution. The ardent evolutionist and trial lawyer, Clarence Darrow, once stated: “There is no such thing as a crime as the word is generally understood... (people) are in jail simply because they cannot avoid it on account of circumstances which are entirely beyond their control and for which they are in no way responsible” (as quoted in Weinberg, 1957, pp. 3-4). Is it any surprise that bombings, burnings, revolution, crime, and carnage follow in the wake of such a godless and senseless philosophy? Is it any surprise that Johnny turns to illicit sex, drugs, theft, and the



like—once he has accepted evolution? Without any moral standard, immorality is the only logical result. Hear Harvard’s eminent evolutionist, George Gaylord Simpson, on this matter of responsibility when he admitted:

Man stands alone in the universe, a unique product of a long unconscious, impersonal, material process with unique understanding and potentialities. These he owes to no one but himself, and **it is to himself that he is responsible**. He is not the creature of the uncontrollable and undeterminable forces, but is his own master. **He can and must decide his own destiny** (1953, p. 155, emp. added).

Given these criteria, what should we expect Johnny to do? Given that the grave is the end and that whatever “heaven” or “hell” a person experiences is the “here and now”—what kind of moral responsibility should we expect children to possess? We would do well to remember the inspired statement in Galatians 6:7: “Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.” As Guy N. Woods noted: “Convince a man that he came from a monkey and he’ll act like one!” (1976, 118[33]:514). Families cannot long stand where there is no respect for God-given law. Parents become tyrants and children become delinquents.

Third, parents and children alike find themselves constantly trying to “do away” with parts or all of God’s Word. The Bible states that man began in a perfect state and then fell (Genesis 1-3). Evolution states that man began in a low state and through evolution (progressive improvement) has become more perfect. The Bible states that Eve was created from Adam’s side by an Almighty God (Genesis 2:21-22). Evolution states that the sexes evolved. The Bible states that the first man was Adam. Evolution teaches that the first man was *Australopithecus* or *Homo habilis*. The Bible states that man was created with a soul and that the soul will live on through eternity. Evolution states that man has no soul and that the grave is the end. The Bible teaches worldwide catastrophism (Genesis 6-8). Evolution demands uniformitarianism and naturalism. The Bible speaks of a God of purpose, plan, and design in creation (Romans 1; Psalms 19:1; et al.). Evolution speaks of a process of death, anguish, misfits, upheavals, struggles, and trial-and-error. But worst of all, acceptance of evolution makes a liar out of Jesus Christ, Who stated in Matthew 19:4 and Mark 10:6: “But from the beginning of the creation male and female made he them.” Furthermore, if the first chapter of the Bible cannot be trusted, how can the rest of it be trusted? If the first

Adam was not a real man created in the image of God (Genesis 1:26), then is the second Adam (i.e.: Christ, 1 Corinthians 15:45-47) a mythical, allegorical figure as well? If not, why not?

Who can know the ultimate end results of a doctrine such as evolution once it has been accepted as “fact”? The results will be tragic indeed, for “the fool hath said in his heart that there is no God” (Psalm 14:1). Once the family has discarded the idea that God said what He meant and meant what He said, the objective standard of His Word becomes purely subjective and “everything is permitted.”

Fourth, dehumanization of the family (and of mankind in general) will result from the acceptance of evolution. Ethical subjectivism will rule in a “might-makes right” situation. The “strong-eliminate-the-weak” philosophy of Frederich Neitzsche soon will begin to blossom. The “if it feels good, do it” thinking of subjectivism will mushroom. And what will be the results of such? Look around at the effect of this kind of thinking on the family today. Baby murder (euphemistically called “abortion”) already is legal. One can but wonder if the elimination of the aged, halt, lame, blind, etc., is far behind. If one piece of matter in motion is not worth any more than any other piece of matter in motion, as evolution postulates, then there is no difference between stomping out a cockroach and smashing in the head of a newborn baby in the hospital delivery room. If there is no God, everything is permitted!

Adolf Hitler was influenced greatly by the evolutionary theory of Darwin. Robert Clark has written: “Adolf Hitler’s mind was captivated by evolutionary teaching, probably since the time he was a boy. Evolutionary ideas—quite undisguised—lie at the basis of all that is worst in *Mein Kampf* and his public speeches” (1948, p. 115). Karl Marx wrote regarding Darwin’s *Origin of Species*: “Darwin’s book is very important and serves me as a basis in natural history for a class struggle in history. Not only is it a death blow here for the first time to teleology in the natural sciences, but their rational meaning is emphatically explained.” (as quoted in Davidheiser, 1969). In fact, Marx wanted to dedicate his book, *Das Kapital*, to Darwin, but Darwin, fearing family objection, declined the offer.

The atrocities committed by both Hitler and Marx need no resurrecting here. They are well known to all students of world history. But what does need to be stressed is the fact that Darwin’s evolutionary influence was in large part responsible for the warped, twisted thinking of these men—and others like them.

Darwin's "survival of the fittest" has been called upon by famous dictators time and again (e.g.: Hitler, Mussolini, Lenin, Stalin, et al.) as justification for their actions. Each dictator or leader thought his country and his people "most fit for survival" and acted accordingly. We all know the painful, tragic results. Little wonder the family finds itself in such trouble, with divorce now affecting one out of every two marriages in many states in America. Little wonder infanticide (abortion) is legal. Little wonder venereal disease is at epidemic proportions. Little wonder euthanasia is being considered as an "end to it all." What else might one expect, if evolution is accepted as true?

### CONCLUSION

Families, robbed by evolution of a belief in an all-powerful God, soon will come to realize that what is sown also is reaped. Those who try to effect a compromise through theistic evolution be no less effected, as they will watch the Bible's authority come to mean less and less as the days pass. Children, convinced they are no more than "glorified apes," will turn to hedonism and utilitarianism by the untold thousands. Sex outside of marriage will increase at staggering rates, and with it the untold anguish from venereal disease, unwanted pregnancies, etc. Mothers and fathers will see parental control slip through their fingers and be replaced by suffering and anguish. Followed to its logical results, evolution primes a society for takeover by those who have as their very intent the destruction of both organized society and the family. Why aid them in their goal?

Evolution has nothing good to offer. It speaks only of a naturalistic, hedonistic life with the grave as the end. It offers no eternal joy, no peace here or in the hereafter, no sanctity of bonds between humans and their Creator God. Rather, it offers only ethical subjectivism, secular humanism, scientific humanism, and atheism. Given the choice—knowing all the facts—what family would choose the latter?

### REFERENCES

- Bales, J.D. and R.T. Clark (1966), *Why Scientists Accept Evolution* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker).  
Baxter, Batsell B. (1971), *I Believe Because* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker).  
Bettex, F. (1901), *Science and Christianity* (New York: Abingdon).  
Clark, Robert E.D. (1948), *Darwin, Before and After* (London: Paternoster Press).  
Clark, W. LeGros (1955), *The Fossil Evidence for Human Evolution* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press).

- Crick, Francis (1981), *Life Itself* (New York: Simon & Schuster).
- Criswell, W.A. (1972), *Did Man Just Happen?* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan).
- Culp, G.R. (1975), *Remember Thy Creator* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker).
- Darwin, Charles (1859), *The Origin of Species* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1909 edition).
- Darwin, Francis, ed. (1888), *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin* (London: Appleton).
- Darwin, Francis, ed. (1898), *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin* (London: Appleton).
- Davidheiser, Bolton (1969), "Time, Entropy, and Evolution," *Bible-Science Newsletter* (Minneapolis, MN: Bible-Science Association), August/September.
- Dilbeck, W. Harland (1978), "Theistic Evolution or Atheism?," *Firm Foundation*, 95[49]:3,12, December 5.
- Dobzhansky, Theodosius (1956), *The Biological Basis of Human Freedom* (New York: Columbia University Press).
- Dobzhansky, Theodosius (1967), "Changing Man," *Science*, 55:409, January 27.
- Duncan, Ronald and M. Weston-Smith (1977), *The Encyclopaedia of Ignorance* (London: Pergamon).
- Futuyma, Douglas J. (1987), "World Without Design," *Natural History*, 96[3]:34.
- Gish, Duane T. (1972) *Evolution: The Fossils Say No!* (San Diego, CA: Creation-Life Publishers).
- Gould, Stephen J. (1987), "Darwinism Defined: The Difference Between Fact and Theory," *Discover*, 8[1]:64-70, January.
- Gould, Stephen J. (1980), "Is Man a Subtle Accident?," *Newsweek*, November.
- Gribbin, John (1981), "Of a Comet Born," *Science Digest*, 89[3]:14, April.
- Hall, Marshall and Sandra Hall (1974), *The Truth: God or Evolution?* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker).
- Hawthorne, J.N. (1960), *Questions of Science and Faith* (London: Tyndale).
- Hoyle, Fred and Chandra Wickramasinghe (1981), *Evolution from Space* (New York: Simon & Schuster).
- Huxley, Aldous (1966), "Confessions of a Professed Atheist," *Report: Perspective on the News*, June.
- Huxley, Julian (1960) "At Random: A Television Preview," *Issues in Evolution*, ed. Sol Tax (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press).
- Huxley, Leonard (1903), *Life and Letters of Thomas Henry Huxley* (New York: MacMillan).
- Huxley, Julian (1960), "The Emergence of Darwin," *The Evolution of Life*, ed. Sol Tax (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press).
- Jastrow, Robert (1977), *Until the Sun Dies* (New York: W.W. Norton).
- Kerkut, G.A. (1960), *The Implications of Evolution* (London: Pergamon).
- Marsland, Douglas (1969) *Principles of Modern Biology* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston).
- Millikan, Robert A. (1925), *Nashville Banner*, August 7.
- Moody, Paul Amos (1962), *Introduction to Evolution* (New York: Harper & Row).
- Morris, Henry M. (1966), *Studies in the Bible and Science* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker).
- Morris, Henry M. (1998), *The Twilight of Evolution* (El Cajon, CA: Institute for Creation Research).
- Osborn, Henry Fairfield (1918), *The Origin and Evolution of Life* (New York: Charles Scribner's & Sons).
- Rall, Harris A. (1936), *Faith For Today* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury).
- Ricci, Paul (1986), *Fundamentals of Critical Thinking* (Lexington, MA: Ginn Press).
- Sartre, Jean Paul, (1961), "Existentialism and Humanism," *French Philosophers from Descartes to Sartre*, ed. Leonard M. Marsak (New York: Meridian).

- Simpson, George Gaylord (1953), *Life of the Past* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).
- Simpson, George Gaylord (1960), "The World into Which Darwin Led Us," *Science*, 131:966-969, April 1.
- Simpson, George Gaylord (1964), "The Non-prevalence of Humanoids," *Science*, 143:769, February 21.
- Simpson, George Gaylord, C.S. Pittendrigh, and L.H. Tiffany (1965), *Life: An Introduction to Biology* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World).
- Smith, Charles (1929), *Third Annual Report of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism*.
- Sunderland, Luther (1984), *Darwin's Enigma* (San Diego, CA: Master Books).
- Thompson, Bert (1977), *Theistic Evolution* (Shreveport, LA: Lambert).
- Thompson, W.R. (1956), "Introduction," *The Origin of Species* (London: Dent & Son), pp. vii-xxv.
- Watson, D.M.S. (1929), "Adaptation," *Nature*, 123:233, August 10.
- Weinberg, Arthur (1957), *Attorney for the Damned* (New York: Simon & Schuster).
- Weisz, Paul (1965), *Elements of Biology* (St. Louis, MO: McGraw-Hill).
- Wells, Albert (1962), *The Christian Message in a Scientific Age* (Richmond, VA: John Knox).
- Whitcomb, John C. and Henry M. Morris (1961), *The Genesis Flood* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker).
- Wilder-Smith, A.E. (1975), *Man's Origin: Man's Destiny* (Minneapolis, MN: Bethany Fellowship).
- Wolthius, Enno (1963), *Science, God, and You* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker).
- Woods, Guy N. (1976), "Man Created in God's Image," *Gospel Advocate*, 118[33]:514,518, August 12.
- Woods, Guy N. (1982), "'And be not Conformed to this World,'" *Gospel Advocate*, 124[1]:2, January.
- Wyszog, R.L. (1976), *The Creation-Evolution Controversy* (East Lansing, MI: Inquiry).
- Zirkle, Conway (1959), *Evolution, Marxian Biology, and the Social Scene* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press).