What Are Some Good Questions to Ask an Evolutionist? Jason Lisle and Mike Riddle 1

Is Christianity the Enemy of Science? Glenn S. Sunshine 6

Responding to Atheist Propaganda Ken Ham 9

Answering the Skeptics Avery Foley and Ken Ham 12

Evolution (Not Creation) Is a God of the Gaps Stuart Burgess 14

**What Are Some Good Questions to Ask an Evolutionist?**

by Dr. Jason Lisle and Mike Riddle on December 2, 2014

*The Bible instructs believers to have answers when challenged by any and all who oppose the Word of God.*

A football coach recruited the best defensive players he could find. His strategy was to have the best defense in the conference. All through the season the opposing teams were unable to score many points. When the season was over his team posted a record of zero wins, ten losses, and two ties. How could this happen? The answer is they had no offense.

**A Christian Game Plan**

This is where many Christians are in their efforts to witness to unbelievers. The Bible instructs believers to have answers when challenged by any and all who oppose the Word of God (defense—1Pe 3:15). The Bible also instructs believers to bring down all strongholds and anything that exalts itself against the knowledge of God (offense—2Cor 10:4–5). Sadly, while many Christians lack the knowledge to challenge unbelievers (offense), they also lack a defense.

What is meant by defense and offense in Christian witnessing? Defense means that the Christian can answer questions such as: How do you fit dinosaurs into the Bible? Where did Cain get his wife? How could Adam name all the animals in one day? What about carbon-14 dating? Does God really exist? Couldn’t God have used evolution?

Offense means the Christian can ask the unbeliever questions that challenge his or her worldview. The strategy of asking good questions can be used to demonstrate to unbelievers that their belief in evolution is a sort of “blind” faith and is not something derived from empirical science. They can also illustrate to the compromised Christian (a person who professes to believe in both the Bible and ideas such as evolution or millions of years) that God’s Word is a completely accurate record and is not to be modified by secular opinions of what is possible.

There are several different types of questions that are useful in apologetics; we will cover four general categories of questions in this chapter. Questions can be used to help us assess and clarify the worldview of the critic. What does he really believe, and how is he using the terms? We will call these “clarification questions.” We can ask “foundation questions” about the most basic laws of science, and the beginning of first things. There are “textbook questions”—questions that can expose inconsistency in common textbook claims. These are particularly useful in public school settings. And finally, there are worldview questions—questions that can be used to show that the evolutionary worldview is utterly, intellectually defective.

**Clarification Questions**

These questions are used to help explain the meaning of words or terms. A definition in science needs to be clear and precise. It should include all the attributes that distinguish it from all other entities. If any of these attributes are missing, then the definition becomes ambiguous.

* What do you mean by *evolution*?
* What do you mean by *theory*?
* What is meant by a *fact* in science?

Let’s examine some examples of the importance of establishing definitions.

“Evolution is change over time.” This is not a legitimate definition because it includes everything in the universe.

“Evolution is genetic change in a species over time.” While this may be one definition of “evolution,” it is not the claim at issue in the origins debate. Such a definition includes all forms of change, including changes that both creationists and evolutionists believe in (e.g., information-decreasing mutations). Therefore, this does not adequately define the type of evolution relevant to origins; that is, Neo-Darwinian evolution that suggests that an amoeba can change into a man over millions of years.

“Evolution means both micro and macro changes.” This is a common use of evolution in textbooks. Dog varieties or different beak sizes of finches thus become examples of evolution. This definition includes both variety within the kinds and Neo-Darwinian evolution (molecules to man). The definition tacitly implies that small observed changes, sometimes referred to as microevolution, will lead to large unobserved changes (macroevolution), which begs the question at issue.

From these examples we see that it is important to establish definitions of terms prior to any discussion.

**Foundation Questions**

These questions aim at the core, or foundation, of the unbeliever’s evidence.

* What is the ultimate cause of the universe?
* How did life originate?
* Where did the dinosaurs come from?
* Where are all the millions of transitional fossils in the Precambrian and Cambrian layers?
* Since information is nonmaterial and in all observed cases always requires an intelligent sender, how did all the information contained in DNA originate?
* How do we know that is true?
* Has that ever been observed?
* Are there any assumptions in what you are describing?

In this chapter we will analyze the cause of the universe question. Analysis of the other questions can be found in the *New Answers Books 1 & 2*.

*Question:* What caused the universe to come into existence and where did the original energy or matter come from?

This is an important question because it aims at the very foundation or beginning of the entire evolution worldview. Without a cause (and a mass/energy source) there can be no big bang, evolution of stars, or life. Some evolutionists may scoff at such a question by stating it is not a legitimate question. Others might state that science does not deal with such questions or we can’t know such things. In either case this is a “brush-off” to avoid the question. There are only three possible responses to this question:

1. The universe created itself.
2. The universe has always existed.
3. The universe had to be created.

*Response 1:*The universe created itself.

For something to create itself it would have to both exist (in order to have the power to act) and not exist (in order to be created) at the same time. This is a contradiction—an illogical position to take. Based on all known scientific understanding and logic we know that from nothing, nothing comes. Therefore, this is not a legitimate response. A person arguing this way has violated the law of non-contradiction and is ignoring good science. This now leaves two possible choices.

*Response 2:* The universe has always existed (no beginning).

In order to analyze this response we need to understand some basics about the second law of thermodynamics. The second law is concerned with heat—the flow of thermal energy. Everything in the universe is losing its available energy to do work. To illustrate this concept we will use the example called “No Refills.”

You have just been given a new car for FREE! All expenses for the lifetime of the car are paid. Sounds like a good deal. However, there is one catch. You are only allowed to have one tank of gas and never allowed to refill the tank. Once you have driven the car and used up all the gas, the car can no longer be used for transportation. In other words, the gas (energy source) has been used up and cannot be reused to propel the car. This is what the second law of thermodynamics deals with. Usable energy is constantly becoming less usable for doing work. Unless the car obtains new fuel from an outside source, it will cease to function after it exhausts its first tank of gas.

Likewise, the universe is constantly converting useful energy into less usable forms. As one example, stars are fueled by hydrogen gas that is used up as it is converted into heavier elements. But the problem is this: for any given region of space, there is only a finite amount of available energy. There is just only so much hydrogen available per cubic meter. This means that unless the universe obtains new useable energy from an outside source, it will cease to function in a finite amount of time. Stars will no longer be possible, once the hydrogen is gone.[[1]](#footnote-1)

However, there is no “outside source” available. The universe is everything, according to the secular worldview. Like the car, the universe would cease to function after its first “tank of gas” is exhausted. But if the universe were infinitely old, it should have used up that energy a long time ago. Putting it another way, if stars have eternally been processing hydrogen into heavier elements, then there would be no hydrogen left! But there is. The fact that the universe still contains useable energy indicates that it is not infinitely old—it had a beginning.

*Response 3:* The universe had to be created.

Since the universe could not create itself and it had to have a beginning, the only logical solution is that the universe had to be created! This leaves us with the original question to the evolutionist, “Where did the matter come from to create the universe?” Any reply not recognizing that the universe was created ignores the laws of science and good logic.

When asking this question, be prepared to answer the challenge, “Where did God come from?” This question indicates a misunderstanding of the nature of God. It suggests that God is within (or “bound by”) the universe and that God is part of the chain of effects within time—all of which require a cause. We should be prepared to correct the misunderstanding, and point out that God does not require a cause since He has always existed, is beyond time, and is not part of the physical universe. God is a spirit, not a sequence of energetic reactions, and so the laws of thermodynamics (which place a finite limit on the age of the universe) do not apply to Him.

Remember the former things of old, For I am God, and there is no other; I am God, and there is none like Me (Is 46:9).

**Textbook Questions for the Classroom**

These questions are used to help students in the classroom critically think through information in a textbook or further explore statements made by a teacher.

* While some molecules do combine to form larger structures such as amino acids, it has been shown that this always results in a mixture of left- and right-handed amino acids that is not used in life. Since this is true, is there some other explanation for how the molecules useful for life might have formed? (Be prepared for an answer involving “given enough time it could happen.”)[[2]](#footnote-2)
* Since oxygen is known to destroy molecular bonds, and since the lack of oxygen in the atmosphere (meaning no ozone) would cause all potential life to be destroyed by ultraviolet rays, how could life have formed? (Be prepared to follow up with a question about hydrolysis—water decomposing molecules.)
* Since water breaks down the bonds between amino acids (a process called hydrolysis), how could life have started in the oceans?
* The National Academy of Sciences defines a theory as “a comprehensive explanation of some aspect of nature that is supported by a vast body of evidence” and science as “the use of evidence to construct testable explanations and predictions of natural phenomena.”[[3]](#footnote-3) Does this mean scientists can reproduce how life originated or test any step of the process for how life evolved? If not, then how can evolution qualify as a theory?
* Microsoft uses intelligent programmers and complex codes to create the Windows operating system. However, information in DNA is millions of times more dense and complex. How could the process of evolution, using natural processes and chance, solve the problem of complex information sequencing without intelligence? (Be prepared for an answer involving “given enough time it could happen.”)
* Bill Gates (founder and former CEO of Microsoft) recognized that the processing capabilities of DNA are “like a computer program but far, far more advanced than any software ever created.”[[4]](#footnote-4) Using all their intelligence and all the modern advances in science, have scientists ever created DNA or RNA in a laboratory through unguided naturalistic processes? If not, then isn’t the origin of life still an unverified assumption?
* DNA, RNA, and proteins all need each other as an integrated unit. Even if only one of them existed, the many parts needed for life could not sit idle and wait for the other parts to evolve because they would dissolve or deteriorate. Is there any compelling (observable) evidence for how all these components evolved at the same time or separately over time?
* Isn’t it true that whenever we see interdependent complex structures or codes we automatically assume an intelligent person had to put them together? So why do we assume that DNA, or RNA, or a cell, which is more complex than any computer ever designed, happened by chance? Doesn’t that seem to go against good science and logical thought?
* Is there any observed case where random chance events created complex molecules with enormous amounts of information like that found in DNA or RNA? If not, then why should we assume it happened in the past?
* A living cell is composed of millions of parts all working together and is considered more complex than any man-made machine. Then, since the process of evolution has no blueprints (cannot plan for the future) for building something, since over time things tend to deteriorate unless there is a mechanism in place to sustain them, since virtually all known mutations decrease genetic information (or are neutral), since natural selection would not be operating until the first cell formed, how could the process of evolution ever assemble something as complex as a living cell with all its information content?
* Since we started with finches and the finches stayed finches, isn’t this just an example of variety within a kind?
* Since we started with bacteria, and the bacteria that became resistant to the antibiotic remained bacteria, isn’t this just another example of variety within a kind?
* What naturalistic evidence could actually disprove that evolution is the explanation for life on earth (or the formation of the universe)?

It is important to remember that whenever asking questions of a teacher or instructor, asking the questions at an appropriate time and in a respectful manner is extremely important. More questions related to specific topics can also be found in the books *Evolution Exposed: Biology[[5]](#footnote-5)* and *Earth Science[[6]](#footnote-6)* by Roger Patterson.

**Worldview Questions**

These are the questions that can stop people in their tracks. A series of well-stated worldview questions can expose the inconsistency of non-biblical worldviews. It is the Christian worldview alone that makes science, knowledge, and ethics possible. We can help unbelievers see this by asking the right questions.

* How do you account for the existence and nature of laws? In particular, how do you account for (1) laws of morality, (2) laws of nature, and (3) laws of logic? (Laws of morality make sense in the Christian worldview where God created human beings in His own image [according to a natural reading of Genesis] and therefore has the right to set the rules for our behavior.)
* If we are simply chemical accidents, as evolutionists contend, why should we feel compelled to behave in a particular fashion?
* If laws of morality are just what bring the most happiness to the most people, then why would it be wrong to kill just one innocent person if it happened to make everyone else a lot happier?
* If laws of morality are just the adopted social custom, then why was what Hitler did wrong? (Laws of nature make sense in the Christian worldview; God upholds the entire universe by His power. God is beyond time, and has promised to uphold the future as He has the past [Gen 8:22].)
* In your worldview, why do the different objects in the universe obey the same laws of nature?
* Do you have confidence that laws of nature will apply in the future as they have in the past? If not, then why did you bother to answer my question? You assumed your vocal cords and my ears would work in the future as they have in the past, otherwise I could not understand your answer.
* Since you have not experienced the future, how do you know that the laws of nature will behave in the future as they have in the past? The answer “it’s always been that way before” is not legitimate because it assumes that the future will be like the past, which is the very question I’m asking.
* In the Christian worldview, it makes sense to have universal, immaterial, unchanging laws of logic. These are God’s standard for correct reasoning. How do you account for the existence and properties of laws of logic?
* Do you believe laws of logic are universal (applying everywhere)? If so, why (since you do not have universal knowledge)?
* Why do we all believe laws of logic will be the same tomorrow as they are today, since we are not beyond time and have not experienced the future?
* How can you have immaterial laws if the universe is material only?
* Why does the material universe feel compelled to obey immaterial laws?
* How does the material brain have access to these immaterial laws?

If you ask these questions properly, and are prepared for the common unsound responses, you can dismantle the evolutionary worldview. There is simply no good rebuttal to the Christian position, though many will make attempts. See *The Ultimate Proof of Creation[[7]](#footnote-7)* by Dr. Jason Lisle for more information on worldview apologetics, and for examples of using these kinds of questions in actual dialogues.

**Conclusion**

The importance of asking questions is an essential part of Christian apologetics. Jesus often used the technique of asking questions. In Mk 11:29–33 Jesus refutes the chief priests, scribes, and elders by asking them a question.

But Jesus answered and said to them, “I also will ask you one question; then answer Me, and I will tell you by what authority I do these things: The baptism of John—was it from heaven or from men? Answer Me.”

And they reasoned among themselves, saying, “If we say, ‘From heaven,’ He will say, ‘Why then did you not believe him?’ But if we say, ‘From men’”—they feared the people, for all counted John to have been a prophet indeed. So they answered and said to Jesus, “We do not know.”

And Jesus answered and said to them, “Neither will I tell you by what authority I do these things.”

Jesus used good questions to show the foolishness of those who attempt to argue with God. We can do the same, by learning to think biblically, and knowing just a few of the many inconsistencies of the evolutionary worldview.

<https://answersingenesis.org/evidence-against-evolution/probability/what-are-some-good-questions-to-ask-an-evolutionist/>

**Is Christianity the Enemy of Science?**

*By Glenn S. Sunshine*

**Answering the Church’s Critics**

The recent [spate of books](http://www.breakpoint.org/listingarticle.asp?ID=7070) by anti-theists (such as Dawkins, Hitchens, and Harris) has recycled a number of old arguments against belief in God in general and Christianity in particular. While none of the challenges are particularly new and have been answered effectively many times (with answers in some cases going back to the Middle Ages and even the late Roman Empire), our lack of knowledge of the long history of apologetics in the Church has made it appear as if the case the anti-theists make is stronger than it really is.

In this article, we will explore why the specific charge that Christianity is irrational, anti-intellectual, and anti-science sticks so readily on the Church, as well as look at one response to the idea that Christianity is the enemy of science.

**FIRST, HUMILITY**

To begin, we need to acknowledge that for a large segment of the Church, the charge of being anti-intellectual is all too true. Particularly in the wake of the fundamentalist-modernist controversy of the early 20th century, a significant percentage of the Christian world has simply withdrawn from active engagement with the intellectual movements that have shaped the culture. This is far from the historic tradition of the Church, where Christians for centuries had been the intellectual leaders of Western civilization.

A simple glance at the walls of your local Christian bookstore demonstrates how far we have gone down this road toward anti-intellectualism. In Elizabethan England, the bestselling books were collections of sermons and works of serious theology, many of which are still studied today. Look at the shelves now, and ask the owner what kinds of books and materials are selling. Ask to see the apologetics or biblical commentary section, and compare it to the more therapeutic, “feel good” sections of the store. How many of these books will still be read and studied in 400 years?

This is not an attack on Christian bookstores—they need to stay in business, and so they stock what sells. The question is: Where is the demand for more serious works that stretch our minds? The fact is, the market is not there (except for a few popular authors), and so the stores cannot afford to stock them. In our desire to preserve the simplicity of the Gospel, we have ignored Christ’s command to love God with our *minds*—something Jesus thought was so important that He added the word to the text of Deuteronomy 6:5.

But even before the fundamentalist-modernist controversy, Western culture had begun drawing a line between science as the world of fact, and religion as the world of faith. This division, explored in Nancy Pearcey’s [*Total Truth*](http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/1581347464/104-7387083-0996716?ie=UTF8&tag=breakpoint-20&linkCode=xm2&camp=1789&creativeASIN=1581347464), is a critical element of how the Western world has approached the relationship of Christianity and science since the Enlightenment. The basic idea is that anything that belonged to the world of facts has nothing to do with religion, and anything religious has nothing to do with fact, just opinion or faith. The two are seen as incompatible worlds that do not touch.

So scientists can simultaneously accept undirected evolution—a view that was expressly intended to take God out of the picture of creation—and yet believe in God and even be a member of one of the historic Christian churches. But compartmentalizing our thinking like this—religion here, science there, ethics in that corner, and so on—not only results in a disintegrated view of the world, but it implicitly rejects Christ’s claim to be Lord of *all*, which includes nature, science, fact, ethics, meaning, as well as faith.

Quite simply, the Christian world has largely abandoned an integrated worldview, and has lost its mind as a result. One of the most urgent needs of the Church today is to recover intellectual life for the service of the kingdom of God.

**MAKING SCIENCE POSSIBLE**

So how do we answer the specific charge that Christianity is anti-science? There are several approaches we could take to answer this question. Many people have pointed out, for example, that the leading figures in the scientific revolution were devout Christians. Some have made the point that the question itself dates only to the 19th century, since before then [Christians led](http://www.breakpoint.org/listingarticle.asp?ID=5414) the field in scientific enterprises. Others point to the fact that [many leading scientists](http://www.breakpoint.org/listingarticle.asp?ID=4093) today [believe in God](http://www.pfm.org/storeitem.asp?ID=1953).

Here, I want to look at the question from a different angle, one more directly in keeping with the need for an integrated understanding of the world and our place in it: Which worldview, Christianity or materialism (that is, the idea that the physical universe of matter and energy is all that exists), provides a surer foundation and motivation for studying the natural world? Or, more simply, which worldview makes it possible to do science—the search for explanations of why the physical world works as it does?

The biblical worldview teaches that God made the universe. Since God is a rational being, He constructed the universe in a rational way. In other words, it is possible to make sense of it. The biblical worldview also teaches that human beings are made in the image of God. Being an image-bearer of God has a number of important implications; but for our purposes, it means we are rational, because God is rational. Although our rationality is finite and God’s is infinite, it is nonetheless possible for us to “think God’s thoughts after Him” and discover the rules that govern the universe. Moreover, Christians throughout history have believed that God revealed Himself in the natural world, and thus we could come to know Him better by studying it. These studies, known as natural theology or natural philosophy, are the historical roots of science and a major motivating factor for many of the key figures of the Scientific Revolution.

These aspects of the biblical worldview also explain why what we know today as modern science developed only in the Christian West, and not in other areas of the world that had different worldviews. For example, in the East, the physical world was seen as an illusion, a dream in the mind of God. That being the case, the highest use of the mind was meditation to see past the illusion, not attempting to make sense of how the illusion worked. As a result, Asian countries produced remarkable technologies, but no science in the sense of a coherent, non-philosophical explanation of the physical world.

In the Muslim world, it was believed that God directly controlled everything. This had important consequences for how the natural world was viewed. For example, while medieval theologians were working on early forms of scientific laws, the prominent Sufi scholar Abu Hamid al-Ghazali argued that the very idea that there were laws governing the physical universe was an attempt to limit Allah’s freedom and was therefore blasphemous. Muslims who argued for ideas like this were contradicting the Qur’an, making them infidels and thus subject to execution. The net effect of this kind of thinking was that Muslims excelled at math and practical disciplines like astronomy, geography, and medicine (up to a point), but did not develop science[V1] —that is, the search for answers to questions about the natural world through a process from hypothesis to theory.

**WHAT ABOUT MATERIALISM?**

So the biblical worldview was the foundational idea that made science possible. But what about materialism? How does it measure up as a worldview for science?

Materialistic explanations of the universe have to rely on one of two explanations for where the universe came from. The first is that the universe is eternal. This idea runs into problems almost immediately because of the second law of thermodynamics. This law states that the useable energy in a closed system is constantly decreasing, which means that an eternally old universe would have run out of useful energy by now. To solve this problem, some physicists argue that the universe can reset itself periodically by collapsing and re-forming in what is known as an oscillating universe. While there are logical problems with this idea (see William Lane Craig’s *The Kalam Cosmological Argument*), it still leaves us with our current universe having a starting point.

This brings us to the second version of materialism, which argues that the universe came into existence at a specific moment in an event known as the Big Bang. While Christians see the Big Bang as having been initiated by God, the materialist version of the theory argues that the universe essentially brought itself into existence. How this is possible is a mystery, and this led the scientific establishment, which was wedded to the idea of an eternal universe, to resist the idea of the Big Bang when it was first proposed: The only way to make logical sense of a universe that came into existence was to argue for a creator, something a materialist can never do. Only when the old guard died off and the evidence for the Big Bang became overwhelming was the idea accepted.

The key question in the Big Bang is where the universe came from. Unfortunately, since the laws of physics as we know them may not apply prior to the Big Bang, there is no way of knowing this. (An oscillating universe theory could conceivably argue that the laws of physics are eternal, but since it is impossible to look before the Big Bang, there is no evidence for this, and it would specifically require that the fundamental second law of thermodynamics be reversible and thus not eternal.) However the laws of physics came into existence, they led to the formation of galaxies and planets. On at least one of these planets, chemicals combined to produce organic compounds, which in turn combined with others, and somehow the compounds organized themselves and came to life, despite the well-known law of biology that life does not come from non-life.

Given the extreme implausibility of this happening—it is well beyond mathematical possibility—some thinkers have posited an infinite number of universes, with ours being the lucky one in which the impossible actually happened. Others have suggested that life on earth arrived here from outer space, but that does not solve the basic problem of how it arose in the first place: In fact, it makes it worse. If the universe is not old enough for the process to have occurred on Earth, having life come from another planet shortens the time even more, because now you have to take into account the extra time it takes for it to travel from wherever it developed to Earth.

In any event, somehow life began on earth, and by a process of random mutation, living organisms grew progressively more complex as survival of the fittest weeded out weaker, non-competitive life forms. Eventually, out of these random processes, human beings evolved. Our brains, which are the product of random mutations that enabled us to survive in the distant past, have somehow also developed the capacity to decipher the laws of the universe. This is what enables us to do science.

**RANDOMNESS V. RATIONALITY**

So here is the question: Would you trust an airplane that was designed using a random number generator to fill in the variables for the engineering specifications? Would you trust a bridge whose loading parameters were set with random numbers? If not, why would you trust a randomly produced brain to be able to make sense of the universe? If we are truly nothing more than the products of random variations in the arrangement of matter, why should we assume we are able to make sense of anything? For that matter, why should we assume that an undesigned universe is comprehensible in the first place?

What makes better sense: to believe an explanation with so many “somehows” that provides no real answer to how you can trust the conclusions of human thinking, or to accept the idea that the universe is rational, and we can understand it, because that is how it was all designed?

Far from being the enemy of science, the biblical worldview provides the essential foundation that makes science possible. It provides a coherent explanation of both the comprehensibility of the universe and the capabilities of human reason—something materialism cannot do. In fact, materialism’s reliance on unexplained events—the source of matter and energy, the origin of the laws of physics, the ability of the human mind to understand the world, and so on—requires far more acts of faith than Christianity.

*Glenn Sunshine, a key faculty member for BreakPoint’s* [*Centurions Program*](http://www.breakpoint.org/generic.asp?ID=2748)*, is chair of the Department of History and professor of early modern European history at Central Connecticut State University. He has published two books on the Reformation including* [The Reformation for Armchair Theologians](http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0664228151/104-7387083-0996716?ie=UTF8&tag=breakpoint-20&linkCode=xm2&camp=1789&creativeASIN=0664228151)*, a popular history of the Reformation. His next book, tentatively titled* How We Got Here: Why You Think the Way You Do*, will be published by Zondervan.*

[V1]Dr. Sunshine, others would argue that disciplines like astronomy, geography, medicine *are* science. So how are you defining *science* here?

**Responding to Atheist Propaganda**

by Ken Ham on January 16, 2015

Christians need to understand that many secularists have put together a very effective propaganda machine as a part of their effort to impose their atheistic religion on the Western culture, intimidate Christians, and influence the government to limit freedom of religion (particularly in regard to Christianity).

To help counteract this aggressive effort, Christians—wherever they are in the West— need to be aware of the terms being used in the secularist campaign and what Christians need to be doing to help counter their campaign.

Secularists know the adage that if you “throw enough mud at the wall, some of it will stick.” If enough false information and misleading accusations are spread, people will begin to believe them.

This has happened in a number of places:

**1. The use of the word science**

Here is how I discussed the word *science* during my debate with Bill Nye “The Science Guy” last February:

Public school textbooks are using the same word *science* for observational and historical science. They arbitrarily define *science* as naturalism and outlaw the supernatural. They present molecules-to-man evolution as fact. They are imposing the religion of naturalism/atheism on generations of students.[[8]](#footnote-8)

I also stated the following during the debate:

The word *science* has been hijacked by secularists in teaching evolution to force the religion of naturalism on generations of kids. . . . The creation/evolution debate is really a conflict between two philosophical worldviews based on two different accounts of origins or historical science beliefs.

The word *science* is defined as “the state of knowing: knowledge as distinguished from ignorance or misunderstanding.”[[9]](#footnote-9) Scientific pursuit needs to be broken into two parts: experimental (observable or operational) science and origins (historical) science. Both creation and evolution involve historical science (beliefs) and observational science (such as the study of genetics).

Experimental science that builds our modern technology is accomplished through the scientific method. And origins or historical science is the non-repeatable, non-observable science dealing with the past—which enters the realm of beliefs (really, religion).

In almost all of today’s government-run educational systems, the religion of secular humanism—with its foundation of naturalistic evolution based on man’s word/beliefs about the past (molecules-to-man evolution)—is guised in textbooks, lectures, and secular museums as so-called “science.” But the same word *science* is used for the experimental science that helps build technology. Because students aren’t taught the difference between historical and observational science, they are brainwashed into thinking that molecules-to-man evolution is the same science as what has built technology—which it is not. It is what we call a “bait-and-switch fallacy” (a fallacy in logic). It’s really a conflict between two philosophical worldviews that are based on two different accounts of origins or historical science beliefs.

Because of this misuse of wording by the secularists, Christians need to be using the terms *observational science* and *historical science* over and over again! The secularists hate these terms, for they don’t want people to know they actually have a religion (a worldview) they are trying to impose on the masses. Their propaganda campaign, which confuses the meaning of the word *science* and attempts to indoctrinate people in evolutionary ideas, has been very successful. To help counter their efforts, we need to keep delineating between ”observational” and ”historical” science as much as we can—much to the consternation of the secularists!

**2. The use of the word religion**

The word *religion* has a variety of definitions. But one of the main definitions (as given by the *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*) is “an interest, a belief, or an activity that is very important to a person or group.”

Atheists have effectively propagandized the culture to indoctrinate people to think that if you believe in God as Christians do, then that is religion—however, if you don’t believe in God and believe the universe and all life arose by natural processes, then supposedly that is not a religion! But as we constantly point out, atheism and humanism are religions—it’s a belief meant to explain life by natural processes, without the supernatural involved.

Atheists go ballistic when I say in many articles that they are trying to impose their religion of naturalism on the culture. But the point is, they are! Just because atheists refuse to acknowledge it does not mean they are not doing it. In fact, due to the atheist propaganda effort, it’s one of the reasons we are losing Christian symbols (crosses, Nativity scenes, and so on) across the nation. Furthermore, in the US and other western countries, the government is imposing a religion on millions of children when they insist that schools only teach evolution in science classes and not biblical creation. Officials insist that evolution is deemed to be “science” and creation is “religion.” Evolutionists have been indoctrinating people with a false view of the words *science* and *religion*.

I am encouraging Christians, as much as they can, to use the word *religion* to describe secularism. When a secular group like the Freedom from Religion Foundation or Americans United for the Separation of Church and State lodge a lawsuit to get a cross removed from a public place or a statue with someone praying, and so on, then we need to make sure to be vocal about the fact that secularists have imposed their religion of atheism.

People deny that humanism and atheism should be considered religions, but even various US courts have ruled and described in their decisions that humanism should be viewed as a religion. In Oregon, an inmate sued, with the assistance of the American Humanist Association, to have a humanist study group recognized as a religious study group along with Bible studies in the prison. Arguing based on the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment, the inmate won the right as the District Judge ordered secular humanism to be viewed as a religion. While humanism was previously viewed as a non-theistic religion in the rationale for the Supreme Court case of *Torcaso v. Watkins*, this is the first ruling that clearly establishes atheistic secular humanism as a religion whose practice should be protected under the First Amendment.[[10]](#footnote-10) Additionally, the US Army has commissioned humanist chaplains to serve those soldiers who deny God’s existence.

**3. The word *intolerance***

*Intolerance* is defined in the *Merriam-Webster Dictionary* this way:

Unwilling to grant equal freedom of expression especially in religious matters unwilling to grant or share social, political, or professional rights.

Secularists often accuse Christians who, for example, take a stand on marriage being one man for one woman based on the Bible, as being intolerant. But in fact, Christians are the ones who are tolerant of others. You see, Christians who stand on God’s Word will authoritatively speak against gay marriage, but they should not be intolerant of the people who disagree with them. But I find that those who call Christians “intolerant” are really the ones who are intolerant! So when a fire chief in Atlanta, Georgia, is fired by a city council because his personal beliefs concerning marriage are based on the Bible, Christians need to be vocal about the city council’s being intolerant!

**4. The word *proselytize***

The *Merriam-Webster Dictionary* has this definition of *proselytize*:

To try to persuade people to join a religion, cause, or group.

Actually, America’s courts have not been able to give an accepted definition of this word. Some people claim that just telling someone about the gospel of Jesus Christ is supposedly trying to force one’s belief on someone (their definition of proselytizing). Christians will certainly share their beliefs and the hope of forgiveness of sins with others, but they recognize that they cannot force someone to become a Christian. Only God can change people’s hearts.

In reality, it’s the secularists who are trying to force their religion on others as they intimidate people to accept the basic tenets of their religion, such as evolutionary naturalism. Many atheists don’t necessarily use the word *proselytize*, but they claim that a Christian working in a government institution or a government-funded place cannot bring their Christianity into the workplace. Yet many professors at government-subsidized universities will openly proclaim their atheism (and even attack the Bible and the Christian faith) in their classes. But if a professor were to admit he was a Christian and make statements about his religious beliefs to the students, he would likely be disciplined or fired.

More and more we see intolerant secularists trying to limit the Christian influence by attempting to intimidate Christians not to bring their Christianity into their workplace. They ultimately want Christianity eliminated altogether from the public arena. Meanwhile, secularists are free to exercise their religion wherever they want to.

**Conclusion**

As secularists are successful in getting the governments to teach evolution as fact to millions of students in Western nations and will not allow biblical creation to be taught in science classes, we should be pointing out their deceptive use of terms. Indeed, the secularists continually misuse the word *science* as they indoctrinate people into a false worldview of naturalism so they can impose that religion on young people. At the same time, they exhibit their intolerance of Christianity and Christians in the culture. The secularists want to express their beliefs throughout society and want Christians to keep their beliefs inside their churches. In reality, governments are sanctioning the religion of naturalism and that it be imposed on millions of children and teens. At the same time, Western nations have supported a growing intolerance of anything Christian and are limiting free speech and the freedom of religion in trying to squelch the free exercise of Christianity.

I challenge Christians, especially Christian leaders, to be more vocal in this battle, boldly proclaiming the gospel to unbelievers and calling Christians back to the authority of the Bible. As we stand firmly and boldly on the truths of Jesus Christ as the Creator and Savior in our apologetic arguments, we must also use correct terms like *historical science*, *observational science*,*religion*, and *intolerance* when engaging the secularists in the ongoing war against Christianity in Western nations. It’s why you will find Answers in Genesis using these terms in our articles, billboards, and other outreaches as we do our best to help undo the work of the atheists’ propaganda campaigns and point people to the hope that we have in Jesus Christ as we give a defense of the Christian faith.

<https://answersingenesis.org/countering-the-culture/responding-to-atheist-propaganda/>

**Answering the Skeptics**

by Avery Foley and Ken Ham on April 21, 2015

Skeptics of the Bible often grasp at straws trying to find a [contradiction in the Bible](https://answersingenesis.org/contradictions-in-the-bible/) so that they can justify dismissing the Bible as what it claims to be—the Word of God. One place they often point to is Pr 26:4–5, “Do not answer a fool according to his folly, lest you also be like him. Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own eyes.” A superficial reading of these verses suggests a contradiction but, ironically, these verses actually provide a profound strategy for answering the arguments of skeptics.

**Don’t Answer**

Verse four says, “Do not answer a fool according to his folly, lest you also be like him.” Presuppositions play an important role in apologetics. Everyone has starting assumptions (presuppositions) that they assume to be true at the onset of an argument. For example, an atheist has the presupposition that God does not exist and that the universe and life arose naturalistically. Bible-believing Christians, however, have the presupposition that God exists, He has revealed Himself to us in His Word, and that the Bible, because it is God’s Word, is the true history (and future!) of the universe. These two sets of presuppositions are quite obviously very different. It is through our presuppositions that we interpret the universe as we seek to answer questions about past events or the purposes involved in those events.

.

Often when a Christian is debating with a skeptic, the skeptic will want the Christian to give up their presuppositions and approach the debate “neutrally.” For example, the skeptic may ask the Christian to “prove” that there is a Creator without using the Bible. But Christians cannot give up their presuppositions because this results in adopting the skeptic’s presuppositions, forcing us to answer the argument on their terms. To agree to think like the skeptic is to violate the command of Paul to “take every thought captive to the obedience of Christ” (2Cor 10:4–6). There is no such thing as achieving “neutrality” in an argument. Jesus makes this clear when He says, “He who is not with Me is against Me” (Mt 12:30). When a Christian gives up their presuppositions, they are walking into a battle unarmed and unprotected because they no longer have the proper framework of biblical revelation through which to interpret evidence and present arguments. If we agree to the terms of the skeptic, we are answering the question in accord with the foolish assumptions of their unbiblical worldview. We are not to do this. “Do not answer a fool according to [the terms of] his folly, lest you also be like him.”

**Don’t Accept Atheist Presuppositions**

Here is a practical example of this. Let’s say an atheist and a Christian are having a cordial debate and the atheist says, “Prove to me that there’s a Creator, but you can’t use the Bible because I don’t believe it’s true.” The Christian says, “Sure! I won’t use the Bible; there’s lots of evidence for a Creator in the universe.” What the Christian has done is accepted the atheist’s foolish presupposition—that the Bible is not true—and now they are arguing according to the atheist’s terms. The Christian then begins to point out some great examples of design in the universe, like hummingbirds, butterflies, and peacocks. But then the atheist says, “That’s all well and good, but what about animals that tear each other apart? What about parasites and deadly bacteria? What kind of a Creator makes all that kind of stuff?” The Christian is stuck on a path of folly. Without the Bible, she cannot explain how God’s creation was originally perfect (Gen 1:31) but death and suffering came into the world with Adam’s sin (Gen 2:17). By accepting the atheist’s presuppositions and giving up her own, the Christian is unable to properly answer this skeptic’s objection.

What should be done instead is to proclaim the truth of who God is and how He created the universe just as He describes in the Bible. Just as a soldier would not put down his weapon because his opponent doesn’t believe his weapon is real, a Christian should never lay aside the Word of God, which is a powerful sword given to us by God (Heb 4:12; cf. Eph 6:17). The skeptic knows that God exists because God has made it plain to everyone through the general revelation of creation. They know there is a divine and powerful God, but they suppress that truth in unrighteousness (Rom 1:18–23). Open the Scriptures and show the skeptic why they are mistaken. Read Genesis 1, Jn 1:1–5, and Col 1:15–18 to them and explain how God created all things through Jesus Christ who is the Creator. Call them to look to God as the foundation for their thinking, not their own thoughts and opinions. As we proclaim the truths of the Bible, we trust that the Holy Spirit will work to open the eyes of the skeptic to the truth of God’s Word and convict them of their own sinfulness and need for Jesus Christ as the Savior (Rom 10:5–16).

**Do Answer**

Verse five reads, “Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own eyes” (Pr 26:5). Just because we refuse to accept the skeptic’s terms of debate does not mean that we should leave their arguments or objections unanswered. We are commanded in Scripture to answer the skeptical questions that people have about the Christian faith and point these people to the hope we have in Christ and the forgiveness He offers (1Pe 3:14–17; cf. 2Tim 2:23–26). This is the essence of apologetics from a biblical perspective.

After we explain that we will not give up our presuppositions but will use the true history recorded in Scripture to interpret the evidence and present arguments, we can “answer a fool according to his folly” by showing him the logical consequences of his presuppositions. To do this, we help the skeptic see where his thinking leads when it is followed to its natural conclusions—we point out the foolishness of his thinking so he doesn’t think he is wiser than God. For example, you can ask, “If you believe that animals killing one another is simply part of nature and humans are just smart animals, then why is it wrong for humans to kill and eat one another? We don’t get mad at a big salmon eating a smaller salmon.” This type of question reveals the skeptic’s inconsistent thinking, exposing the foolishness of a worldview without God.

**Never Assume**

Most atheists assume several things to be true. For example, they assume the existence of morality, logic, and the consistency of the laws of nature. And, yet, according to their own presuppositions, none of these things should exist. And yet they do! Let me explain why their assumptions are inconsistent with a worldview that assumes only matter and energy exist, helping the skeptic to see the foolishness of their materialistic or naturalistic worldview.[[11]](#footnote-11)

**Assuming Morality**

Most skeptics believe in the existence of morality. Indeed, they will often argue against the biblical God by claiming that [God is an immoral monster](https://answersingenesis.org/who-is-god/god-is-good/the-harsh-god-of-the-old-testament/) for acts of judgment like the global Flood of Genesis. But what standard do they have to claim that God is immoral? If life just evolved naturalistically from matter and energy, then where do immaterial laws of morality come from? And who establishes these laws? Government? Society? The individual? If it is government, then one government cannot call the actions of another government wrong. So was Hitler wrong in trying to exterminate the Jews? If it is society, then they run into the same problem. They can’t look at a cannibalistic society and claim that what they are doing is wrong because their society approves of the practice. Is it the individual? If this is the case, and murdering and stealing are right for me, then why shouldn’t I murder and steal from you? They can’t tell me it’s wrong! It’s just wrong for you.

Each of these scenarios is ultimately inconsistent, and the world cannot operate based on such arbitrary standards of morality. We all intuitively know that these things are wrong because God has written His law on our hearts (Rom 2:15). But in an evolutionary worldview, there is no absolute standard for morality and no reason why anyone should even have a sense of right and wrong since morality is immaterial. After all, if humans are just highly evolved animals, why should we care about evil? Isn’t it survival of the fittest that drives evolution? And if murdering and stealing helps me survive better, why shouldn’t I murder and steal? When presented with these questions, the skeptic is likely to attempt to give a reason, but that reason is not based on absolute truth but the opinions of individuals. Apart from a standard from God, each man does what is right in his own eyes.

**Assuming Logic**

Skeptics also assume the [existence of logic](https://answersingenesis.org/world-religions/atheism/atheism-an-irrational-worldview/) and use it to frame their arguments. But in a random, naturalistic universe, why should immaterial laws of logic exist? Where did they come from and why do they consistently apply everywhere throughout the universe? In a naturalistic universe there is no explanation for laws of logic that is not arbitrary, and yet they exist and everyone uses them.

**Assuming Natural Law**

Skeptics face yet another problem. They assume that the laws of nature exist and that they are consistent. Indeed, to be able to do observational science in the present you have to assume that the laws of nature won’t change tomorrow. We can only do experiments, make predictions, and repeat those experiments and get the same results because the laws of nature don’t change from day to day. They are immaterial and constant throughout the universe. But why is this? How can we be certain that tomorrow the law of gravity won’t just randomly change? If these natural laws are just the result of random, natural processes, then why should they remain consistent? And how do immaterial laws of nature come into being in a material, naturalistic universe? Secularists have no logical explanation for the existence of these laws and yet they assume their existence as they deny that God is the one who put them in place.

**The Biblical Worldview**

All of these—morality, logic, and natural laws—exist only because the Bible is true and because the Creator God of the Bible exists. We have laws of morality because there is a Lawgiver who has given us a firm foundation for morality in the Bible, His revelation to us. We have laws of logic because there is a Mind behind the universe and laws of logic are a reflection of His image in us (Gen 1:27). Natural laws are consistent because there is a Creator who made these natural laws and who consistently upholds the universe (Heb 1:3). Therefore, we should expect the laws of nature to be constant (Gen 8:22).

It’s only in a biblical worldview that these things can exist. There is no explanation for these immaterial laws in a naturalistic worldview. And yet an atheist must assume these things in order to argue against the Christian worldview. This is like someone who doesn’t believe in air arguing against the existence of air. He must use air as he breathes and talks to make his argument, and he must use air for his argument to travel to the ears of his listeners. In order to argue against the existence of air he must assume the existence of air! It’s the same with those who argue against a Christian worldview. Whether they recognize it or not, they are assuming that Christianity is true in order to argue against it. The fact that they cannot sufficiently account for these and other ideas from their own worldview demonstrates that it is internally inconsistent and does not meet the test of being a rational foundation to stand upon. In the end, they use the very minds and air given them by God to argue against His existence.

**Don’t Answer—Answer!**

When we are engaging skeptics with the truth of God’s Word, we can apply the “don’t answer/answer” strategy found in Pr 26:4–5. We don’t accept the skeptic’s “folly,” his terms for the debate. We stand firmly on our presuppositions. Instead, we show the skeptic the logical consequences of his foolish presuppositions and point him to the truth of the Christian worldview. Ultimately, our goal in biblical apologetics is to proclaim the truth of the gospel of Jesus Christ and to call sinners to repent and trust in their Creator and Savior.

<https://answersingenesis.org/apologetics/answering-the-skeptics/>

**Evolution (Not Creation) Is a God of the Gaps**

by Prof. Stuart Burgess on May 26, 2015

When a false god is called upon to solve gaps in knowledge, this is sometimes referred to as “god of the gaps.” For example, if someone did not know that ice is formed when water freezes and proposed that there was an “ice god” that occasionally causes ice to spontaneously appear, then they would be guilty of using a god-of-the-gaps explanation.

**Biblical Creation Is Not a God of the Gaps**

Atheists have often accused Christians of invoking God to fill in a gap in scientific knowledge. Even the great scientist Isaac Newton has been accused by atheists of using a god-of-the-gaps explanation when he said that the universe reveals evidence of design.[[12]](#footnote-12) But creationists like Newton do not believe in a god of gaps, but a God of absolute necessity. Newton recognized that the universe could not exist without the supernatural creative power of an almighty Creator.

Newton and most of the other founding fathers of science could see that the universe can only be fully explained with a combination of natural and supernatural explanations. Creationists only invoke God in origins when a supernatural action is necessary according to the laws of science. For example, according to the conservation of matter and energy (the first law of thermodynamics), it is impossible for a universe to come into existence without the supernatural intervention of an all-powerful being.

The Bible is scientifically correct when it states that divine supernatural power is required to create the universe (Gen 1:1) and life (Gen 2:7) and different kinds of creatures (Gen 1:24). The Bible is also scientifically accurate that divine supernatural power is required to uphold all things (Col 1:17). Rather than being accused of superstition, the Bible should be commended for correctly identifying the areas of origins where a supernatural Creator is necessary.

**Biblical Creation Is Not Anti-Science**

Creationists are sometimes accused of ignoring scientific evidence and being anti-science. But belief in God in no way diminishes zeal for how life works. The great pioneer scientists of the 17th to 20th centuries were inspired by their belief in God. Likewise, modern-day scientists who are biblical creationists find their belief in a purposeful universe to be a help in their work.

Biblical creationists are always eager to learn from real scientific discoveries in every area of science. I personally have designed rockets and spacecraft for the European Space Agency and NASA using the latest scientific knowledge in physics and engineering. I have a patent on a special gearbox that was used on the world’s largest civilian spacecraft and have been awarded three national prizes for the development of technology for spacecraft.

The only “science” that creationists do not use is the speculative science of evolution that has nothing to do with useful operational science. Evolutionary ideas like “monkey-to-man charts” that supposedly chart human evolution are based on pure speculation and not useful to science and technology in any way.

**Evolution Is Guilty of God-of-the-Gaps Explanations**

Ironically, it is actually evolution that is blatantly guilty of god-of-the-gaps explanations. When secular biology books attempt to explain why creatures or plants have a certain design, the answer is almost always “evolution did it” or “natural selection did it” without any explanation as to *how* the design feature could evolve by chance.

This is what Dawkins has written about the origin of life:

We have no evidence about what the first step in making life was, but we do know the *kind* of step it must have been. It must have been whatever it took to get natural selection started . . . by some process as yet unknown.[[13]](#footnote-13)

The above quote is a classic example of evolution being a god-of-the-gaps explanation. There is a total gap in what evolution can explain about the origin of life, and Dawkins invokes the god of evolution to fill in the gap and asserts that natural selection “must” have gotten started somehow. But natural selection by itself cannot create anything; it can only select from things already created.

When my daughters did a two-year advanced biology course at high school in the UK, the teachers kept saying that “evolution did this” and “natural selection did that” for the origin of features like fins and wings and hearts and lungs. Near the end of the course, one of my daughters challenged the teacher and said, “Miss, you keep saying ‘evolution did it,’ but you never actually explain *how* evolution did it.” The teacher had to confess that my daughter made a valid criticism, and the rest of class agreed.

Since evolution has no credible evidence, biology books use examples of adaptation as supposed examples of evolution. Darwin’s finches and resistant bacteria are held up as classic examples of evolution even though they are not evolution at all. These adaptations involve no new information, but simply a shuffling of existing genes.

**Evolution Is Guilty of Being Anti-Science**

Ironically, it is evolutionists, not creationists, who are guilty of ignoring scientific evidence.[[14]](#footnote-14) Over the last 70 years there have been many thousands of experiments with sophisticated equipment trying to create life in the laboratory from dead matter and energy.[[15]](#footnote-15) However, all of these experiments have clearly demonstrated that life cannot come about by chance. Evolutionists have a choice. Either they accept the laboratory experiments or ignore them and put faith in the god of evolution. They have chosen to ignore the evidence and exercise blind faith in chance.

Evolutionary philosophy holds back scientific progress by seeking false evolutionary explanations of origins. If you refuse to believe that a jumbo jet was designed, it will affect the way you investigate the complexity of the aircraft. If you believe that the aircraft evolved by chance, you will not have your mind open to possibilities of coordinated design. When the human genome was discovered to have far more information than expected, evolutionists immediately jumped to the conclusion that it was “junk” DNA because evolution predicts bad design not sophisticated design. However, subsequent work showed that the junk DNA was not junk at all, but highly coordinated information with important functions. That example shows how evolution holds back science.

A few years ago I spoke to a senior professor of microbiology at my university (who is an agnostic) and asked what he thought of the theory of abiogenesis—the theory that life can evolve from dead matter. He said the concept was a type of superstitious black magic. The biology professor had no religious bias and had been taught the dogma of evolution for decades, but he could still see that abiogenesis was not real science but so speculative that it could be called black magic.

**The Missing Link: Yet Another Gap in Evolution’s Knowledge**

When Darwin published his *Origin of Species* more than 150 years ago, one of the problems with his theory was that there was a missing link between man and apes. That missing link is still missing today despite extensive searches for fossil evidence of evolution all over the world. Fossil evidence shows that humans have always been strikingly different from apes. Humans walk on two legs, whereas apes walk on all four limbs. Humans have an arched foot, whereas apes have a flexible foot like a hand. Fossil evidence shows that no ape-like creature has ever had an arched foot for walking upright. As with every other aspect of evolution, the evolutionist ignores the gaps and encourages everyone to put their faith in the god of evolution.

**Evolution Is Like a Magic Wand**

I recently talked with another senior professor of microbiology at my university (another agnostic), and he made a surprisingly frank admission about evolution being a “god of the gaps.” He is not a creationist but like many biologists can see the serious weaknesses in the theory of evolution (although he keeps his views discreet for fear of losing his job). This microbiologist told me that evolution can be described as a “magic wand.” He said that he has noticed how even the experts say “evolution did this” and “natural selection did that” without any actual explanation being given and no demonstration in the laboratory. He said that the evolutionist can explain any aspect of origins by simply waving a magic wand and saying “evolution did it.”

**Paying Homage to the God of Evolution**

Evolution makes no useful contribution to scientific and technological advances. However, there is an unwritten rule in the modern secular biology community that after completing a scientific study (on a topic not linked to evolution),evolution is mentioned in the write-up as being the explanation for the origin of features of design. In the same way that a religious essay is finished by paying homage to a particular god, so in modern secular biology essays are finished by paying homage to evolution. I have personally worked on biology-related projects where this is exactly what has happened. The end result is that the community blindly believes that the god of evolution must be true.

**A Battle of Worldviews**

Biblical creation versus evolution is not “faith versus science,” but a worldview that includes God versus a worldview that has excluded God. Evolution is not a scientific theory because it has an unjustified assumption that God was not involved in origins. It is wrong for Christians to be accused of having a hidden religious agenda because biblical creation openly declares its worldview. Ironically, it is actually evolution that hides its atheistic agenda by pretending to be just science. If Isaac Newton and the other great scientists were here today, they would be astonished and saddened at the atheistic bias in modern secular science.

**Giving Credit to the Creator**

In modern society, a scientist is not allowed to say “God did it” for any aspect of creation, whether it is ultimate origins or the origin of any detailed design feature. The phrase “God did it” is seen as anti-scientific. But if God is the author of creation, then He deserves acknowledgement and credit for His work. And if God is the author of creation, then scientific investigation can only be helped by recognizing God as Creator.

If you refused to believe that a jumbo jet had been designed, then that would be dishonoring to the designers. How much more dishonoring it is when secular science and the secular media refuse to acknowledge that creation has a Designer. Thankfully there are many scientists today who are prepared to acknowledge the Creator despite the risk to their jobs and careers. Such scientists can have the satisfaction of knowing they stand shoulder to shoulder with the greatest scientists that ever lived such as Newton, Kepler, Pascal, Faraday, Maxwell, Kelvin, and Flemming. And by the way, the last three great scientists in this list knew of Darwin’s theory and rejected it—a fact that secular science has never publicized.
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