



***Atheistic Pagan  
THEORY of EVOLUTION  
(SATANIC EVOLUTIONISM)***

V/s

***BIBLICAL CREATION TRUTH  
(TRUE SCRIPTURAL CREATIONISM)***

\*\*\*\*\*

**Satanic Evolutionism**

***Bible's Authority***

***V/s Man's Fallible Guesses***

***Is It Science versus Faith?  
Or Is It Bible and True Science?***

***Bible & True Science***

***V/s Atheistic Theory of Evolution  
(Debunking the Pagan Myth of Evolution)***

\*\*\*\*\*

*Evolution, at the most, is an idea about history,  
Not observational science.  
There may be inferences we can make  
About the past based on modern observations,  
And these may or may not be true,  
But don't bother claiming that ideas about history  
Are the same as repeatable observations in the present.  
And don't insult us by thinking that we will believe that they are.*

**Roger Patterson**

\*\*\*\*\*

*If science depends on  
Naturalistic explanations,  
It must accept that our thoughts are  
Simply the products of chemical reactions  
That evolved from random chance.  
How can you ultimately rely on randomness  
To evolve the correct way of thinking?  
If there is no God,  
Ultimately, philosophically,  
How can one talk about reality?  
How can one even rationally believe  
That there is such a thing as truth,  
Let alone decides what it is?*

**Ken Ham**

\*\*\*\*\*

## SATANIC EVOLUTIONISM

**Evolutionism** is a *subtle satanic doctrine* aimed to deny the existence of the unseen *reality* of a Creator God! Under the pervasive influence of the unseen devil and his demons, *Evolutionism* is propounded, advocated and propagated by the atheistic philosophers, scientists, and evolutionists whose goal is to deny God's role in creation and, instead, attribute all that exists to the *goddess* of blind *chance*. Nevertheless, “--- *that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shown it unto them. For, the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse*” (Romans 1:19-20).

*Evolutionism* is, therefore, a hodge-podge of contradictory *doctrines* built upon imaginary and unscientific false atheistic theories, which hopelessly keep on “mutating”. These baseless theories basically include the so-called *cosmic* evolution of *matter* and *organic* or *biological* evolution of complex *life*. The multi-varied forms of these baseless, theories grotesquely display a biased *spirit* of pseudo-science and the blind, religious, irrational *faith* of its proponents and naïve adherents. Consequently, just as there are different religions with their diverse gods and belief systems so also *atheistic* evolution means different *things* with varied *views* to different “*classes*” or “*genre*” of *atheistic* evolutionists. The proponents of evolutionary theories actually wear the garb of true science. But, in real life, they are the deceived ‘high priests’ of *atheistic evolutionism* - a subtle devilish religion, and not at all a *true science*.

*Atheistic evolution* is *purportedly* a process of gross gradated changes over a long period ranging from millions to billions of years (*Doctrine of Gradualism*) during which the so-called cosmic and organic evolution has taken place. Accordingly, the complex universe comprising of galaxies with its immeasurable stars, planets and other cosmic bodies has supposedly evolved from huge clouds of hot gases or from some undefined imaginary primitive *nebulous* matter and so on. However, they cannot account for the *origins* of such primitive nebulous matter, etc.

Next, organic or biological “*evolutionary theory holds that all species probably evolved from a single form of life which lived about 3 and 1/2 billion years ago. Over time, the basic life form evolved into two or more species. These species, in turn, developed into many other species;*”<sup>1</sup> which next, eventually produced “*the more than 2 million species that inhabit the earth today*”<sup>2</sup> (*Doctrine of Speciation*). Most evolutionary change is supposedly as a result caused by the interaction of processes which could be best termed as *Doctrines of Mutation, Natural Selection* (“*Survival of the Fittest*” with its outfits: *Directional Selection, Stabilizing Selection and Sexual Selection*). Add to these the recent doctrines such as the *Genetic Drift, Synthetic Theory and Punctuated Equilibrium* and so on. There is simply no end to man's *fallible* speculations.

There is no room for any direct *creation* of universe or life, including human life, by God. Instead, *cosmic evolution* presumes our universe made up of sextillions of stars has evolved from lower units of matter such as hydrogen atoms or from a cloud of hot gases in the course of *billions of years*. But *why* only *some* hydrogen atoms or a few clouds *evolved* into complex universes is a mystery even for intelligent minds to grasp and thereby appreciate the *myths* of evolution. Next, *biological* evolution is the “*Theory that all living things developed from a few simple forms of life through a series of physical changes. According to evolution, the first mammal developed from a type of reptile, and ultimately all forms are traced back to a simple, perhaps a single-celled, organism.*”<sup>3</sup> Unfortunately, there is no evidence to prove such claims.

Are we to blindly believe that the many *species* of plant and animal life of *today* have evolved from some simple unicellular *primitive* forms of life that lived about *three and half billions* (or, more?) *years* ago? Are we to believe that some ‘simple form’ of unicellular life evolved into the ‘complexity’ of human life? Imagine the evolutionary magic of primordial life forms that, contrary to known *laws of nature* and of *chance*, supposedly evolved, in the course of *billions of years*, into more than “1,000,000 *species of insects*, 250,000 *species of beetles*, 110,000 *of butterflies and moths*, 80,000 *of shellfishes*, 80,000 *of snails*, 60,000 *of arachnids*, 40,000 *of flies*, 25,000 *of barnacles, crabs, lobsters and shrimps*; 20,000 *of fishes*, 10,000 *of bees*; 10,000 *of wasps*, 9,000 *of worms*; 5,000 *of ants*, 1,200 *of birds* and 1,000 *species of cockroaches*. There are also many *species of larger animals*, and over 180,000 *species of plants*. *Species of fungi* are 100,000; *algae* 20,000; *mosses* 20,000; *corals* 5,000; and *sponges* 3,000; besides many other *species of living things*.”<sup>4</sup>

The so-called primeval *nebulous* matter or hot gases/hydrogen atoms and undifferentiated protoplasmic life have supposedly come into concrete *existence* from *nowhere*. Appeal is made to undefined *blind operations* of unintelligent impersonal gods of *chance* to account for the existence of the same. Accordingly, in atheistic evolutionary thinking there is simply no room at all for any *uncaused efficient cause*, as demanded by pure logic and true science as well as by common sense, to account for the *origin* and planned well-designed *creative* development of *matter* and *life* forms. And, educated scientifically trained minds believe as such with blind faith.

There is simply no room for any Intelligent Designer and Creator God to account for the complex universe and the living world with all its energy systems and the intricate laws governing the same in absolute mathematical precision and orderly perfection; whose *origins* the atheistic scientists and evolutionists, even as they accidentally stumble at and discover, cannot logically account for but irrationally assign the same with religious zeal to some impotent blind and dumb goddess of *chance*! Accordingly, “... *when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools*” (Romans 1:21-22).

To assume complex *species of life* as having *evolved* out of some *simple* undifferentiated unicellular life forms, finally evolving into ‘*homo sapiens*’ sounds *fictional* and *absurd*! Even atheistic scientists are not *convinced* of any truth in the theories of evolution. As admitted by Professor Jerome, “*We have no acceptable theory of evolution at the present time. There is none; and I cannot accept the theory that I teach to my students each year. Let me explain. I teach the synthetic theory known as the neo-Darwinian one, for one reason only; not because it’s good, we know it is bad, but because there isn’t any other. Whilst waiting to find something better, you are taught something which is known to be inexact, which is a first approximation.*”<sup>5</sup>

Of course, given sufficient time ranging from *millions to billions* of years, evolution has become possible, but only in the fancy imagination of evolutionists, of course. This is somehow considered to be a scientific possibility but only according to the *fancy* speculations and *myths* of the evolutionists. In other words, **Time** is the fanciful ‘*hero*’ or ‘*god*’ of the *evolution plot*. Imaginary time slots *convert* the *myths* of evolution to sound scientifically *true*. These are next accepted by *faith* by the atheistic scientific community. And, it is *believed* as such, contrary to the true scientific spirit and in spite of *the* lack of evidence. And, instead of acknowledging God, the goddess of *chance* with irrational faith in its *prophetic probabilities* is worshipped.

Atheistic scientists and godless evolutionists need to be rationally *objective*, and without prejudice come to terms with “*The fact that evolutionary processes, on the scale of millions of years, cannot be observed, tested, repeated or falsified, places them in the category of historical*



science. In secular science, evaluating historical events is considered just as acceptable as conducting laboratory experiments when it comes to developing scientific theories. Since scientific theories are subject to change, it is acceptable to work within an admittedly deficient framework until a better or more reasonable framework can be found.”<sup>6</sup>

“When we deal with the issue of origins, we must realize that no people were there to observe and record the events. When scientists discuss the origins of the universe, or life on earth, we must realize that the discussion is based on assumptions. These fallible assumptions make the conclusions of the discussion less valid than if the discussion were based on actual observation. Almost all biology textbooks written in the last two generations have been written as if these presuppositions were true.”<sup>7</sup>

Unjustifiably, the “Proponents of the evolutionary worldview expect everyone to accept evolution as fact. This is a difficult case to make when the how, why, when, and where of evolutionary history are sharply contested or unknown by the scientists who insist evolution is a fact. Evolutionists often claim that creation is not scientific because of the unprovable assumptions that it is based on. The fact that evolution is based on its own set of unprovable, untestable, and unfalsifiable assumptions is recognized by many in the scientific community.”<sup>8</sup> Somehow, atheistic scientists choose to be **subjectively speculative** rather than be **honestly** rational and objective.

As such, in view of what is stated above, one is left wondering as to how the *myths* of evolution are considered to be truly scientific. Fallible *unscientific* conclusions based upon ‘unprovable’ assumptions are accepted as scientific facts with an irrational religious *faith* by the biased atheistic scientists and evolutionists. On the other hand, any belief in a Creator God is unacceptable; instead, it is replaced by a blind belief in *chance* who is the goddess of evolution. And such a state of mind only confirms the biblical truth that ‘once God gives one over’, man succumbs to subtle deception. Such deception *leaves no room* to objectively *perceive* and accept by *faith* any revealed *truth* and **unseen reality**.

## Systems of Reality Perception

There are obviously *three* basic systems of *perception* by which we acquire or obtain the knowledge of “reality” or “truth”. One, “Rationalism” – *determines the reality through reasoning*; two, “Empiricism” – *determines reality through what we see, touch, taste, hear and smell*; three, “Faith” – *determines reality through confidence in the authority and veracity of someone*” who has the knowledge of realities, *physical or spiritual*, that cannot be simply verified through the use of our five senses (R. B. Thieme). In principle, *scientific knowledge* is restricted to that obtainable by ‘*empiricism*’ and ‘*rationalism*’ subject to **verification** by experimentation.

“Observability, testability, repeatability, and falsifiability are the hallmarks of the scientific method. If an idea is not observable, testable, repeatable and falsifiable, it is not considered scientific. Neither **creation** nor **evolution** is directly observable, testable, repeatable, or falsifiable. Each is based on certain philosophical assumptions about how the earth began. Naturalistic evolution assumes that there was no God, and biblical creation assumes that there was a God who created everything in the universe. The argument is not over the evidence – the evidence is the same – it is over the way the evidence should be interpreted”<sup>9</sup>.

Next, the weakness of the so-called *rational* scientific method lies in its restricting itself “to gaining knowledge about the universe by allowing only naturalistic and materialistic explanations and causes. Science in this sense automatically rules out God and the possibility that He created the universe, because supernatural claims, it is asserted, cannot be tested and repeated. The denial of the supernatural events limits the depth of understanding that science can have and the types of questions science can ask.”<sup>10</sup> Nevertheless, scientists are quick to entertain the goddess of *chance* to whom they blindly attribute supernatural powers to bring into existence something out of nothing contrary to sound logic! And, blindly call it “SCIENCE”!

It is altogether impossible for human beings to explain the *origin* of *life* apart from God’s revelation in the Bible. “Research on the *origin* of *life* seems to be unique in that the conclusion has already been authoritatively accepted .....What remains to be done is to find the scenarios which describe the detailed mechanisms and processes by which this happened. **One must conclude that, contrary to the established and current wisdom, a scenario describing the genesis of life on earth by chance and natural causes which can be accepted on the basis of fact and not faith has not yet been written.**”<sup>11</sup>

Anyway, both Biblical Creation Truth and the Theory of Evolution are built upon *faith* in *presuppositions*. These are relied upon to account for the *origin* of Matter and Life in all its complex forms wherein everything is governed by intricate well-defined laws. However, *faith* in one’s *presuppositions* about realities has to be *realistic faith* and *rational*. Only infallible inerrant Biblical Revelation can provide the basis of *proven evidence* especially of *things* or *realities* that *cannot be seen*. Therefore, *faith* in biblically derived presuppositions is *realistic* and *rational*. On the other hand, *faith* in fallible humanly derived *presuppositions* or *speculations* is *blind*.

Unfortunately, all such *blind faith* is unrealistic, irrational, religious or superstitious. This includes the *negative faith* of the evolutionists, mainly their “*philosophical leap of faith that lies at the eve of evolution thinking*” such as “*molecules-to-man macroevolution*” or a “*soup of hydrogen atoms-to-sextillion stellar systems evolution*”. However, this kind of evolution is neither observable nor repeatable nor is it falsifiable to be treated as *true* science. Actually, to unbiased sound minds, *evolutionary theories* are only a ‘*hodge-podge*’ of *fallible* presuppositions and vague speculations which may, in due course of time, eventually ‘*mutate*’ or else, ‘*fossilize*’ but never *evolve* into *true* science!

***Biblical Revelation***, dealing with “***Creation Truth***”, on the other hand, is undoubtedly totally **RELIABLE**, **ABSOLUTE** and **INFALLIBLE**. After all, it proceeds from the Intelligent Mind of the ONE Supreme Omniscient God who is the perfect source of all true knowledge and sound practical wisdom. Undoubtedly, Biblical Divine “*Revelation is a direct road or path*” to comprehension of *realities*, seen and unseen. And, it is absolute; “*but is closed to a great many people and independent of rational thought. Those who can make use of it are fortunate. The second path is strictly rational and scientific...but relative with respect to the recording instrument, *man**”<sup>12</sup>

However, scientific *man* is hopelessly a *crude, imperfect* recording instrument. As such, *Scientific Knowledge* is hopelessly **RELATIVE**, **FALLIBLE** and **UNRELIABLE**, and it keeps constantly changing. Objectively speaking, “*All science is based on observation and experimentation by using our senses. But *reality* is not always identical with our *perception*. Reason and experience must intervene to correct the direct impression of the senses and to construct in our brains a picture which corresponds to what we call the external world, the objective world, in opposition to the subjective idea which is the result of the information given by the senses. In short, this picture is relative, and not absolute.*”<sup>13</sup>

Scientific Enterprise, however, is not without its ‘*uncertainties*’ and ‘*practical limits*’. Its crude findings and conclusions are not necessarily **absolute**. As such, “*To help us understand that science has practical limits, it is useful to divide science into two different areas: operational science and historical science (origins). Operational science deals with testing and verifying ideas in the present and leads to the production of useful products like computers, cars, and satellites. Historical science (origins) involves interpreting evidence from the past and includes the models of evolution and special creation. Recognizing that everyone has presuppositions that shape the way they interpret the evidence (rationalism) is an important step in realizing that historical science is not equal to operational science.*”<sup>14</sup>

As historical sciences, the models or doctrines of “Evolution” and “Special Creation” have to depend upon prior subjective presuppositions to interpret evidence from the past. Accordingly, “*Because no one was there to witness the past (except God), we must interpret it (the evidence) based on a set of starting assumptions. Creationists and evolutionists have the same evidence; they just interpret it within a different framework. **Evolution denies the role of God in the universe**, and creation accepts His eyewitness account – the Bible – as the foundation for arriving at a correct understanding of the universe.”<sup>15</sup>*

As a matter of fact, “*All scientists, creationist or evolutionist, have the same evidence; the difference is the presuppositions that are used to interpret that evidence. All reasoning is based on presuppositions. Biblical creationists start with the assumption that the Bible provides an accurate eyewitness history of the universe as a basis for scientific thought. Evolutionists begin with the presupposition that only natural laws can be used to explain the facts. Facts exist in the present, and our interpretations are an attempt to connect the past to the present. The evolutionists must **assume** everything about the past, while biblical creationists have the **Bible** as a “time machine” that can provide **valuable insight** into the **past**...”<sup>16</sup>*

---

1: The World Book Encyclopedia (International), World Book Inc., USA, Vol. E 6, p .406 2: *ibid.*

3: *The World Book Dictionary*, Vol. 1 A-K, World Book, Inc; US; p.737,

4: Finis J. Dake, *Dake’s Annotated Reference Bible*, Dake Publishing, Inc; USA, p. 82

5: Prof. Jerome Lejeune, *Evolution Exposed*, [www.answersingenesis.org](http://www.answersingenesis.org).

6: Patterson, R. *Natural Selection v/s Evolution*, 2007; [www.answersingenesis.org](http://www.answersingenesis.org) 7: *ibid.* 8: *ibid.*

9: Roger Patterson, *Evolution Exposed: What is Science?* [www.answersingenesis.org](http://www.answersingenesis.org). 10: *ibid*

11: Yockey, H.P., *A calculation of the probability of spontaneous biogenesis by information theory*, *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 67:377–398, 1977; quoted by Roger Patterson in “*The Origin of Life*”, *Evolution Exposed*, [www.answersingenesis.org](http://www.answersingenesis.org).

12: Lecomte Du Nouy, *Human Destiny*, The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., New York, USA , 1956 reprint, p.15.

13: R. Patterson; *What is Science? Evolution Exposed*, 2007;[www.answersingenesis.org](http://www.answersingenesis.org).

14: Ken Ham, *Creation: Where’s the proof?* [www.answersingenesis.org/go/proof](http://www.answersingenesis.org/go/proof). 15: *ibid* 16: *ibid*



# BIBLE'S AUTHORITY V/S MAN'S FALLIBLE IDEAS

*“The fundamental debate is really about the most trustworthy source of information about history. Do we start with the Bible, Which God says is true in every detail, including its history, or do we start with the changing theories of imperfect man? God tells Christians to walk by faith and that ‘without faith it is impossible to please Him’ (Hebrews 11:6).”* \_\_\_\_\_ Bodie Hodge

## THE HOLY BIBLE

“The Holy Bible, as a Book which is “superior to all other books”, “stands before the world unique, defying all comparison or competition. It owes nothing to any other, although every other is indebted to it. The Bible differs from every other book.

1. Every book must have an author, and an author whose moral and intellectual perceptions are equal to the task. Now we assert, that the book we call the Bible infinitely transcends the moral and intellectual powers of any man, or any set of men of which history makes mention; this is not less true even of the men whose names are associated with its production. Our assertion is that the Bible contains “the oracles of God” --- that God is its author --- that its origin can and must be traced to the Almighty mind.

2. Its history already is of itself a science, in which a lifetime would be too short to become perfect. Some portions of it are older than any known record besides. None of it belongs to one age alone --- “It goes up to the beginning of all things, and gives some prophetic notices of the end of all things” --- whilst every passing age affords some evidence that it is intimately connected with it. It gives us faithful biographies of such men as Moses, and David, and Solomon, and Daniel, and Paul, and John, and Jesus. Its history runs parallel with the history of the most learned, most mighty, and most polished nations of antiquity; and still holds on its way, and will, till “the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our God and of His Christ.” Against it earth and hell have been leagued, and many times has every copy been hunted out to be burned, as though it were the enemy of God. Does it not differ, then, from every other book in its history?

3. Every author has a style peculiarly his own, and oftentimes it is so strongly marked that many who know the author can easily detect his anonymous productions. So is it with the Bible. The first thing which strikes us perhaps on minutely examining its style is its unity. Another thing is its style is its sublime simplicity. The treasures of Heaven, the secrets of God, the depths of eternity, are made clear to the mind of a child.

4. A book is worthless or valuable in proportion to the new truths it unfolds, to the light it throws on old truths, or to the purifying and elevating thought it presents. Now every page, almost every line, in the Bible, if thus estimated, becomes invaluable. But what are those revelations which make it differ from all other books? Among many others it reveals to us God in all His perfections. It reveals to us man as he was, is, and might be. The disclosures it makes on this subject are such as our consciousness approves.

5. But what book has exerted a title of the influence that the Bible has over individuals, and families, and societies, and institutions, and governments, and nations?!” It has gone hand in hand with civilization, science, law, and has been the precursor of all that could elevate the physical, intellectual, and moral conditions of a people. Happy is the man who experimentally understands its influence”!

**Joseph S. Exell, *The Bible Illustrator*, Vol.1, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, USA, p. XXIII**  
(Above Text Reproduced with Permission: *Courtesy: Elizabeth Kool*, Baker Book House, USA)

## BIBLE'S AUTHORITY V/S MAN'S FALLIBLE IDEAS

Objectively speaking, as has been convincingly stated earlier, “*The fundamental debate is really about the most trustworthy source of information about history. Do we start with the Bible, which God says is true in every detail, including its history, or do we start with the changing theories of imperfect man? God tells Christians to walk by faith and that ‘without faith it is impossible to please Him’ (Hebrews 11:6).*”<sup>1</sup>

The Self-existent Ever-Living God is the Source of everything. He is the Creator of all forms of life. These life forms include the microscopic viruses, bacteria and unicellular simple life forms as well as the multi-varied diverse and complex forms or species of flora and fauna. Accordingly, “*The only true account of the origin of life on earth is found in the account of the only Eyewitness who was there. The Bible explains that the presence of life on earth is the result of supernatural actions of an omnipotent Intelligent Designer—the God of the Bible. Many complain that accepting this supernatural explanation stops anyone from pursuing knowledge about the natural world, but the presence of a logical Creator provides a reason to look for order in the universe. This point is underscored by the fact that many of the major fields of science were founded by men who believed in the Creator God of the Bible. The only aspect of science that the acceptance of creation excludes is the story of evolution.*”<sup>2</sup>

However, as stated by Ulric Jelinek, “*Under Divine Guidance, men did not attempt to interpret what they were told to write.*”<sup>3</sup> “*... the Divine Guidance lay in the fact that none of the writers of the Scripture tried to interpret what they wrote in the light of the science of the day, because had they done so this book would be full of errors as are many books of today. Now this book is not a scientific text book. If it were written as a scientific textbook it would have needed to be written in the terms of final science. ...nor are we living in the time of final science; as a matter of fact we are just beginning to scratch the surface of things scientific.*”<sup>4</sup> And the scientific knowledge man has gained is nothing in comparison to what God knows!

The God of the Bible *declares* that He created by *fiat* all the material and spiritual creations, the animate and inanimate things and that He is the First and the Last Cause of everything that exists; not only that, He further states that He is going to destroy “*the heavens and earth* (of Genesis 1:3-31) *that are now*” (2 Peter 3:13) and create “*new heavens and earth*” (2 Peter 3:22) and ‘*all things new*’ instantly by *fiat*. Of course, atheistic scientists cannot accept nor feel comfortable with any biblical truth! They simply cannot, given their strong unholy bias.

On the other hand, *theistic evolutionists* entertain their own ideas about God whom they *profess* to know as a “*Creator God who creates by fiat*”. At the same time they assume He is a ‘*Creator of Evolution*’. Indoctrinated with the *myths* of evolution, they assume that God has brought everything into existence by *creating* and *setting in motion* an *evolutionary process* that worked all the *wonders* in the course of *billions of years*. With a worshipful attitude, perhaps, they then ‘*gasp*’ and adoringly whisper “*How Great Thou Art?!*”

The Bible states and proves that GOD IS and that HE is the CREATOR of *Matter* and *Life*. HE is the SUPREME INTELLIGENT DESIGNER and the FIRST CAUSE of everything that has been in existence and now exists, both seen and unseen realities. However, “*The agnostic and the atheist do not seem to be in the least disturbed by the fact that our entire organized, living universe becomes incomprehensible without the hypothesis of God. Their belief in some physical elements, of which they know very little, has all the earmarks of an irrational faith, but they are not aware of it.*”<sup>5</sup>



Anyway, the *arrogant human tendency* is always to blatantly ignore the ‘*hypotheses*’ rather the ‘*reality*’ of God! So, the true Living God is never real to them. And so, they are given over to hold on to vague speculations with *irrational* religious *faith*.

Again, “*Many men who are intelligent and of good faith imagine they cannot believe in God because they are unable to conceive Him*”. However, “*An honest man, endowed with scientific curiosity, should not need to visualize God, any more than a physicist needs to visualize the electron. Any attempt at representation is necessarily crude and false, in both cases. The electron is materially inconceivable and yet, it is more perfectly known through its effects than a simple piece of wood. If we could really conceive God we could no longer believe in Him because our representation, being human, would inspire us with doubts. It is not the image we create of God which proves God. It is the effort we make to create this image.*”<sup>6</sup>

Some astute *atheistic* Scientists and Evolutionists know that they cannot deny the FIRST CAUSE without making them-selves look foolish, ignorant, and highly biased. As such, these “*Evolutionists do not deny the FIRST CAUSE*”. Most embarrassingly, therefore, “*Their theory begins with matter or substance already in existence. They believe in primitive nebulousity and powers possessed by molecules. They do not try to account for how these came to exist, how molecules got their inherent powers, or how there came to be definite laws governing them so that they could produce, without failure, all things as we now have them. Their theory does not show why there is such bitter hatred against the God of the Bible as being that **first cause**. It does not consider proved facts, but has absolute faith in a mere supposition which no fact has ever been produced to prove. Its teachers seemingly deny God, the Bible, and known facts and continue to rob multiplied thousands of children of simple faith in God and the Bible without a sting of conscience. They do multiplied drawings of different kinds of human beings rising from a molecule through a monkey to the present man, and add guess upon guess of how life was in each stage of evolution, but refuse to accept the Bible truth of the origin of all things. They glibly deny God and His work in creation and at the same time pose as having the only truth on the subject.*”<sup>7</sup>

Once the vague atheistic theories of evolution take hold of any man, there is no room left in man’s biased mind for any revealed biblical truth. Evolutionary thinking then reduces the biblical doctrine relating to the ‘*fall of man*’ to a mere *myth*. Man’s sinful nature is then treated as a mere animalistic instinct from which he is required to further evolve by obtaining freedom from the same through the processes of civilization and moral development. As such, there is no ‘*sin*’ and hence, there is no need for man’s redemption from sin through the atoning sacrifice of Christ. Next, there is no resurrection, no life after death, no accountability to God, no judgment, no heaven, and no hell-fire. Thus, all the Biblical Doctrines are reduced to mere myths and, instead, the *myths* of evolution are religiously accepted as “*scientific truth*”. Nevertheless, puny man will have to bow down to biblical authority over him or her, sooner or later; or else, **be chastened in the lake of fire** and *accept the very biblical truths he flatly denies now*. That is how the Bible describes the fate of those who despise the Word of God and its Rule in one’s life and conduct – really, a fearful outcome for those who arrogantly but foolishly deny if not defy the living God.

---

1: Bodie Hodge. 2: Roger Patterson, “*The Origin of Life*”, *ibid*.

3: Ulric Jelinek, *op. cit.* p.6. 4: *ibid.* p. 5.

5: Lecomte Du Nouy, *Human Destiny*, The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., New York, USA , 1956 reprint, p.15. 6: *Ibid*, p. 15

7: Finis Jennings Dake, *op. cit.* p.80.

Is it Science v/s Faith  
Is it Science v/s Faith  
OR  
Is it the BIBLE And True SCIENCE  
Is it the BIBLE And True SCIENCE

\*\*\*\*\*

*“Since there is no real scientific evidence  
That evolution is occurring at present  
Or ever occurred in the past,  
It is reasonable to conclude that  
Evolution is not a fact of science,  
As many claim.  
In fact, it is not even science at all,  
But an arbitrary system  
Built upon faith in universal naturalism.”*

**Roger Patterson**

\*\*\*\*\*

*“If science depends on  
Naturalistic explanations,  
It must accept that our thoughts are  
Simply the products of chemical reactions  
That evolved from random chance.*

*How can you ultimately rely on randomness  
To evolve the correct way of thinking?*

*If there is no God,  
Ultimately, philosophically,  
How can one talk about reality  
How can one even rationally believe  
That there is such a thing as truth,  
Let alone decides what it is?”*

**Ken Ham**

## Is it Science v/s Faith or Is it the Bible and True Science

Genuine living faith in God as the Creator of *matter* and *life* is not only realistic but is relevant, very essential, and mandatory. This *faith* is spiritually fruitful as the same is built upon reliable biblical revelation. As such, it is not like the blind *irrational* faith of those who accept the unscientific speculations of baseless evolutionary theories about the *origins* of matter and life. Anyway, to be objective, “*One must conclude that, contrary to the established and current wisdom, a scenario describing the genesis of life on earth by chance and natural causes which can be accepted on the basis of fact and not faith has not yet been written.*”<sup>1</sup>

Zealous Bible-believing *theistic evolutionists* state that “*God delights in concealing things; scientists delight in discovering things*” (Proverbs 25:2, Message Bible). Accordingly, they assuredly believe that “*It must be exciting to be a scientist today. It must be even more exciting to be a scientist, who believes in God, able to examine the natural world through the eyes that recognize the work of the great Master Architect.*”<sup>2</sup> The problem arises when “*Believers see Science as a threat and Scientists as enemies of Faith.*”<sup>3</sup> And the problem is further aggravated when *theistic evolutionists* add unhealthy confusion even to biblically orientated and spiritually well-ordered minds by failing to interpret both the “*Holy Bible*” and the “*Book of Science and Natural Revelation*” the way *God* wrote them.

Actually, there is simply no real tangible conflict between ‘*Good Science*’ and ‘*Biblical Faith*’; rather, it is a *conflict* between *God* and the *Old Serpent of Evolution* falsely interpreting, if not questioning, *God’s* Creation accounts in the Bible. In the process, the Man, rather the *Innocent Christian*, becomes the *arena* of that *conflict*. He has to choose *either* to accept the Biblical Creation account *literally* by *faith* or else, allow himself to be carried away by the intellectually appealing but biblically and empirically or factually unfounded ‘*scientific speculations*’ the *Serpent of Evolution* has to dangle.

Scientist Urlick Jelinek eloquently states: “*Since God wrote the Bible and God wrote the ‘Book of Science’ there can be no disagreement between them. And if there is any disagreement in our minds between them you will find that it is because there is something wrong with either the observation of the facts or the interpretation of that observation.*”<sup>4</sup>

Instead of studying the Bible to find out what *God* has to say about His creation and evaluate the questionable scientific findings accordingly, *theistic evolutionists* interpret the dubious research findings in relation to erroneous biblical views such as the “*Traditional Six-day Creationism*”. Or else, they blindly accept the vague findings as absolute truth. In the process, they make themselves ‘*look foolish*’ and ‘*ignorant*’. Certainly they are not aware of the fact that there are two biblical accounts in Genesis 1: One, an *instant* original creation of *Genesis 1:1* and the other, the true *Biblical Six-day Creation* based upon *literal* interpretation of *Genesis 1: 3-31*.

Nevertheless, our “*Realistic scientists know that they might never uncover all the mysteries of creation*”. And though they “*...may never fully resolve {all} questions in this life, {still they believe} it is a legitimate and exciting quest, and we are discovering wonderful things along the way.*”<sup>5</sup> However, in the meantime, it will be a wise thing to be careful “*not to smuggle into Scripture concepts that are not there... the Divine Guidance lay in the fact that none of the writers of the Scripture tried to interpret what they wrote in the light of the science of the day, because had they done so this book would be full of errors as are many books of today. Now this book is not a scientific text book. If it were written as a scientific textbook it would have needed to be written in the terms of final science. ...nor are we living in the time of final science; as a matter of fact we are just beginning to scratch the surface of things scientific.*”<sup>6</sup>



Whether they openly agree with it or not, *theistic* evolutionists are guilty of “*smuggling into Scripture concepts that are not there*”. Instead of allowing the Scriptures to confirm and clarify the so-called *tested and well-established genuine scientific findings*, they are ‘*smuggling into Scripture*’ evolutionary concepts or baseless “*scientific speculations*”. Or else, they *indulge* in biased biblical interpretations and falsely presume that ‘*Genesis 1 is about the Who of creation, not the How of creation*’. Accordingly, they tell us that Genesis 1 creation account need *not be taken literally* but be treated as a ‘*genre of the creation epic*’ adopted by Moses.

Certainly, the Bible is not technically a scientific textbook written in ‘*terms of final science*’. Yet, the Bible in its very first book titled ‘Genesis’ deals with subjects of permanent scientific value, fundamentally, but not finally. Genesis, as such, is ‘*preeminently scientific bedrock*’ upon which all true knowledge (all Sciences) should find a permanent foundational base. As has been appropriately observed by George C. Morgan, the “*Book of Genesis*” actually “*contains the foundation truths of theology, cosmogony, anthropology, sociology, hamartiology, ethnology, and soteriology. None of these subjects are dealt with finally, but all are presented fundamentally. Genesis supplies men with the rudiments of the science of God. It offers a theory of the origin of the universe. It says the first thing concerning the science of man. It lays the foundations of the science of society. It reveals the simplest matters of the science of sin. It introduces the study of the science of races. Finally, it presents the initial truths concerning the science of salvation. The essential value of the book is the fundamental character of its teaching on all these matters. Its declarations meet us at the point where knowledge, proceeding along the line of investigation, fails; and present truths undiscovered by investigation.*”<sup>7</sup>

Biblical Revelation and Natural-General Revelation, when left untainted by human misinterpretation of both biblical and scientific facts, go hand in hand. These two domains cannot be at war with each other if both the biblical facts and scientific discoveries are interpreted without any prejudice or bias. Bible and true Science can be the proper and the real sources of true knowledge in our “*pursuit of the ultimate answers of life.*” Biblical Faith and true Science based upon Natural Revelation cannot be at odds or in a flat disagreement with each other. These two sources of knowledge cannot act as enemies at logger-heads or be engaged in a ‘war of words’. Rather, as succinctly pointed out by the physicist and theologian John Polkinghorne, “*Science and Religion ... are friends, not foes, in the common quest for knowledge*”. All who seek true profitable knowledge should keep this fact in mind in their common quest for knowledge.

---

**1: Yockey, H. P., *A Calculation of the Probability of the Spontaneous Biogenesis by Information Theory*, *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 67:377-398, 1997.**

**2: John Halford, *Editorial*, *Christian Odyssey*, *op. cit.* p. 4.**

**3: *ibid*, p. 4.**

**4: Jelinek, Ulric, *Science and the Bible*, Kingston Bible Trust, England, p. 4.**

**5: *Creation and Evolution?* *op. cit.* p. 8.**

**6: Ulric Jelinek, *op. cit.* p. 5.**

**7: George Campbell Morgan, *Handbook for Bible Teachers and Preachers: Applications to Life from Every Book of the Bible*, Baker Book House, USA, 1982, p. 1**

**BIBLE and TRUE SCIENCE  
VS  
ATHEISTIC EVOLUTIONISM**

***Debunking the Atheistic Pagan Myth of Evolution***

\*\*\*\*\*

*“God has created and made everything beautiful in its time”.*

*“Also He has put eternity in their hearts,  
Except that no one can find out the work  
That God does from beginning to end. ”*

**(Ecclesiastes 3:11)**

\*\*\*\*\*

*“Science cannot answer the questions relating to the Genesis of Matter and Life; or, prove that there has been ever any evolution of life from inert matter; or, that animate primordial life forms actually evolved from inanimate matter. Only Philosophy based on Natural Revelation and beyond that Theology based on Biblical Revelation can arrive at an answer to any question of Origin of Matter and Life that is intellectually and scientifically satisfactory.*

*Philosophically speaking, ‘Effect’ cannot be greater than the ‘Cause’. Now, that rules out the possibility of any blind chance (a lesser cause) giving rise to matter (a greater effect), and inanimate matter (a lesser cause) giving rise to animate life forms (a greater effect). Therefore, theologically speaking, GOD, as the Prime Mover and Uncaused Cause, is the Creator of Matter and Life including Human Life as well as the Unseen or Invisible Spirit-life.”*

***~~~ Fr. Carmo Martins, Personal Notes, paraphrased.***

\*\*\*\*\*

***“The agnostic and the atheist***

***Do not seem to be in the least disturbed  
By the fact that our entire organized,  
Living universe becomes incomprehensible  
Without the hypothesis of God.  
Their belief in some physical elements,  
Of which they know very little,  
Has all the earmarks of an irrational faith,  
But they are not aware of it.***

***Some of them have remained slaves to a naïve verbalism”***

***Lecomte Du Nouy***

\*\*\*\*\*

## BIBLE and True SCIENCE v/s ATHEISTIC EVOLUTION

The *Answer* to the *Question* of *Origin* of *Matter* and *Life* is actually outside the realm of scientific enterprise or any other human investigating enterprise. No man can really ever find out (*cf.* Ecclesiastes 3:11) the real answers to the knotty questions relating to the *origin* of matter and life; nor explain the *purpose* for the existence of matter and life; nor provide any *meaning* to human life. At the most, men may philosophize; or, they may confidently lean upon *biblical* revelation. The pertinent questions relating to the *origins* are purely philosophical and theological issues and are, therefore, not within the realm of the *empirical* scientific enterprise.

Scientifically unfounded Theory of Evolution is technically not a true science. It is not *even* a philosophy but an illogical nonsense. The so-called theories of *Evolution* hailed as *scientific* realities and taught in almost all the fields of higher education have *fancily* occurred and still *occur* in the *minds* of the *atheistic- materialistic* scientists and evolutionists. These theories are then *blindly* accepted by the educated *elite* without questioning because there is no room for questioning. “*Thus saith the Atheistic Scientist*”... and that settles it, once for all...*to question* is to invite *antagonism*; or else, sound foolish and ignorant or downright stupid!

*Evolutionism* is more of a religion that includes atheistic theories of inorganic-cosmic evolution and organic-biological evolution. These theories encapsulate a ‘*family*’ of fallible ideas and myths to account for the *origins* of *matter* and *life* in a crude attempt to do away with a living Creator God. Subsequently, evolution of complex life forms over the course of *billions of years* culminating in the ‘*Descent of Man*’ from a Common Ancestor is firmly but blindly believed without any ‘*sting of conscience*’!

Frankly speaking, most “*People believe the ideas of the evolutionary development of life on earth for many reasons: it is all that they have been taught and exposed to, they believe the evidence supports evolution, they do not want to be lumped with people who do not believe in evolution and are often considered to be less intelligent or “backward,” evolution has the stamp of approval from real scientists, and evolutionary history allows people to reject the idea of God and legitimize their own immorality.*”<sup>1</sup> Next, “*Evaluating the presuppositions behind belief in evolution makes for a much more productive discussion. Two intelligent people can arrive at different conclusions using the same evidence; so their starting assumptions are the most important issue in discussing historical science.*”<sup>2</sup>

However, the vague unfounded Theories of Evolution have been constantly ‘*mutating*’ and ‘*evolving*’ into new *revised* forms and will further ‘*evolve*’ into yet newer modified versions. At the moment, “*Classical Darwinism has been replaced by an enlarged theory of natural selection which (purportedly) does greater justice to the facts of the living world. With the rise of twentieth-century biochemistry an evolutionary approach to the subject of the origin of life (purportedly) became possible. A most influential hypothesis was stated by A. I. Oparin (1924), and by Haldane (1929). According to a recent modified version of this hypothesis, life originated by a process of chemical evolution on the earth, before there was free oxygen in its atmosphere. Through the action of ultraviolet light, inorganic material gave rise to organic molecules, which in turn evolved into complex polymers having a primitive capacity to reproduce. From these diffused polymers, specific closed organisms developed, culminating in the nucleated cell. At this stage, chemical evolution was succeeded by organic evolution.*”<sup>3</sup>



Both the archaic or the historical and the modern *modified* versions certainly sound like fancy fiction-stories! Next, '*Naturalism*' and '*Materialism*' are based on *beliefs* that "*scientific laws are adequate to account for all phenomena*" (naturalism) and "*physical matter is the only fundamental reality and that all organisms, processes, and phenomena can be explained as manifestations of matter*" (materialism). As such, those indoctrinated with *naturalism* and *materialism* cannot entertain anything *supernatural*, including *supernatural biblical truth*.

Rather, as has been accurately pointed out by S. Hawking and L. Mlodinow, "...one's concept of reality can depend on the mind of the perceiver. That viewpoint, with various subtle differences, goes by names such as *antirealism*, *instrumentalism* or *idealism*. According to those doctrines, the world we know is constructed by the human mind employing sensory data as its raw material and is shaped by the interpretive structure of our brains. This viewpoint may be hard to accept, but it is not difficult to understand. There is no way to remove the observer – us – from our perception of the world."<sup>4</sup>

"As measuring devices, however, we are crude instruments"<sup>5</sup> No wonder, fallible scientific theories keep on changing! On the other hand, the Word of God is permanently unchanging, infallible and inerrant, absolutely trustworthy and foundational to all true knowledge.

As pointedly commented by Lecomte Du Nouy, "*Science struggles constantly against the imperfections of our sensorial system, the rhythms of which are not always in unison with outside phenomena.*"<sup>6</sup> Given such a drawback he advises: "*Let us try not to transpose facts belonging to one scale of observation in our own universe onto another, and, above all, let us beware of casting human judgments on events which transcend our experience.*"<sup>7</sup> (*italics, mine!*)

Whether scientists freely admit it or not, the vague fancy Theory of Evolution is still a theory; it is "*what fallible scientists think or speculate*" whilst *claiming* they are searching for truth about the *origins* of *matter* and *life* based on what they observe in nature. Unfortunately, it is an *eternally incomplete* search for truth. And, it will remain an eternally incomplete search, because the study of the *origins* of *matter* and *life* includes *truth* that cannot be purely ascertained by the use of the '*five senses*'. Nor it can be ascertained by mere *rationalism* as is the case in all empirical sciences. Anyway, "*evolution cannot be truly scientific as it cannot be observed experimentally or repeated to prove the validity of its conclusions*".

Any unbiased scientist, who is objectively rational, will do well to accept without prejudice that "*The evolution of living beings, as a whole, is in absolute contradiction to the science of inert matter. It is in disagreement with the second law of thermodynamics, the keystone of our science, based on the laws of chance. To account what has taken place since the appearance of life, we are obliged to call in an "anti-chance" which orients this immense series of phenomena in a progressive, highly "improbable" direction (incompatible with chance), resulting in the human brain.*"<sup>8</sup>

Accordingly, Lecomte Du Nouy doesn't fail to confront fellow but erring scientists by stating as follows: "*Should we keep our blind confidence in human reason and intelligence, we will attribute these contradictions to our momentary ignorance and will say: In a near or distant future, new facts or new interpretations will enable us to shed light on these obscurities, due to our imperfect knowledge of reality'. But in so doing, we cease to think rationally, scientifically. We simply express a hope based on a sentimental trust in science. What is more, we completely lose sight of the fact that when these contradictions, as in our example, are not with details, but with a set of fundamental concepts, which constitute the foundations of our science, we have*

*actually shaken the whole scientific edifice in the name of which we have condemned (Biblical) Faith, and have been driven, by an irrational faith in an unaccountable abstractive intelligence, to demonstrate its failure.”<sup>9</sup>*

Obviously, the imaginary *evolution* of *man* from some ‘*common ancestor*’ is scientifically *untenable*. For, “*Just as there seems to be an impassable gap between the irreversible ‘evolution’ of electrons and that of atoms (built up of electrons); between the irreversible ‘evolution’ of atoms and that of life (built up of atoms); so also there seems to be an intellectually impassable gap between the ‘evolution of life’ and that of ‘man’ as such.*”<sup>10</sup>

Atheistic scientists are prone to foolishly *think* that the universe has evolved from some primitive material atoms, call it ‘*soup of hydrogen atoms*’. But, from what did the *original* hydrogen atoms evolve? Analytically, “*Material atoms are made up of sub-atomic particles: protons, electrons and neutrons. But between the realm of the atoms and that of electrons there is today an impassable chasm; the laws which explain the motion and behavior of the electrons are not the same as those which govern the atoms.*”<sup>11</sup> Obviously, “*right at the beginning, there is a break in the continuity of the history of the evolution of the universe, or rather in man’s interpretation of this history.*”<sup>12</sup>

Next, some biased scientists blindly *assume* that *life* came into existence from lifeless inert matter some billions of years ago by *spontaneous generation* (*abiogenesis*). Others assume and theorize inorganic matter gave rise to organic matter under the action of ultraviolet rays, eventually evolving into a ‘*nucleated cell*’. But they cannot account for the *origin* of primitive matter they begin with whilst theorizing. Instead, they fall back on ‘*chance*’; but then, the *laws* of *chance* cannot account for the *origin* of any primitive life.

On the whole, realistically and objectively speaking, “*It is impossible to lay down the basis for a calculation which would enable one to establish the probability of the spontaneous appearance of life on earth*”<sup>13</sup> ‘*by chance*’. Still, wonder and worship the goddess of ‘*chance*’ ‘and ‘*gasp*’, ‘*How Great Thou Art?*’ Moreover, in accordance with the known laws of chance, “*The probability for a single protein molecule of high dissymmetry to be formed by the action of chance and normal thermal agitations remains practically nil*”. Accordingly, “*An explanation of the evolution of life by chance alone is untenable today. It does not permit the incorporation of man and of his psychological activities into the general pattern of things.*”<sup>14</sup>

If it be scientifically and logically impossible for even a “*simple*” protein molecule to evolve by *chance*, how can one account for any evolution of complex phenomena of Life and that of Man *by mere chance*? Does it mean that Mother Nature chose to “*cheat*” or *violate* the *laws* of *chance* to make evolution from *simple* to *complex* forms somehow still possible, when logically arguing it could never be possible by “*chance*”, lawfully? As otherwise, “*It is totally impossible to account scientifically for all the phenomena pertaining to Life and its development and its so-called progressive evolution, and that, unless the foundations of modern science are overthrown, they are unexplainable.*”<sup>15</sup>

Unfortunately, this is rather pretty difficult for biased minds to digest and honestly accept and thereby uphold one’s scientific integrity and that, even after realizing the fancy theory of evolution stands debunked on its own for lack of evidence! Nevertheless, in their misguided zeal to deny God, “*Evolutionists seem pathetically eager to find some way of accounting for the universe and its life forms without resorting to God and creation. But they must inevitably fail, and some at least sense they will fail. ‘In our attempts to understand the nature of the universe, theorists must often admit to reaching a possible dead end – a question we may never*

*satisfactorily answer'*; James M. Cline, *The Origin of Matter, American Scientist*. Vol.92, March-April 2004; p. 156'. It is obvious that Genesis 1 is a satisfactory answer, but our atheistic physicists and astronomers keep trying since they feel they must find an answer that does not involve God." <sup>16</sup>

The so-called evidence for evolution is absolutely irrelevant to logically account for the origin of matter and life. Nor is it substantially valid and credible to scientifically explain the origins or the basal first cause - which is the root and the trunk necessary to nourish and support the Tree of Evolution. Next, Louis Pasteur has disproved the theory of spontaneous generation. Yet, scientists have not given up that theory. They still maintain that life gradually came into existence from lifeless inert matter. But they cannot explain precisely how; instead, they keep on guessing, thereby only displaying their unholy biased ignorance.

It has been theoretically stipulated that everything observable and subject to scientific experimentation and scrutiny deals with the five known existing categories: time, force, action, space and matter. Scientists cannot account for the origin of these basic five scientific categories and the Laws of Nature that govern their relationships as arising out of nothing by mere 'blind chance'. The actual origin of these five prominent categories can only be accounted for by the biblical witness of Genesis 1:1 wherein Time (In the Beginning), Force (God), Action, (created), Space (heavens) and Matter (and the earth) rightly fit in.

Atheistic Scientists are frenetically working overtime to explore the origin of matter and life so as to account for the existence of life and matter without the need of a Creator God! And, even if scientists do somehow succeed in creating life in the laboratory, it will only prove that it requires an intelligent mind to create it and that nothing can come from nothing by 'chance'. As such, to be scientifically precise, nothing has ever evolved or can ever evolve of its own out of nothing by chance. True science rejects the theory of evolution rooted in the assumption that "Nothing working on nothing by nothing, through nothing, for nothing begat everything" <sup>17</sup> including the super-intelligence of the atheistic scientists.

Next, the theory of biological evolution contradicts known laws of nature. "It is a law of nature that nothing reproduces anything greater than itself. There can be no evolution without the power of reproduction in living things. Since reproduction is a prior condition to evolution, it cannot be a product of it. Hence we face the logical necessity for the creation of life and its power of continued reproduction." <sup>18</sup> Unfortunately, biased evolutionists are not willing to weigh the facts that are in favor of creation and change. In a way, they somehow demonstrate that God has given them over to hold on to the blatant evolutionary lies. Accordingly, they further indulge in formulating and reformulating the so-called scientific but vague irrelevant speculations which make sense only to those who have no fear of God.

Life comes only from the pre-existing life and non-living matter can never give birth to life. If we do not allow our prejudice to blind us, we will conclude "The laws of chance, in their actual state, cannot account for the birth of life". It is scientifically impossible to explain the 'birth of life' by resorting to the operation of the laws of chance. Instead, we should be quick to honestly admit that the laws of chance actually "forbid any evolution other than that which leads to less and less dissymmetrical states." <sup>19</sup> Such a relevant conclusion necessarily goes against the theory of evolution. For, according to evolutionary thinking "The history of the evolution of life reveals a systematic increase in dissymmetries, both structural and functional". Therefore, such a "... formidable contradiction stands today as an insurmountable obstacle in the path of materialism" <sup>20</sup> - or evolutionism, or naturalism, or religious fanatical atheism and communism.



The intelligent unbiased minds have no other option but to *believe* in the Self-existent Creator God of the Bible as the *uncaused First Cause* of everything that exists. Accordingly, it is rationally sound and scientific to believe that “*In the Beginning, God created the Heavens and Earth*”. God is the *Uncreated Source* that has brought the *Heavens and Earth* into existence not during the *six days* of the creation week, 6000 or 10,000 years back, but by *fiat* in the *dateless* pre-historical past. The ‘*work of the six days*’, the truth of which is challenged by the evolutionists in vain and because of which challenge *theistic evolutionists* have bowed down to them by compromising with the biblical truth of Genesis 1 and 2 is a much later work of renewal and restoration through re-creation.

Atheistic Scientists and Evolutionists unduly feel threatened by the Biblical account of *Creation* because as absolute *revealed* truth along with Natural Revelation it strikes at the *root* of the Tree of Evolution. And once you strike and chop off the root and the trunk at its very base the whole tree falls flat. If evolution ever worked, then scientists should be able to prove how the *first* forms of *matter* and *life* came into existence *out of nothing*. Apart from it, evolution is nothing but downright myth and as such, the Theory of Evolution stands automatically debunked!

**Anyway, those who blindly believe the vague Theories of Evolution know that there is no real substance in the theories that presume to explain the origin of even simplest forms of life. Admittedly, “... there is not a single fact or a single hypothesis, today, which gives an explanation of the birth of life or of natural evolution. Willy-nilly we are, therefore, obliged either to admit the idea of transcendent intervention, which the scientist may well call God as anti-chance, or to simply recognize that we know nothing of these questions outside of a small number of mechanisms. This is not an act of faith but an undisputed scientific statement. It is not we, but the convinced materialist who shows a powerful, even though negative, faith, when he obstinately continues to believe, without any proof, that the beginning of life, evolution, man’s brain, and the birth of moral ideas will some day be scientifically accounted for. He forgets that this would necessitate the complete transformation of modern science, and that, consequently, his conviction is based on purely sentimental reasons.”<sup>21</sup>**

Moreover, as is very well known to educated atheists and atheistic scientists, “*The ideas of natural selection, speciation, adaptation, and evolution are often used interchangeably by secular scientists*”. This they formidably do so, so as to unjustly suppress Biblical Truth as well as Natural Revelation. And, instead of honestly acknowledging the truths of which they are fully aware they not only stubbornly hold on to evolutionary lies but unjustly further propagate these lies in the Name of Science clothing themselves with a scientific garb.

But “*When scientists and authors use evolution to mean both “change in features over time” and “the history of life on earth,” it is difficult to know which definition is being used in each instance. This is often used as a bait-and-switch technique (equivocation). When small changes that arise as a result of the loss of information are used as evidence for molecules-to-man evolution, the switch has occurred.”*<sup>22</sup> Anyway, the foes of rational biblical faith are in no way without any excuse!

Upholding the well-established structural design in creation, “*Biblical creationists consider major structures to be part of the original design provided by God. Modifications to those structures, adaptations, occur due to genetic recombination, random mutations, and natural selection. These structures do not arise from the modification of similar structures of another kind of animal. The beak of the woodpecker, for example, did not arise from the beak of a theropod dinosaur ancestor; it was an originally designed structure. The difference in beak*

*shapes among woodpeckers fits with the idea of natural selection leading to changes within a population of woodpeckers—within the created kind.”*<sup>23</sup>

Furthermore, “*The rationalist, who in the last forty years has had reason to doubt the all-mightiness of reason, accepts without tremor the overthrow of physical theories considered unshakable in his youth. He admits the inconceivable space in which the electrons move. He admits that the electron is a “wave of probability”. He admits the existence of particles such as the “Neutrino”, and the “Anti-neutrino” which were invented for reasons of pure mathematical symmetry. He admits, without resistance, the existence, the reality of these paradoxical entities which he is forbidden to visualize---*”<sup>24</sup> “... yet he obstinately refuses to admit the possibility of a supernatural, creative power without which the greatest scientific problems are incomprehensible, simply because the models furnished by his sensorial experience do not enable him to conceive or visualize it even though he is quite aware of their limits. He knows and does not even discuss the fact that the image he has built up of the universe rests on reactions determined in him by a minute fraction (less than 1 per thousand billions, or 0.000,000,000,001 per cent) of the vibrations surrounding him and which go through him without leaving a trace in his consciousness. **There is nothing more irrational than a man who is rationally irrational.**”<sup>24</sup> Unashamedly, the atheistic highly biased cocked rationalists and evolutionists along with the atheistic scientists take pride in being wholly rationally irrational.

The fact that the CREATOR GOD of the Bible exists and that He is the FIRST CAUSE of everything that exists is a *basic spiritual reality*. But then, just as in the case of unseen but known physical ‘*paradoxical entities*’ one is ‘*forbidden to visualize*’, so also we are expressly ‘*forbidden to visualize*’ known and unknown spiritual realities.

Nevertheless, “*whether or not you think God exists is not a concern at the moment. What should concern you is maintaining logical and clear thought. If you say ‘There is No God’ you are being arbitrary and foolish (Psalms 14:1; 53:1-2).*”<sup>25</sup> “*A logical statement might be, ‘On the basis of rationalism and empiricism, God does not exist. But if you dogmatically say ‘I do not believe God exists...’ you demonstrate inconsistent thinking. If you truly do not think God exists, at least express the concept by making a statement that shows you are a logical thinker*”<sup>26</sup> Notwithstanding biased speculations, scientific discovery, at the most, has only disproved wrong traditional beliefs claimed to have been derived from the Bible.

The Bible’s view is that God is the unchallengeable Almighty Creator of the universe and all that is in it. And that our vast incomprehensible universe is maintained by His almighty power with an utmost scientific precision that defies the imagination of our crude scientists. “*This is no happenstance. The regularity of nature is the constancy of God who sustains the physical, moral and spiritual order. Nature or Science is a tribute to the Majesty, to the wisdom and to the Benevolence of God.*”<sup>27</sup>

The Almighty Creator God of the universe reveals Himself to us in the Bible in a well organized logical sense “*because God is totally organized*”<sup>28</sup>. God not only makes organized sense, “*but His organized sense is presented in the Bible in the form of a plan we can understand. God not only has a plan but His plan is perfect and His plan includes you. You are the object of God’s plan. If you can say: ‘I am a person, I am a human being, I belong to the human race’, then you can say ‘God has a personal plan for me’. That is why you are here on this earth.*”<sup>29</sup>

But if you deny the *reality* that you are a *human being* and instead claim, without any *proof*, that you or your ancestors have evolved from some ‘*common anthropoid monkey*’, then

you have no other option but to *live* as a monkey, or else ‘*mutate*’ into a donkey. Now, you will quickly admit, if you are a logical thinker, of course, by ‘*chance*’ that it is not at all possible for a monkey to mutate into a donkey. But the very fact that you can *think* logically and critically and, therefore, not *dumb*, should prove to you that you have not descended from monkeys but that you are a PERSON created in the Image and Likeness of God.

Nevertheless, contrary to facts that can be relied upon to ascertain spiritual realities, “*The agnostic and the atheist do not seem to be in the least disturbed by the fact that our entire organized, living universe becomes incomprehensible without the hypothesis of God. Their belief in some physical elements of which they know very little, has all the earmarks of an irrational faith, but they are not aware of it. Some of them have remained slaves to a naïve verbalism.*”<sup>30</sup>

And, slaves to “naïve verbalism” they are! And, as long as *scientists choose* to remain enslaved to naïve verbalism they can as well be labeled as *pseudo-scientists* who are clever at *concealing their ignorance*. If we are rational and objective then we will openly *confess* that “*The Omnipotence of God does not enter into the restricted pattern of our actual scientific thought. It is no more shameful to confess it than to confess our incapacity to conceive the electron which we have domesticated.*”<sup>31</sup> As such, atheistic scientists and evolutionists are without excuse.

“*What is science? It is the method by which man tries to conceal his ignorance. It should not be so, but so it is. You are not to be dogmatical in theology, my brethren, it is wicked; but for scientific men it is the correct thing. You are never to assert anything very strongly; but scientists may boldly assert what they cannot prove, and may demand a **faith** far more credulous than any we possess. Forsooth, you and I are to take our Bibles and shape and mould our belief according to the ever-shifting teachings of so-called scientific men. What folly is this! Why, the march of science, falsely so called, through the world may be traced by exploded fallacies and abandoned theories. Former explorers once adored are now ridiculed; the continual wrecking of false hypotheses is a matter of universal notoriety. You may tell where the learned have encamped by the debris left behind of suppositions and theories ... as broken bottles.*”<sup>32</sup>

Somehow, it is very encouraging to know that there are scientists who understand biblical creation truth and are, therefore, *convinced creationists*. And, “*Clearly, creationists can indeed be real scientists. And this shouldn’t be surprising since the very basis for scientific research is biblical creation. The universe is orderly because its Creator is logical and has imposed order on the universe. God created our minds and gave us the ability and curiosity to study the universe. Furthermore, we can trust that the universe will obey the same physics tomorrow as it does today because God is consistent. This is why science is possible.*

“*On the other hand, if the universe is just an accidental product of a big bang, why should it be orderly? Why should there be laws of nature if there is no lawgiver? If our brains are the by-products of random chance, why should we trust that their conclusions are accurate? But if our minds have been designed, and if the universe has been constructed by the Lord, then of course we should be able to study nature. **Yes, science is possible because the Bible is true.***”<sup>33</sup>

The Living Creator God is very much actively involved in the human affairs! Like it or not! And, “*It is because God created a logical, orderly universe and gave us the ability to reason and to be creative that technology is possible.*”<sup>34</sup> As such, to come to a logical conclusion: Here is the point: “*If there is a God, if He has revealed Himself, if He makes sense, if He has a perfect plan, and if He has perfect plan for every human being, including you, then YOU owe GOD a hearing.*”<sup>35</sup> Will you, please, stand up, and listen to the God of the Bible?



Please, for your very own sake, listen to the Living God Who speaks to **you** in the *First Person*, saying: “*The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool... for ALL those THINGS hath Mine Hand hath made, and all those things have been, thus saith the LORD, (regardless of your latest theory of evolution or the particular phase of evolution); but to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and TREMBLES at MY WORD*” (Isaiah 66:1-2).

And, to those who really listen and tremble at God’s Word and humbly obey Him, they are promised an eternal inheritance in His Kingdom and further, ruler-ship under the Risen Christ in the *new* eternal heavens and earth! “*Well, the universe has not existed from eternity past, but it will exist eternally in the future. There was a beginning, but there will be no end. . . ‘The new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord’ (Isaiah 66:22)... Peter says that we can then "look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelled righteousness" (II Peter 3:13).*”<sup>36</sup>

---

1: Roger Patterson: *Natural Selection vs. Evolution* March 8, 2007, [www.answersingenesis.org](http://www.answersingenesis.org).

2: Roger Patterson, *ibid.*                    3: J. D. Bernal, *The Origin of Life*, New York, 1967.

4: Hawking, S. & Mlodinow, L., *The (Elusive) Theory of Everything*, Scientific American India, October 2010, p.50.

5: Lecomte Du Nouy, *op. cit.* p. 140-141, 145.    6: *ibid*    7: *ibid*    8: *ibid.* p.76.    9: *ibid*    10: *ibid*

11: *ibid.* p.    12: *ibid*    13: *ibid.* p.19; 41.    14: *ibid* p.19. 15: *ibid*

16: Henry Morris, PhD, *The Eternal Future of Time, Space, and Matter*; [www.icr.org](http://www.icr.org).

17: Finis Jennings Dake, *op. cit.* 83.    18: Dake J. Finis, *op. cit.* p.83.

19: Lecomte Du Nouy, *op. cit.* 40    20: *ibid*            21: *Ibid*, p. 98.

22: Roger Patterson, *Natural Selection vs. Evolution, Evolution Exposed*, March 8, 2007 [www.answersingenesis.org](http://www.answersingenesis.org).

23: R. Patterson, *ibid.*    24: Lecomte Du Nouy, *op. cit.* p.100.

25: R. B. Thieme, *op. cit.* p.3    26: *ibid.* p.3.    27: Uric Jelinec, *Bible and Science; op.cit.*, p. 7.

28: R. B. Thieme, *op. cit.* 4.    29: *ibid*    30: Lecomte Du Nouy, *op. cit.*. 134.    31: *ibid*

32: Charles Haddon Spurgeon. 33: Jason Lisle, Ph. D., *Can creationists be scientists?* [www.icr.org](http://www.icr.org).

34: Jason Lisle, Ph.D, *ibid.*    35: R. B. Thieme, *op. cit.* p. 4.

36: Henry Morris, Ph.D., *The Eternal Future of Time, Space, and Matter*, [www.icr.org](http://www.icr.org)



In the Section to follow (**PART TWO**), the basic biblical facts about God's *Works of Creation* are briefly dealt with. If we choose to rightly divide and handle the Word of Truth relating to creation accounts fearfully and objectively without any bias rooted in the traditional creation concepts, it will become very clear that there are actually *three* and distinct *phases* of God's works of Creation.

The *first phase* is dealt with briefly in *Genesis* 1:1; the *second phase* is covered by *Genesis* 1:3-31 and the *third phase* is as prophesied in such Scriptures as *Isaiah* 66: 67, 2 *Peter* 3: 13 without any mention as to the actual length of the periods or ages relating to the *three phases* of creation.

The **GOD** of the Bible is the **CREATOR GOD** who WAS. He had created '*In the Beginning*' a perfect and beautiful universe and everything in it *instantly* by *fiat*, in the *dateless past*, or in the *eternity past* without any reference to elusive *time*;

And GOD IS, who, beginning with Day One, worked for six days both to *create* by *fiat* and make, *mould*, *re-fashion*, *re-align*, *re-order*, *restore* and *replenish* here on *earth* (*second phase*); and since then, GOD has been working *providentially* and *miraculously*, in the realm of *time*.

And GOD WILL BE; and He *is to come*, and He will come soon and display His omnipotent power by *creating* new heavens and a new earth, *not* by *creating evolution* or by setting in motion some evolutionary process, but by *fiat* (*third phase*); and that, to uphold His Glory and for His eternal pleasure, in the *eternity future*!

As such, it is not at all necessary to embrace the *atheistic* evolutionary worldview in as much as the God has created everything by *fiat* and will destroy it. He will next create New Heavens and a New Earth, *not* by *creating evolution* or *in six days* but, undoubtedly, *instantly* by *fiat*, true to His awesome creative power and perfect character!