



# SCIENCE AND THE BIBLE



## BIBLE CONFERENCE

by Carl W. Deems, Th. D.

## THE COUNTER ATTACK

### INTRODUCTION:

In this lesson I will give an overview of the state of “science” in the last half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. I describe how naturalistic science had a stronghold on most academic and political organizations, the exceptions being outposts in Christian churches and schools. Then, in the 1920’s, a “creation” science movement began as a result of the Scopes “Monkey” trial. In the 1950’s the movement gained strength when a Christian Baptist named Ramm wrote a book that defended some of the tenants of naturalistic science and leaned toward “theistic evolution.” I tell next how a backlash ensued from which some Christians decided to form the Creation Research Society. I then show it was the foundation and catalyst for many other similar groups to be formed. I conclude by mentioning a new movement called “Intelligent Design.” It has taken on naturalistic science, in particular Darwinism, from the argument that some things in the natural world can only be explained in light of a “designer.”

### IN THE BEGINNING

By the last half of the 20th century, it looked like "naturalistic science" was such a monolith that it could never be overturned. In the late 1950's, the National Science Foundation funded the "Biological Sciences Curriculum Study" which was instrumental in emphasizing the theory of evolution in high school biology textbooks. In the 1960's, in response to the widespread perception that the Soviet Union had gained the upper hand in science and technology, evolution (the religion of Marxism) gained prominence in American public schools. As a result, all classroom instruction in biology was given along evolutionary lines. In fact, the historian Richard Hofstadter wrote at the time that "opposition to evolution seemed only a very distant memory."

To give an example of how bad "it" can get, by the end of the 21st century, the Roman Catholic Church, the "church that Peter founded" continued its never ending downhill slide and surrendered to evolution completely. Pope John Paul II who recently died (April 2005) was a card carrying "evolutionist,"

These notes are given freely as the Lord provides. They are not to be sold. All rights reserved. No part of these notes, nor any previous editions of these notes may be copied or duplicated by any means without the express written consent of Carl W. Deems, Burning Bright Ministries, Pensacola, Florida.

"In a major statement of the Roman Catholic Church's position on the theory of evolution, Pope John Paul II has proclaimed that the theory is 'more than just a hypothesis' and that evolution is compatible with Christian faith. In a written message to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, the pope said the theory of evolution has been buttressed by scientific studies and discoveries since Charles Darwin ... 'It is indeed remarkable that this theory has progressively taken root in the minds of researchers following a series of discoveries made in different spheres of knowledge', the pope said in his message Wednesday. 'The convergence, neither sought nor provoked, of results of studies undertaken independently from each other constitutes, in itself, a significant argument in favor of this theory...'"

As a result, one will find that evolutionary science is the norm or "paradigm" in all the major state schools and most of the private ones as well. Only in such oasis outposts as Fundamentalist Christian colleges and universities, Christian day schools, and home schools, is evolution allowed to be taught, or to be taken "seriously." Thus, present academia is filled with naturalist scientists. But that may not last for much longer.

A new type of scientist emerged in the 1920's that used science to support the Genesis account of the Bible. These scientists, who were mostly Christians, accepted the challenge of higher critics and other "scholars" to show it was possible to reconcile the scientific record and a literal reading of Genesis. Their ultimate aim was to discredit accepted scientific notions and reestablish science in terms that are in-line with the "literal" interpretation of the Bible.

In addition, these scientists are not interested in the compromise of "theistic evolution." To the theistic scientist, God specially created all things. Today, a popular cliché of neo-orthodox and liberal writers is to the effect that God has "revealed in Scripture the fact of creation, but has left the method to be worked out by scientists." According to Morris, this is just a round about way of saying, "that evolution should be accepted in the hope that the scientists will allow the belief that god is the one controlling the process."

There are various forms of theistic evolution, and different terms that have been used to describe the various schemes. These include orthogenesis (goal directed evolution), nomogenesis (evolution according to fixed law), emergent evolution (involves the appearance of new characters and qualities at complex levels of organization which cannot be predicted solely from the study of less complex levels), creative evolution (creative evolution is based on two principles, one, that the universe is inherently creative, and two, that this creativity appears in an evolutionary manner) and others, none of which are truly acceptable to Christians since they are all primarily atheistic. The evolutionary scheme least objectionable to the Christian is simply that God used evolution to accomplish his purpose in creation. This is usually called "biblical evolution." The theistic scientist talked

about in this section rejects theistic evolution outright.

According to Ross, the founders of scientific creationism were initially driven by a defense of the Genesis Flood. In 1923, Seventh-Day Adventist named George McCredy Price wrote a book entitled, "The New Geology." His purpose in writing the book was to combat the incursion of "evolutionary" teachings (which to him meant dating the earth greater than a few thousand years old) in the "Christian" church. Price made the case that Genesis 6 through Genesis 9 gives the account of a relatively recent flood and that it covered the whole world, just as the Bible said it did. In his view, the Genesis flood accounted for all the geological features on the planet, the fossil record, the coal and limestone deposits, etc. Price was not concerned that at the time, he received little "scientific" support for his claims because in his opinion, they suffered from such a case of "university-itis" that they were hopeless as a source anyway. He assumed that their findings were always going to fit pre-defined paradigms, so what they said didn't bother him in the least.

Price's book and ideas received a big boost during the Scopes Monkey Trial. Fundamentalist and conservative Christians, still feeling humiliated by the way the trial was prosecuted, and the defeat of their champion William Jennings Bryan, looked to Price as a way to, as Ross puts it, "take the evolutionists down a bit." Price's book, his zeal, and his abilities as a public speaker made him the ideal spokesman for their cause.

In the 1950's, Bernard Ramm, an "accomplished" scholar with a Doctorate in philosophy of science, according to Ross, became concerned over the growing popularity of Price's "flood geology" among Christians and wrote "The Christian View of Science and Scripture." Basically it was a hack piece on the whole creationist movement. He urged Christians to repudiate Price's literal interpretation of the scriptures, calling it "narrow bibliolatry." In addition, he urged Christians to adopt his view of creation and the Genesis account that he called, "progressive creationism."

Ramm would have better accomplished his purpose had he not written his book. His reference to "narrow bibliolatry," was not taken too lightly by conservative Christians who saw Ramm's book, and rightly so, as an attack on the Bible. (It's all about a book.) Basically, his concept of "progressive creationism" came too close to those of the higher critics. Not only did Ramm not believe in the literal days of creation but he also denied the recent appearance of man, basically assigning the Genesis account to an allegory. For these reasons, and because of the short list of "creative acts," he and his followers were willing to accept, Ramm ended up fermenting rather than lessening the zeal of the "creationists."

Ramm's movement towards "higher criticism" and "theistic evolution" caught the attention of two men; John C. Whitcomb, Jr. professor of theology at Grace Theological Seminary, and Dr. Henry M. Morris, Chairman of the department of civil engineering at Virginia Polytechnic Institute. They teamed up together to publish "The Genesis Flood" in 1961. This rather extensive work sought to put some additional scientific facts to Price's Flood geology and to show that Flood

geology, the literal interpretation of the six days of creation, and the recent creation of man was the only orthodox interpretation of the Bible. Although many of the points made by the men were included in Price's book, the men did not mention Price, apparently, according to Ross, in an attempt to distance themselves from the Seventh-Day Adventist.

"The Genesis Flood," Ross believes, "gained a tremendous boost from a new sense of desperation in the fundamentalist and (ultra-fundamentalist) camp. These Christians were finding fewer ears sympathetic to their ridiculing of science and scientists." In fact, "naturalistic" science was experiencing accelerated success (e.g. in computers, telecommunications, rocketry, nuclear physics) and was too much of an economic benefit (the love of money again) for "Bible Believing Christians" to make much headway against it. "The Genesis Flood" provided the scientific answers they felt they needed to go up against a modern day "naturalistic science" Goliath.

### **CREATION RESEARCH SOCIETY**

Energized by the publication of "The Genesis Flood", genetics professor Walter Lammerts began discussions with Morris and eight other Christian scientists on the possibility of forming a society in which the Bible accounts of Genesis and science in general would be defended. In 1963 these ten men formed the Creation Research Society (CRS). As a result of their work, these scientists brought about, as Ross calls it, "a spectacular revival of Biblical Flood and recent geology." Within 10 years the CRS could boast 450 members with graduate degrees, several self-sustained research projects, and an educational program that had successfully entered the majority of America's fundamentalist and evangelical Christian schools and churches through books, pamphlets and other media.

In the early 1970's CRS began to splinter into other groups, multiplying the effect of the movement many fold. The most known of these groups, the Institute for Creation Research (ICR) was founded by Henry Morris in 1972. They called what they did "creation science" and what they believed "scientific creationism." ICR sponsored debates with naturalistic scientists, held seminars, spoke at churches, and carried on the fight for Biblical view of creation with evangelistic zeal. In 1981, ICR began offering graduate degrees in creation science.

According to Ross, nearly every conservative church in America had been influenced by CRS, and its daughter organizations (such as the ICR). In addition, the movement spread to other countries as well, including Australia, Canada, Russia, South Africa, and the United Kingdom. The key to their success, he feels, was "its tireless attempts to defend the scientific accuracy of the Bible." By the 1990's, reports Ross, the teachings of these new organizations became so predominant that the news media, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the National Academy of Sciences now define "creation," "creationist," "creationism," and even "evangelical Christianity" according to the

beliefs of Flood geology.

### **THEISTIC SCIENCE WITHOUT APOLOGY**

One of the major attributes found in the "theistic scientist" of today, as opposed to the "theistic apologist" of the late 19th century is their lack of timidity. You could say that they have an "attack dog" temperament when it comes to defending the fundamental scientific truths of the Bible, especially when it comes to the book of Genesis. To be sure, for the most part these are Christian folks who practice "Christian charity," have manners, and "suffereth long." But when it comes to science and scientific discussions, the analysis of data, and ultimately their faith in God and the Biblical truth, they don't back down. In fact, because the data is pouring in that supports their viewpoint, they have a confidence about them that is making the opposition very nervous. Added to this confidence is that this new breed of theistic scientist is very articulate in both their speaking and their writing. They are able to make the complex issues understandable to the laymen, and because these men are scientists in their own right, they are able to argue the "hard science" problems with credibility within academia. Thus, with the new breed of theistic scientist, there is no longer the gap between the "theologian" and the "scientist" as there was in the last part of the 19th century.

Morris is a good example of this kind of "theistic scientist." He is polite and comfortable in modern academia. He can speak the "scholars" language because he has attended their schools and has taught at one of the most prestigious engineering schools in the country. Morris, as a result, is not one to back down when it comes to the science in "creation science." Below is an example of what he has to say about the foundation of modern geology, long time scales,

"One of the main objections to creationism has always been its supposedly too-short time scale. It seems to be part of our modern culture somehow to believe that the earth is billions of years old. Prior to the acceptance of uniformitarianism in the early 19th century, however, a much shorter time scale had been held by the great majority of scientists. The evolution model, of course, demands an immensity of time. As we have already noted, not even thirty billion years would suffice for the chance of evolution of even the simplest living molecule, but somehow evolutionists continue to believe in evolution anyway. In any case, it is obvious that a vast amount of time is essential for the evolution model. For those who believe in evolution, therefore, physical processes which indicate a short time scale must be explained away; only those processes commensurate with a long time scale can be accepted for use in geochronology."

Another example of this type of scientist is Dennis Gordon Lindsay. He states in his book "Science and Scripture,"

"One thing is certain: No verse in the Bible has ever been found in violate any known law of science. God's Word contains not one inaccuracy, contradiction, absurdity or blunder. The absence of error in the Bible is truly remarkable since all other ancient books, and even many recent ones, contain scientific blunders and mistakes. There are many theories contradicting scripture, but there has never been found one scientifically established law denying a Biblical passage, verse or precept. Everything about the universe coincides with the Bible, pointing with overwhelming force to a Personal Creator whose mind and power are infinite."

Lindsay goes on to say that for years the Science Research Bureau has publicly offered a reward of \$1,000 to any person who could prove the existence of a scientific blunder in the Bible. He states that even though the offer was made in seventy-seven different countries, no claim has ever been made. He says that some years ago a lawsuit was brought against the head of the Science Research Bureau, Dr. Harry Rimmer, by a Mr. William Floyd who thought he had found several bona fide scientific blunders in the Bible. The judge, (Benjamin Shalleck of the Fourth District Municipal Court), heard both sides of the case and awarded his decision in favor of the Bible. In addition, Lindsay says that another man, Dr. John Grebe, former director of the nuclear and basic research at Dow Chemical, Midland, Michigan, has offered a \$1,000 reward with similar criteria.

As one can see, "theistic science" is not just about "creation" any more but tackles the questions of the scientific critics of the Bible in every other scientific discipline as well. For example, quoting Lindsay again, this time from the introductory comments of his book,

"Our study will take us through various fields of science - and the most current knowledge. We shall see God's Word can meet the test of all the latest discoveries, even though it was written several thousand years ago. The Christian has nothing to fear when investigating the laws of biology, physics, astronomy, hydrology, meteorology, or any other discipline. God's Word harmonizes perfectly with science - or should we say that science harmonizes perfectly with God's Word. When there is a discrepancy, it is science (man's understanding) which always needs modifying, and in time it will make that adjustment as it has so often in the past. The Word of God stands forever."

Backing up his claim, Lindsay's book contains scores of examples of how science backs up the Bible in the disciplines he mentioned with the addition of miscellaneous items he called "fascinating facts."

Another "theistic scientist" with impeccable credentials is Dr. Jonathan Wells. Wells serves as a senior fellow with the Discovery Institute's Center for Science and Culture, an organization that blends, according to Strobel, Well's dual passions for both hard science and the issue of science's influence on broader society. His

undergraduate degree from the University of California at Berkeley was geology and physics, with a minor in biology. At Yale Graduate School, where he earned a doctorate in religious studies, Wells specialized in the nineteenth-century controversies surrounding Darwin. His book, "Charles Hodge's Critique of Darwinism" was published in 1988. He has also authored a book "Icons of Evolution," which was published in 2000.

According to Strobel, who interviewed Wells, and included the interview in his book, "Icons of Evolution" takes a clear headed, scientific look at the same visual images that had convinced Strobel of the truth of Darwinian evolution while he attended school. The four 'icons' were: The Miller experiment, Darwin's Tree of Life, Haeckel's embryos, and the Archaeopteryx missing link. Wells succeeds in both his book and in the interview with Strobel to systematically and "scientifically" trash all four.

The first icon, the Miller experiment, is a case in point. It was an experiment, conducted under contrived conditions, in which organic materials were created from a so-called prehistoric soup. In order to better understand what Wells says about this experiment, I have taken the liberty to copy verbatim from the Duke University educational web site about what they say about the Miller Experiment. Note, and this is a key point, that there is no mention of what the organic materials were that were created as a result of the experiment. Below is the information I "lifted" from the site:

"The Miller/Urey Experiment By the 1950s, scientists were in hot pursuit of the origin of life. Around the world, the scientific community was examining what kind of environment would be needed to allow life to begin. In 1953, Stanley L. Miller and Harold C. Urey, working at the University of Chicago, conducted an experiment which would change the approach of scientific investigation into the origin of life. Miller took molecules which were believed to represent the major components of the early Earth's atmosphere and put them into a closed system. The gases they used were methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>), hydrogen (H<sub>2</sub>), and water (H<sub>2</sub>O). Next, he ran a continuous electric current through the system, to simulate lightning storms believed to be common on the early earth. Analysis of the experiment was done by chromatography. At the end of one week, Miller observed that as much as 10-15% of the carbon was now in the form of organic compounds. Two percent of the carbon had formed some of the amino acids which are used to make proteins. Perhaps most importantly, Miller's experiment showed that organic compounds such as amino acids, which are essential to cellular life, could be made easily under the conditions that scientists believed to be present on the early earth. This enormous finding inspired a multitude of further experiments.

Now what Wells pointed out in his book, and in the subsequent interview with

Strobel, is that the organic materials found in the experiment were "formaldehyde" and "cyanide!" Strobel recalls the Wells interview like this,

"They may (Wells said) be organic molecules, but in the lab at Berkeley you couldn't even have a capped bottle of formaldehyde in the room, because the stuff is so toxic. You open the bottle and it fries proteins all over the place, just from the fumes. It kills embryos. The idea that using a realistic atmosphere gets you the first step in the origin of life is just laughable. Now, it's true that a good organic chemist can turn formaldehyde and cyanide into biological molecules. But to suggest that formaldehyde and cyanide give you the right substrate for the origin of life, he said, breaking in a chuckle, Well, it's just a joke.' He let the point sink in before delivering the clincher. 'So you know what you get?' he asked. 'Embalming fluid!'"

But Wells had much more to say about the state of "science" today, than the four icons. Wells makes the point that today there "is an ensemble of half a dozen evidences that point to a transcendent, intelligent cause." Wells calls this "mind-boggling stuff!" Scientists in the nineteenth century, he says, "weren't aware of these things when they said naturalism accounts for everything. Thanks to the discoveries of the last five decades, we know a lot more today."

Wells says this about the evidence for God,

"First, theism, with its concept of transcendent Creator, provides a more causally adequate explanation of the Big Bang than a naturalistic explanation can offer. The cause of the universe must transcend matter space and time, which were brought into existence with the Big Bang. The Judeo-Christian God has precisely this attribute of transcendence. Yet naturalism, by definition, denies the existence of any entity beyond the closed system of nature. Second, the fine-tuning of the physical laws and constants of the universe and the precise configuration of its initial conditions, dating back to the very origin of the universe itself, suggest the need for a cause that's intelligent. Theism affirms the existence of an entity that's not only transcendent but intelligent as well - namely God. Thus, theism can explain both Big Bang cosmology and the fine-tuning. Pantheism can't explain the origin of the universe, because pantheists believe in an impersonal god that's coextensive with the physical universe. Such a god doesn't bring the universe into being from nothing, since such a god doesn't exist independently of the physical universe. If initially the physical universe didn't exist, then the pantheistic god wouldn't have existed either. If it didn't exist, it couldn't cause the universe to exist."

Strobel asked Wells if Deism could account for the creation, to which he replied,

"Yes. I'll provide that caveat - deism can do the same, but I believe the existence of design subsequent to the Big Bang undermines deism as an adequate explanation. You see, deism can't explain the evidence of discrete acts of design or creation after the universe was created. The deistic god never intervenes in nature, yet we're seeing evidence of intelligent design in the history of life. For example, the high information content in the cell provides compelling evidence for an act of intelligent design of the first life, long after the beginning of the universe." Taken together, what we know today gives us heightened confidence -- from science-- that God exists. The weight of the evidence is very, very impressive -- in fact, in my opinion it's sufficiently conclusive to say that theism provides the best explanation for the ensemble of scientific evidence we've been discussing. Science and faith are not at war. When scientific evidence and biblical teaching are correctly interpreted, they can and do support each other. I'd say to anyone who doubts that: investigate the evidence yourself."

### **THEISTIC SCIENCE IS HERE TO STAY**

To say that "theistic science" has become a growing "movement" is probably an understatement. In the Henry M. Morris book "History of Modern Creationism" that are listed the names and addresses of over 100 "creation science" organizations. Obviously there are many more. My own "Google" search for "creation science" on the "web" yielded 34,200,000 hits. This means that there are 34,200,000 different sites "out there" that make either reference to "creation science" in some way (I'm sure not all the sites are favorable.) In the same way "theistic science" yielded 137,000 hits.

Below is just a partial list of creation-science type organizations and addresses from around the world. This list itself was taken from a Bible defending "creation science" website called Christian Answers:

1) Institute for Creation Research, P.O. Box 2667, El Cajon, California 92021, U.S.A. - [www.icr.org](http://www.icr.org)

2) Creation Research Society, P.O. Box 969, Ashland, Ohio 44805-0969, U.S.A.  
E-mail: [wolfrom@aol.com](mailto:wolfrom@aol.com)

3) Geoscience Research Institute, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, California 92350, U.S.A.

4) Access Research Network, P.O. Box 38069, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80937-8069, U.S.A.

5) Answers in Genesis, Australia (formerly Creation Science Foundation), P.O.

Box 6302, Acacia Ridge DC, Queensland 4110, AUSTRALIA.

6) Answers in Genesis, P.O. Box 6330, Florence, Kentucky 41022-9937, U.S.A.

7) Creation Science Association, P.O. Box 821, Station A, Scarborough, Ontario M1K 5C8, CANADA.

8) Creation Magazine UK, Ltd., P.O. Box 770, Highworth, Wiltshire SN6 7TU, UNITED KINGDOM.

9) Korea Association for Creation Research, Olympian Building, Room 811, 196-7 Jamilbou-dorg, Songpua-Ku, Seoul, SOUTH KOREA.

10) Bible and Science of Japan, c/o Dr. Masami Usami, 1-4-41 Kamimito, Mito-Shi, Ibaraki-Ken 310, JAPAN.

11) Christian Center for Science and Apologetics, ul. Gogolia 33-8, Simferopol, 95011, Crimea, UKRAINE - <http://west.crimea.com/~creation/>

Theistic science is apparently here to stay in Christian education also. Below I quote a typical excerpt from a High School textbook used in Christian schools across the country. This book is from one of dozens of Christian textbooks that are being used everyday by Christian school children from Kindergarten through High School:

That God is the Creator of this world is an undeniable truth. The founders of modern science supported this truth of Creation, the laws and principles of science also affirm it. Nevertheless, many scientists today have rejected Creation; instead, they credit chance, time, and energy with the origin of the universe and all that makes up the physical world. The belief that the universe (and all that is in it) originated by natural processes over billions of years is referred to as "evolution." Cosmic evolution refers to the chance origin of the universe as a whole. Biological evolution, organic evolution, refers to the gradual development of life on Earth, generally from simple organisms to complex ones. Evolutionists, except for some who try to merge evolution with creation and make the Creation an evolutionary process, deny the role of the Creator in creation. Contrasted with evolution is the Biblical principle of special creation. Instead of relying upon thoughtless chance, time, and energy, special creation depends upon a Creator, the omnipotent (all powerful) and omniscient (all-wise) God. Special creation refers to God's work of calling the universe and all that is in it into existence "ex nihilo" (out of nothing) and making complex living organisms out of simple components as

when He formed man from the dust of the ground. A study of the Biblical creation accounts indicates that God simply spoke the earth and the universe into existence on the first day of Creation, and that He spent another five days organizing the physical elements to form the sun and stars, plants, animals, and mankind. His creative work was climaxed by the formation of man out of the 'dust of the ground.' The concept of special creation must be accepted by faith, as also the concept of evolution must be accepted by faith. God's Word the Bible, is the basis of special creation. The basis of evolutionary origins is faith in men's guesses."

### **IS THEISTIC SCIENCE WINNING?**

Perhaps it is too early to say that "theistic science" is winning its battle against "naturalistic science." But the signs are all there. Certainly a "breach in the line" of naturalistic science has been made, and beginning to widen. Here is what Henry Morris's has to say in one of his latest works on the topic,

"When "Scientific Creationism" was first published in 1974, the modern creationist revival was really just beginning to attract interest from the evolution dominated scientific educational establishment. The Creation Research Society was ten years old, and the Institute for Creation Research (under its present name) only two years old. The book was prepared because of the great need at the time for a general text a reference work on all aspects of the creation model of origins, a book which would be scientifically accurate and well documented, yet understandable and persuasive to the non-scientist as well as the scientist. That it did meet this need is confirmed by its wide use and eleven printings. For over a decade it has served as probably the best known and most influential book in this important field. Many people have been led to sound creationist convictions through reading it, and many schools and colleges have used it as a textbook or required reference. In the meantime, the creation movement has proliferated, with creationist associations now active in every state and many foreign countries. Many more books on creationism are available now that was the case in 1974. This becomes especially obvious in the greatly expanded bibliographies in this new edition of Scientific Creationism. Nevertheless, the demand for this particular book continues very strong, so it does seem appropriate to issue it now in a new, updated edition. There have, of course, been many significant scientific developments bearing on the creation/evolution issue since the publication of the first edition. Not surprisingly, these all seem to strengthen the case for creation and weaken the case for evolution. Many of them, whether by coincidence or otherwise, seem to reflect the influence of the creation movement, with the evolutionists coming more and more to acknowledge the validity of the evidences and

arguments cited by creationist writers and speakers.

Morris then goes on to cite examples. For instance, he comments there is the growing influence of the "punctuated equilibrium" concept in biology and paleontology. Creationists have been saying for quite some time that there were no true transitional forms in the fossil record, as neo-Darwinians had maintained. Now, Morris reports, that he finds leading evolutionists are saying the same thing.

Another example that Morris gives is the abandonment of the concept of natural selection as a "creative force." Creationists have long argued that natural selection has no predictive value and thus is a mere tautology (a logical truth that by definition), stating the obvious fact that organisms that "survive" are thereby decreed to have been the "fittest." Perhaps they may be the fittest, but it doesn't really give any information on how it "evolved" in the first-place. Morris asserts that today, many evolutionists agree with this judgment, and are looking for other possible mechanisms. Morris states that "An author of one of the thirty-odd anti-creationist books published in recent years, acknowledges, 'The claim that natural selection is a tautology is periodically made in the scientific literature itself.'"

Another "extremely significant development," according to Morris, is the resurgence of catastrophism in geology. (And this is indeed "a significant development" since the whole foundation of Darwinism is founded on uniformitarianism.) Here, again, Morris claims, creationists have led the way, "arguing for years that traditional uniformitarianism ("the present is key to the past") was an impotent dogma, completely incapable of accounting for the great rock beds of the earth's crust, especially the very fossil deposits which had been used as the main evidence of evolution." Now, according to Morris, the neo-catastrophists are saying the same thing, though they are careful not to credit creationists.

Morris points out in his book that what the geologists are running into is the abrupt, or as he calls them "short happenings," of the great beds of cataclysmically formed and deformed rocks found everywhere. He asserts that,

The 'long ages of nothing in particular' are evidenced almost solely by the necessity to provide time for evolution, not by the hydraulic of paleontological character of the fossil-bearing sedimentary rocks themselves. Nevertheless, geologists continue to insist on long ages refusing to acknowledge the possibility that all these catastrophic 'episodes' in earth history could really be interconnected and essentially contemporaneous, comprising what would amount to a single world wide hydraulic cataclysm. In view of the absence of any worldwide geological unconformities, however, as shown previously, the latter is a much more likely explanation of the geological column.

Morris gives as his example, Robert Dott, who in his presidential address to the Society of economic Paleontologist and Mineralogists, choose the term

"episodicity" instead of "catastrophism,"

"What do I mean by 'episodic sedimentation?' Episodic was chosen carefully over other possible terms. 'Catastrophic' has become popular recently because of its dramatic effect, but it should be purged from our vocabulary because it feeds the neo catastrophist-creation cause."

David Raup a leading geologist and paleontologist also sees the turn towards catastrophic geology. He says,

"A great deal has changed, however, and contemporary geologists and paleontologists now generally accept catastrophe as a 'way of life' although they may avoid the word catastrophe. In fact, many geologists now see rate, short-lived events as being the principle contributors to geological sequences...The periods of relative quiet contribute only a small part of the record."

Leading British geologist Derek Anger reaches the same conclusion:

"I am coming more and more to the view that the evolution of life, like the evolution of the continents and of the stratigraphical column in general, has been a very episodic, affair, with short happenings' interrupting long ages of nothing in particular."

Henry Morris acknowledges that although there may be some problems with the creationist model, he feels the problems with the evolutionary model are far more serious:

"There are still problems, and more research needs to be done to resolve these, but the problems of the evolution model are far more serious. As a result, there are today thousands of recognized qualified scientists who have become creationists, in spite of the evolutionary indoctrination which they received in school and the evolutionist intimidation which they received in school and the evolutionist intimidation which they now face in organized intellectualism. In a very real sense, creationism is more scientific than evolutionism, and evolutionism is far more religious than creationism.

But Morris is not the only one to see a trend in the "right direction." Despite strong pressure on every side for scientist to accept evolutionism as "truth", many intelligent and experienced scientists either openly or secretly dismiss evolution as highly unlikely or impossible. In the 1980s, researcher and lecturer David Watson noted an increasing trend that continues today, disturbing those who want evolutionism to be perceived as the accepted scientific consensus:

"...A tidal wave of new books... threaten to shatter that confidence - titles like "Darwin Retried" (1971), Macbeth; "The Neck of the Giraffe:

Where Darwin Went Wrong" (1982), Hitching; "The Great Evolution Mystery" (1983), Taylor "The Bone Peddlers: Selling Evolution" (1984), Fix; "Darwin Was Wrong - A Study in Probabilities" (1984), Cohen; "Darwinism: The Refutation of a Myth" (1987), Lovtrup; and "Adam and Evolution" (1984), Pitman. Not one of these books was written from a Christian-apologetic point of view: they are concerned only with scientific truth - as was Sir Ernst Chain when he called evolution 'a fairy tale'."

Also Science Digest makes this statement:

"Scientists who utterly reject Evolution may be one of our fastest-growing controversial minorities... Many of the scientists supporting this position hold impressive credentials in science."

Secular researcher Richard Milton summarized the current world situation in this way,

"Darwinism has never had much appeal for science outside of the English-speaking world, and has never appealed much to the American public (although popular with the U.S. scientific establishment in the past). However, its ascendancy in science, in both Britain and America, has been waning for several decades as its grip has weakened in successive areas: geology; paleontology; embryology; comparative anatomy. Now even geneticists are beginning to have doubts. It is only in mainstream molecular biology and zoology that Darwinism retains serious enthusiastic supporters. As growing numbers of scientists begin to drift away from neo-Darwinist ideas, the revision of Darwinism at the public level is long overdue, and is a process that I believe has already started."

The "intelligent design" movement within the scientific community is another sign that things are beginning to move in the right direction. Although not necessarily pertinent in a paper on "theistic science," intelligent design science is worthy of mention because it shows that the problems with Darwinism are not only seen from those which have a "religious" motivation. These scientists although not necessarily interested in the theological implications of creation, argue the case for creation from the point of view of an "intelligent designer" and they are getting a hearing.

One example, of an evolutionist who "converted" is the late Dr. Arthur E. Wilder-Smith, an honored scientist with an amazing three earned doctorates. He held many distinguished positions throughout his life, and Wilder debated various leading scientists on the subject of evolution throughout the world. In his opinion, the "Evolution model" as he called it, did not fit as well with the established facts of science as did the "Creation model" of intelligent design. As a result, this is what he has to say now about evolution:

"The evolutionary model says that it is not necessary to assume the existence of anything, besides matter and energy, to produce life. That proposition is unscientific. We know perfectly well that if you leave matter to itself, it does not organize itself - in spite of all the efforts in recent years to prove that it does."

### **CONCLUSION:**

In this lesson I gave an overview of the state of "science" in the last half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. I described how naturalistic science had a stronghold on most academic and political organizations, the exceptions being outposts in Christian churches and schools. Then, in the 1920's, a "creation" science movement began as a result of the Scopes "Monkey" trial. In the 1950's the movement gained strength when a Christian Baptist named Ramm wrote a book that defended some of the tenants of naturalistic science and leaned toward "theistic evolution." I then told how a backlash ensued from which some Christians decided to form the Creation Research Society. Then I showed it was the foundation and catalyst for many other similar groups to be formed. I concluded by mentioning a new movement called "Intelligent Design." It has taken on naturalistic science, in particular Darwinism, from the argument that some things in the natural world can only be explained in light of a "designer."