

EVOLUTION AND YOU

by

D. James Kennedy

A.B., M.Div., M.Th., D.D., D.Sac.Lit., Ph.D.,
Litt.D., D.Sac.Theol., D.Humane Let.

There are two great revolutions taking place in our world right now. First, there is a surprising and welcome revolution taking place in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union and in other places where Communist materialistic atheism has reigned from forty to seventy years. There, people are turning away from evolutionary, materialistic atheism. They are turning to freedom, they are turning to God, they are turning to the Bible, and they are turning to religion.

A professor at the University of Leningrad told me recently that today it is legal to teach religion in the public schools of the Soviet Union. Yet it is not legal here in America.

Recently, American Christian booksellers were invited for the first time to show their wares at the Moscow Book Fair. One of those book-sellers brought 50,000 Bibles to give away to people in the Soviet Union. The police stopped them after several hours for the simple reason that there was such a mob of people clamoring for Bibles that every aisle of the Book Fair was jammed and traffic was gridlocked. They were required to stop giving the Bibles away for two hours; then they were allowed to resume for another hour . . . then another break . . . then resume for another hour. The police weren't trying to prevent them from distributing Bibles—they were simply trying to keep the Moscow Book Fair open.

Further down the same aisle of the Book Fair, where the Christian bookseller was giving away 50,000 Bibles—and people were almost trampling over each other—at the American Atheist Society booth, Madalyn Murray O'Hair was displaying her wares. Someone who was there told me that hardly anyone stopped to even see what she had to offer, because they knew all too well. They had had atheism for seventy years and wanted nothing more to do with it.

Just last night, Billy Graham told me about a recent debate he had had in Siberia at the second largest university in Russia. He was debating with one of their leading scientists, a man who headed the department of anthropology. Dr. Graham asked him: "How old do you think man is? How long do you believe man has been on this planet?"

He replied, "About 10,000 years."

Several Moscow scientists that Dr. Duane T. Gish debated recently openly espoused creation. Others said, "We have known this [evolution] was nonsense all along." It's amazing what a marvelous teacher experience is.

But there is a second revolution going on—a revolution that has been going on in America. It is moving in diametrically the opposite direction. Since the early sixties, America has been plunging headlong away from God, religion, and the Bible—at least, officially—and into materialism, atheism, evolutionism and a godless secular philosophy of life.

That, I think, is not only ironic, to a great extreme, but tragic as well. Certainly it is cast into the sharpest contrast by the counter-revolution that is taking place in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union today.

EVOLUTION'S DEADLY HARVEST

“Evolution and You” is my topic. My friends, the seeds of secularism, grounded, of course, in evolution, have been and are producing a most pernicious and deadly harvest in America today. Recently I read an interesting illustration by Dr. Ernest Gordon, dean emeritus of the Princeton University Chapel. By the way, he is also the hero of the *Bridge over the River Kwai*. He is the man who, after discovering the New Testament, was converted and was used to bring about the conversion of hundreds of other soldiers who were in captivity there. He said something which I think illustrates the results of this evolutionary view very, very aptly:

During the late fifties, I was invited to address the senior class of an English department in a city high school. When I arrived at the school, I introduced myself to the assistant headmaster, whose office was at the entrance. He guided me to the appropriate lecture hall.

Twenty years later, I was invited to the same school for the same purpose. I again presented myself to the same office, but it was no longer the habitat of an educator [of the assistant headmaster]. It was the command post of a police inspector. Corridors and classrooms were monitored by police officers who reported regularly to the inspector. The reasons for the change were obvious: violence, assault, rape, drug-induced madness.

I interpret this scene as evidence of the end times of a civilization that had once benefited from the Christian worldview, one that exalted creation and people, and provided the ideals essential for an authentic education. I recognize that civilization does not create Christians. However the community of faith created and still creates the civility that is evidence of civilization.

That demoralized school is the tragic consequence of a society's rejection of the biblical world view that provided the intellectual dynamic of Western education. What is education but an expression of the prevailing culture?

I think that is a very dramatic presentation of the bitter fruit of the materialistic, evolutionary view of our time.

Just recently I was handed an article from a newspaper, which included a picture of often-quoted Harvard scientist, Dr. Stephen Jay Gould. To quote the article:

Man—or even woman—as the crowning achievement of some grand cosmic plan? What mortal conceit! “We’re an afterthought,” says Gould, the distinguished paleontologist, essayist, Harvard University professor and author. “A little accidental twig.”

There, from the man who is probably today America's leading evolutionist, is a definition of man! Not created a little lower than the angels, but an accidental twig! Not an accidental twig, merely, but a *little accidental twig!*

What do you do with little accidental twigs that fall on your lawn? You pile them on a heap and burn them, or throw them in the garbage. That is, I guess, the view of life that Gould must hold. We are nothing more than a little accidental twig. The writer of the article states: "There is nothing quite like a conversation with Stephen Jay Gould to knock a little evolutionary humility into a person."

My friends, he is doing more than that. He is destroying the whole significance of mankind. That is precisely what evolution does. Because, of course, evolution from the beginning has been at all-out war with teleology. ("Teleology" means "purpose"—that anything has an end for which it was made or created.)

The Western Christian view of man has always held that man is here for a purpose. The Christian view has been summed up in the first question of the Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Confession of Faith: "What is the chief end of man?" The answer: "Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever." But the evolutionist does not question whether that is the chief end of man or some other end, but would say there is no end or purpose (teleology) in any man's life at all, which is precisely what the evolutionary view of life has produced.

If life has no purpose, it has no meaning. Consequently, it has no significance. No wonder suicide is today's second major cause of death among young people. Suicide becomes a very live option when life has no meaning. When life has lost its purpose, its meaning, and significance, be prepared for an epidemic of suicide, of drugs, of alcoholism and maybe even the plunge into some sort of Eastern mysticism, where a person might find some sort of irrational significance for life, or at least a feeling that will make the drabness of a meaningless existence bearable for a time.

IMPACT OF SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

We have seen in the courts in the past three decades, four very significant decisions that have ushered us into this secular apocalypse. First of all, the Supreme Court ruled prayer out of our schools. Then they ruled the Bible out of schools. Next they ruled the Ten Commandments out of the schools. Now they have voted against the balanced treatment of creation along with evolution in the schools. So, we have seen banished from the thought of our young people the idea that they have been created by anyone, or that there are any laws or moral absolutes which they should obey. By the way, the Supreme Court's decision against allowing the Ten Commandments to be posted on the walls of the schools in Kentucky, said, "Lest looking upon them from day to day, the students should be moved to obey them."

If there is no judge, then there is no one to whom we are accountable or responsible. Therefore, if God is dead or absent from both ends of the process of life, then it is true, my friends that, as Nietzsche said, "Anything is permissible." And that is one of the basic motivations that lies behind the belief in evolutionism.

A number of years ago, I watched an interview on television being conducted with Sir Julian Huxley, grandson of Thomas Huxley who was known as Darwin's "bulldog." Sir Julian, until he died some few years back, was probably the premier evolutionist in the world. He was president of the United Nation's Educational, Scientific, Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and, of course, an extraordinarily influential man. The person questioning him asked, "Why do you think that evolution caught on so quickly?"

I was amazed at his reply: "We all jumped at the *Origin* [*Origin of Species*] because . . ."

I have often thought it would be interesting to go to a college biology or geology classroom and begin that quote from Sir Julian Huxley, world's leading evolutionist at the time, and ask the students to complete it. What kind of answers do you think we would get? Would it be: "Because the evidence uncovered by Darwin was so scientifically compelling that we were forced by pure reason and rationality, by the scientific integrity of our calling as scientists to accept the facts as true." Isn't that basically what students in our schools have been taught in the last hundred years?

But what was Huxley's answer? He said this: "[I suppose the reason] we all jumped at the *Origin* [*the Origin of the Species*] was because the idea of God interfered with our sexual mores." Mores, of course, is the secular version of morals. Mores are simply what people are doing, not what God says they ought to do.

Do you mean evolution is not purely a scientific thing? Do you mean the motive was anti-religious, anti-moral, anti-God right from the beginning? "The idea of God interfered with our sexual mores." Translate "sexual mores" as "sexual immorality," because God doesn't interfere with any kind of sexual mores, only sexual immoralities. There is Huxley's reason for the acceptance of evolution.

EVOLUTION'S BASIC PILLARS ARE COLLAPSING

What has a hundred and thirty or so years of this teaching finally given to us? It is interesting that during the last decade, when America has been rushing through more and more court edicts involving evolution, the basic pillars of the evolutionary faith have been collapsing all around them. Yet there are many people who suppose that perhaps the evolutionists have proven their case. Today we have evolutionists saying, "We don't even have to present evidence any more. Evolution is a fact. It is not only a fact, it is the most thoroughly proven fact in all of science." Nonsense!

Let us look at some of the facts that have come to light just in the last decade. Dr. Francis Crick was the co-discoverer of DNA, for which discovery he received the Nobel Prize. DNA is the master control of all of our genetic development; that double-stranded helix that contains all of our genes. DNA is the most complex molecule known to man. It is so fantastically complex that Crick decided to apply probability science analysis to the probability of DNA arising by random chance. Remember, the god of evolution is a trinity of "matter, chance, and time"—the threefold gods of evolutionists' religion.

What was the chance of DNA arising by random chance in the entire history of the world,—the suppositious history which, according to the evolutionists, is 4.6 billion years. Crick applied the science of probability to that question and it turned out that the answer was zilch! That is not a scientific expression, but it describes the result very accurately. What that said in very simple language is that not only could a human being ever have evolved naturally and spontaneously in the entire history of the world, but even a single living cell could never have evolved. But beyond that, one single molecule within the nucleus of that cell, the DNA molecule, could never even have evolved naturally in the entire history of the world! Astounding!

All of which says that everything you and your parents and children have been and are being taught about how life arose spontaneously in some ancient sea, is false. Crick, being honest enough to accept that (however, being an atheist, he wasn't willing to accept creation), then invented a whole new theory.

One scientist has said: There are two requirements for inventing evolutionary theories:

- (1) It depends on your ability to weave a tale.
- (2) It depends on the credulity of your audience.

With both of those “requirements” seemingly in mind, Crick came up with what he calls “directed panspermia.” The idea is very simple. Since life could never have arisen naturally, and since he assumes there is no God, then some advanced race living on another planet revolving around some other sun, somewhere out there in space, sent space ships containing sperm cells out into the cosmos and *voila!* Here we are!

Now, that is simply a lengthening of the shadow. In logic, it is called an “infinite regress,” and of course, it is completely useless in solving any problems, as you can see, because, to any thinking person, the question is going to automatically arise, “Where did this advanced race of people come from?” And if they came from a more advanced race of people from even another planet, where did *they* come from? On and on it goes, until the credulity of the audience is finally exhausted.

Then, shortly after that theory emerged, another scientist of equal or greater fame, Sir Fred Hoyle of Cambridge University, decided to examine the possibility of a living cell arising spontaneously—not in the supposed 4.6 billion year history of the Earth, but in the entire history of the universe, which figure, by the way, keeps changing from year to year and is now estimated to be roughly twenty billion years on the outside. So anywhere—here or on another planet—even to the entire beginning of the universe, he applied the science of probability analysis to the possibility of a living cell arising spontaneously and concluded that the chances of that happening were ten to the forty thousandth power.

Most people are not used to thinking in terms of powers. May I simply say that Lecomte du Noüy, a French evolutionary scientist, Nobel-Prize winner, and expert at probability science, said that anything whose probabilities are less than ten to the fiftieth power will never happen. To give you an idea of the size of that number, there are about that many electrons in the entire

universe. Ten to the 51st power is ten times that many and ten to the 52nd power is ten times that many. Ten to the 53rd and 54th, the 167th, the 2,900th . . . keep going to the 40,000th power. Do you have any idea what that means?

Evolutionists like to assign a long period of time for the age of the earth. Fine. Ten thousand years are not enough? How about ten billion? Ten trillion? Ten quadrillion? Ten septillion? Ten octillion? A hundred-million-billion-trillion times ten ...whatever? Do you realize that a figure I just gave is but a tiny fraction of ten to the 40,000th power? All of which very simply is to say that the chance evolution of a cell never ever happened at all, anywhere, any time!

Hoyle, of Cambridge University, one of the world's leading astronomers and mathematicians, was the originator of one of the only two widely accepted cosmogonies of the twentieth century. Though his Steady-State theory lost out in the popularity contest with the "Big Bang" theory, nevertheless, to be the originator of such a theory is quite an accomplishment. Hoyle said to suppose that somewhere on this Earth, by purely natural spontaneous random causes, the entire complexity of a living cell with all of its amazing and unbelievable complexity could have arisen by chance "is evidently *nonsense* of a high order"!

He is saying what you and your children were being taught as scientific fact is nothing less than "nonsense of a high order." My friends, evolution is dead coming out of the starting gate. They rang the bell, lifted the post, and the horse dropped dead at the gate!

NO "MISSING LINKS"

But if that isn't bad enough, along comes Dr. Stephen Jay Gould, probably the leading American evolutionist today and professor at Harvard University. He and another very highly reputed scientist, Dr. Niles Eldredge, the curator of the American Museum of Natural History (no small position of honor in the scientific community) have made a very interesting revelation. These two leading evolutionists, both atheists and opponents of creationism, have finally come out and said what creationists have been saying for a hundred years or more: that there is a systematic absence of transitional forms—the so-called "missing links."

Darwin said that we are not talking about a missing link, but there should be a finely graduated chain between everything and everything else. Rather, we are talking about billions of missing links. Said Darwin, you should stumble over them when you step out your back door.

But, at last, after the absence of "missing links" had been trumpeted by notable creationists, such as Dr. Duane Gish, Dr. Henry Morris and many others over the last thirty years, now these highly placed and respected evolutionists have said the same thing. There is a systematic absence of missing links between all of the phyla.

Gould, being an atheist, was not willing to jump into the arms of God. Sir Fred Hoyle, on the other hand, concluded that the only explanation for the existence of life on this planet is through the existence of a very high order of intelligence, which he says, we may call *God!*

He has endured a great deal of opposition and persecution for that, but he has stood by his guns and we commend him for that. He took his science to its logical, rational conclusion. Gould, in my opinion, was not so rational or reasonable. But like Crick, he invented a new form of evolution. Being no slouch when it comes to inventing stories and weaving tales, he came up with another one that ought to at least get notable mention in the science fiction awards of the year! He calls it “Punctuated Equilibrium.”

Gould says that species come into existence suddenly and they remain in stasis (or the same) for long periods of time—maybe millions and millions of years. Then suddenly, many cease to exist. Now, how are they connected to other species? Well, he said, suddenly there is this burst of evolutionary activity and something else develops very quickly. Which concept, as Dr. Gish has often been one to say, is similar to the old idea of Goldschmidt (University of California) called the “hopeful monster” theory—the idea that a lizard laid an egg and a bird, fully developed, flew away.

However, Gould has modified this slightly and said that it took a little bit of time to do this, but then the bird came out very quickly. It all happened sort of over in a valley somewhere, undetected. I think it’s very interesting that we don’t find any evidence of this.

Why is it that we don’t find any evidence of these transitional forms? Because, you see, it happened so fast they didn’t leave any trace. But, excuse me sir, haven’t you been saying for a hundred years that the reason we can’t see evolution taking place today is that it happens too slowly? Let me see if I have this right: The reason we can’t see it happening in the past in the fossil record is because it happened too fast, and the reason we can’t see it happening today is because it happens too slowly. That’s marvelous, and I think an incredible tribute to the credulity of his listeners and his amazing ability to weave what seemed to be plausible tales.

Of course, Gould didn’t call it “hopeful monsters,” but rather, “punctuated equilibrium.” Now, my friends, I think we all know that “hopeful monsters” is just not going to play, not even in Peoria, and certainly not at Harvard, but “punctuated equilibria”? Now that’s got class! That is what is called a “Madison Avenue Makeover” and that is designed to fly!

May I point out that there is no evidence that this ever happened. It is entirely a story. But that is, of course, what evolution is—a story. What kind of a story? If you go to France, they will tell you. In fact, Dr. Paul Lemoine, one of the most prestigious scientists in France, who was selected to be the editor of the entire volume on evolution in *L’Encyclopedie Francaise*, the French equivalent of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, said that evolution is a “fairy tale for grown-ups.”

This is not some preacher somewhere saying that. This is one of the most prestigious scientists in France today who said that evolution is a fairy tale for grown-ups. That, my friends, is exactly what it is. In fact, a Swiss scientist of considerable note has said that it [evolution] is the greatest deceit that has ever been perpetrated on science.

It is also interesting that if you go back to the beginning of the Darwinian controversy when the Darwinian evolutionists were debating with some of the creationists of the time, we find that

professor Adam Sedgwick was using the same arguments that Gould is using today to support evolution. However, Sedgwick was using them as obvious evidence for creation.

Professor W. Cannon, one of the leading evolutionists today, says that Sedgwick was, in his estimation, possibly “the greatest geologist who ever lived”—and he was a thoroughgoing creationist. This was an appraisal by a modern living evolutionist. But note this: Sedgwick said that *creation* was obvious because it was very clear that species appeared suddenly, abruptly, with no forbears. They remained in stasis for long periods of times, and that many disappeared leaving no traces. Of course, that makes perfect sense if there is a Creator.

But notice, that is exactly what evolutionist Gould is saying in “punctuated equilibrium.” There is no creator, so we have, literally, creation without a creator. That, too, is a fairy tale as well.

SCIENCE EXCLUDES GOD

Dr. W.R. Thompson, head of the National Institute for Biological Control, is one of Canada’s most outstanding scientists. In fact, he was selected to write the Introduction to the centennial edition in 1959 of Darwin’s *Origin of Species*. He was a scientist of that stature. He said that one result of Darwinism was a decline in scientific integrity. How true that is. We find suddenly the rise of all sorts of fraudulent activities taking place in science. He also said that one of the most damaging results of Darwinism was that for the first time in the history of science, science had been separated and is now conceived as totally separated from God. Such was never heard of before in science. Today it is almost accepted as a commonplace that a creator cannot be conceived and tolerated in the whole scientific discussion.

In fact, one of the people who testified in the 1981 Arkansas creation/evolution trial said that after reviewing one of the creation-science textbooks she threw it in the trash because it referred to a creator. Now, suddenly, if there is any reference to God or to a creator, this somehow has now become unscientific. Science has been redefined as that which excludes God.

Let me give you a few other examples of this same mentality. To quote Gould again, he said in his testimony that creation science was not scientific “because it calls upon the intervention of a creator [to create the world].” Another example: Ronald W. Coward, teacher of biology and psychology in Arkansas schools, said at the same Arkansas trial that a book written by a creationist “attributed certain phenomena in the natural world to an intelligent creator/designer and that therefore it was not scientific.”

That has raised a very interesting question in my mind. If a book mentions a Creator, you throw it in the trash. Do you have the ground rules? Do you understand how this is played? If a book mentions a Creator had anything to do with the creation of the world, you throw the book in the trash because it is unscientific! We all understand now how the game is played.

But the last paragraph of Darwin’s *Origin of Species* states:

There is grandeur in this view of life with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one; and that, whilst this planet has gone cycling on according to the fixed law of gravity, from so simple a beginning endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful have been and are being evolved.

Should not Darwin's book be thrown into the trash?

But, as I say, the descendants of Darwin pushed it farther from the origin of the species to the origin of life, the origin of the earth, the origin of solar system, and the origin of the universe itself, and thus ruled the Creator out completely. One of the results of Darwinian evolution was to finally get rid of God altogether. I think this is a most significant fact and it is having incredibly adverse consequences in the lives of young people in our country today.

I remember debating Gould one time on a television program. He said to me that after all, it is only a small clique of people, fundamentalists, who want to have creation taught and we shouldn't change our academic curriculum because of them. Well, how wrong can one be? According to an NBC-Associated Press poll taken in 1981, eighty-six percent of the people in America either want creation alone or creation and evolution taught in our schools. Only eight percent want only evolution taught. Only eight percent of the people in this country want what we're getting in our public schools today! That is a tragedy.

Yet we are led to believe that this small group of fundamentalists are the only people who want this taught in order to import their religious views. Of course, that is not true. They are accused of having an ulterior motive—to bring religion into the schools by teaching creation.

Now, of course, Gould would not have any ulterior motives—or would he? Well, he has stated them a couple of things in print. Namely, that he did have other motives and one was to advance his liberal political views. Just how liberal are they? He and Eldredge stated in another article that they learned their Marxism at their father's knee, and Gould stated, under oath in the Arkansas trial that he was a Marxist. So who is it that is importing other views? And who has ulterior motives for bringing evolution into the classroom?

CENSORSHIP OF CREATION SCIENCE

We have been told over and over again that evolution and not creation must be taught because, "evolution is science and creation is religion." Right? That was the basis of Judge Overton's decision in the Arkansas case and that ran all through the majority decision of the Supreme Court Case dealing with the Louisiana Balanced Treatment Act. I would like to quote one of the most insightful discussions of this matter I have ever read. It comes from Justice of the Supreme Court Scalia, and was concurred in by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Justice Rhenquist. This is what he said:.

The censorship of creation science has at least two harmful effects. First, it deprives students of knowledge of one of the two scientific explanations for the origin of life and leads them to believe that evolution is proven fact; thus, their education suffers and they are wrongly taught that science has proven their religious beliefs false.

This is what is happening to our children today. These are the words of Associate Justice Antonin Scalia, and the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court agrees. Scalia continues, “The United States Supreme Court has held that Secular Humanism is a religion.” Repeatedly, I have heard people deny that Secular Humanism is a religion and yet the Supreme Court has said in *Torcaso v. Watkins*, in 1961: “among non-theistic religions in North America are Buddhism . . . and Secular Humanism.”

Scalia continues: “Belief in evolution is a central tenet of the religion of Secular Humanism. Thus, by censoring creation science and instructing students that evolution is fact, the public school teachers are now advancing religion in violation of the establishment laws.” These are the words of Justice Scalia of the Supreme Court of the United States in a legal opinion rendered about a year ago, and agreed with by Chief Justice Rhenquist.

CHURCHES AND SEMINARIES AFFECTED

The facts are, my friends, that evolution is easily as religious and actually more religious than creation; that creation is as easily scientific and, in fact, more scientific than is evolution. Why do I say that evolution is religious? There are more religions based upon evolution than there are upon creation. Creation is held by Conservative Evangelicals and Fundamentalists who are Christians, and groups like the Church of Christ and the Seventh-day Adventists. On the Catholic side are (I’m quoting Wendel R. Bird, who wrote the brief for the Supreme Court), Orthodox Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy. Then there is Orthodox Judaism, Islam (Muslims), and some Hinduism.

But evolution is taught by Theological Liberalism and Neo-Orthodoxy. Do you know what that means? That means most of the mainline Protestant churches and most of the mainline theological seminaries in America today are teaching some form of theistic evolution. So you have a vast array of denominations that hold to some form of evolution.

By the way, these same denominations have filed “Friend of the Court” briefs opposing having creation taught in our schools. I am talking about mainline branches of the Episcopal Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Methodist Church, and many of the other denominations who are teaching some form of theistic evolution, as is Neo-Modernist Roman Catholicism—vast areas of Roman Catholicism teach some form of theistic evolution.

This is true in Judaism—Reformed Judaism and Humanistic Judaism. It is also true in the non-Judeo-Christian religions of Buddhism, most Hinduism, Secular Humanism, and other Humanist faiths, and many Non-theistic religions, as well as Atheism, which is also declared to be a religion by the Supreme Court. So there has been—there are today—a tremendous number of religions based upon, believe in, and teach some form of evolution—more than those that teach creation.

SCIENTISTS WHO BELIEVE IN CREATION

The fact of the matter is: As far as scientific creationism being scientific, *creationists gave us science!* Creationists are the founders of almost every single one of the dozens and dozens of different branches of science. These were created by great scientists who believed in creation.

Their names are the names of the great in the history of science. As Dr. Morris points out, the various disciplines of science were established by Bible-believing Christians who believed in creation. Among these are:

Antiseptic Surgery	Joseph Lister (1827-1912)
Bacteriology	Louis Pasteur (1822-1895)
Calculus	Isaac Newton (1642-1727)
Celestial Mechanics	Johann Kepler (1571-1630)
Chemistry	Robert Boyle (1627-1691)
Comparative Anatomy	Georges Cuvier (1769-1832)
Computer Science	Charles Babbage (1792- 1871)
Dimensional Analysis	Lord Rayleigh (1842-1919)
Dynamics	Isaac Newton (1642-1727)
Electrodynamics	James Clerk Maxwell (1831-1879)
Electromagnetics	Michael Faraday (1791-1867)
Electronics	Ambrose Fleming (1849-1945)
Energetics	Lord Kelvin (1824-1907)
Entomology of Living Insects	Henri Fabre (1823-1915)
Field Theory	Michael Faraday (1791-1867)
Fluid Mechanics	George Stokes (1819-1903)
Galactic Astronomy	William Herschel (1738-1822)
Gas Dynamics	Robert Boyle (1627-1691)
Genetics	Gregor Mendel (1822-1884)
Glacial Geology	Louis Agassiz (1807-1873)
Gynecology	James Simpson (1811-1870)
Hydraulics	Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519)
Hydrography	Matthew Maury (1806-1873)
Hydrostatics	Blaise Pascal (1623-1662)
Ichthyology	Louis Agassiz (1807-1873)
Isotopic Chemistry	William Ramsay (1852-1916)
Model Analysis	Lord Rayleigh (1842-1919)
Natural History	John Ray (1627-1705)
Non-Euclidean Geometry	Bernhard Riemann (1826-1866)
Oceanography	Matthew Maury (1806-1873)
Optical Mineralogy	David Brewster (1781-1868)
Paleontology	John Woodward (1665-1728)
Pathology	Rudolph Virchow (1821-1902)
Physical Astronomy	Johann Kepler (1571-1630)
Reversible Thermodynamics	James Joule (1818-1889)
Statistical Thermodynamics	James Clerk Maxwell (1831-1879)
Stratigraphy	Nicholas Steno (1631-1686)
Systematic Biology	Carolus Linnaeus (1707-1778)
Thermodynamics	Lord Kelvin (1824-1907)
Thermokinetics	Humphrey Davy (1778-1829)
Vertebrate Paleontology	Georges Cuvier (1769-1832)

To say, as some evolutionists do, that creationists are not true scientists is absurd, since creationists created science.

SCIENTIFIC CREATIONISM

Keep in mind that creation can be taught as biblical creationism, dealing with such matters as God creating the world in six days, Adam and Eve, the Fall, the Flood, and things of that nature. But scientific creationism is what we have been asking to have taught in our schools, and that does not teach the book of Genesis at all; it deals only with matters of scientific concern.

What does scientific creationism deal with? It deals with biology, anthropology, paleontology, anatomy, physics, geology, stratigraphy, chemistry, stereochemistry, biophysics, biochemistry, astronomy, astrophysics, cosmology, cosmogony, ichthyology, botany, thermodynamics, probability analysis, etc., etc. Those terms are not even found in the Bible; they deal with scientific material only.

The scientific evidence for creation is overwhelming. So much so, that leading evolutionists on both sides of the ocean have just admitted that the basic pillars that have held up evolution for over a hundred years have collapsed in the last decade—just at the time the courts are saying evolution must be taught and some evolutionists are saying that it [evolution] is a proven fact; it is the best proved fact in history—it needs no evidence.

This reminds me of the note in the margin of a preacher’s sermon which says: “Argument weak here. Pound pulpit.” To say evolution is a fact is like standing in the ruins of a great building that has collapsed from an earthquake and saying, “Is this not the most magnificent, the most unshakable structure that was ever built?”

But it is encouraging that the truth is getting out today, and a number of people are becoming interested in and becoming convinced of the scientific evidence for creation, which is growing at a phenomenal rate. Since just four years ago there has been a tremendous number of people who have become aware of the truth and realize they have been fed fairy tales and have been deceived.

Dr. Colin Patterson, chief paleontologist of the British Museum, which has the largest collection of fossils in the world, said that he woke up one day and suddenly realized that he had been deceived and deluded into thinking that evolution was a proven fact. And he asked himself one morning, “What do I, indeed, know about evolution for sure?”

His answer: “Nothing!”

He asked a group of evolutionists from around the world, who met shortly thereafter at the Field Museum in Chicago, “Can any of you tell me anything that you know for sure about evolution?” Silence!

Finally, one man raised his hand. “One thing I’m sure of, Dr. Patterson, is that we ought not to teach it in high schools.”

Yet, we’re teaching it in kindergarten!

But the truth will out. I am sure the day will come when evolution will be recognized to be the pernicious and harmful falsehood, deceit, and fairy tale that it really is. People will realize at length that a great and glorious Creator, the Almighty omniscient God has created the world—and you and me. The most scientifically accurate statement on origins ever made is “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.”

Sermon delivered by Dr. D. James Kennedy on August 2, 1990, at Coral Ridge Presbyterian Church in Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

104806