

WHEN EVOLUTIONISTS TELL THE TRUTH

www.aubeacon.com

Introduction:

- A. Imagine a court case in which the prosecuting attorney calls as his witnesses...
 - 1. The parents of the accused, his wife, his business partner and golfing buddy.
 - 2. Everyone testifies against the accused. How strong would the case be?
- B. Those are t/kind of witnesses I wish to call to t/stand inre t/general theory of evolution.
 - 1. Understand, we are not talking about micro evolution—species getting larger or changing color—but macro or general evolution—changing from species to another, or from microbes to us.
 - 2. The general theory of evolution is on trial: true or false?
 - 3. The testimony of preachers, parents & Bible teachers are often discounted; after all, they are not typically scientists!
 - 4. Taking testimony from evolutionists about evolution is like calling the family of the accused to testify to testify on their behalf.
 - 5. Will see some Scripture, but can't use to prove – cause they don't believe it.
- C. Title: WHEN EVOLUTIONISTS TELL THE TRUTH
- D. Purpose:
 - 1. To reveal t/truth about t/general theory of evo.: it is not supported by the evidence
 - 2. To show that no one needs to be afraid to believe in special creation
 - 3. To show that there is a bias, a motive behind the evolutionists' teachings.
 - a. "How Religion Originated. Among the non-scholarly populations of at least the civilized world, surely the most common idea is that religion, if it be true, has been divinely revealed. Divine revelation as an explanation of religious genesis has no place in this book, and under ordinary circumstances all theological interpretations of the origins of religion would be dismissed from consideration as irrelevant or prejudicial." (INTRODUCTION TO RELIGION, Richard Norbeck)

I. IS EVIDENCE NEEDED?

- A. The general theory of evolution is taught as a fact in high school textbooks.
 - 1. "Darwin's theory of evolution presented a new way of life... This view... continues to be upheld by research today... All organisms on Earth are united into a single tree of life by common descent." (**Biology**, Prentice Hall, p. 386)
 - 2. Puzzling to students who believe the Bible.
 - 3. A cause of frustration to those who know t/flaws in ttheory as their views are thrown out as t/antings of Jesus-freaks who are not smart enough, not studied, not scientists.
- B. Surely the scientists and scholars are best equipped to judge the physical evidence for and against the general theory of evolution.
 - 1. BUT - What if evolutionists told the truth?
 - 2. Most will not evaluate the physical evidence objectively, but some have, and this is their story.
 - 3. We are taking t/testimony of witnesses friendly to t/theory, who believe Evolution true.
 - 4. This what not hear in textbooks or on T.V., but **this is truth, from their own mouths!**

II. WHEN EVOLOUTIONISTS TELL THE TRUTH

- A. Even those who vigorously support t/general theory of evolution have moments of candor.
- B. **The origin of the universe**
 - 1. Big bang cosmology is probably as widely believed as has been any theory of t/universe in t/history of Western civ... It rests, however, on many untested, & in some cases untestable, assumptions. Indeed, big bang cosmology has become a bandwagon of thought that reflects faith as much as objective truth." Burbidge, G., '92. *Scientific American*, 266(2):96.

2. Dr. Jastrow, prominent space scientist and astronomer: “The Universe, & everything that has happened in it since t/beginning of time, are a grand effect **without a known cause.**” (What Bible says – **GEN 1:1**) “In science, as in t/Bible, t/world begins with an act of creation. That view has not always been held by scientists. Only as a result of t/most recent discoveries can we say with a fair degree of confidence that the world has not existed forever; that it began abruptly, without apparent cause, in a blinding event that defies scientific explanation.” Dr. Robert Jastrow, *Until The Sun Dies*.
 3. They admit they cannot explain, especially not with science, but not willing to accept **Gen. 1:1!**
- C. **The appearance of life** – They believe we all came from biotic goo!
1. “This theory is an act of faith. The act of faith consists in assuming that the scientific view of the origin of life is correct, without having **concrete evidence** to support that belief.” (ibid) pg. 63
 - a. We are often been jeered, for we we rely on faith.
 - b. Takes greater faith to believe what they do – Absolutely no evidence!
 2. “Science still has no answer to the riddle of life,” Jastrow writes. “The record of the first billion years of the earth’s existence has been erased--the magic period when life evolved here. The theory of the chemical origin of life is held by scientists as an article of faith **without proof.**” (ibid)
 - a. Where’s our faith? **Heb. 1:1-3. Faith is in the evidence.**
 - b. More than blind faith, for archeology is catching up, proving what Bible says.
 - c. Many archeologists have used Bible to find lost cities, explain findings.
 - d. We have more than faith, have evidence. THEY – HAVE NONE!
 3. “Many chemists have tried, and their results shed some light on t/problem, but the gap between nonlife and life remains. At present, science has no satisfactory answer to the question of the origin of life on the earth.” Dr. Robert Jastrow, *Until The Sun Dies*, pg 62
 4. “Considering the way the prebiotic soup is referred to in so many discussions of the origin of life as an already established reality, it comes as something of a shock to realize that there is **absolutely no positive evidence for its existence.**” Molecular biologist Dr Michael Denton in *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, Adler & Adler, Publishers, Inc. USA, p. 261, 1985.
 5. “If there were a basic principle of matter which somehow drove organic systems toward life, its existence should easily be demonstrable in the laboratory. One could, for instance, take a swimming bath to represent the primordial soup. Fill it with any chemicals of a non-biological nature you please. Pump any gases over it, or through it, you please, and shine any kind of radiation on it that takes your fancy. Let the experiment proceed for a year and see how many of those 2,000 enzymes [proteins produced by living cells] have appeared in the bath. I will give the answer, and so save the time and trouble and expense of actually doing the experiment. You would find nothing at all, except possibly for a tarry sludge composed of amino acids and other simple organic chemicals. How can I be so confident of this statement? Well, if it were otherwise, the experiment would long since have been done and would be well-known and famous throughout the world. The cost of it would be trivial compared to the cost of landing a man on the Moon. . . . In short there is not a shred of objective evidence to support the hypothesis that life began in an organic soup here on the Earth.” Sir Fred Hoyle, British physicist and astronomer, *The Intelligent Universe*, Michael Joseph, London, 1983, pp. 20-21, 23.
 6. So, can’t explain how first organism came about. Well, what if we grant them that, what about proving we came from goo to apes, and from apes to you and me.

D. The evolution of life

1. “Biologists would dearly like to know how modern apes, modern humans and the various ancestral hominids have evolved from a common ancestor. Unfortunately, the fossil record is somewhat incomplete as far as the hominids are concerned, and it is all but blank for the apes. The best we can hope for is that more fossils will be found over the next few years which will fill the present gaps in the evidence.”
 - a. That’s an empty Hope!
 - b. “David Pilbeam [a well-known expert in human evolution] comments wryly, ‘If you brought in a smart scientist from another discipline and showed him the meager evidence we’ve got he’d surely say, “**forget it: there isn’t enough to go on**”.’” Richard E. Leakey, *The Making of Mankind*, Michael Joseph Limited, London, 1981, p43
2. From the publishers’ advertising of a recent evolutionary book, “Evolution Without Selection”, by A. Lima-de Faria, Esvier Science publishing Co. Inc., New York (NY) USA, 1988 372 pages. “The interpretation of evolution is in a state of upheaval: the rapid advancement of Molecular Biology has led into question many of the tenets of Darwinism and neo-Darwinism which, although valuable approaches at the time they were formulated, **never fulfilled the criteria demanded by real scientific theories** . . . In the author’s opinion, no real theory of evolution can be formulated at present.”
 - a. It doesn’t even meet their own criteria. To even suggest such a theory, to be a hypothesis – educated guess – must be proveable, testable, *reasonable!*
 - b. And yet, not even being that – TAUGHT AS FACT TO STUDENTS!
3. Niles Eldredge, the paleontologist and evolutionist: “We paleontologists have said that the history of life supports [the theory of gradual adaptive change, dc], all the while really knowing that it does not.” – from *Darwin On Trial*
4. “The neo-Darwinist is now reaching the point of dignity in the history of science that the Ptolemaic system in astronomy, the epicycle system, reached long ago. **We know that it does not work.** And that is interesting. Because from the actual structure of the chromosome we can demonstrate that the human species **did not come from a progressive humanization of a pre-human.**” Quoted from Conference Paper, October 1975, *The Beginning of Life*, by Prof. Jerome Lejeune, Chair of Fundamental Genetics, Univ. of Paris, France.
5. Dr. Graeme Patterson, Sr. Prin. Officer of Paleontology, Brit. Mus. Of Natural His., in the keynote address to the Amer. Mus. Of Natural His., NYC 11/5/81, challenged the prestigious body of evolutionists to name one thing they knew to be true about evolution. NO ONE DID.
6. **Evolving over time does not work.** For t/eye to function it has to have all parts at the same time, cannot be a progressive development. Many of our systems the same way!
7. Seeing all the evidence, why still believe? Why lie? Why do this?

III. THE MOTIVE BEHIND EVOLUTION

- A. Why would scientists continue to support a theory which evidently, by their own admissions, does not have the necessary supporting evidence?
 1. Sir Arthur Keith (evolutionist): “Evolution is unproven and unprovable. We believe it because the only alternative is special creation, which is unthinkable.” Timothy – have itching ears. Rom 1, not believe God!
 2. Man does not want to retain God in his knowledge (Romans 1:28). They don’t want God there!
- B. They don’t like the alternative to the general theory of evolution!

1. Aldous Huxley was a British novelist who wrote *Brave New World* (1932), and was a grandson of “Darwin’s Bulldog,” T.H. Huxley. He was the brother of the leading atheistic evolutionist Sir Julian Huxley and died the same day as Christian apologist C.S. Lewis, and the assassination of JFK (22 Nov. 1963). Aldous Huxley made this frank admission about his anti-theistic motivation: “I **had motive** for not wanting the world to have a meaning; consequently assumed that it had none, and was able without any difficulty to find satisfying reasons for this assumption. The philosopher who finds no meaning in the world is not concerned exclusively with a problem in pure metaphysics, he is concerned to prove that there is no valid reason why he personally should not do as he wants to do, or why his friends should not seize political power and govern in the way that they find most advantageous to themselves. . . . For myself, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation, sexual and political.” Aldous Huxley, *Ends and Means*, p. 270 ff.
 - a. **Why – so can be immoral**, no reason to not do as want, live as want.
 - b. Rom. 1 – exchange truth of God for lie – become own GOD!
2. “**Humanism**: An outlook that places man and his concerns at the centre of interest. Modern Humanism, which does away with traditional Christianity, is characterized by its faith in the power of human beings to **create their own future**, collectively and personally.” *Growth of Ideas. The evolution of thought and knowledge*. Ed. Sir Julian Huxley, 1965, pp. 99, 336.
3. “They [most Americans] believe that t/Earth is billions of years old and that life evolved gradually from simple to complex forms. But they also believe that evolution was a means by which God carried out a plan to create humans. For tactical reasons, Darwinists don’t rush to tell all these people that they are missing t/point, but all in good time. Let people first learn that evolution is a fact. They can be told later what evolution means.” (NO GOD – Can’t have both, don’t go along with it!) (Phillip E. Johnson, Prof. of Law at Boalt Hall, Univ. of California at Berkeley. “*Unbelievers Unwelcome in the Science Lab*”, Los Angeles Times, November 3, 1990.
4. Professor Richard Lewontin, a geneticist, is a renowned champion of neo-Darwinism, and certainly one of the world’s leaders in evolutionary biology. “We take the side of science *in spite of* t/potent absurdity of some of its constructs, *in spite of* its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, *in spite of* t/tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a **prior commitment**, a **commitment to materialism**. It is not that t/methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our a priori adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that pro-duce material explanations, no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying...
 - a. Why force what is not true, and come up with ideas no matter how wild.
 - b. Why? Read on!
 - c. “Moreover, that materialism is an absolute, for **we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door.**” Richard Lewontin, “Billions and billions of demons”, *The N. Y. Review*, January 9, 1997, p. 31.
 - d. They know it’s not so and cannot prove it, but try to. They adopt outlandish ideas, no matter how far-fetched.
 - e. Why? They cannot let a Divine foot in. There can’t be a God!
5. “One is forced to conclude that many scientists and technologists pay lip-service to Darwinian theory only because it supposedly **excludes a Creator.**” Dr. Michael Walker, Senior Lecturer —Anthropology, Sydney University. *Quadrant*, October 1982, page 44.

6. Evolutionist Dr Per Bak, of the Niels Bohr Institute, Copenhagen, while reviewing Paul Davies' recent book *The Fifth Miracle*, writes (emphasis added): "Paul Davies gets into all of the corners of research into the origin of life. ... Cynically, one might conclude that much of his vague thinking in fact represents the sad state of affairs in this field of research. We are nowhere near understanding the origin of life. *But let us try to avoid invoking miracles.*" (BELIEVING IN GOD!) *New Scientist* 160 (2155):47, October 10, 1998.
- a. Snobbish snubbery of God!
 - b. Who is it, Psalmist says, that says in heart is no God? THE FOOL! (Psa. 14:1)
- C. If there is no God...
1. Matter is eternal; life is an accident; there is no hope! There is no sin! Anything goes! There is no accountability; there is no absolute standard of right and wrong!
 2. By their own words they accept this.

CONCLUSION

- A. Prof. Evelleen Richards, a non-creationist Historian of Science at the University of NSW, on TV program *Lateline*, 9 October 1998. "Science ... is not so much concerned with truth as it is with consensus. What counts as "truth" is what scientists can agree to count as truth at any particular moment in time...[Scientists] are not really receptive or not really open-minded to any sorts of criticisms or any sorts of claims that actually are attacking some of the established parts of the research (traditional) paradigm -- in this case neo-Darwinism -- so it is very difficult for people who are pushing claims that contradict that paradigm to get a hearing. They'll find it hard to [get] research grants; they'll find it hard to get their research published; they'll find it very hard."
1. **THIS IS WHY WE DON'T HEAR TRUTH!**
- B. From a French recording of internationally recognized geneticist, Professor Jerome Lejeune, at a lecture given in Paris on March 17, 1985. Translated by Peter Wilders of Monaco. "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.** While waiting to find something better you are taught something which is known to be inexact. . ."
- C. Is there any bias?
1. "It is absolutely safe to say that, if you meet somebody who claims not to believe in evolution, that person is ignorant, stupid or insane (or wicked, but I'd rather not consider that)." (Richard Dawkins, Oxford Prof. *New York Times* book review, 1989)
[review, 1989](#))
- C. **Invitation:**
1. The fact is, the Bible tells us where we came from, why we are here and where we are going.
 - a. Came from – Gen. 1:1, 2:4.
 - b. Why here – Eccl. 12:13
 - c. Where going – Jn. 3:16, Phil. 3:20, Jn. 14:1-3
 2. Reject that information and we have virtually no reason for living!
 3. Don't reject, don't ignore, don't seek another way. Most of all – don't be afraid to believe in the truth of God!

