

***The Deconstruction of Biblical Creation by Atheism  
& the Resulting Implications for the Atheist:  
A Biblical Critique & Response***

Russ Atmore



Reformation Life Institute

***The Deconstruction of Biblical Creation by Atheism  
& the Resulting Implications for the Atheist:  
A Biblical Critique & Response***

**Introduction**

At the heart of our subject tonight lies the distinguishing feature between the Christian & non-Christian. The Christian accepts the biblical record of creation. The non-Christian does not. The current and ongoing debate regarding religion & science centers ultimately around this subject.

The Christian recognizes no contradiction between religion and science, unless the science is wrong & invalid. The Christian accepts the Bible as his or her final authority because it comes from God. For the Christian, the Bible speaks to science. It does not contradict true science, nor does true science contradict the Bible. This is not the view of the non-Christian. It is true that the Bible does not speak to every issue of science or mathematics, but the principles that it declares or reveals do not contradict what we know about these two fields.

This year saw the 200<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Darwin's birthday on February 12. The acclamations given to Mr. Darwin have bordered on the religious to the point of unashamed worship. He is the father of modern evolution though the doctrine of evolution today is far more advanced than Darwin could have imagined. Darwin merely provided the entrance to a way of thinking that ultimately would become a leading doctrine behind Hitler's Germany & Lenin & Stalin's Russia. Both regimes are long gone, but their ideas remain, evolution flourishes and atheism is on the increase.

Evolution and atheism are flourishing at the present, enjoying a recovery based largely upon the popular work primarily of four individuals. These individuals are Richard Dawkins, Daniel Dennett, Christopher Hitchens & Sam Harris. Evolution is, of course, connected with atheism; indeed, it is the logical product of it. In order to deny God & his existence – you need to develop a doctrine or idea that postulates the very opposite of what the Bible declares. In order to deny the existence of God – you must have an alternative and substitute. If there is no God, what is there then? The atheist must postulate something in place of God. Since he denies God's existence, he must affirm the existence of something else.

Dawkins & friends are not the only advocates of atheism via evolution. There are numerous individuals in all the fields of knowledge who hold the same view. What Dawkins has done (along with his friends) is to make evolution & its mother, atheism popular. In fact, we could say that they have made it evangelical. It is a gospel that they propound with religious fervor. This is not something new, and the Christian should not feel unprepared or afraid to contend with such individuals. The unbeliever has been with us since the Fall of Man.

If everything that exists is the product or result of chance or time (evolutionary time, that is), then the atheist has no intelligible ground or foundation for promoting any significance with respect to himself or herself. At the same time, the atheist has no intelligible or credible foundation for asserting any moral position. And when Mr. Dawkins asserts with his arrogant confidence that God does not exist & that we are the products of evolution, he does so with evangelical fervor & moral outrage at any

disagreement with him. But what moral position would this be? Any moral position is defined as an establishment of law that governs & directs life. And this position must be from somewhere. How do evolutionary blobs become moral?

How can the atheist insist on any moral worth or value or moral necessity, if he is simply the product of chance & time? Morality cannot be deemed moral unless there are some moral basics or guidelines. The atheist cannot appeal to personal human worth – because what would define the worth or value of an individual? The evolutionist leads the way in the destruction of human life from abortion to euthanasia & now to embryonic cell research.

If morality proceeds from man, then he must be recognized as a moral being. If this morality is his innately, then differences in moral standards (I eat people; I do not eat people) must be equally valid & meaningful.

Why is it that something is acceptable to one person & reprehensible to another? Why should they feel this way? Is it not because they are moral beings? Even the denial of God by the atheist must stem from some moral ground. Ultimately, it is this issue that distinguishes a Christian from a non-Christian. All exhibit some moral features, yet one claims his morals as non-binding & the other claims his as binding. Yet both make moral pronouncements, which they expect others to receive, if not believe.

The modern disciplines of scientific study were founded on and derived from such men as Newton, Kepler and others. These men admitted to design in nature. However, as we know in 1830, Charles Lyell produced his book, *Principles of Geology*, in which he promoted long ages of uniformitarian processes in geology. This opened the door for Darwin, as Lyell's disciple to promote biological uniformity. Stephen Jay Gould of the 20<sup>th</sup> century updated the work of Lyell and defended uniformitarianism & evolution.

The first biblical doctrine to come under attack was the age of earth, then subsequently the Flood. With the demise of these doctrines, creation no longer is necessary. The decline of belief in these biblical doctrines has lead to a compromise by Christians. Today, we find those who claim to be Christians who promote progressive creation, the Day-Age theory and of course theistic evolution (as espoused by Francis Collins). Francis Collins is well known for his landmark discoveries of disease genes, and for his leadership of the Human Genome Project (HGP). He has being described as "*one of the most accomplished scientists of our time*". He currently serves as Director of the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Maryland.

Richard Dawkins has just produced a new book, *The Greatest Show On Earth: The Evidence For Evolution*. Let me read you some excerpts:

"Fashionably relativist intellectuals chime in to insist that there is no absolute truth: whether the Holocaust happened is a

matter of personal belief; all points of view are equally valid and should be equally “respected”.

The plight of many science teachers today is no less dire. When they attempt to expound the central and guiding principle of biology; when they honestly place the living world in its historical context — which means evolution; when they explore and explain the very nature of life itself, they are harried and stymied, hassled and bullied, even threatened with loss of their jobs.

At the very least, their time is wasted at every turn. They are likely to receive menacing letters from parents and have to endure the sarcastic smirks and close-folded arms of brainwashed children. They are supplied with state-approved textbooks that have had the word “evolution” systematically expunged, or bowdlerized into “change over time”. Once, we were tempted to laugh this kind of thing off as a peculiarly American phenomenon. Teachers in Britain and Europe now face the same problems, partly because of American influence, but more significantly because of the growing Islamic presence in the classroom — abetted by the official commitment to “multiculturalism” and the terror of being thought racist.

It is frequently, and rightly, said that senior clergy and theologians have no problem with evolution and, in many cases, actively support scientists in this respect. This is often

true, as I know from the agreeable experience of collaborating with the Bishop of Oxford, now Lord Harries, on two separate occasions. In 2004, we wrote a joint article in *The Sunday Times* whose concluding words were: “Nowadays there is nothing to debate. Evolution is a fact and, from a Christian perspective, one of the greatest of God’s works.” The last sentence was written by Richard Harries, but we agreed about all the rest of our article. Two years previously, Bishop Harries and I had organized a joint letter to the Prime Minister, Tony Blair.

In the letter, eminent scientists and churchmen, including seven bishops, expressed concern over the teaching of evolution and their alarm at it being posed as a “faith position” at the Emmanuel City Technology College in Gateshead.] Bishop Harries and I organized this letter in a hurry. As far as I remember, the signatories to the letter constituted 100 per cent of those we approached. There was no disagreement either from scientists or from bishops.

The Archbishop of Canterbury has no problem with evolution, nor does the Pope (give or take the odd wobble over the precise palaeontological juncture when the human soul was injected), nor do educated priests and professors of theology. *The Greatest Show on Earth* is a book about the positive evidence that evolution is a fact. It is not intended as an antireligious book. I’ve done that, (see *The God Delusion*) it’s

another T-shirt, this is not the place to wear it again. Bishops and theologians who have attended to the evidence for evolution have given up the struggle against it. Some may do so reluctantly, some, like Richard Harries, enthusiastically, but all except the woefully uninformed are forced to accept the fact of evolution.

They may think God had a hand in starting the process off, and perhaps did not stay his hand in guiding its future progress. They probably think God cranked the Universe up in the first place, and solemnized its birth with a harmonious set of laws and physical constants calculated to fulfill some inscrutable purpose in which we were eventually to play a role.

But, grudgingly in some cases, happily in others, thoughtful and rational churchmen and women accept the evidence for evolution.

What we must not do is complacently assume that, because bishops and educated clergy accept evolution, so do their congregations. Alas, there is ample evidence to the contrary from opinion polls. More than 40 per cent of Americans deny that humans evolved from other animals, and think that we — and by implication all of life — were created by God within the last 10,000 years. The figure is not quite so high in Britain, but it is still worryingly large. And it should be as worrying to the churches as it is to scientists. This book is

necessary. I shall be using the name “historydeniers” for those people who deny evolution: who believe the world’s age is measured in thousands of years rather than thousands of millions of years, and who believe humans walked with dinosaurs.

To return to the enlightened bishops and theologians, it would be nice if they would put a bit more effort into combating the anti-scientific nonsense that they deplore. All too many preachers, while agreeing that evolution is true and Adam and Eve never existed, will then blithely go into the pulpit and make some moral or theological point about Adam and Eve in their sermons without once mentioning that, of course, Adam and Eve never actually existed!

If challenged, they will protest that they intended a purely “symbolic” meaning, perhaps something to do with “original sin”, or the virtues of innocence. They may add witheringly that, obviously, nobody would be so foolish as to take their words literally. But do their congregations know that? How is the person in the pew, or on the prayer-mat, supposed to know which bits of scripture to take literally, which symbolically? Is it really so easy for an uneducated churchgoer to guess? In all too many cases, the answer is clearly no, and anybody could be forgiven for feeling confused.

Think about it, Bishop. Be careful, Vicar. You are playing with dynamite, fooling around with a misunderstanding that's waiting to happen — one might even say almost bound to happen if not forestalled. Shouldn't you take greater care, when speaking in public, to let your yea be yea and your nay be nay? Lest ye fall into condemnation, shouldn't you be going out of your way to counter that already extremely widespread popular misunderstanding and lend active and enthusiastic support to scientists and science teachers?

The history-deniers themselves are among those who I am trying to reach. But, perhaps more importantly, I aspire to arm those who are not history-deniers but know some — perhaps members of their own family or church — and find themselves inadequately prepared to argue the case.

Evolution is a fact. Beyond reasonable doubt, beyond serious doubt, beyond sane, informed, intelligent doubt, beyond doubt evolution is a fact. The evidence for evolution is at least as strong as the evidence for the Holocaust, even allowing for eye witnesses to the Holocaust. It is the plain truth that we are cousins of chimpanzees, somewhat more distant cousins of monkeys, more distant cousins still of aardvarks and manatees, yet more distant cousins of bananas and turnips . . . continue the list as long as desired. That didn't have to be true. It is not self-evidently, tautologically, obviously true, and there was a time when most people, even educated people, thought it

wasn't. It didn't have to be true, but it is. We know this because a rising flood of evidence supports it. Evolution is a fact, and [my] book will demonstrate it. No reputable scientist disputes it, and no unbiased reader will close the book doubting it.

Evolution is an inescapable fact, and we should celebrate its astonishing power, simplicity and beauty. Evolution is within us, around us, between us, and its workings are embedded in the rocks of aeons past. Given that, in all cases, we don't live long enough to watch evolution happening before our eyes, we shall revisit the metaphor of the detective coming upon the scene of a crime after the event and making inferences.

The aids to inference that lead scientists to the fact of evolution are far more numerous, more convincing, more incontrovertible, than any eyewitness reports that have ever been used, in any court of law, in any century, to establish guilt in any crime. Proof beyond reasonable doubt? Reasonable doubt? That is the understatement of all time."

In order for Mr. Dawkins to deny the existence of God, he must systematically deconstruct & dismantle creation, and the way you do that is by aggressively asserting the doctrine of natural selection or evolution. It's really quite simple, isn't it? And this is all they have! They have no proof of evolution, though Mr. Dawkins claims he does. But his proof of the glory of nature can just as easily be attributed to God and ought to be.

So how does the atheist deconstruct creation? And if he succeeds at deconstructing atheism, he will then have succeeded in destroying God. This is how he thinks. In order to deconstruct creation, you must start with time. We might as well ask the question: who can measure time? We are told that the universe is billions of years old? Since we cannot and have not probed the limits of the universe, how can the atheist make such a claim? Well, that does not matter: science affirms it, therefore it must be so. Is it not interesting that the biblical account of creation features so much of time?

For instance, *"in the beginning,"* is a reference to time. The cycle of *"light"* and *"dark"* is a reference to time. Each successive day of the week is numbered, i.e.; *"the first day,"* etc; the phrase *"morning and evening"* is a reference to time. The fourth day saw the creation of the permanent markers of time, (Gen. 1:14 – 19)

*"And God said, "Let there be lights in the expanse of the heavens to separate the day from the night. And let them be for signs and for seasons, and for days and years, and let them be lights in the expanse of the heavens to give light upon the earth." And it was so. And God made the two great lights--the greater light to rule the day and the lesser light to rule the night--and the stars. And God set them in the expanse of the heavens to give light on the earth, to rule over the day and over the night, and to separate the light from the darkness. And God saw that it was good. And there was evening and there was morning, the fourth day."*

It is interesting again that the genealogies of Genesis 5 begin with creation, and contain life spans and totals. The Flood account contains references to specific calendar days that are in keeping with the days of Genesis 1.

Therefore, time is a major issue to consider. The Christian can simply ask the atheist – where did time come from? This seems to me to be a good question, since the evolutionist needs time for his so-called evolutionary forms to develop, but where did that time originate? If the so-called Big Bang brought into existence the options of evolutionary development, then in what did that gigantic cosmic explosion consist & exist before it went bang. Surely, for it to exist – time must have existed.

Since the atheist needs time for his evolutionary forms to develop, we can now turn our attention secondly, to those forms. What are they? And where is the evidence for a time-generated slow metamorphosis of the various species that currently exist. There is absolutely no evidence. There are no new species in existence. Darwin could cite no new species – for the simple reason that no one has ever produced a species by the mechanisms of natural selection. It doesn't happen.

Evolution is troubled by and destined for continuing trouble due to irreducible complexities for which they have no answer. How does a new species come about? No answer. The evolutionist used to claim the fossil record as his best evidence, but it is abundantly clear that the fossil record has not yielded one transitional form between species, nor is there any

evidence of the transitional process in action. No in-between transitional forms. It is well known that fossils appear instantaneously in the fossil record. They are just there, but no transitional forms. If we date rocks by the fossils contained within them, how can we then turn around and consider patterns of evolutionary change through time in the fossil record?

Why no transitional forms? Why such poor evidence for evolution either in the past or now in the present? The reason why there are none, is because of the law of increasing entropy, or the 2<sup>nd</sup> Law of Thermodynamics. The atheist assumes in his evolutionary model that the universe is evolving upwards, whereas the 2<sup>nd</sup> Law of Thermodynamics says that the whole universe is heading in the opposite direction – running headlong into disorder, that is, breaking down.

The atheist is violently opposed to God and anything Christian. Christopher Hitchens states openly that he does not like anyone who is religious. Listen to what a number of individuals said in celebration of Darwin's 200<sup>th</sup> birthday. Sir Julian Huxley said that, *"Darwinism removed the whole idea of God as the creator of organisms from the sphere of rational discussion."* Richard Dawkins in similar vein, said, *"life has no higher purpose than to perpetuate the survival of DNA...life has no design, no evil and no good, nothing but blind pitiless indifference."* He does not seem indifferent to me when it comes to evolution or atheism. On the contrary, he is quite excited and evangelical about the whole thing.

William Provine stated, *"there are no gods. No purposes and no-goal directed forces of any kind. There is no life after death...there is no ultimate*

*foundation for ethics, no ultimate meaning in life, and no free will for humans.*" Provine is right to say there are no gods, since the Apostle Paul says the same thing in 1Cor. 8:4 – 6, and I would quite agree that man's will is in bondage to the nature of man. Fallen man's will is bound to his fallen nature and as Paul would say, "man is dead in trespasses & sins..." (Eph. 2:1). Provine, of course, does not agree with the Apostle Paul, he has other reasons for saying what he says, namely an antipathy towards God. He is a nihilistic atheist and currently teaches at Cornell University.

In contrast to these statements, the fathers of modern science pause to contemplate the Creator. Sir Isaac Newton (father of universal gravitation) said, *"this most beautiful system of the sun, planets and comets could only proceed from the counsel and dominion of an intelligent and powerful Being."* Robert Boyle (father of modern chemistry) said, *"when I study the book of nature I find myself oftentimes reduced to exclaim with the psalmist, how manifold are thy works, O Lord! In wisdom hast thou made them all."* Michael Faraday (father of electromagnetism) said, *"...even in earthly matters. I believe that the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, been understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead."*

Now the child in school is always shown the time scale of evolutionary form development. This is the standard *de facto* method of communicating evolutionary theory. Show a few diagrams – include evolutionary data, therefore, it must be true. For instance, this is what is shown: The fossil record is shown as a vertical column with marine invertebrates on the bottom, fish on top of them, then amphibians, reptiles,

and mammals, with man on the top. This column is a column of time with time in the past on the bottom, and present time on top. This fossil column is presented without question as if it were true. In other words, the column is shown as real data. (We may add, of course, the word, *supposedly*)

Our children & college students are led to believe that the order of first appearance of the fossils over time proves evolution. So the paper evidence of forms appearing over a large period of time proves evolution – this is the evidence presented to our children. However, they never tell the student that fossils actually do not appear in this way at all. Fossils do not occur in this order, from the simple to complex or from bottom to top or from billions of years ago to millions of years ago.

Now here's the crux of the issue: all those first or earliest supposed fossils at the bottom (i.e., long ago) are equally as complex as any animal today, and are essentially the same as their modern counterparts. The truth is, that fossils appear abruptly in the record, completely formed and developed, and fully functional without ancestors in previous levels of time that are less developed.

The entire fossil record consists mainly of marine invertebrates (animals without a backbone, like jellyfish, coral). And, according to the evolutionist, all life forms today come from a common ancestor or very few ancestors. All of this stuff, is just simply dumped on the student or adult, and since it carries official backing, i.e.; political or educational backing, it therefore is true.

But here is what the evidence really shows. The forms or fossils from the past appear abruptly in time fully formed. Second, there is complete diversity within the forms – so we look at birds or fish or dogs, etc (using modern definitions). Third, as these forms travel up the column of time, their appearance does not change all that much. We call this lack of change "*stasis*."

Stasis describes the tendency to stay the same, or remain stationary. So body styles go extinct as you travel up the column, but there are no new basic styles that are introduced. Why is this? Because there is simply no changing bodily evidence or change in the forms. This has often simply been called "the missing link". No transitional form(s) in between a bird & a dog for instance. The missing link is missing.

The fossil record provides further support the Biblical Flood. There are no evolutionary trends that can be seen crossing the divide from basic forms and the production of new ones. What we see is a transition from a complete marine form(s) at the bottom of the column of time to a more terrestrial form at the top. On every level, the dominant fossil is marine, but more and more land-dwelling fossils start to appear. The evolutionist refuses to consider that the Flood was the cause of this. In fact, it is the only evidence for the change from marine to land-dwelling fossils in the record. Therefore, we accept the Flood – it makes sense and of course, God recorded it, so we believe it.

Now any scientist knows that hypotheses are nothing unless demonstrated or proven, so why is it that they surmise evolutionary theory

as true when the evidence is weak, or in my opinion, just not there? Because ultimately in the dismantling and deconstruction of creation, you have to get religious. The evolutionist, therefore, has his or her own religion.

Richard Dawkins makes great effort to avoid this connection, but he is very passionate about his beliefs. So to divert attention from philosophy or theology, he makes a powerful appeal using the familiar revolutionary tactic – introduce fear into the equation and the opposition will quake and thus become ineffective.

This was the result of the Scopes Trial in its post-trial after-effects. Since Christians had never really considered anything other than creation, the introduction of evolution as truth sent shock waves reverberating in their midst. And with no or little scientific data in their arsenal, they were not equipped to answer the aggressive data of the evolutionists.

Many Christians find themselves in this condition today. We are afraid of information that is on the opposite side, especially if that information is couched and framed in aggression. Furthermore, the Christian does not *want* to, nor does he or she *like* to respond in the same way as the evolutionist does, and thus we are always on the defensive and back-pedaling. No one listens to nice arguments that honor God. All of this contributes to the deconstruction of creation by the evolutionist, and the result is the supposed demise of God.

Intellectual battles or cultural battles are begun, fought on and lost over assumptions. If you can define it, you win. Mr. Dawkins and his henchmen assume and then define their assumptions.

For instance, Sam Harris in his *Letter to a Christian Nation*, is not happy about faith or religion in the public life of our nation. In his “Note to the Reader,” he writes:

"Forty-four percent of the American population is convinced that Jesus will return to judge the living and the dead sometime in the next fifty years. According to the most common interpretation of biblical prophecy, Jesus will return only after things have gone horribly awry here on earth. It is, therefore, not an exaggeration to say that if the city of New York were suddenly replaced by a ball of fire, some significant percentage of the American population would see a silver lining in the subsequent mushroom cloud, as it would suggest to them that the best thing that is ever going to happen was about to happen—the return of Christ.

It should be blindingly obvious that beliefs of this sort will do little to help us create a durable future for ourselves—socially, economically, environmentally, or geopolitically. Imagine the consequences if any significant component of the U.S. government actually believed that the world was about to end and that its ending would be glorious. The fact that nearly half of the American population apparently believes this, purely

on the basis of religious dogma, should be considered a moral and intellectual emergency."

He paints Christians as ignorant or morally incompetent. Harris uses aggressive vitriolic language. He suggests in his best-selling 2004 book, *The End of Faith*, that belief in God is inherently evil and a sign of mental instability that leads to evil social effects. God is an ogre, especially the God of the Bible, who is not a god that any sane or morally sensitive person would believe in let alone love. Belief in God, he says, corrupts human beings.

Such language is aggressive and Christians especially don't like this kind of attack. We don't like it, because we might not know how to respond to it, or we feel that we cannot really express to Mr. Harris what we might really want to say to him with equal aggression.

Mr. Harris and Mr. Dawkins are not really aiming their books at the Christian. We feel the impact because of their aggression, but the authors seek an audience among the cultural elite. This is atheistic evangelism in a nutshell. You dismantle creation by positing and assuming the utter impossibility of such a fact, using language that attacks Christians at their most vulnerable point (namely; their refusal to respond in the same way – so we don't) - & if you aim it at others.

Contrarian journalist Christopher Hitchens, in his 2007 book, *God is Not Great: How Religion Poisons Everything*," posits four objections to religion or faith. First, religion he says totally misrepresents the origin of

man and the existence of the cosmos. Second, religion creates a servile attitude in man, a self-interest and self-centeredness in man. Third, religion is the great cause of sexual repression. Fourth, religion, he says, is ultimately grounded in wishful thinking.

Mr. Hitchens states openly that he does not like religious people. It is somewhat surprising that he has recently worked on a film project *Collision*, with Douglas Wilson, each of them debating the question – “*Is Christianity good for the world?*” *Collision* began airing yesterday on October 29, 2009.

Mr. Hitchens likes to shame people in the acknowledging of their views. This is the fear tactic. It is not that Mr. Hitchens is seeking to convince a Christian to abandon his or her beliefs, but rather he is seeking to promote atheism among those who might not really have thought about their unbelief. Like Mr. Dawkins and Mr. Harris, his aim is the popular market. You increase the numbers of unbelief by attacking aggressively the Christian and their beliefs. Ridicule God and the Bible in contrast to evolution and you increase the army of atheism.

Mr. Dawkins hates Jesus Christ because Jesus is too restrictive. The Old Testament God is too vengeful; the New Testament Jesus is too loving, but the atheist is not interested in that kind of comparison (though he does use the OT vengeful God argument). Mr. Hitchens says that Jesus in the Book of revelation is far more vengeful than the God of the Old Testament. To paraphrase Hitchens, when it comes to violence Jesus makes the God of the Old Testament look like an amateur.

Such attitudes by the atheists are prevalent in their views on creation. Creation means the existence of God. Even the horrible doctrine of theistic evolution has God in the picture. Mr. Dawkins attacks Francis Collins for his theistic evolution – it is simply an inconsistency for Dawkins.

In order to deconstruct creation – attack Christians, attack God, and attack the Bible. Cast doubt and aspersion on all of these and you advance the cause of atheism. These three factors, time, forms and fear are used by the atheist to dismantle God & his creation. These are, of course, not all the arguments, but they weave in and out all other arguments holding them together. This lecture is simply designed to reveal these basic points of attack.

Let us ask this question then: does God need to prove his existence? It is not the same as asking does man need to prove the existence of God. Man always wants to prove the existence of God and unless this can be scientifically documented and measured, it cannot therefore be true. God does not need to prove his existence. He exists. Yet he has provided abundant proof of his existence. In fact, God says that man knows him as Creator, but refuses to acknowledge this truth. For instance in Romans 1:19 – 23,

*"For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them. For his invisible attributes, namely, his eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly perceived, ever since the creation of the world, in the things that have been made. So they are without excuse. For although*

*they knew God, they did not honor him as God or give thanks to him, but they became futile in their thinking, and their foolish hearts were darkened. Claiming to be wise, they became fools, and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal man and birds and animals and creeping things."*

Man has exchanged the glory of the unchangeable and immortal God into images resembling man, birds, animals and creeping things. Is there not some subtle or perhaps some direct statement by God here, that this is what evolution is?

Evolution is indeed a deconstruction or dismantling of God and his creation. You will notice in Romans 1 that this evolutionary substitution is called an exchange of the glory of God. This means that God has revealed his glory, and man changes it. It is not that these forms (man, birds, animals and creeping things change themselves or evolve), but that man changes them himself.

Therefore, any so-called evolution is simply an expression or act by man of assigning glory to himself. Is this not why atheists and evolutionists claim to be on the upward scale of movement? Man is getting better. Just think, if we came from *ardipithecus ramidus*, nicknamed "Ardi" (supposedly 1.2 million years older than "Lucy") then indeed we are getting better, or I should say, we must be evolving.

Psalm 19:1 states clearly that,

*"the heavens declare the glory of God, and the sky above proclaims his handiwork."*

Astronomers refuse to see God's glory in the heavens. For decades the dominant cosmological theory has been the Big Bang, that somewhere 13.7 billion years ago in a very dense hot state that has been expanding ever since, the universe appeared. Some Christians say that God used the Big Bang to bring about all future developments (via evolutionary means), however, the Big Bang does not conform to the Genesis account of creation differing in many details in terms of order. Cosmologists of late have posited that we live in a multiverse of which our universe is but a quantum fluctuation – the latest in an evolutionary cyclic phase.

So hydrogen, helium and some lithium all at very hot temperatures suddenly began to cool and from that cooling out came the stars and galaxies. An immense so-called faith is required to believe this with absolutely no proof provided. The glory of the galaxies which is absolutely glorious is obviously from God we believe, but we believe this because the God who said that the heavens declare his glory has revealed that glory of himself to us, and now we truly receive and believe this revelation from God.

The Big Bang is about origins and the atheist likes it because it removes God from the picture, but God is never removed from us. God states that he himself is very near to us. Psalm 145:18 states that *"the Lord is near to all who call on him, to all who call on him in truth."*

The fool says in his heart that there is no God (Psalm 14:1). If there is no God then there is no fool, and if there is no fool then there is no atheist. If there is no atheist, then there must be a God. The very existence of an atheist is the proof that God exists. If God exists then the atheist exists and God says he is a fool.

So we return to where we began. We do not recognize a contradiction between religion and science. The God of the Bible is the God of science. If everything that exists is the product of time and chance, then the atheist has no intelligible ground or foundation for the promotion of any significance regarding themselves, nor does the atheist have any credible foundation for asserting any moral position. How can the atheist ever insist on any personal worth or any moral necessity – if we are simply the products of time and chance?

Therefore, the atheist has not deconstructed or dismantled God or God's creation, but he has dismantled himself. He is now broken and defiled, and like Humpty Dumpty, he cannot put himself together again. Only the God who made him can do that.

*Soli Deo Gloria*

## **Bibliography**

Michael J. Behe, *Darwin's Black Box*  
Timothy Keller, *The Reason for God*  
R. Albert Mohler, *Atheism Remix*  
Vern Poythress, *Redeeming Science: A God-Centered Approach*  
Fazale Rana, *The Cell's Design*  
Ravi Zacharias, *The End of Reason: A Response to the New Atheists*  
Ravi Zacharias, *Can Man Live Without God*  
Ravi Zacharias, *The Real Face of Atheism*  
Douglas Wilson, *The Deluded Atheist*

## **Atheistic Bibliography**

### **Sam Harris**

*The End of Faith*  
*Letter to A Christian Nation*

### **Richard Dawkins**

*The Greatest Show On Earth: The Evidence For Evolution*  
*The God Delusion*  
*The Oxford Book of Modern Science Writing*  
*The Selfish Gene*  
*The Blind Watchmaker*  
*The Ancestor's Tale*  
*Unweaving the Rainbow*  
*Climbing Mount Improbable*

### **Christopher Hitchens**

*God is Not Great: How Religion Poisons Everything*  
*Blaming the Victims*  
*Letters to a Young Contrarian*  
*A Long Short War: The Postponed Liberation of Iraq*  
*Love, Poverty, and War: Journeys and Essays*  
*The Missionary Position*

*The Portable Atheist: Essential Readings for the Non-Believer*  
*Thomas Jefferson: Author of America*  
*Thomas Paine's "Rights of Man": A Biography*  
*The Trial of Henry Kissinger*  
*Why Orwell Matters*

**Daniel Dennett**

*Content and Consciousness*  
*Brainstorms: Philosophical Essays on Mind and Psychology*  
*The Mind's I: Fantasies and Reflections on Self and Soul*  
*Elbow Room: The Varieties of Free Will Worth Wanting*  
*The Intentional Stance*  
*Consciousness Explained*  
*Darwin's Dangerous Idea: Evolution and the Meanings of Life*  
*Kinds of Minds*  
*Brainchildren - Essays on Designing Minds*  
*Freedom Evolves*  
*Sweet Dreams: Philosophical Obstacles to a Science of Consciousness*  
*Breaking the Spell, Religion as a Natural Phenomenon*