



*Excerpt from*  
*WHAT PAUL MIGHT SAY TODAY*  
*Critiques in the Practical Theology of 21<sup>st</sup> Century Western Christendom*

I include this chapter among these critiques on modern practical theology because so many Christians unwittingly accept the popular (but maligned and erroneous) meaning of faith which has been popularized by certain members of the scientific community. Having accepted this fallacious definition of faith, many Christians succumb to the cultural pressure to also accept, as if fact, the hypotheses of the big bang and evolution. The blatant misrepresentation of faith, coupled with the dearth of theological training at the local church level, has left many Christians floundering, confused as to how these hypotheses might be reconciled with Creation. Here we shall see there is nothing to reconcile because these hypotheses are just that: untested, unfounded “what ifs,” void of any substantial evidence; whereas, faith in the biblical account of creation has more than enough evidence to substantiate its veracity.

Because of its many great advances, the scientific community has gained considerable clout in recent decades. This coupled with the fact that most people are not equipped to debate scientists at their level of expertise, lead many to simply accept whatever the scientific community tells them without challenge. However, this is exactly wrong. Scientists are not omniscient, nor are they error free. They are merely trained observers who use big words to discuss their particular topics of interest. They ask questions and seek answers. Sometimes they ask the wrong questions and arrive at faulty conclusions. Sometimes their passion gets the best of them, clouding their logic, and they arrive

at wrong conclusions. As a result, numerous scientists hold differing opinions on various subjects. One presents a hypothesis and another sets out to disprove it. Discord is always prevalent within the scientific community.

Dishonesty is also something to which the scientific community is not immune. The conscious and constant misrepresentation of faith is a prime example. So too is the continued misrepresentation of the hypotheses of the big bang and evolution as if they were known facts. Even though hundreds of qualified scientists present very convincing arguments in their particular fields of study to show these hypotheses cannot be accurate, nevertheless (because they present a rallying pole for those who despise the idea of a Creator, to whom they must submit), many scientists passionately cling to these fairy tales and seek to convince others to do so as well.

## ***Faith Misrepresented***

At the nurses’ station in a local hospital, I recently saw a ‘Thought for the Day’ poem hanging on a cabinet. In part, it read, “*Faith believes the unbelievable, receives the impossible.*” Of course I reacted, and proceeded to take a few minutes to set the record straight. For this is exactly what faith is not. Unfortunately, many people, from atheist to theists alike, consistently misrepresent faith. For some this is a calculated condemnation, for others it is simply innocence.

On the surface, this innocuous yet misguided insight seems quite harmless, even benign; but statements like this

encourage the misperception that science is based on cold, hard facts while faith is merely a biased, ambiguous conviction, void of evidence. However, nothing could be further from the truth. Both aspects of this argument are erroneous; for science routinely employs faith and faith, by definition, is always based upon known quantities.

This misrepresentation of both science and faith is further propagated by the notion that the observable universe is our only reality; whereas, intangible issues and metaphysical concepts are nothing more than subjective uncertainty. The concept of a Creator, being intangible, falls into this category. As such, a survey at the National Academy of Sciences revealed that 69% of the biologists and 79% of the physical scientists claimed to be atheists. Most of the other scientists claimed agnosticism; there were very few believers. Commenting on these figures Oxford University scientist, Peter Atkins, argued,

You clearly can be a scientist and have religious beliefs. But I don't think you can be a real scientist in the deepest sense of the word because they are such alien categories of knowledge.<sup>1</sup>

To substantiate this perceived distinction between science and religious beliefs, many have attempted to redefine the meaning of faith so that it has one meaning when referring to science and quite a different meaning when applied to religion. In an interview as part of the series "Believe it Or Not," famed biologist Richard Dawkins brazenly, yet feebly, argues this redefined, pseudo, dual definition of faith. The fact that neither biblical theology nor theologians use faith

in the way he defines it, is seemingly of no concern to anyone. When asked the question: "Do scientists ever need faith?" Dawkins answered,

Not in the sense of faith as meaning belief in something for which there is no evidence. There are various senses of faith in which we do—scientists do participate. There's {sic} branches of science which I don't understand; for example, physics. It could be said, I suppose, that I have faith that physicists understand it better than I do. And so when I say something that physicists tell me, such as that there was nothing before the big bang—they're not allowed to talk about the word "before" in the context of the big bang—I sort of have faith that physicists understand enough to be allowed to say that, even though I don't understand why they're allowed to say that. But it's not blind faith; it's not faith in the absence of evidence. It's faith that's based upon confidence in the scientific method, in the scientific peer review process, the fact that I know that there are other physicists who can test, verify, criticize the views of any one physicist. So it's not the same as religious faith, which is based upon no evidence at all.<sup>2</sup>

In yet another discussion, Dawkins makes the accusation that this new kind of faith, which he has imagined as being without

<sup>1</sup> Nature © Macmillan Publishers Ltd 1998  
Registered No. 785998 England [http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v394/n6691/full/394313a0\\_fs.html](http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v394/n6691/full/394313a0_fs.html) (accessed March 20, 2012).

<sup>2</sup> Dawkins, Richard. Interviewed by Paul Hoffman, Part of the Series Believe it or Not. Recorded on: October 21, 2009. <http://bigthink.com/ideas/17052> (accessed March 22, 2012).

evidence, “. . . is the principal vice of any religion.”<sup>3</sup>

This, I must say, is the epitome of double-talk: of both exercising a double standard and implementing the adage, “having your cake and eating it too.” Unable to deny that science employs faith, he proceeds to place varying degrees or senses on faith, so that some faith is based on evidence and some is not. Then, even as he claims religious beliefs are without evidence, he makes reference to the big bang and the physicists who, although they are not allowed to discuss the word “before” in the context of the big bang (frankly because there is not evidence), he has faith in their beliefs because . . . well, they are scientists.

So let’s get this straight. Dawkins claims that those who find sufficient evidence for the reality of an unseen intelligent Creator are exercising blind faith. After all the only evidence they have is easily dismissed: a historical account as old as recorded history, a highly ordered, mechanical, complex universe, which is further complicated by all the metaphysical complexities of humanity such as intelligence, reason, emotion and even consciousness itself. Whereas, on the other hand, they have good reason for their faith—those who believe the material universe exploded into existence from nothing, by its own non-existent energy. Although they are very aware that their good reason is void of real evidence (so much so, they are encouraged not to discuss it); still, they have the biased imagination and ambiguous conviction of many scientists who believe the chaotic aftermath of this explosion organized itself into this

highly complex, structured, mechanical system, from which organic life eventually sprang forth out of the inorganic material, which had appeared out of nothing, by its own non-existent energy. Then, this organic life somehow sustained itself on non-existent nutrients and finally (after splitting into a myriad of life forms, the most complex and animated life forms developed a new reality, a metaphysical consciousness with a universal morality, a sense of reason, and all the other problematic metaphysical, human complexities. I wonder if Dawkins has ever heard of Ockham’s Razor?

### *Series of Logical Fallacies*

Those who argue that science is based solely on the evidence presented in the observable universe, whereas religion relies on ambiguous uncertainty, commit at least four errors in logic—three strategic misrepresentations and the fourth, a straw man.

- (1) Claiming some faith is merely based on ambiguous conviction, devoid of evidence.
- (2) Claiming science does not employ faith, or at least not in the sense that religion does.
- (3) Claiming reality exists only in the observable universe.
- (4) Then using these false premises, they conjure up the fallacious straw man argument of blind faith on which to rest their erroneous case.

The blind faith conclusion is indeed valid if the premises were true—that faith is nothing more than a subjective uncertainty, evoked without evidence, and that reality exists only in the observable material universe. Once blind faith is concluded there is nothing left to discuss. It is the final nail in the coffin of religion. The idea of God is relegated to but a romantic notion that gives some folks a

---

<sup>3</sup> Dawkins, Richard. “Is Science a Religion?” Published in the Humanist, January/February 1997. <http://www.thehumanist.org/humanist/articles/dawkins.html> (accessed March 22, 2012).

fuzzy feeling. However, these premises are erroneous, as is the fallacious straw man argument they support.

To thoroughly sort through these thoughts, we must ask the right questions with clearly defined terms. That which is essentially at issue is a series of three interrelated questions. What is faith? Does science rely on faith? And, what is reality? First, we discuss faith.

### ***Biblical Faith Defined***

As pointed out earlier, many scientists, and our culture at large, consistently misrepresent the biblical position on faith. In what debate is it justified for one side to redefine terms to better fit their argument? True debate, indeed communication in general, demands valid, clearly defined terms. In that biblical faith is a topic with which many scientists take issue, it only seems fitting to understand, accept, and base the discussion around the biblical definition of faith rather than the new and maligned version propagated by those who claim atheism. Scripture sets forth many prime examples of faith and provides a very clear definition: “*Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen*” (Heb. 11:1)

There are four Greek terms that must be dealt with in this passage:

- (1) Faith, πίστις *pistis*: belief, trust, assurance, credence, fidelity, reliance upon.
- (2) Substance, ὑπόστασις *hupostasis*: (concrete) essence, reality; (figurative) assurance, confidence, substance.
- (3) Hope, ἐλπίζομένων *elpizo*: expectation, confidence.
- (4) Evidence, ἐλεγχος *elengchos*: conviction, proof.

So then, “the *substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen*” or, we might

also translate it, “*Trust is the assurance of things expected, the proof of things unobserved.*”

### ***Faith Employed Daily***

Many examples of faith as “the *substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen*” are routinely employed in our daily lives, both in a physical and an intangible sense. In a physical sense, if I enter a concert hall and sit down at the beautiful Steinway grand piano and reach out to stroke the keys, I expect to make music. This expected reality is not without cause. I have played music on pianos hundreds of times and fully expect that it will happen again. There may be no strings in the piano, perhaps it is a hollow showpiece, but that is not my belief. It is a beautiful, expensive Steinway on stage in a concert hall; I expect it to respond accordingly.

Again in the physical sense, suppose when I leave my house in the morning, it is locked, all the lights are off and no one is there. But when I return at the end of the day, I find the door unlocked the lights on, and still no one there. I will believe that someone has been there. The unlocked door and the burning lights are sufficient proof of this unseen event. Of course, I could refuse to believe it. I could speculate that perhaps an earthquake rattled the house, unlocked the door, and flipped the light switches. Or perhaps the cat somehow jumped up to unlock the door and flip the light switches. However, the obvious cause, the simplest answer, the Ockham’s Razor, is that someone was in the house.

In the intangible sense, I have complete trust in my wife’s devotion to me. When I awaken tomorrow morning she will be there. This is my expected reality, my hope, my faith, my confidence. This reality is not based on some unfounded,

ambiguous conviction, but on history and the solid relationship we have shared for many years.

Again in the intangible sense, I have faith in my wife's moral behavior. Presented with a situation in which she could steal some valuable object without anyone ever knowing it, I am confident without any doubt that she would not do it. This unseen reality is not based on some ambiguous conviction but on my intimate knowledge of her morals, her past actions, her character.

### ***Faith in a Creator***

Scripture speaks of faith based on reason; nothing is ever mentioned of some subjective, ambiguous conviction. If some romantic fancy is the depth of one's trust in God, this so called faith will certainly fail when put to the test. Thus, it is not faith at all. Faith is born of evidence. The passage, "*Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen*" goes on to explain that, "*through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear*" (Heb. 11:1, 3). The Psalmist understood this reasoning, this evidence for belief in a Creator, "*The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament His handiwork*" (Ps. 19:1). This beautiful, highly ordered universe is deemed so strong an evidence for the existence of an intelligent Creator that a solemn warning is given to those who disregard it:

*The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse (Rom. 1:19-20).*

This reasoning, as we shall see shortly, is the same as that employed by modern science. The idea of things that are

observed being caused by things that are unseen is so common to science that the laws of physics are based upon this reality. Who has ever seen the forces of gravity or electromagnetism? Who has ever seen a radio wave? We can see their effects and measure outcomes with various devices, but we cannot directly observe them. Just as "*the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made,*" so too, scientists often understand the visible by the invisible. This, by definition, is faith. Faith is not some ambiguous romantic ideal born of wishful thinking. By definition, faith is based on evidence. By definition, there is nothing blind about faith; at least not in the biblical or theological definition.

Nowhere in Scripture is anyone ever asked or encouraged to believe something for which there is no evidence. Therefore, Peter admonished, "*Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asks you a reason of the hope that is in you*" (1 Pet. 3:15). And sufficient reason there is. This highly ordered, complex universe is more than sufficient evidence to trust in the reality of an unseen, intelligent Creator.

If we direct the argument away from the physical we can speak of other realities, the even more complex unseen metaphysical realities of the human condition: consciousness, love, deduction, and the very life force itself that brings animation. It is for these reasons that throughout the whole of recorded history, mankind, from children to some of our greatest intellects, have, and still do, reach the conclusion that God exists.

### ***Science Consistently Relies on Faith***

There are no varying degrees or senses of faith. There is but one understanding of faith, it is the same for science as it is for

religion. Faith, or trust, or belief (for they are synonyms) is always based on evidence. Science employs it regularly. The statement, “science does not need faith” is made either in ignorance or self-deception. Science has faith in the laws of physics, and for good reason; there is strong evidence. Many theories or expected realities, at both the quantum and the galactic levels, are based on “*the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen.*” The existence of unseen realities is no stranger to physics; there is ample proof of things that are seen being caused by things that do not appear. As pointed out earlier, we need look no further than electricity, the forces of gravity, radio waves, or the unexplained nuclear forces at the quantum level, none of which have ever been seen, but definitely exist.

In a physical sense, when archaeologists discover a fossil of some unknown organic life form, by faith they know the fossil was formed by some extinct being or organism, as the case may be. While a high school nerd might have carefully crafted and placed it there as a hoax, the obvious cause, the simplest answer, the Ockham’s Razor, is that it was formed from an extinct life form.

When astronomers observe a star wobbling in space through their powerful telescope, they conclude there is an unseen orbiting planet. This belief is not based on some unfounded, ambiguous conviction, but on our understanding and faith in the Doppler Effect and Newtonian physics. They cannot see the planet, but they know, they expect, they believe, it is the gravitational pull of a planet causing this wobble.

The Doppler Effect provides yet another example, called a redshift. Wavelengths of light emitted from an object moving away from the observer increase proportionally, thereby shifting to

the red end of the spectrum and creating what is called a redshift. Applying this knowledge to certain celestial bodies lead astrophysicists to believe the universe is expanding. At least this is the expected reality.

A nebula is another example. Based on the knowledge of our known world a nebula is believed to be a cloud of gas and dust in outer space. Although no astrophysicist has ever actually collected specimens from a nebula, this is the expected reality.

By analyzing the photosphere and chromosphere of the solar spectrum, scientists have concluded that the sun consists of some 67 elements. They believe this solar spectrum represents the entire sun—except perhaps the solar core, where a certain degree of mixing likely transpires between the layers of the sun’s interior. At least this is the expected reality; but, of course, no astrophysicist has ever actually collected and analyzed any material from the sun, nor have they explored its core.

In the intangible sense, every scientist expects the earth to continue on its axis throughout the night so that the sun appears on the horizon in the morning. This reality is not based on some unfounded, ambiguous conviction but on a faith proven by history and the laws of physics. It has happened every day since time began. We cannot see the forces that cause it, but we are sure they exist and we have faith they will continue to work.

If I drop my pen, I expect it to fall to the floor. I believe this because I have seen it happen with many objects time and again. It is the law of gravity in action. But we do not understand gravity . . . what it is, how it works. Nor do we know it will continue to work; but we have faith that it will. Using Newton’s statement that Force = mass x acceleration, we can calculate the force a falling object generates; but we

cannot see the force. We must take it on faith that forces even exist, and we must make assumptions as to what these forces are.

No one has ever seen electrons, yet every scientist believes they exist. Or what scientist would ever tell you they do not believe in magnetism? While we cannot see it, we know it exists. We understand how to use it, to manipulate it, to measure it; but ultimately, like gravity, we cannot touch it or directly observe it.

In reality, faith and science have a symbiotic relationship. All these examples in science employ the same faith Scripture speaks of: the assurance of things expected, the proof of things unseen; things that are seen being caused by things that are unseen. The argument that science does not need or utilize faith is a deceptive, logical fallacy. It is a disingenuous, strategic, misrepresentation of the meaning of faith. The premise that science is based solely on the observations of the tangible, material universe must not be accepted.

Nor can it be accepted that faith in the metaphysical world is based merely on some subjective, unfounded, ambiguous conviction. My very consciousness and intellect (meager as it may be) that empowers me to make this argument, and yours, which empowers you to read and understand it, are unseen metaphysical realities. Oh yes, there is ample reason to believe in the unseen. There is ample reason to have faith in a Creator of the universe. For, *“the heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament shows His handiwork” (Ps. 19:1)*.

This is the Ockham’s Razor to the origin of this highly ordered, complex universe and to the even more impressive and problematic metaphysical complexities of humanity. Add to this the historical data of God’s personal interventions with humanity on various levels and the

evidence is overwhelming. On the other hand, it hardly fits the Ockham’s Razor test to suppose this wondrous universe (from the quantum to the galactic levels) exploded into existence from nothing by its own non-existent energy, after which this chaotic disarray of inorganic, unintelligent, material organized itself into a highly structured system. Then, organic life sprang forth from the inorganic material and then somehow sustained itself on non-existent nutrients. Then, this organic life evolved a metaphysical consciousness, a sense of morality, a sense of self and reason.

### ***What is Reality?***

We are still faced with the question of reality. What is it? In the aforementioned passage, Doctor Dawkins expressed personal faith in his fellow scientists. He basically said he believed his fellow scientists know their particular subject well enough for him to trust them and the scientific method. Unfortunately for Dawkins science is forever changing, so that what is believed true today may not be so tomorrow. Science has changed its reality many times after proving itself wrong. Strangely enough, science actually prides itself in these changes; at least, that is, in its ability to adapt to them. The bottom line is that we really cannot trust scientists always to be correct regardless of how learned they are in their particular disciplines.

One hundred and fifty years ago science believed light consisted of waves. Since light was a wave it required a medium for its dissemination; they called the medium “ether.” Today scientists question the wave nature of light and they no longer believe ether exists.

For centuries, science operated on the principles of Classical Physics, by which Newton discovered and unified the laws of

motion. Many discoveries in thermodynamics, chemistry, and electromagnetism were based on this reality. Then Albert Einstein conceived his theory of relativity. Scientific reality suddenly changed. Quantum and modern physics was born. Again new discoveries were made based on these new subatomic realities. Time and space were redefined. The atom was split, and electromagnetic energy was further investigated.

As a credentialed respiratory therapist for nearly forty years, I can tell you first hand that based on the proven evidence of anatomy and medical science thirty years ago, we knew patients in need of mechanical ventilation should receive a volume of 15 cc x wt/kg, along with 4 sigh breaths per minute, equal to 22.5 cc x wt/kg. As the years passed, we began to realize the pressures generated by these volumes were more critical than the actual volumes. We realized these high pressures were causing irreparable damage to the lungs. Gradually this volume decreased to 12 cc, then 10 cc, until today, we believe we should ventilate at 6 cc to 8 cc x wt/kg, with no sigh breaths at all. If lung injury is present, we will go as low as 4 cc x wt/kg. However, even today in many ICUs, if you find yourself on a mechanical ventilator you might be ventilated at the old volumes, which were once held to be truth but are now known to be untrue. What medical science believes to be true sometimes is not; and what is proven in scientific medical studies is sometimes not put into clinical practice, just as what is discovered in other disciplines of the scientific and research community (if it happens to contradict a popular hypothesis), is generally not discussed in the classroom or in popular scientific literature.

### ***Reality is Beyond the Mere Physical***

In quantum physics there is no solid matter; everything is emptiness and energy, be it light or dark. Electromagnetic energy flows throughout various systems, from subatomic particles and atoms to molecules and cells, creating forces that internally hold these various systems together, while simultaneously, externally, bonding and yet separating each system from others of like kind, thereby resulting in what we perceive as solid matter.

As knowledge of quantum mechanics grew, it became apparent that nonlocality (in which particles of a given structure could be influenced by something outside their system) might transpire. Because this made it impossible to treat systems spatially separated from one another as independent, Einstein took issue with the concept, ridiculing it as “spooky action from a distance.”<sup>4</sup> However, in recent years scientists have demonstrated that subatomic nonlocality exists. Once two or more particles collide they are immediately linked, entangled. The information each particle contains is smeared over the others, so that, no matter how far apart they are, by measuring the previously uncertain momentum of one, the second will instantaneously gain a clearly defined momentum.<sup>5</sup> This is the “spooky action at a distance” that Einstein could not believe, for it takes place without further physical contact, thereby making it, by definition, metaphysical. This is a huge problem for many modern scientists because for them, metaphysics does not exist.

---

<sup>4</sup> Overbye, D. 2006. New tests of Einstein’s ‘spooky’ reality. *International Herald Tribune*, January 10, 2006. <http://www.iht.com/articles/2005/12/28/healthscience/sneinstein.php> (accessed August 15, 2007).

<sup>5</sup> Zeilinger, A. 2006. Spooky action and beyond. Interview by *Die Weltwoche*, January 3, 2006. <http://www.signandsight.com/features/614.html> (accessed August 12, 2007).

Scientific knowledge is forever changing. There is still much to learn of quantum physics, and science has yet to unify the forces of quantum mechanics with those of classical physics. To date, however, nothing in science has answered the question as to the nature of reality. But as we look ever deeper into the subatomic world of energy, information, and emptiness, it prompts us to explore the issue of reality even further. For, when at the quantum level, there is no actual solid matter and nonlocal metaphysical events occur, yet, when bonded together, these same systems construct something of a solid, materialized hologram (that is, the observable universe); what is reality?

I submit that the biblical answer is not only very clear on this subject, but very evident as well. Ultimate reality is something other than the mere physical universe; for *“things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.”* At the quantum level there is an unseen energy that sustains all things. Scripture tells us it is the Creator who is the source of all things, and it is He who holds the universe together; *“all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist” (Col. 1:16-17)*. As evidenced by the complex nature of creation, the Creator is intelligent. As evidenced by many historical accounts of man’s interaction with the Creator, the Creator is personable. We call this Creator, God. God is our ultimate reality. God has revealed that He is Spirit. Therefore, ultimate reality is Spirit.

Being Spirit, God is metaphysical; that is, other than physical. As previously pointed out, the concept of such a reality is not without precedent in our world. Gravity and electromagnetism are without physical form. Human consciousness is metaphysical, without physical form. Even the physical things we observe and touch,

ultimately, at the quantum level, consist of emptiness, electromagnetism, and information. Therefore, it is predictable that reality is indeed metaphysical. Given enough time, science, in that it is the methodical quest for knowledge, would have to arrive at this conclusion. This illusion of physical matter, our universe, is but a temporal holographic matrix, constructed and maintained in the mind of the Creator, who Himself is Spirit.

On a personal level, the individual reality for each of us goes beyond our physical body to reach the depths of our soul and spirit. While someday the body will die and the universe pass away, the soul and spirit live on. The soul and spirit transcend this entire temporal holographic matrix which God created, set in motion, and energizes, so man (whom He created in His own image) might be redeemed from his chosen rebellion.

Unlike science, the biblical account of reality never changes. There is one God. God is Spirit and the Creator of all that exists. He spoke and the universe was so. He is the light, the source of energy and all things are held together by Him. God created man in His own image, for His own pleasure, and made Himself known to man immediately upon man’s creation. He has interacted with man on many levels since then. Being made in the image of God, man has freewill and thus freedom of choice. Man chose to disobey God. Man suffers the consequences. God Himself provided reconciliation for man through a qualified redeemer: one without sin, Jesus Christ, the Son of God. By simply accepting this gift through faith man is justified, sanctified, and saved from the ultimate punishment, eternal death. This is a constant message throughout Scripture which, unlike science, does not change. Neither does God change; as He said, *“I am the Alpha and the Omega, says the*

*Lord, which is and was and is to come” (Rev. 1:8).*

## **Conclusion**

Scientists pride themselves on being rational. In most respects they are; especially when it comes to the hands-on experiments employed as they seek to disprove a theorem. But at the philosophical level, seeking to answer the most asked question of humanity, seeking to understand the origins of the universe, most scientists are as irrational as one can be. It is a visceral irrationality, assumed by default to satiate their pride and emotional opposition to the reality of an intelligent Creator to whom they must answer. Here, they let their emotion get in the way. Here, they refuse to apply Ockham’s Razor to the problem.

Scripture tells us we would encounter this mindset in the last days before Christ returned to earth. Like the antediluvians, the culture will be such that men and women will not glorify or thank God. They will become vain in their imaginations and their foolish hearts will be darkened. Professing themselves to be wise they will become fools. They will change the truth of God into a lie, and reverence and serve the creature more than the Creator. They will not retain the knowledge of God in their minds.

For this reason, God will give them over to their shameful lusts. Just as they will not think it worthwhile to retain the knowledge of God, so too God will give them over to a depraved mind. They will be filled with evil, sexual immorality, greed and depravity. They will be full of envy, murder, strife, deceit and malice. They will be gossips, slanderers, and haters of God, violent, arrogant and boastful. They will be inventors of evil things and disobedient to parents; they will have no understanding, no fidelity, no love, no mercy. Although

they will know God’s righteous decree—that those who do such things deserve death—they will not only continue to do these things but will take pleasure in others who practice them as well (Rom. 1).

This is not a commentary on scientists, but on the cultural mindset that breeds so many aggressive God haters. Offended by the Gospel, they gather together to commiserate and comfort one another under the banner of atheism. But in the end, their support for each other’s disbelief will account for nothing, because

*That which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God has shown it unto them. For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse (Rom. 1:19-20).*

Man is free to deny his Creator’s existence and free to deny his obligation to his Creator; but in the end he will pay the price. Let it be known that it is the duty of all to fear God and keep His commandments. He commands all men everywhere to repent, to receive the forgiveness of sin through a personal faith in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, the Savior of all men.

As for faith, it holds the same meaning for science as it does for religion; both are based on the evidence. It is unreasonable and unscientific to believe the universe magically appeared from nothing on its own accord, by its own non-existent energy; and that non-existent organic life organized itself to spring forth from inorganic material; that this simple, vulnerable life form then sustained itself on non-existent nutrients. Then, somehow, this life became animated and moved on to a whole new reality, a complex metaphysical reality of consciousness, a set

of common morals and a need to love and be loved. If we want to discuss a belief in something without evidence, this is where we should start. If there is such a thing as blind faith, this is it.

Believers must not shrink from the brash, misguided scientists who misrepresent faith. We must not let our opponents redefine and malign the meaning of faith. Their arguments are filled with logical errors of ad hominem attacks, strategic misrepresentations, and straw man arguments. Although it is without any real support and easily refuted, do not let them take the discussion to the contrived, convoluted hypothesis of evolution, which feebly attempts to answer but one small step in the process from their imagined big bang to the reality of human consciousness. Their hypothetical origin of the species is merely a red herring, a logical fallacy specifically employed to avoid the only real issue, the origin of the universe. The big bang hypothesis is woefully lacking, and they know it. That is why, as Dawkins pointed out in the earlier quotation, physicists are *“not allowed to talk about the word ‘before’ in the context of the big bang.”* Before we discuss the supposed evolution of the species, let us determine the origin of the universe and the origin of life itself.

We have a duty to be ready always to give an answer to every man that asks us a reason for our hope (1 Peter 3:15). This does not mean we have to master every scientific argument in the many scientific disciplines. But neither should we fear them for all truth comes from and leads back to God. We need simply to define and articulate our personal faith and the evidence for it: that is, *“The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament His handiwork” (Ps. 19:1).*