Liberty University
DigitalCommons@Liberty University

What You Need to Know About... | Willmington School of the Bible

1-1-2009

What You Need to Know About Why so Many Scientists Reject Creationism & Cling to Evolutionism

Harold Willmington
Liberty University

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/will_know

Willmington, Harold, "What You Need to Know About Why so Many Scientists Reject Creationism & Cling to Evolutionism" (2009). *What You Need to Know About....* Paper 6.
http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/will_know/6

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Willmington School of the Bible at DigitalCommons@Liberty University. It has been accepted for inclusion in What You Need to Know About... by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Liberty University. For more information, please contact scholarlycommunication@liberty.edu.

WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW ABOUT WHY SO MANY SCIENTISTS REJECT CREATIONISM & CLING TO EVOLUTIONISM

Why do most scientists reject the biblical account of creation and accept evolution as a fact?

I was looking forward to attending the Intelligent Design sessions held here last Friday, but a "bout with gout" kept me from it. Some time ago as I was preparing a series of Q & A in regard to the first 11 chapters of Genesis I thought today's "What You Need to Know" series might be appropriate in keeping with those Friday sessions. Why indeed do most scientists accept evolution?

I believe there are several reasons involved:

One, there is an incredible peer and professional pressure to do so. This is the case for both student and professor. For example, in preparing his or her Ph.D. dissertation the student would think more than twice before including even the slightest question in regard to the "established facts" of evolution. Then, if later offered a teaching position in a secular university, the pressure to conform would be increased lest he or she be terminated for "poisoning" the minds of his/her students. Two examples can be cited here:

A. An evolutionary biologist at the Smithsonian Institution with two doctorates was punished for publishing a scientific article making a case for Intelligent Design. (Quoted in an article in the February 2004 *Wall Street Journal*)

B. In December of that same year the renown British philosopher, Antony Flew, made worldwide news when he repudiated a lifelong commitment to atheism citing, among other factors, evidence of Intelligent Design in the DNA molecule. For this he was soundly denounced by the academic world.

So much for academic tolerance!

The **second** reason is that few evolutionary scientists are even remotely aware of the current, abundant, factual claims in regard to Intelligent Design. The sad truth here is most in the academic world would probably refuse to consider them at any rate!

The **third** reason is one which may reside in the subconscious level of the mind itself. To explain: let us suppose you were totally in the dark as to your original ancestry. You were of course aware of both parents and grandparents but then the trail grew cold. But desiring to know more, you investigated and eventually discovered there were two opposing answers to your quest.

A. **That your original ancestors were not human at all but rather a speck of protoplasm living in a slime mass which was floating on some ancient sea surface.** Now fast forward to untold millions of years later where you find yourself as a hairy, subhuman, brute creature sitting on the same branch with an ape in the Tree of Life. Finally, you jump down, discover fire, invent the wheel, and miracle of miracles, become a civilized human being! Well, this view is somewhat humbling to say the least.

B. **That your ancestors were always human.** In fact your original parents were the most beautiful, handsome, intelligent, and talented human beings that ever lived, and for a while, dwelt in the most glorious park-like garden ever known on planet earth. But more than that, the Supreme Being that created them in His own image actually gave them dominion over all nature. WOW! Talk about a heritage to be proud of! So then, these are the two positions in regard to your original ancestry – which one would you choose? Why the second! But of course, all atheistic scientists have utterly rejected and even reviled the very concept of the second, and stubbornly continue to cling to the first. But why?

In answering this, let us return for a moment to the first position where it is described in Genesis 1 and 2. Adam and Eve were of course the first parents, the Garden of Eden was their home, and their original Creator was Almighty God Himself. All well and good. But in Genesis 3 everything seems to fall apart. Here we are told our first parents disobeyed God, partook of the forbidden fruit, thus allowing that deadly hissing serpent called "Sin" to descend like a ton of bricks upon the human race. The results were tragic indeed. As sons and daughters of Adam and Eve we have all been born with sin natures, separated from the God that created us, dead in trespasses and sin, having no hope in this present world (Eph. 3:12).

Now admittedly this is indeed bitter medicine to swallow. No one likes to be told that the wages of his sin is death and that an eternal hell awaits the unrepentant person. All this brings us to the center of the third reason – why men accept atheist evolution instead of Special Creation.

It's one thing to accept the glorious account in Genesis 1 and 2 but quite another thing to accept the grievous account in Genesis 3. Stated another way, it is my opinion that a key reason for the rejection of Special Creation is NOT because of the <u>historical</u> statements in the Bible but the <u>moral</u> statements. Thus men prefer the Slime Pond to the Garden Park, for the first position has no binding, ethical standards, thus allowing total freedom regarding any lifestyle, and most important, assures there will be no final accounting to God Himself.