

1. The Privileged Planet

In an article published on-line in 2006, Harvard psychology professor and popular author Steven Pinker made the following statement in specifying some important items of scientific knowledge ... *our planet is an undistinguished speck in an inconceivably vast cosmos*. Pinker concluded his list of essential scientific doctrines by saying, *I believe that a person for whom this understanding is not second-nature cannot be said to be educated*.

As you watch this documentary, think about the difference and relationship between **facts** and **conclusions**.

What are some of the **facts** related to our planet and the universe that impressed you? Notice how obvious most of them seem once your attention had been drawn to them. They fall into **3 categories**: factors critical to life; the fine tuning of those factors and of the physical laws necessary for complex life; the concurrence of factors necessary for observing and understanding of the universe.

What is the **documentary's conclusion** from the facts presented? The documentary concludes that there are too many factors for our existence that have to be just right for them to be merely coincidental. Taken together, these factors lead to a conclusion that the Earth is either very rare or completely unique. They are indicative of deliberate intelligent design and engineering. Is this a reasonable conclusion? **This conclusion is reasonable, but not conclusive**.

What facts are you aware of which lead to a contradiction of that conclusion? What argument would lead to a contradiction of that conclusion? What about self-generation and arrangement?

Let's attempt to analyze Pinker's words. *Our planet is an undistinguished speck [] in an inconceivably vast cosmos ... a person for whom this understanding is not second-nature [] cannot be said to be educated. []*

Translation: *the earth is unimportant, insignificant, and irrelevant in the overall scheme of such a vast universe. Failure to see it this way [the way materialists do] clearly shows that a person is uneducated, ignorant, and hasn't been properly indoctrinated.*

Do you think this is being overly critical of Professor Pinker – that it's reading into his words something he does not mean? How would you characterize his assertions about scientific knowledge in light of the facts presented in the documentary - as knowledgeable scientific observations and reasonable conclusions based upon known facts - OR as the dogmatic expressions of an ideologue?

Throughout this series, both in the videos and in the discussions we will discover that evolutionists like Pinker routinely make these kinds of **overreaching derogatory ideological statements** in an attempt to pass them off as scientifically accurate. Why would someone, especially someone with academic standing and reputation to uphold assert such absurd things in the face of the obvious?

A philosophy of **materialism causes blindness** to what is readily apparent pertaining to the uniqueness of the Earth. Pinker's blindness is a classic example of a dogmatic faith resulting from adherence to a false philosophy. A philosophy must necessarily be classified as **false** when it does

not comport with reality or equip its proponents to see what is obvious about the real world. Like many others, Pinker has embraced the false presuppositions of materialism and they are governing his mind and heart. Materialism is a form of scientific reductionism. It's like wearing glasses with orange lenses that filter out all other wavelengths so the whole world appears orange. By eschewing design, many scientists have far too long operated with an **inadequate set of conceptual categories** which has led to a constricted vision of reality.

Guess what happened **when the Smithsonian Museum of Natural History scheduled a showing of The Privileged Planet**. Law professor and author Philip Johnson put it like this: *Protests were organized, journalistic allies were summoned, and the public was warned that the sky would fall if the video were not repudiated. The governors of the institution duly disclaimed responsibility ... The backlash continued ... demonstrations were organized against author Gonzalez at his home campus to show that heresy in science does not go unpunished. Subsequently Gonzalez was denied tenure despite a superior record of teaching and publication...*

COMMENTS: *The wrong view of science betrays itself in the craving to be seen as right.* Emotional attachment to an ideological position reveals that a person is not acting as an unbiased investigator seeking the truth. Such a person obviously has a personal stake in the outcome and cannot be trusted to perform with disinterest in the outcome as a true scientist. He may even be a corrupted reporter who manipulates the facts to conform to his own skewed preconception of reality or to fit in with what is popular at the time.

What **concluding thoughts** about the documentary and this discussion would you care to offer?

People such as Pinker who **represent the elite in all areas of our society** – lawmakers, regulators, judges, teachers, scientists, etc. They advise those at the highest levels of government and society according to their errant philosophies, and indoctrinate those who teach us and our children into their way of thinking. **They speak with absolute certainty about the nature of the universe** as if they were there and understood exactly what was going on when it all began. Well I don't have such first-hand knowledge and can't observe most things in the cosmos closely enough to make definitive statements about their origins. Can you?

It really is important to be aware of our limitations as well as our ideological biases. It is certainly foolish for us to formulate our understanding according to what we don't know, based upon facts we don't have. As far as we know, **life** doesn't exist anywhere other than our planet. Materialists are forced by their ideology to expect [believe] that life, including complex life, and even intelligent life is common in the universe - is nothing special because to view it otherwise would be tantamount to admitting to the miraculous appearance of life on Earth. Of course, we must leave open the possibility of new discoveries. But for the present, we have no choice but to work with the facts and evidence we do have. And those facts as we have seen, are not inconsistent with a [non-religious scientific] conclusion that intelligence is responsible for designing our planet as well as the laws of the universe. And, if that conclusion is upheld in other areas of science, it strengthens the possibility that there is a reason for our existence and **that our lives count for something.**

How do these observations affect you?

2. Incredible Creatures that Defy Evolution (1)

Our 1st documentary, *The Privileged Planet*, argued that the facts supported intelligent design based on: planetary factors critical to life; the fine tuning of those factors and of the physical laws necessary for complex life; and the concurrence of factors necessary for observance and understanding of the universe.

The discussion points following the video showed that acceptance of invalid assumptions [ie, those of materialism] lead to an inability to properly interpret reality – undermine one's ability to think [see] clearly.

In the 1st discussion, we compared comments by Harvard professor and author Steven Pinker with some observations about our planet. Pinker, in specifying "some important items of scientific knowledge," also said ... *precious and widely held beliefs, when subjected to empirical tests, are often cruelly falsified*. What do you think he means by that? Could he be referring to beliefs that have religious implications?

Yet, when the professor's own beliefs about our planet were measured against clearly observable facts, it was his **materialistic views** of the universe that were falsified - and, his views are not uncommon. Pinker, like many others, **never intends to be judged by his own standards**. They define *faith* as a euphemism for *religious beliefs*, meaning believing in something (such as the existence of God) without good reasons to do so. **This presentation asks such people for their explanation** of the origins of some complex life-forms we observe in nature.

How was our speaker introduced to the intelligent design explanation of life? What happened to him as a result?

How do evolutionists view the anatomy of plants and animals? **Chemical determinist, Francis Crick**, has been quoted as saying, Biologists must constantly keep in mind that what they see was not designed, but evolved. **Evolutionist and popular author Richard Dawkins** acknowledged that *Biology is the study of complicated things that give the appearance of having been designed for a purpose*. So, plants and animals look like they were designed, even to evolutionists, right? The Darwinistic definition of life is **author Cairns-Smith's** philosophical preference, **but** when he describes what he actually sees, he speaks of something very different: *What impresses us about a living thing is its in-built ingenuity, its appearance of having been designed, thought out – of having been put together with a purpose*.

How do evolutionists view the anatomy of plants and animals? Evolutionists view the anatomy of plants and animals as the products of chance yet having the appearance of being designed. This description seems contradictory, can you tell why? *As products of chance exhibits a philosophical commitment to naturalism*, while *having the appearance of being designed is a conclusion from observing nature*.

Observation is at the very heart of scientific investigation, and design is recognizable. Ideological presumptions [philosophical predispositions] have no place in science because they color every fact and interpretation to fit their predetermined conceptions, ie. such bias forces the results

and explanations to fit the mold imposed regardless of the direction the data is leading.

What is it that makes one think of design when he sees something? Who says it is not what it appears to be? **What criteria do evolutionists use to distinguish between things that are deliberately designed and things that are not?** In other words, what scientific means do evolutionists employ to differentiate between what merely **appears** to be deliberately engineered from that which actually **is** designed?

There is no scientific method employed. Seeing design as illusory is a consequence of accepting the ideology of materialism as fact - that random interactions between materials, energies, forces, and influences over time resulted in the accidental formation of everything that exists in nature. It's putting on those orange-tinted glasses. **Law professor and author Phillip Johnson** put it like this, *It takes years of indoctrination to learn to ignore evidence of intelligent design that is so apparent before our very eyes.*

As part of the research for his 1st book, *Darwin's Black Box*, 1996, biologist Michael Behe conducted a survey of college biology texts and technical journals. He found a total, systematic absence of any attempts at Darwinian explanations for complex biological systems. Many of those systems had been fully understood for at least 40 years. As part of the research for his 2nd book, *The Edge of Evolution*, 2007, Behe again conducted that same survey with the same results. Not one explanation had since been published offering a plausible scenario by which complex biological systems and mechanisms could have evolved. **Any scientists that claim to have explained something, when in fact they have published no explanation at all, should be exposed as a fraud.**

The philosophy of naturalism taken as scientific fact bypasses the necessity of proof and becomes unchallengeable truth that argues against any and all intelligent design inferences. Unless biologists can provide a testable mechanism capable of creating new complex organs as well as the large amount of information necessary for their incorporation and operation, **the correct scientific conclusion is that biological creation remains an unsolved mystery.**

What is the central objective of science education in public schools? to instill a naturalistic [materialistic] way of thinking as the only correct way of thinking. Are students, parents, or other interested parties permitted to raise these issues we have been looking at in public schools?

On June 13, 2001, **Pennsylvania Republican Senator Rick Santorum** proposed a two-sentence amendment (drafted by Phillip Johnson) to the White House-sponsored education bill that was then under consideration in the US congress. The amendment passed by a huge bipartisan majority of 91-8, survived the conference committee virtually unchanged, and was approved by both houses of congress. The amendment as presented read, *It is the sense of the Senate that (1) good science education should prepare students to distinguish the data or testable theories of science from philosophical or religious claims that are made in the name of science; and (2) where biological evolution is taught, the curriculum should help students to understand why this subject generates so much continuing controversy and should prepare students to be informed participants in public discussions regarding the subject.*

Unfortunately, through the efforts of evolutionists who do not want their philosophical theory chal-

lenged or even examined, the wording of the amendment was watered down so as to be meaningless and never made it into the education bill. This does not prevent you from sharing the videos and discussions in this series with others including teachers. **Intelligent design is not a religious issue because it does not include the specifics of anyone's particular belief system** nor is it a deductive argument from first principles. Intelligent design is a recognizable and credible explanation for the complexity and form of reality, both biological and non-biological. There is no extra scientific evidence or faith requirement. When the stones are arranged to form recognizable letters that spell out the word "welcome," anyone can rightly conclude that an intelligent agency was responsible for their placement, **and that's the crux of the problem.** A conclusion that intelligent design has been active in nature is a threshold that naturally opens way for inquiry into the activity, nature, and personality of such a designer.

How will you respond once a conclusion of intelligent design has been reached?

3. Mystery of the Megaflood

The 1st discussion led to the conclusion that belief in invalid assumptions leads to an inability to properly interpret reality. The second video pointed out a number of features in animals for which evolutionists have no explanation - strange for a theory that has grown in magnitude as an explanation for everything. This video will reveal the entrenched consensus view of scientists enslaved to the false notion of geological forces being overturned by the facts.

Early in the 1920s, J. Harland Bretz published evidence for a gigantic flood hundreds of feet deep and a hundred miles wide that ripped through the open expanse of eastern Washington state. His work is an outstanding example of investigative science. Yet he was met with scientific and personal vehemence; his theory was considered an outrageous hypothesis. The geological establishment came out en masse to stamp out his heresy. They went to extreme, even ridiculous lengths to explain away the huge mass of field data Bretz had accumulated. Why?

John Stewart Mill's famous Victorian era essay *On Liberty* comments that even where the majority chooses not to enforce its will with formal legal restraints and penalties, nonconforming individuals may be intimidated by the tyranny of the prevailing opinion and feeling. It is in the interest of society to subject even the most cherished doctrines [such as evolution] to a forceful critique from dissenters. Unless we know why one theory must be true and the other cannot be, we do not know the grounds for our opinion.

Geologists think in terms of The past being the key to the future. We rely upon our knowledge of the creation of similar landforms. Therefore It was assumed that the scab-land features would have taken millions of years to create. Why? Suppose you're assumptions or knowledge of those similar landforms is wrong – how certain is your benchmark then?

One obvious way this could have happened was by the gradual erosion caused by rivers – as other dramatic landscapes around the world have been scoured out. Which landscapes would those be – the Grand Canyon cut out by the mighty Colorado River?

Such landscapes as found in the scablands Appeared to have been laid down by slow-moving rivers

over millions of years. How could anyone know this unless someone or a succession of someones was there to observe and record it? *These layers look like they resulted from a giant river flooding again and again.* Why do you think they look like that given that It was already accepted that *The rivers and lakes in the scab-lands today could not have sculpted this landscape.*

Bretz was challenging the orthodox view. *Geologists had come to think on good evidence that most landforms and deposits had formed over long periods of time by ordinary processes. NO! This idea was not derived from good evidence or empirical data, it was their starting assumption,* their framework of understanding so the way they thought about the scab-land features was all wrong from the start. It sounded too much like a biblical flood which they had already decided on philosophical grounds was rubbish.

What is another name for the formation of geographical features by disaster? Catastrophism – the idea that the natural defining features of most landscapes resulted from catastrophic events rather than by day-by-day slow weathering [uniformitarianism]. We've actually witnessed and recorded many lesser catastrophes in modern times.

This knowledge of the processes involved comes through the use of advances in technology such as seismometers, the accumulation of empirical data, and interpretation of collected data resulting in the formation of a theory that explains the phenomenon. Here we see technology making possible testing to discover what happens under the surface of a fast-moving body of water – finally, some real science!

[The producers of this video neglected to properly illustrate or mention the extreme cutting action of grit, gravel, and debris churned up and carried as an abrasive slurry by the torrent of fast-moving water.]

The discussion about the ash layer and multiple flood theory is not all that cut and dry. Notice that the experts have shifted from the no-flood certainty of the 1920s to posit as many as 100 floods to explain the build-up of sedimentary rock layers in the scablands. Obviously thick sedimentary layers were first laid down over the whole area by a much more encompassing flood (or floods) that covered the land mass. Such depositing, sorting, and layering of sediment into distinct bands is typical of moving sediment-rich waters. The land had to be built-up hundreds of feet above the bed-rock before the Missoula flood occurred in order to carve those scabland features out.

At first glance, one would think that dating sedimentary layers is a reasonable approach. Yet most of us have no idea of the different types of dating methods, the types and numbers of assumptions that are involved in each, or of the fact that completely different dates can be arrived at for the same layers. **We don't know** how many attempts at dating gave dates that were unacceptable given the geologists' uniformitarian framework, and were thus discarded unreported [see Richard Feynman's comments below]. **We don't know** whether or not the labs selected to date the materials were chosen because they typically gave dates consistent with the geologists' expectations. Straightforward unbiased science in dating cannot be taken for granted.

How can the truth lie *somewhere in between*, that is, a combination of gradual processes and catastrophic ones? What does common, gradual, every-day weathering have to do with carving out

the scablands? The geologist seems to be saying that catastrophic floods that occur in cycles repeatedly sweeping an area may be regarded as normal [non-catastrophic] for this region. How did scientists determine which geologic features had resulted from very slow natural processes? In other words, what scientific criteria allowed these men of science to distinguish between catastrophically rapidly caused geological formations from those resulting from every-day gradual processes? They interpreted what they saw as they were trained to, and thus found [interpreted the landforms according to] what they expected to find.

There were no scientific criteria that provided a basis for scientists to distinguish between catastrophically rapidly caused geological formations from those resulting from gradual every-day weathering. Because of their uniformitarian presumptions, what they saw looked to them just like they imagined something that had taken place over long periods of time ought to.

How can proceeding upon the basis of **unchallenged assumptions without criteria** for measuring results be called science? What would you call it? Without appropriate criteria for evaluating results, scientific investigation cannot proceed because to do so would be stacking the deck or rigging the game in favor of a particular viewpoint.

What was the incorrect assumption held by the elite scientific majority? Generally, the elite scientific majority believed in uniformitarianism, the philosophy that all past geological processes work at about the same way and rate we see today, ie, the present is the key to the past. Why would these scientists think this? Geologists were taught to think in terms of the same gradual change mentality that biological evolutionists use.

What are some types of catastrophic events they most certainly were aware of? They certainly knew of earthquakes; volcanic eruptions; floods; tsunamis; mud slides; meteorite impacts; forest fires; weather related events like monsoons, storm surges, hurricanes, tornadoes, etc. Did you know that there is preserved fossil evidence of trillions of once-living organisms buried in rock layers [sedimentary, ie, deposited by water] all over the whole planet including the very summits of many mountain ranges?

The concept of an old Earth began as an assumption in the mid 1700s by scholars who rejected the global flood of Genesis. This old Earth idea predates and legitimizes both uniformitarianism and evolution, and fits nicely into the current worldview of materialism that dominates our intellectual institutions. Consequently testing and interpretive assumptions, methods, and data that support an old Earth are accepted, even preferred and legitimized while such assumptions and methods yielding more recent dates and data are viewed as anomalous, disregarded, and unreported.

Many of biologist Stephen Jay Gould's essays against sociobiology (the attempt to apply Darwinian theory to human culture and behavior) deal with the role that ideology and personal prejudice have played in the history of science, particularly Darwinian science. But it is one thing to expose prejudice and ideology in the science of the past; it is another to acknowledge its living influence in the present.

Even after going through this Lake Missoula flood debacle, geologists haven't changed their basic assumptions, the way they think, or their bias against the Genesis flood account. The attitude of the scientific elite (or any other elite class for that matter – political, economic, medical, etc.) in every age

is the same – **although we may have been wrong in the past, what science knows NOW it knows for sure.**

In his 1974 commencement address, renowned **physicist Richard Feynman** told the graduating students of Cal Tech to cultivate *a kind of scientific integrity, a principle of scientific thought that corresponds to a kind of utter honesty ... For example, if you are doing an experiment, you should report everything that you think might make it invalid – not only what you think is right about it ... The idea is to try to give all the information to help others to judge the value of your contribution; not just the information that leads to judgment in one particular direction ...* **The first principle is that you must not fool yourself – and you are the easiest person to fool ... [and] you should not fool the laymen [try to snow him] when you're talking as a scientist.**

What lessons do you derive from this session?

4. Unlocking the Mystery of life

In the previous discussions, I have stressed that there are fallacious assumptions lying at the bottom of the false perceptions and reasoning that governs those who hold the high ground in scientific matters. Such false perceptions and reasoning has infiltrated into other areas of society as well. **The implications of materialism affect everyone**, whether or not they are aware of them and can articulate them.

Although this video doesn't mention it, **Darwin himself had already been influenced by old earth uniformitarian [naturalistic] thinking** when he took his historic voyage and developed his evolutionary model. As you watch the 1st half of this video, you will begin to see that advances in technology are rapidly exposing the truth about living things.

What mechanisms do evolutionists believe bring about changes in living things? Are **genetic mutation and natural selection** real means that effect actual changes in organisms? According to Darwin, how is each supposed to work and what does it accomplish? What do common sense and experimentation indicate?

Prior to the work described in Darwin's Black Box (1996) by Michael Behe, testing **Darwinism by the molecular evidence had never even been attempted.** **The true scientific question** – Does the molecular evidence as a whole tend to confirm Darwinism when evaluated without Darwinian bias – had never before been asked. Some scientists believe so strongly in Darwinism that their critical judgments are affected – **they consequently overlook obvious problems with Darwinian scenarios and as we have seen, often confidently assert things that are objectively untrue.**

Just as there are **some biological systems that are irreducibly complex**, there are complex molecules that are not. They are not one of several integrated parts that function together once they have been constructed. Nevertheless, that does not mean that they can be conceived of as being built in a Darwinistic manor. As with all irreducibly complex systems, the processes involved in **putting together single complex molecules require a series of precise steps and molecular assemblers**, none of which can be eliminated or their order changed. **It is a carefully regulated production process that is itself irreducibly complex** and during which the opportunities to go wrong are enor-

mous.

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/space/finding-life-beyond-earth.html> [Finding Life Beyond Earth](#) is a 2011 NOVA documentary that appears to be produced specifically to combat the powerful presentation of the first video in this series, **The Privileged Planet**. In it top astrobiologists explain how conditions on 2 moons of Jupiter have a wide range of dynamic environments - atmospheres thick with organic molecules, active volcanoes, and vast saltwater oceans. **The implication is that the chemical origin of life could have occurred on these moons far away from the Goldilocks zone of the Sun's influence.**

The question that faces all of us is *what should we do if the empirical evidence and our philosophy are going in different directions?* So, the question that faces evolutionists (and all materialists - politicians, economists, educators, etc.) is **what should we do if the empirical evidence and our materialist philosophy contradict one another?**

Today, thanks to people such as **William Dembski**, science has criteria for distinguishing between the results of natural processes and those of intelligent design and engineering. Thanks to **Michael Behe**, scientists have a handle on quantifying the operation of natural processes such as mutations. Thanks to **Kenneth Meyers**, the intelligent design movement is forcing scientific naturalists to deal with the source of information encoded in all living things. Werner Gitt, director and professor at the German Federal Institute of Physics and Technology says **There is no known law of nature, no known process, and no known sequence of events which can cause information to originate by itself in matter.**

Since information is something fundamentally different from matter, **what is the ultimate source of that information?** - If not intelligence, then what? Neither is the random interaction between materials energies and forces an adequate starting point for rationality. **If intelligence is excluded, what other alternatives are there?** **We can't even conceive of the existence and conveyance of information apart from the rational expression of an intelligent mind.**

Anti-Darwinian sentiments are common among scientists. **The Darwinian house of the gradual accumulation of small changes leading to new species is teetering.** **The primary issues in dispute are the extrapolation from micro to macro-evolution and the creation of new genetic information.** Its only hope is a very slim one. It lies in the ongoing search for **a new mechanism** to effect such changes to replace the clearly inadequate ones, mutation and natural selection. However, evolutionary scientists are quick to deny that there any substantive disagreements within their camp. Yet it is difficult to maintain that there is no controversy worth discussing while books and articles about the controversy keep on regularly appearing.

The constant use of propaganda and smear campaigns against challenges to the status quo instead of laying out the controversy squarely on the table show that science educators are not confident that their cherished theory can survive careful inspection and critical thinking. **Science that deserves to be defended isn't afraid to meet criticism with its own methods:** reasoned arguments, precise definitions, repeatable experiments, and an open mind about all questions that can't be settled by scientific testing.

With the **recent advances in molecular biology**, it has become apparent that **intelligent design had a significant role in the origin of life** as well in the variety of forms it takes. This threshold conclusion naturally moves the discussion from science to metaphysics. That is, from considering what is there and how it came to be, to considering the reasons and purposes behind the designer's work. **The first documentary raised the question of purpose in the universe, now this one raises the question of the purpose of man.** The answers to these questions can only come from the designer himself. Has he spoken, and if so what has he revealed about himself, the world, life, death, morality, and accountability?

Consider your **MEANING** – your connection to the rest of the cosmos and life; **PURPOSE** – the direction and goals of your lives; and **SIGNIFICANCE** – the impact of your lives upon others and even the world. For we can find ourselves only in knowing the designer – **only in his intentions and will** is the resolution of our search for knowledge and understanding even possible.

It has been my intention to demonstrate that **Christian faith properly understood from the Bible and reason proceeding upon valid assumptions compliment one another**. That is, what we find in the world, in living in the world, when accurately interpreted is exactly what we expect to find according to the Scriptures because they are the Designer's word to mankind. There are no surprises in life and there will be none in death for those who take seriously these writings and understand what they mean by what they say.

We cannot conceive of an intelligent designer apart from personality. Though we may not know exactly what the Scripture means by expressing mankind as **made in the image of God**, it is obvious that we were meant to relate to him. Therefore fulfillment and satisfaction in this life cannot be found apart from seeking our meaning, purpose, and significance in fellowship with the Living God who is there.

What about you, having now gone through the first four sessions,
are you still confident in your opinions about this life and content with your future prospects?

5. Darwin's Dilemma: The Mystery of the Cambrian Explosion

In the previous series of 4 videos, my emphasis in the discussions has been to show that **scientific naturalism and intelligent design are not two different and separate subjects – science and religion. They are competing verifiable answers to the same set of questions** regarding the origin and nature of the universe and life. To be consistent, once one accepts the premise of a closed system (materialism) [see Intro to the Intellectual Basis of Christianity], he is bound to accept the resulting conclusions no matter how disagreeable he may find them.

We have seen that **thinking in reaction to the biblical account has philosophically corrupted science and then used that corrupted science as a weapon against truth**. This is consistent with what we expect to find mankind doing after his rejection of God's rule in **Gen.3. Rom.1** describes the deterioration of the situation after the Fall this way,

For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who suppress the truth by their wickedness because what can be known about God is evident within them, because God made it plain to them. For since the creation of the world His invisible

attributes – his eternal power and divine nature – **have been clearly perceived being understood by what has been made**, so they are without excuse. For even though they knew God, they did not honor him as God or give him thanks; but they became futile in their speculations and their foolish hearts were darkened. Though professing to be wise, they became fools and changed the glory of the immortal God into images resembling mortal man and birds and animals and reptiles.
Rom.1:18-23

The passage continues with a series of indictments against mankind for *exchanging the truth about God for a lie* followed by the consequence that *God gave them over* to all kinds of moral and unnatural forms of degradation. Man, the once noble crown of God's creation to whom the world was given to enjoy, explore, and govern had fallen and become depraved and debased.

In other words **moral autonomy has led to the abnormal moral and physical conditions of the world**. So what we find in the world is what we expect to – the unguided reason of man seeking ways to explain the universe without God and to rationalize his immorality. In this series it has been shown that **man can only accomplish this by sacrificing both truth and reason**. The Darwinist approach has consistently been to find some supporting fossil evidence, claim it as proof for evolution, and ignore all the difficulties.

In scientific practice the theory normally precedes the experiment or fact-gathering process. **Observation always needs to be selective**. It requires a chosen object, a definite task, an interest, a point of view, a problem to focus on. **The conjecture provides a starting point for investigation when it is stated with sufficient clarity that it can be criticized**. Progress is made **not** by searching the world for confirming examples (which can always be found), but by searching out falsifying evidence that reveals the need for a new and better explanation. **A theory's scientific status depends less upon its subject matter than upon the attitude of its adherents toward criticism**. Scientific methodology exists wherever theories are subjected to rigorous empirical testing, and it is absent wherever the practice is to protect a theory rather than to test it.

Darwin was relatively candid in acknowledging that the evidence was in important respects not easy to reconcile with his theory, but in the end **he met every difficulty with a rhetorical solution**. His point of argument was that the common ancestry thesis was so logically appealing that rigorous empirical testing was not required. He proposed no daring experimental tests, and thereby started his science on the wrong road. **Darwin himself established the tradition of explaining away the fossil record**. All the basic elements of Darwinism are implied in the concept of ancestral descent with modification which was from the start thus protected from empirical testing.

Naturalistic evolution is not merely a scientific theory; it **is the official creation story of modern secular culture**. The experts, the scientific priesthood, therefore have a vested interest in protecting the story, and in imposing rules of reasoning that make it invulnerable. **Their dogmatism is a human characteristic that grows out of insecurity**. It is particularly pronounced in the case of individuals or groups that hold power positions which are **threatened by criticism**.

What stands out to you as a vulnerability of evolution as a theory? The gradual development of all life forms from a common ancestor is tacitly predicted by the evolutionary model, but it is not supported

exactly where it ought to be - by the fossil evidence. Well what model does fossil evidence support? The fossil evidence supports independent rapid creation of the major phyla with differentiation occurring from each.

Have you ever thought about the difference between what you know and what you think you know? Ever make a statement about something and find yourself backpedaling when someone challenges it? Why? Because you overstated it – spoke beyond what you really knew and could support with evidence and/or argument and were exposed. Often our knowledge consists of ideas we picked up from our culture, our associates; television, or school. Just because we became convinced of something [believed it; swallowed it; were taken in by it] is no comment on the accuracy of it. It's really more of a subjective persuasion or opinion than it is actual knowledge related to truth. Even being present during some situation doesn't guarantee that we know what is really going on. We are often too wrapped up in our own point-of-view and limited by our lack of all the facts and motivations to interpret it correctly. In other words, **we think we know and it seems to us that we understand**, but it very well may be that we don't.

We have found in this series that what many call *knowledge* is false, that it's not even science – it's **philosophy made to sound like science**, and the motives of those preachers of Darwinism are anything but pure. People that seem so sure of themselves in spite of the empirical evidence to the contrary are often quite smug in their high opinion of themselves. Can you imagine standing before almighty God with an attitude like that?

It's not that materialists/naturalists/evolutionists/atheists are dumb. They are often very intelligent and learned, but their flight from God has made them vulnerable to delusion and deception as we read in **Rom.1, professing to be wise, they became fools.** Your whole generation has a sense of being lost – without meaning in the world, without purpose, without morals, without a basis for law, with no final principles, and no final answers for anything. **Where ought one go for a proper framework of understanding, to learn correct thinking, and become wise?** How about to the one who has the power and understanding to engineer and build whatever he conceives? How about to the word he spoke to fallen men?

Come to the Bible with your questions and ask them honestly. You will find, as I have, objective truth corresponding to reality and **a chain of cause and effect** that rings true. **There comes a time when what is called for is commitment rather than additional information.** At some point you come to the place where you have good and sufficient reasons to know that the Christian answers are truth. **There's a point where the preponderance of evidence or lack of it forces a conclusion, and that conclusion demands of you a corresponding response.** In this case failure to bow to those answers reveals us to be disobedient and guilty. **What would be an appropriate response to a conclusion that the universe and everything it contains was designed by an intelligent being?** Remember the tragedy of **Romans 1 ... even though they knew God, they did not honor him as God or give him thanks; but they became futile in their speculations and their foolish hearts were darkened. Though professing to be wise, they became fools...**

6a. Flood Geology

As expected, scientific bias against the biblical accounts of creation, the Fall, the curse (pronouncement of judgment), and the flood has led us down **a convoluted path of bizarre and distorted thinking**. No wonder man is so myopic when it comes to the preponderance of evidence before his very eyes. It should be noted that evolutionists don't just throw up their hands in defeat when evidences such as these are presented. **They concoct the most ridiculous scenarios to explain away what is otherwise easily apparent. In other words, their squirming to avoid the simple truth is transparent.** Again, the corruption of man's reasoning is what the Bible leads us to expect from mankind's continuing flight from the truth of God.

Can one change his beliefs on demand? Can he be compelled to swap one set of beliefs for another? No – beliefs are too ingrained, too fundamental to the way we have come to view and understand the world. One cannot just **decide** to believe or not to believe something. Yet it is possible to examine and articulate those ideas that have shaped our thinking and even challenge them. That is why seeking the truth, thinking about empirical evidence, and revisiting the steps of one's own logic are so important. **They involve being brutally honest in criticizing one's own worldview and ethical behavior.** But that is still not sufficient – we desperately need an authoritative word from someone who knows us and knows the truth about the world. Without it, we are left to drift in a sea of relativism and pragmatism.

The Bible praises God for two great works. **The first is creation. Rev.4:9-11** *O Lord [God the Father] you are worthy to receive glory and honor and power, for You created all things and by Your will they exist and were created.* **What is the second? Rev.5:8-9** *You [God the Son] are worthy to take the scroll and open its seals for You were slain and have ransomed [NIV - purchased] us by [liberated us by payment of] Your blood out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation. Eph. 1:7 in Him we have **redemption** through His blood, the forgiveness of sins.*

Although the Bible discusses creation, **redemption** from sin and judgment is its pervading theme for it is a revelation for fallen men. Redemption means deliverance, liberation through payment of a ransom (forgiveness). Forgiveness is the only effective remedy for true moral guilt; therapy just won't do. **People characteristically don't like to be confronted with or reminded of truth that puts them a negative light or to have the ugly core of their prejudices exposed.** This is especially true of sophisticated people who have high regard for themselves. Few indeed admit to the validity of the criticism and repent [change their minds]. More commonly, **they react** as follows. In June, 1978, **Alexander Solzhenitsyn** gave a commencement address at Harvard University, later published as A World Split Apart. In the speech, **Solzhenitsyn attacked one of his audience's most deeply held prejudices, the assumption of a benevolent human nature.** He warned his audience against the tyranny of the prevailing opinion. Before his address, Solzhenitsyn was much honored in the liberal media as a hero to Soviet tyranny. Afterward he was widely dismissed in elite circles as a cranky religious eccentric who should not be taken seriously.

As you watch this next presentation, notice how transparent to common sense many of the explanations for geological features and aspects of the fossil record are – that it is not necessary to have a formal education in geology or paleontology to see these things.

6b. Rock Strata, Fossils, and the Flood

Do the facts **Dr. Snelling** discusses show him to be a religious nut out to persuade the simple-minded that there is a God who sent a flood that covered the whole earth? Or, does he offer a scientific explanation for the various phenomena he discusses? **How do Snelling's explanations compare to those of the naturalists?** Does his use of the Bible as an accurate record of what happened invalidate his arguments or does it enhance the credibility of the Biblical account?

In the early chapters of Genesis, there are **2 major occasions for God's judgment** – the disobedience of Adam in the Garden (**chap.3**) and the rush to moral depravity by men in general (**chap.6-8**). There is a principle exhibited here and elsewhere in the Bible – where there is judgment there is mercy in the form of redemption. In **Genesis 6**, the cause for God's anger is stated;

The Lord saw how great man's wickedness on the earth had become, and that every inclination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil all the time. The Lord was grieved that he had made man on the earth, and his heart was filled with pain ... Now the earth was corrupt in God's sight and was full of violence. (verses 5-6, 11) So the Lord sent a flood in judgment upon the whole planet but spared Noah and his family along with representative groups of animals to repopulate the earth. In **Mt.24:37-39** Jesus spoke of that terrible judgment **comparing it to the final judgment that will occur at his second coming**.

*For as in those days before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day Noah entered the ark, and they were unaware until the flood came and swept them all away, **so will be the coming of the Son of Man [in judgment]**.* The New Testament treats this judgment and deliverance as historic fact and uses it to illustrate the salvation from certain judgment for all who come to Christ, **1 Peter 3:18-21**. This is one of those places where there are no other options. One may enter the ark of God's salvation as long as the door remains open. **Once the door is shut [Gen.7:16b], the wrath of God will consume everyone outside of Christ.**

7. Moment of Impact (2)

In this series of videos and discussions I have spoken of the teachings and historical accounts of the Bible as being objectively true. The measure of this has been objective scientific evidence understood without the modernistic philosophical bias of uniformitarianism and evolution. **Jn.1** tells us that the material universe and its structure was the work of a personal intelligent being. *In the beginning [already] was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was [already] in the beginning with God. **All things came into being [became] through him**, and without him not one thing came into being. (v.1-3)*

The next documentary is unusual - see if you can figure out why.

Remarkably, anatomical features are described in this presentation in terms of design with purpose in mind and engineered to convey certain abilities. This program is a NATURE production and like the NOVA and National Geographic series, all previous NATURE shows **deify** evolution as the creator of life and **personify** it as a personal being. Many programs are simply vehicles used to preach the gospel of evolution. **They personate the random processes of evolution as the design**

and engineering work of a god because there simply is no other appropriate terminology for what we observe in nature.

People often do not understand the full implications of the unexamined ideas they have picked up from their education and from the culture. A great many students and professors are so thoroughly steeped in naturalistic assumptions that they find it difficult to follow a discussion that does not take those assumptions for granted. Even superb scientists who assume a Darwinian framework do not seem to grasp that **the purposeful arrangement of parts is the hallmark of intelligence**. It does not mimic random mutation; it is the exact opposite.

The same rules apply to all proofs – scientific, philosophical, or religious. After the question has been defined for whatever problem we wish to solve, **the proof consists of two steps. A** – The theory must be non-contradictory [internally consistent] and must give an adequate answer for the phenomenon in question. **B** – We must be able to live consistently with our theory. Modern people reject the Christian answers or do not even consider them because they have already accepted with implicit faith the presupposition of the uniformity of natural causes in a closed system [see Intro to the Intellectual Basis of Christianity 1].

Most philosophers of science do not regard **falsifiability** as a necessary trait of a successful scientific theory. Nevertheless a frequent charge made against intelligent design is that it is not falsifiable or testable. But the fact that critical reviewers advance scientific arguments against intelligent design shows that **it is falsifiable**, in fact it is open to falsification by a series of straightforward laboratory experiments. Is the same true for Darwinism? How could one falsify the claim that a particular biochemical system was produced by a Darwinian process?

The claim of intelligent design is that no unintelligent process could produce an irreducibly complex system. **To falsify this claim**, one need only show that at least **one** unintelligent process could produce the system. **The claim of Darwinism** is that some unintelligent process could produce the same system. **To falsify this claim**, one would have to show the system could not have been formed by **any** of a potentially vast number of unintelligent processes – which is effectively impossible to do. Nevertheless, **Darwinism's claims are potentially positively demonstrable, and if after a reasonable time they aren't, they ought to be called into question.**

Rather than making a serious attempt to grapple with scientific issues, the defenders of scientific naturalism hurl a barrage of rhetorical missiles at anyone audacious enough to pose legitimate questions. **They are extraordinarily indiscriminating about the arguments they employ** to discredit and defeat intelligent design. The strategy is to throw everything that comes to hand at the enemy in hope that something will destroy this baffling, irrational menace.

The revelation in the Bible fits perfectly with what we find in nature – evidence of intelligent design and the creation of things that could not have self-generated; evidence of a universal flood and judgment covering vast stretches of land; degradation of the moral fabric of society fleeing from the knowledge of God; the complete breakdown of logic in explaining what happened historically that resulted in the observable universe; etc. However, **knowledge of this does little but condemn us for our unbelief.** The objective facts demand of us a subjective response to God. This is what the

Scriptures mean by calling us to repent and believe in Jesus Christ, not as an ideal or a symbol but trusting him as Savior.

After Jesus had demonstrated many space-time proofs [miracles – demonstrations of God's power to cause results not possible by natural means] that demanded a response of repentance, he pronounced curses [woe to you] upon those places where the people refused to repent [Mt.11:20-24] and calls everyone to believe in him. *Come to me, all who labor and are heavy laden [under the guilt and consequences of sin], and I will give you rest [forgiveness - rest for your souls, v.29], Mt.11:28*

There is another response that people who hold power had to the undeniable space-time proofs of Christ's authority and power. **It is the reaction of unbelief regardless of the empirical evidence.** Jn.11 records Jesus' raising of Lazarus from the grave after he had been dead 3 days. The Jewish power elite had **no interest in the truth**, so they completely disregarded the miracle and its implications. Their only concern was keeping their positions of power and control. They feared that if Jesus continued performing such signs, the whole nation would believe in him which would lead to serious reprisals by the Roman Empire.

So from that day on they made plans to put Lazarus to death (11:53). When the large crowd of the Jews learned that Jesus was in Bethany, they came not only on account of him, but also to see Lazarus whom he had raised from the dead. So the chief priests made plans to put Lazarus to death as well [as Jesus] because on account of him many of the Jews were going away and believing in Jesus (12:9-11).

Are you interested in the truth? Are you an impartial observer able to weigh the pros and cons of the empirical evidence and reach unbiased conclusions? Or are you nursing a blinding prejudice against the truth of the God who is there?

8. What You Aren't Being Told About Astronomy (2): Our Created Stars and Galaxies

Truth is a most precious commodity. The accuracy and correctness of information has never been easily discovered, but today it is more difficult than ever because there is such a glut of conflicting viewpoints and claims available to us. This DVD and its companion, *What You Aren't Being Told About Astronomy (1): Our Created Solar system*, express nicely one of the themes of this series – **suppression of the truth**, the hiding of what is known and obvious because it doesn't support the unassailable precepts of modernism rooted in the notion that all we know of reality requires no Designer, no Builder, no Creator – it is self-propagating.

Nothing is more certain in modern society than the principle that there are no absolutes. This maxim is applied to moral issues in spite of the fact that we live in a physical world completely governed by the absolute laws of materials, physics, and chemistry. One can't get away from the natures of the materials, energies, and forces inherent in the stuff of the universe. Our whole modern society exists because the characteristics of materials are predictable so manufacturing can proceed with mathematical certainty. Why would the moral area be any different? [see Intro to the Intellectual Basis of Christianity 2]

The ultimate absolute is that no matter what people say they are, they are what they are

and the universe is what it is. Everyone is shut up to the fact of reality as it is – the universe's existence and its form; the uniqueness of man; and the fact that the Bible is rooted in history. It is not just a religious book. YES, the Bible incorporates the religious things as part of the total reality. The Bible is rooted in space-time history and speaks of the totality of reality. Therefore the indisputable physical absolutes we find in the make-up of the stuff and laws of the universe [with consequences for disregarding them] do not stand alone. In the total reality there are moral absolutes together with consequences for their disregard as well.

What is the implication of the statements in **Genesis 1 & 2** where God created, made, or did something [*let there be _____; and God saw that it was good; there was evening and there was morning, the _____ day; Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them (2:1); God rested on the seventh day from all his work that he had done in creation (v.3)*]??

The clear implication of such language is to convey the idea that **at creation God did something unique**, something that natural processes could not; and that once he was finished and satisfied with his work, he stopped. Nature could not have done these things then and "she" cannot do them now - which means what for example? New stars are not being formed today.

The significance of the Sabbath is depicted in the 10 Commandments as a reminder of the completion of God's creative activity (Ex.20:8-11). Later, there is a shift in emphasis. The Sabbath is spoken of in connection with God's deliverance [salvation] of Israel from slavery in Egypt (Dt.5:12-15). The Sabbath therefore depicts the great themes of creation and redemption. Once God had completed his creation work, he rested. When Adam sinned, God began to work again making a new kind of creation by redeeming (Gen.3:21) that which was lost. The Jews were persecuting Jesus because He was healing people on the Sabbath (Jn.5:15-17). He said, my Father is working until now, and I am working. God completed his work in redemption with the death and resurrection of his Son. This is what Jesus meant just before he died on the cross by saying *It is finished, Jn.19:28-30*. Now everyone who comes to God through trusting in the Son enters that Sabbath rest (Heb.4:9-10) where he will be complete in Christ.

Scientific investigation depends upon certain assumptions about the world and it is impossible until those assumptions are in place. Faith in the possibility of scientific discovery preceded scientific theory. This faith rested on certain attitudes toward nature, such as its objective reality and lawfulness. The Judeo-Christian conception of the universe is the **only** framework that provides this. To become an object of study the world had to be de-deified and regarded as a place where events occur in a reliable, predictable fashion. Unlike the many ambiguous and capricious gods thought to be living in various objects of the natural world, the single transcendent Creator of Christianity who made a unified, coherent universe provided this.

This monotheistic view is the historical foundation for modern science. The character of the Maker as trustworthy and dependable is also important for his handiwork to exhibit regularity, dependability, and orderliness. **The order of the reasoning is important.** The early scientists argued that because there was a rational God, the world must be lawfully ordered. Design in nature was thus derived from belief in the good and reasonable biblical God prior to observations. The possibility of

an applied mathematics is an expression of the Christian belief that nature is the creation of an omnipotent God and that humans can discover and understand that created order.

Science would never have begun if men had the uncertainty that modern Man has in the area of epistemology. There would have been no way to take with certainty the first steps that the early scientists were able to take. It was because the infinite-personal God who exists made things in correlation that the early scientists had courage to expect to find out the explanation of the universe. The whole area of science turns upon the fact that the God who is there has made a world in which things stand together in relationships. Without this base and the confidence it engendered, there would never have been modern science. Now that this base has been given up, science as we have known it is dying. It has been reduced to two things: mere **technology** and another form of **socio-logical manipulation**. The whole man-made global warming scenario is an example of the latter.

Christian doctrine admits to no limitations on God's power and insists that existence and structure of the universe are contingent upon the free and transcendent will of God. Once this was recognized, it helped to inspire and justify an experimental methodology for science. For if God created freely rather than by logical necessity, then we cannot gain knowledge of it by logical deduction – we have to go out and look, to observe and experiment. Science came to be understood as an aspect of the cultural mandate to take dominion over the Earth, **Gen.1:26-30**.

The early scientists regarded science and the resultant technologies as a means of alleviating the destructive effects of the curse [God's judgment upon sin, **Gen.3:**]. Thus science was permeated with religious concerns for the poor and sick, and with humanitarian efforts to alleviate toil and tedium. Biblical faith thus engendered *a religious urge to substitute a power machine for a man where the required motion is so severe and monotonous that it seems unworthy of a child of God.* The very idea that harsh conditions of human life could be ameliorated was revolutionary, and was rooted in biblical doctrine.

The idea of improving one's life cannot occur to people trapped in a cyclic, fatalistic, or deterministic view of history. The biblical view of history is linear and open to divine activity. Both God and human beings made in his image can be **first causes**, setting in motion new chains of secondary causes.

Amazingly, after making the case that we have been lied to and manipulated to accept ideas completely contrary to the direction all [and I do mean all] facts are pointing, I've had people say to me, so what? What does this have to do with my life – what practical value does it have? They don't see that the incontrovertible truths brought out in these videos and discussions have any relevance for their lives. To me these responses are non-sequiturs. In answer I recommend *A Christian Manifesto*, 1982 by Francis Schaeffer.

To those who have not been convinced of the truth of Christianity, what more is there to say? Alright, forget about these videos and discussions; stay smug in your supposed knowledge if you wish; go on thinking that your perception about Christian truth must be what the Bible actually says; don't bother questioning what you were taught or picked up from others; use every excuse you can conceive of – reject the Gospel of Jesus Christ because you ran across a group of religious fanatics or a bad example who called himself a Christian, or because you hate your life, or whatever – go ahead, but be

warned – the Scripture is clear and speaks with one voice – **YOU ARE ON VERY DANGEROUS GROUND** with absolutely **no defense against the wrath of God**.

Jesus, in referring to his coming crucifixion, likened it to an incident that took place in the desert after Moses had led the Israelites out of Egypt to serve God. God had delivered them from pharaoh's rule and power through a series of miraculous plagues (judgments) and continued to provide for that huge company of people and animals in the desert where they nevertheless complained time after time. **On the occasion Jesus mentioned, God sent venomous snakes among the people and many died.** But, God also had Moses cast a bronze snake and place it on a pole in the midst of the camp. Anyone bitten by a snake would be guaranteed life simply by looking at the snake on the pole which represented the Son of God on the cross - **the mercy of God in the midst of judgment**.

*Just as Moses lifted up the snake in the desert, so the Son of Man must be lifted up [God's judgment on this world, **Jn.12:31-32**] that everyone who believes in him may have eternal life ... Whoever believes in him is not condemned, but whoever does not believe stands condemned already ... **Jn.3:14-15, 18***

What can possibly be more important or relevant to you right now and for your entire future than forgiveness and deliverance from certain, eminent, final, and eternal judgment by the absolutely righteous God who offers this mercy? What? And given the content of these 8 programs, why would you wait? Lay aside your foolish arrogance and separate yourself from the headlong rush of blind humanity toward destruction - humble yourself; come to Jesus as a child; receive and enter the eternal love of God. **Mk.10:13-15; Lk.18:15-17**

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Christian Manifesto (revised ed.) by Francis Schaeffer, 1982, 142 pgs, a call for Christians to change the course of history by returning to biblical Truth **and by allowing Christ to be Lord in all of life;**

Total Truth, Liberating Christianity from its Cultural Captivity by Nancy Pearcey, 2004, 479 pgs (Study Guide Edition, by Nancy Pearcey & Phillip Johnson, 2008)

The Soul of Science: Christian Faith and Natural Philosophy by Nancy Pearcey & Charles Thaxton, 1994, 281 pgs, surveys the development of science and its historic and current relationship to Christianity, and reintroduces believers to their rich intellectual heritage

Darwin's Black Box: the Biological to Evolution, 1996, 289 pgs & **The Edge of Evolution**: The Search for the Limits of Darwinism, 2007, 305 pgs, 2 bks by Michael Behe. **The first** helped to launch the intelligent design movement: the argument that nature exhibits evidence of design, beyond Darwinian randomness. Is Darwinian evolution sufficient to explain life and the complexity of biochemistry as we know it? **The second**, offers further evidence that the universe and life on Earth are designed. Behe uses astounding new findings from the genetics revolution to show that Darwinism is nowhere near as powerful as most people believe. We now know, as never before, what Darwinism can and cannot accomplish.

Reason in the Balance: The Case Against NATURALISM in Science, Law, & Education by Phillip

Johnson, 1995, 239 pgs, argues that the ideas of naturalism dominate modern intellectual life while theism is often considered irrational, and discusses how these ideas affect current controversies in ethics and public policy.

Defeating Darwinism: By Opening Minds, 1997, 131 pgs, The key to defeating the false claims of Darwinism is to open our minds to good thinking habits. Here is first-rate advice on avoiding common mistakes in discussions about evolution, understanding the legacy of the Scopes trial, spotting deceptive arguments, and grasping the basic scientific issues without getting bogged down in unnecessary details.

Objections Sustained: Subversive Essays on Evolution, Law, & Culture, 1998, 188 pgs, some of Johnson's most persuasive writing in opposition to the sacred cow of modern secularism. Several of his pithiest essays attacking the idolatry of Darwin as well as his stimulating thoughts on a wide variety of other topics, including "pop" science, religious freedom, American pragmatism, Paul Feyerabend, Winston Churchill, postmodernism, and natural law.

The Wedge of Truth: Splitting the Foundations of Naturalism, 2000, 188 pgs, Johnson argues compellingly for an understanding of reason that brings scientific certainty back into relational balance with philosophical inquiry and religious faith. He analyzes the latest debates between science and religion played out in our media, our universities, and society at large. He looks to thinkers such as Newbigin, Polanyi, and Pascal to lay a foundation for our seeing the universe in a totally different way. And from that base he then considers the educational programs and research agendas that should be undertaken.

The Right Questions: Truth, Meaning, & Public Debate, 2002, 191 pgs, Johnson pries the lid off public debate about questions of ultimate concern - questions often suppressed by our society's intellectual elite. Moving far beyond matters of creation and evolution, He outlines the questions we all ought to be asking about the meaning of human history, the limits of scientific inquiry, religion and education in a pluralistic society, truth, liberty and moral choices, and God and his word, Jesus Christ. The reigning naturalistic philosophy not only squelches public debate, but also constrains us to ask the wrong questions. Unless we start with the right questions our discussions will be framed by the assumptions of that very philosophy that must be challenged. The Christian church has much too often passively accepted this limiting frame of mind to the detriment of all. But Christian faith and conviction instead ought to lead in opening up the search for truth and meaning through the kind of public education that "teaches in controversy". Then all of us will be prepared to engage in lively, informed, and civil debate about the questions that really matter.

Darwin on Trial (3rd ed.) 2010, 247 pgs, The facts and the logic of the arguments that purport to establish a theory of evolution based on Darwinian principles continue to draw their strength from faith in philosophical naturalism. This edition responds to critics of the first edition and maintains that scientists are taking as scientific fact what really should be regarded as a yet unproved hypothesis.

Genetic Entropy (4th ed.) by J. C. Sanford, 2014, 252 pgs, presents compelling scientific evidence that the genomes of all living creatures are slowly degenerating due to the accumulation of slightly harmful mutations. Sanford begins by examining how random mutation and natural selection actually

operate, and shows that simple logic demands that genomes must degenerate. He then makes a historical examination of the relevant field (population genetics), and shows that the best scientists in that field have consistently acknowledged many of the fundamental problems he has uncovered. He then shows, in collaboration with a team of other scientists, that state-of-the-art numerical simulation experiments consistently confirm the problem of genetic degeneration and that it is clearly apparent in real biological populations. His work largely invalidates classic neo-Darwinian theory. The mutation/selection process by itself is not capable of creating the new biological information that is required for creating new life forms nor can it even preserve our genomes.