

The importance of this subject can hardly be overestimated. Since evolution has been introduced in our schools, the confrontation with our Christian beliefs has multiplied dramatically, because now no child in **any** Grade (I was informed at the Reformation Conference by a school principal) can escape this satanic and atheistic religion of materialism : matter is all there is, and only matter matters. **Man is not different from, or better than, the animals**, said Freud in his *The Humanities in Contemporary Life*. Also in his book *The Future of an Illusion*, he further informed the world out there that **there were no answers to life's situations outside of science**. An astonishing statement, you will agree.

But, someone asks, how did evolution gain entry into our schools? I make mention of the situation regarding schools, since it is a print-out of what is happening globally.

You see, the argument runs like this: In a country where a multiplicity of religions is practiced, you need to find a **neutral and value-free** approach to your subject. And what approach is value free? The answer: A scientific one, because science enables us to rise above the idea of a God who is not the same for everybody and who therefore cannot unite diverse peoples. Unity must be achieved through a common way of thinking based on scientific reasoning which IS the same for everyone. After all **it is argued religious beliefs are about feelings, not facts. Only science deals in facts**. No religion can lay such a claim.

That reply is the cleverly manipulated one to set the minds of the population at ease, while the true aim remains concealed. And what is that aim?

The American educationalist, **John Dewey** **for decades the controlling force behind education in the USA** reveals its true nature. He proudly said that **Darwin's *Origin of Species* introduced a mode of thinking that in the end was bound to transform the logic of knowledge and hence the treatment of morals, politics and religion**. This is an astonishing admission. How it transforms even religion I will come to in a minute.

We have got to understand that the world has become a place in which there are experts in every field. **Science** **since the moon landings and other amazing feats** **has taken over the high ground of authority** and **absolute truth once occupied by the Bible**. You don't argue against science **it alone is neutral and objective**. Do you get the picture? Today everything is measured against **what does science say?** **The Bible is measured against scientific say-so!** Whatever science says, THAT is true. Science is supreme!

### **HOW DOES EVOLUTION FIT INTO THE WHOLE SCENARIO?**

**Evolution (and therefore Darwinism) operates under the guise of science** while it has not 1% of scientific content **it is a lie of monumental proportions that has deceived the whole world!** One can hardly meet anybody in the street that is not under the impression that **evolution is science**, because that is the crucial opening gambit in this whole deception. It is preached with religious fervor, because it is the religion of atheism **there is no God, we are assured, who can call us to account, because science has provided the outstanding answers. It has become impossible to challenge this belief, since** **criticism of Darwinism at any American university would be as unthinkable as going to Mecca to criticize Islam**, writes Denys O'Leary, scientific journalist in her book, *By Design or by Chance?* She goes on to say: **I have never heard such hardline aggressive promotion of atheism under the guise of science as I have heard from the Darwinists. It is, at best, amusing to hear Darwinists charge that the creationists have an underlying religious agenda, when the**

Darwinists' own anti-religious agenda is pretty obvious.

I must now jump backward a century and a half to pick up the argument where Darwin took centre-stage. To begin with, Darwin was not a scientist, and his doctrine (because he was a qualified theologian) was designed to oust God from his position as the God of all creation. Darwin, through a bad choice of friends, steadily became convinced of evolution and less and less persuaded of the truth of the Bible (see Dr. R.E.D. Clark's book: *Darwin: Before and After* numerous chapters). He was further influenced by Robert Chambers' book, *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation* a book which was strangely Christian, yet touting a universal law of nature which in itself (apart from God) progressively gave rise to more complex organisms. But Darwin's change of direction brought him no joy, since, for 10 years after his book was published, no scientist of any standing accepted his doctrine. Professor Sedgwick of Cambridge prophesied that, if accepted, Darwin's teachings: *would result in humanity suffering a damage that might brutalize it, and sink the human race into a lower grade of degradation than to any which it has fallen since its written records tell us of its history.*

A journalist, commenting on Sedgwick's statement at the time said that Darwin had shown every criminal how to justify his ways. That eventually proved to be a monumental understatement.

It was not its scientific content that caused the world to change, but its social applications. The survival of the fittest gave rise to malpractices at every level of society. Rockefeller and his ilk applied it ruthlessly since they were the fittest; war was regarded as desirable because the strongest deserved to win: so more than 160 million people were killed in the name of Darwinism under communist rule. In Africa Leopold of Belgium wiped out tens of millions of blacks since they were not yet humans (Clark, p.111). Darwin was, in fact, a racist, as his earlier title demonstrated: *The Preservation of the Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life.* Even the evolutionist, Stephen Jay Gould, admitted that racism multiplied exponentially as a result of Darwinism!

The litany of horrors that emerged as a result of Darwinism is too long to be mentioned here. NO! It was not its scientific content that assured its success, but the yearning of the unrepentant heart to be rid of God. THAT was its main aim *to be rid of God.* This meant that NO area of our lives was to allow God to have a place. Hence, even the Creation of the universe had to be attributed to something under the control of science.

As Prof. Phillip Johnson of Berkeley said: *The attraction of a materialist universe is that it feeds the imperialism of science by seeming to promise that everything can in principle be understood by science.*

From there, it was a short step to declare that science alone would be the arbiter of truth. *There could be no truth outside of science!*

So, there you have it. Obviously the Bible just did not qualify. So, who set to work to tear the Bible apart and cast its whole account into question? None other than the theologians who when comparing themselves with other professors at their universities who had already sold their disciplines out to evolution were left out in the cold. It was clear that something had to be done!

The obvious place to begin, was to declare the Bible as scientifically untrue. There were two examples used in *ad nauseam*. The first was, of course, the fight between Galileo and Pope Urbanus V111 of Rome. The argument? The church has it wrong the sun does *not*

rotate around the earth, but the earth around the sun. The evolutionists failed to say that it was the establishment scientists that told the pope what he was to believe, anyway.

The second obvious mistake the Bible makes we are assured is to say the earth is flat (how stupid can you get?). How strange even in scientific TV programmes to this day people refer to things as spreading to the four corners of the earth, but nobody thinks of criticizing them for that! Having dealt the Bible these two blows, the rest is easy. You skim over the contents of Genesis 1 and the flood of Noah, and you declare both as myth or poetic language. The astute theologian then comes up with the clever notion that it is not the historical or scientific data in the Bible which is true, but the message it conveys. This is called the *scopus* position in theological terms. This is a comparatively modern approach to the Scriptures, leaving the words of the text intact, while removing their historical and scientific content.

The core of the case against the Bible, however, comes from a succession of theologians in the Higher Critical Movement. Amongst many other champions of this cause the names of Graf and Wellhausen (1878) could be singled out as the best known perpetrators of this cause.\* What did they believe about the Bible?

Having accepted evolution as the route whereby primitive man entered the world some hundreds of thousands of years ago, these men argued that religion also evolved from fetishism to the notion of hundreds and thousands of gods, and from there eventually to monotheism. (In fact, at the end of August, 2008, a conference was held at UNISA entitled, *The Evolutionary Roots of Religion*.) This meant that Moses could not possibly have written the Pentateuch, since, according to them, writing had not yet been invented. This mish-mash of speculative evolutionary thinking was given the name of J. E. D. P., denoting the Jahwist, the Elohist, the Deuteronomist, and the Priestly Code. Supposedly there were three writers of the Pentateuch, and a fourth, the Priest out of the Babylonian Captivity, (Esra) put them all together. Some critics say there were as many as 20 different writers of these 5 Books. My question here is: how does one with a straight face include the 10 Commandments in that document which says one should not bear false witness?

But the dismemberment of the Bible does not end there. Time does not permit me to go into the destructive nature of these so-called theologians who, one and all, seemed bent on destroying every vestige of Divine Authority that the Bible claims for itself. I will, however, tabulate the main claims made by these Critics: Apart from the Pentateuch, the Tabernacle did not exist. The Psalms were the product of some post-exilic person, Ecclesiastes was written by who knows who; there is no inspiration in The Songs of Solomon, Esther is not historical, Isaiah was written by a number of authors (up to 160), Daniel was written by someone else 170 years later, and Jonah is a myth.

All of these false teachings, and many more, are the product of evolutionary presuppositions. The whole of the OT is affected. Why? Because, given that evolution is true, there could be no miracles, because evolution does not allow for them. There can be no prophecies since nobody can see into the future.

\*(Footnote: Spinoza, the Dutch rationalist-philosopher had already in 1670 aired this idea in his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*. Hobbes from England, Richard Simon van Dieppe from France and the Dutchman le Clerk followed, and last-mentioned

proposed that a priest of the Babilonian Captivity was responsible for these five Books of the OT.)

In the NT also; Jesus could not have been born of a virgin, nor could He perform miracles, nor did He know everything since He was a normal man who grew in knowledge, and was no God. The resurrection it goes without saying never occurred, and how could He ascend into heaven anyway? In fact, the whole Bible in their view is a human book, written for the people of that time and only of literary value if any.

The above list, as I have said, presupposes an evolutionary beginning, which in itself is pure speculation. But these men get by because all these findings are presented as the assured results of research. What research? Research which is out to destroy the authority of the Bible from page one.

It would be possible for me to go on at length gainsaying all these absurd claims. The fact is, all archaeological finding of the past 100 years and more prove the exact opposite. These liars refuse to read anything that cut across their line of declared purpose, and they refuse to be confused by the facts like many of our theologians today.

In stark opposition to all this, I quote from one book alone, written by one of the world's greatest archaeologists, Dr. William Foxwell Albright, who, in his book *From the Stone Age to Christianity* said:

I have not surrendered a single position with regard to early Israelite monotheism but consider the Mosaic tradition as even more reliable than I did then [referring to the first edition of his book]. I now recognize that Israelite law and religious institutions tend to be older and more continuous than I had supposed- in other words, I have grown more conservative in my attitude to Mosaic tradition. p.2, 2nd edition.

On the next page he follows with: I now insist much more vigorously on the pattern of prophetic thinking which made the Prophets such successful predictors of the course of history and there are very few prophecies which failed to be confirmed [archaeologically speaking]. On p.32 he asserts: Archaeological research has thus established beyond doubt that there is no focus of civilization in the earth that can begin to compete in antiquity and activity with the basin of the Eastern Mediterranean and the region immediately to the east of it Breasted Fertile Crescent. Other civilizations of the Old world were all derived from this cultural centre.

Concerning the reliability of the Bible he says Nearly every book and passage of the Old Testament has been stigmatized as a literary forgery by at least one scholar. Now it cannot be emphasize too strongly that there is hardly any evidence at all in the ancient Near East for documentary or literary fabrications (p.78). Just three pages later he affirms As critical study of the Bible is more and more influenced by the rich new material from the ancient Near East we shall see a steady rise in respect of the historical significance of now neglected or despised passages and details in the Old and New Testaments.

On p.84 he affirms that historicism has led to an exaggerated emphasis on the evolutionary principle [in which] all social, religious phenomenon are made to fit into a given bed, regardless of the chronology. If a phenomenon seems too advanced for the traditional phase it is assigned on literary evidence, to a later stage; if it appears too primitive it is pushed back into an earlier phase. Against this exaggerated form of historicism vigorous protests have recently been made by men of such different backgrounds as the Swiss Old Testament scholar, W. Eichrodt, and the American philosopher, Morris R. Cohen.

He reveals on p.88 that Wellhausen and his school, to which belonged in the last decade before the World War

practically every Protestant OT scholar of standing in the world, reflect their Hegelian background in various ways; in the unilateral theory of evolution that the fully developed religion of Israel unfolded gradually from the primitive naturalism to lofty ethical monotheism (my emphasis).

Lastly, among the many other quotes I would have liked to include, I rest my case with his exclamation on p.258 where he says: it is absurd to deny that Moses was actually the founder of the Israelite commonwealth and the framer of Israel's religious system. This fact is emphasize so unanimously by tradition that it may be regarded as absolutely certain.

It is not difficult to see why the theologians of our time are drifting around on a sea of uncertainty and twisted theological interpretations. They have lost their source of unchanging authority. They ought to read Gal.1: 6-9 to see where they are heading.

I could continue to provide hundreds of results of research that prove the Bible to be an historically reliable document. These are the books that modernist theologians refuse to read, since it would upset their cherished theories. The two books by Dr. David Rohl alone would astonish you, since he is not a Christian, yet the title of his first book is A Test of Time: The Bible from Myth to History. Also book 2: LEGEND: Genesis of Civilization.

From my own book, Die NG Kerk: Reformeer of DISINTEGREER? I quote the philosopher of science, Karl Popper, who said that Scientific certainty does not exist the origin of life will for ever remain [scientifically] untestable. Sir Bernard Lovell of the Jodellell Bank Observatory in the UK was reported as saying If you ask me how far those stars are, and therefore how old, then the answer is the extraordinary one that you cannot calculate the distance unless you know what cosmological model applies to the universe. In other words, the theory determines the answer! Nobel laureate, Hannes Alfvén, while commenting on the Big Bang as early as 1978 said in the Los Angeles Times that it was unbelievable, ridiculous and fanatical (Jan.).

Another laureate, Prof. George Wald admitted that there are only two possible answers to the origin of life: spontaneous generation [evolution] or special creation. One hundred years ago spontaneous generation was disproved, leaving us with special creation. I cannot accept special creation, and therefore I believe in spontaneous generation (as quoted in Creation Research Society Quarterly, March 1973, p.208). But I particularly like the admission by a world renown sun- astrophysicist, Dr. John Eddy, who confessed the following at an international conference held in Louisiana: I suspect the universe to be 4 500 million years old, but however, given some new and unexpected results to the contrary, and some time for a frantic adjustment, I suspect we could live with bishop Ussher's age for the earth and sun. I don't think we have any observational evidence to conflict with that (see Sept. 1999 Creation magazine, Australia).

Even Professor Stephen Hawking was forced to admit that the odds against a universe like ours emerging out of something like a big bang are enormous. If the rate of expansion one second after the big bang had been smaller by even one part in a hundred thousand million million, the universe would have recollapsed before it ever reached its present size ( A Brief History of Time, p. 121, 122).

After more than 50 years of study of the whole Bible read through at least twenty times, of hundreds of books by theologians, scientists, archaeologists, philosophers and the like, I present you with the Book of Books the Infallible and Inerrant Bible in its original autographa.

The above lecture was presented by Pieter J. Pelsler at Bellville, 25 th October, 2008 to the

Reformation and Revival Conference. The audio CD is available from:

Christian Liberty Books  
P.O. Box 358  
Howard Place, 7450  
Cape Town,  
Tel & Fax: (021) 689-7478,  
Email: [admin@christianlibertybooks.co.za](mailto:admin@christianlibertybooks.co.za)

admin@christianlibertybooks.co.za  
Website: [www.christianlibertybooks.co.za/](http://www.christianlibertybooks.co.za/)

**POSTSCRIPT.** I hardly find it necessary to defend the

Biblical record when it come to Creation and the Flood. But since we are bombarded with the unquestioned Geological Column of the Earth's History, I will say something about that so you can see the degree of deception we are subjected to.

The Column gives us the run-down of the ten or more geological layers with those fancy names, starting with the pre-Cambrian bedrock, followed by the Cambrian, the Ordovician, the Carbon, Jurassic, Cretaceous and others. We are told that it took 4 600 million years to form as erosion deposits, giving us a total depth of 135,8 km. (I added their times per layer up). What is fascinating about this is that the deepest of all layers together on earth is 25 km, (or 18,5%) and the average over all the earth represents between 6 and 9 percent. So, here we have a lie of 81,5% to start with. I have gone to the trouble to calculate the average depth per annum they throw at us, and it comes to 0.03mm per annum – the thickness of a hair!

Now, can you picture a dinosaur being fossilized at that rate of deposition? It would take 200 000 years to get covered! Even a tadpole would call for 200 years of waiting to be fossilized. Fossils ONLY form when five things happen concurrently:

- Immediate death
- Immediate coverage of the whole body with mud
- The exclusion of all oxygen
- The undisturbed lying in one position, and
- The solidifying of the mud into sandstone over time.

From this it is clear that we would have no fossils if the deposition of sediments were according to the Geological Column's own dating. HOAX No. 1.

The second hoax is that the fossils found in these layers are dated according to the layer they were supposedly found in. The higher up, the more recent, such that dinosaurs landed in the 65 million year slot. The further down you go, the older and smaller they become. Why? Because all the layers are in fact the product of the Flood ( I believe) laid down in one year, and those that could move fastest and furthest from the rising waters would be found at the top, and the slowest at the bottom. Evolutionist hate the Flood, so they will do all in their power to discredit the Flood at all costs, else their house of cards would disintegrate into nothing. That is why modern theology discounts the universal Flood.

But, should someone ask how they know how old the sedimentary rock layers are, they will answer: by the kind of fossil you find in that layer. Circular reasoning, I call it! And where these layers are not in the order they are supposed to be, the fossils are given new names so as not to expose their rotten dogma for what it is. OR, they say, overthrusting took place at a scale which defies the imagination – sometimes covering hundreds of kilometers in length and width as has happened in various parts of the world. Such overthrusting is simply wishful thinking – that it could have happened in that manner. Given the flood, nobody would have been able to predict which layer was to be where, since, in different parts of the globe the sequence or thickness would vary dramatically. Just look at the Grand Canyon and tell me what you see there. Even within the canyon the thicknesses vary, and within the canyon some are not even there. Just where are they if all the world was subjected to the so-called Geological Column's fictitious cast in stone depositions? You must know by now that the evolutionist is

never wrong. He always lands on his feet. This is due to their clever footwork and years of practice at lying and getting God out of the equation as to where everything came from. I could go on for some time in this fashion, enumerating the incredible deception the world out there has been subjected to. We could talk about the question of irreducible complexity, the likelihood of one cell evolving with all its millions of connections within itself which must also happen in a specific order else one would not have a living cell at all. The odds, by the way, of one cell forming  $\diamond$ naturally $\diamond$  is 1 in 10 to the power of more than 33,000; where 1 in 10 to the power of 50 (i.e.: fifty noughts) is regarded as the outer limit of possibility.</p>