

GLAD TIDINGS

“And we bring you good tidings of the promise made unto the fathers...” (Acts 13:32)

Vol. XIV

November 27, 2005

No. 48

Science-Origin-Faith

Jerry Fite

Recently, advocates of including “Intelligent Design” in the science curriculum have stirred up controversy in Pennsylvania and Kansas. For many decades the theory of organic evolution has been recognized as the accepted scientific explanation for the origin of all living things. To question this by bringing in another theory, which to many is the slippery slope to accepting the possibility of the existence of God, is unacceptable to many in the scientific community.

It has been interesting to hear those who accept “the Big Bang” theory for the beginning and “organic evolution” for the continued process as “scientific” models argue that “Intelligent Design” should be discussed in philosophy classes, not science classes. To them, “Intelligent Design” is a matter of “faith” implying that “The Big Bang” and “organic evolution” are proven science.

Most modern science text books today offer the widely accepted model of “The Big Bang” as how all things we know and see began in the universe. Is this

theory as much a matter of “faith” as a theory of the beginning of all things from an intelligent creator? Steven Weinberg, the winner of the 1979 Nobel Prize for Physics, recognizes the uniqueness of the “Big Bang.” He writes, “*In the beginning there was an explosion. Not an explosion like those familiar on earth, starting from a definite center and spreading out to engulf more and more of the circumambient air, but an explosion which occurred simultaneously everywhere, filling all space from the beginning, with every particle of matter rushing apart from every other particle.*” (*The First Three Minutes, page 4*).

Notice this evolutionist admits that the “Big Bang” was an explosion unfamiliar to us on earth. Therefore, no one can demonstrate it in a present laboratory setting. In addition, since no human was there to record it, must not an evolutionist accept the “Big Bang” on the basis of faith as much as the believer in God? If “Intelligent Design” is to be regulated to philosophy classes because it deals with matters of faith, should not “The Big Bang” theory, which demands acceptance by faith, be taken out of the science

books and discussed in philosophy classes?

Testing organic evolution as the way in which all living things come into existence and develop produces glaring inconsistencies against what we do see and know. For the theory of organic evolution to be scientific fact, would not we see over and over again living things being spontaneously generated from non-living matter? Instead, we see the demonstration of life begetting life. If organic evolution is proven scientific fact, then the fossil record should be replete with examples of distinct species becoming other species. Instead we see in the fossil record distinct species of animals with a glaring absence of “missing links”. We continue to see and rely on the demonstrated fact that living beings produce after their kind.

To accept a theory which is contradictory to proven science, is poor science. If “Intelligent Design” has no place in science because it demands faith, then out goes the “Big Bang” for it likewise demands faith.