



# Evolutionary Philosophy: The Most Powerful Stronghold is Nothing but Empty Deceit

by Craig R. Dumont

**“Beware lest anyone cheat you through philosophy and empty deceit, according to the tradition of men, according to the basic principles of the world, and not according to Christ.” Colossians 2:8**

**“For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ...” 2 Corinthians 10:6**

The apostle Paul was keenly aware of the many philosophies and deceitful world-views that were being set forth in his day and he didn't hesitate to warn believers to “beware lest anyone cheat [them].” But Paul not only instructed believers to take defensive measures in looking out for doctrines of devils, but he urged the Christian, whom he rightly saw as being delivered from darkness and now possessing the Truth of the gospel and walking in life-giving light, to take offensive pre-emptive action, striking powerfully and without fear at the shameless lies of the enemy. Paul knew the world-changing, paradigm-shifting power of the gospel of Christ (Acts 19:23-27) and never hesitated to walk into the belly of the beast and proclaim the Way, the Truth and the Life. (See Acts chapter 17:15-33) He called for Christians, through the power of the Spirit, to pull down strongholds, cast down arguments and every other high and mighty thing that dared to exalt itself against the knowledge of God. Christians were not to hide out within the confines of safe church buildings or simply exist in the comfort and safety of the seminary, but rather were to aggressively attack and defeat, in the name of Christ, the kingdom of hell and pray and work for the success and growth of the kingdom of God.

One of the most deeply entrenched and powerfully destructive philosophies and “traditions of men” that for over 125 years have warred against Christ, and also therefore Christ's plan for mankind, is Darwinism, or materialistic evolution. It strikes at the very heart of the Christian faith by attempting to undermine the entire Bible by creating scepticism and downright unbelief regarding the Genesis creation account. God-haters understand that if you can undermine or even destroy the confidence in the doctrine of Creation you have undermined or destroyed whole Christian faith, and let me assure you that that is exactly what drives all their activities.

Unfortunately, evolutionary theory has found its way into Christian thinking and has found a comfortable and secure home in far too many theological systems. It shows up in numerous places, as indicated by the very first page in the first chapter of Kenneth Scott Latourette's highly recommended (by even conservative booksellers) **A History of Christianity**. In his first paragraph he writes:

No one knows how old man is. That is because we cannot tell precisely when a creature which can safely be described as human first appeared. One estimate places the earliest presence of what may be called man about 1,200,000 years in the past. A being with a brain about the size of modern man may have lived approximately 500,000 years ago.<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Hugh Ross, who holds a Ph.D in astronomy, is a Christian author who sees his mission as synthesising and

reconciling the Biblical account of creation with the non-Christian evolutionary view so that Christians can be respected in current scientific circles.<sup>2</sup> Ross laments the fact that “nearly half the adults in the United States believe that God created the universe within the last 10,000 years,” and seemingly despairs of the fact that when asked for their reason the answer is “The Bible says so.”<sup>3</sup> Although Ross distances himself from theistic evolution (the belief that God creates only through His control of the natural processes, never independent of them), and in fact, denounces both naturalistic and theistic evolution with equal force,<sup>4</sup> his stated view that the earth is tens of millions or even hundreds of millions of years old and that God used “long creation days” leaves one wondering exactly how Ross thinks Adam came into being.

With this in mind, before I set my sights on the blatant anti-christian fools who speak as those who are ever learning but never coming to the knowledge of the truth, let’s get our theology and history right. What you see embodied in the greater secular institutions and culture today had its roots in the Church’s institution and culture much earlier. *The Church always leads the world*, whether for better or the worse and the entire culture of death captured by the philosophy of evolution is no exception.

While the religious faith and philosophy of evolution can be traced back to Egypt 3,000 years before Christ, the Christian faith vanquished this myth of darkness and released man from the dreadful terror of unknowable, unapproachable, arbitrary gods-who-were-not-gods (because when all things are god then nothing or no one really is). One of the most powerful tools in pulling down the evolutionary stronghold of darkness is the very first declaration in the Christian confession of the Apostles’ Creed: “I believe in God the Father, Maker of heaven and earth,” i.e., the confession of belief in the reality of Genesis 1-3. The very statement of belief in the Creator God of the Bible stood starkly against and conquered the oppressive myths that stymied growth, progress and intellectual freedom.

But several hundred years later some highly influential men came along that would give a new twist to the old pagan evolutionary philosophical faith. Marcion came along and reinserted an “evolutionary god” back into the equation. As Marcion saw it:

The chasm between the Old Testament and the New seemed to him immeasurable, so that by no possibility could both have come from the same God. The New Testament shows us the God of love; the Old reveals to us a Being who is angry, who punishes, whose one idea is justice.

Marcion, therefore, regarded Jehovah a middle being, intermediate between the Supreme God and the material world, the Demiurge, who falsely imagined himself to be supreme.<sup>5</sup>

God either evolved into a “nicer” god, or more probably, was overthrown by a stronger, but more loving god. To clearly mark that evolutionary moment, Marcion divided the Bible into the Old and New Testament which is with us to this day and his division, whether consciously or not, still permeates Christian thought. The God who demanded the destruction of the wicked was harsh and arbitrary, while the God of the New Testament is a God of unconditional love.

The second person that came along was Sabellius, who introduced a different evolutionary concept of God. Sabellius taught that there was a trinity but “not a simultaneous trinity of essence, however, but only a successive trinity of revelation.”<sup>6</sup> He was originally God the Father, was transmuted or evolved into God the Son and then finally, at the high point became God the Holy Spirit. He was never the Triune God of Scripture, God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit coexisting eternally, but rather was one person who took on different forms or modes, hence the term modalism was applied to heretics that followed this line of teaching. The Church historian Philip Schaff points out that “the common element [with the Stoic philosophy] is the pantheistic leading view of the expansion and contraction of the divine nature immanent in the world.”<sup>7</sup> Of course, today’s evolutionary theory believes in an evolutionary expansion of the universe which will be followed by a cosmic collapse. Old ideas, new structures.

Fast-forward some thousand years: A man by the name of Hegel, a new breed of German theologian, comes along with a evolutionary faith that profoundly influenced Marx, Darwin and countless others. Hegel was an ordained Lutheran minister who taught in a Christian university. He held that there was no true objective truth, but that there was only a currently held and accepted thesis, but that eventually someone would counter that

accepted “truth” with an antithesis and that the two would battle until at some point there would emerge or evolve a synthesis. This synthesis would then become the entrenched thesis and the whole thing would start all over again, with man and his knowledge always evolving to a higher, purer, “truer” level.

Interestingly enough, Latourette clearly saw the implication of Hegelian evolutionary thought when he wrote, “The Hegelian philosophy contributed to the emergence of the dialectical materialistic view of history”<sup>8</sup> and Charlotte Allen would later point out that,

Hegel predicted a universe that was essentially self-creating. The planet Earth had developed from a dialectic between astral bodies, while vegetal life had developed from minerals, animal life from vegetal, and human life from animal.<sup>9</sup>

Charles Darwin’s *On the Origin of Species* would not appear until 1859, 28 years after Hegel’s death.

Well before Darwin, however, Europe abounded with Hegel-inspired theories of human evolution. During the 1830’s and early 1840’s, the French theorist Auguste Comte (1798-1857), who would later be known as the father of sociology, published a multi-volume work titled *The Course of Positive Philosophy*, which borrowed from Hegel’s dialectics in tracing the development of civilization. Comte maintained, for example, that human thought patterns had evolved from the theological (attributing causation to supernatural forces), to the philosophical (attributing causation to metaphysical abstractions), to the philosophical (attributing causation to verifiable universal laws).<sup>10</sup>

It was this skewed and anti-Biblical world-view that set the stage, both morally and intellectually for Darwin and his followers, the most dangerous of which is, as stated earlier, are those ostensibly within the household of faith. Today, the most overt and powerful evolutionary idea is carried forward within the Church by those theologians advancing the “openness of God” idea, which denies that God knows the future and hence is “open” to leaning new things and “open” to change. Further, God knows only what is knowable, which, with each book they publish we find becomes less and less. According to this evolutionary theology, God is a god in process.<sup>11</sup>

The “Christian” advocates of evolution-based process theology (Pinnock, Rice, Boyd and many others) are direct descendants of Alfred N. Whitehead, a pantheistic philosopher and the author of *Process and Reality*. Whitehead taught that God was not and could not be a transcendent God, but rather that He was inescapably trapped in history. While God could be said to be “the unlimited conceptual realization of the absolute wealth of potentiality” (i.e., that defining concept of perfection towards which all things are progressing), time was as binding upon Him as it was for His creation. Therefore, “in this aspect, He is not *before* all creation, but *with* all creation.”<sup>12</sup> Whitehead, and today’s process or “openness” theologians who follow his thinking, have rethought God and have concluded:

He is the beginning and the end. He is not the beginning in the sense of being in the past of all members. He is the presupposed actuality of conceptual operation, in unison of *becoming* with every other creative act. Thus by reason of the relativity of all things, there is a reaction of the world on God. *The completion of God’s nature* into a fulness of physical feeling is derived from the objectification of the world in God . . . God’s conceptual nature is unchanged, by reason of its final completeness. But His derivative nature is *consequent upon* the creative advance of the world.<sup>13</sup> (Emphases mine)

So God is evolving, or *becoming*. His nature is in the *process of completion* and only at some undefinable future point will He *come into a fulness*. Process theology is an evolutionary theology that insists that God is purely existential, therefore He only knows what is knowable, which causes Him no end of grief because His creation is con-

The “Christian” advocates of evolution-based process theology (Pinnock, Rice, Boyd and many others) are direct descendants of Alfred N. Whitehead, a pantheistic philosopher and the author of *Process and Reality*. Whitehead taught that God was not and could not be a transcendent God, but rather that He was inescapably trapped in history. While God could be said to be “the unlimited conceptual realization of the absolute wealth of potentiality” (i.e., that defining concept of perfection towards which all things are progressing), time was as binding upon Him as it was for His creation. Therefore, “in this aspect, He is not *before* all creation, but *with* all creation.”<sup>12</sup>

stantly catching Him of guard by doing things He doesn't know about. As "open theologian" Gregory A. Boyd concludes from God's conversation with Job:

Running the cosmos, in short, is no easy matter, even for the Creator. There are forces of chaos (to say nothing of the *satan*) to contend with. Unless Job can do it himself, the poem suggests, he ought to refrain from arrogant accusations.<sup>14</sup>

At this point I don't need to give a summary of the historical advances of the secular version of the evolutionary faith, but I do want to say don't be fooled by the pseudo-scientific jargon used; evolutionary thought is a faith that is absolutely intolerant of any other faith! In whatever form it shows up in it is always at war with the Biblical God.

"The story of human descent from apes is not merely a scientific hypothesis; it is the secular equivalent of the story of Adam and Eve, and a matter of immense cultural importance. Propagating the story requires illustrations, museum exhibits, and television reenactments. It also requires a priesthood, in the form of thousands of researchers, teachers, and artists who provide realistic and imaginative detail and carry the story out to the general public." The problem is there is no evidence; it is built upon many presuppositions which are false and therefore the entire story is a sham and hoax of great proportions.

What is a presupposition? It is something that is taken for granted or advanced as fact; an axiom. I confess: I build my life upon presuppositional truth. Everyone does and there's no way to avoid it. The question that we must ask is, "What presuppositions will we accept as our foundational building blocks upon which our entire world-view is formed?"

Presuppositions are what undergirds the two conflicting views of creation and life. The Biblically-based Christian view of creation and the appearance of man rests on the presuppositional belief that God was the Master Creator and Designer as clearly put forth in the Bible. Christians freely confess that their teachings and actions in this area stem from faith, although stating clearly it is not blind-faith, but rather a faith that is highly informed by self-evident proofs, mainly that creation itself literally shouts, "There is a God! Look at the work of the Creator!" and Divine Revelation through the Bible, God's word to man.

The non-Christian evolutionary view of matter and life springing forth from nothing and advancing little by little through billions upon billions of years also rests upon a presuppositional belief system. However theirs is a belief that takes as a given, or as a point of beginning, that there is no Creator. All the extremely complex and interrelated systems, including life itself, is the result of pure chance with no purpose at all for anything. Indeed, it is a presuppositional stand that requires—demands!—a fantastic leap of faith; blind-faith (as in belief in a "Blind Watchmaker" which presupposes that there's a "watchmaker" even if he is blind). You wouldn't know it by highschool or college textbooks in use today, but the theory of evolution requires such a fantastic abdication of reason and logic that it more rightly qualifies as a "blind faith movement" than even the most fanatical religious "faith movements."

Let me draw you a clear picture of what passes for intelligence and reason in today's world, starting with Albert Einstein, who once said, "The eternal mystery of the world is its comprehensibility." Clarifying this Einstein went on to say:

You may find it surprising that I think of the comprehensibility of the world . . . as a miracle or an eternal mystery. But surely, a priori, one should expect the world to be chaotic, not to be grasped by thought in any way. One might (indeed one *should*) expect that the world evidence itself as lawful only so far as we grasp it in an orderly fashion. This would be a sort of order like the alphabetical order of words, of a language. On the other hand, the kind of order created, for example, by Newton's gravitational theory is of a very different character. Even if the axioms of the theory are posited by man, the success of such a procedure supposes in the objective world a high degree of order which we are in no way entitled to expect a priori. Therein lies the "miracle" which becomes more and more evident as our knowledge develops . . . And here is the weak point of positivist [true knowledge is that which can only be verified by the senses or experience—JN] and of professional atheists, who feel happy because they think that they have not only pre-empted the world of the divine, but also of the miraculous. Curiously, we have to be resigned to recognizing the "miracle" without having any legitimate way of getting any further. I have

to add the last point explicitly, lest you think that, weakened by age, I have fallen into the hands of priests.<sup>15</sup>

Einstein hated the miracle of an ordered universe because it made him confess that “Certain it is that a conviction, akin to religious feeling, or the rationality or intelligibility of the world lies behind all scientific work of a higher order,”<sup>16</sup> but he would not acknowledge God in the face of incontrovertible facts. Einstein’s “quantum faith leap” theory declared there was no God despite uncontested proof that there is.

He’s not alone, as Richard Lewontin, one of the top proponents of materialistic evolution so clearly and unabashedly writes:

Our willingness to accept scientific claims that are against common sense is the key to an understanding of the real struggle between science and the supernatural. We take the side of science *in spite* of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, *in spite* of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, *in spite* of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a prior commitment, a commitment to materialism. It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our *a priori* adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door. The eminent Kant scholar Lewis Beck used to say that anyone who could believe in God could believe in anything. To appeal to an omnipotent deity is to allow that at any moment the regularities of nature may be ruptured, that miracles may happen.<sup>17</sup>

Isn’t that insightful? Two things are worth mentioning. First, Einstein looked out and said that the “regularities” or the “comprehensibility” of the universe *was a miracle* that could not be denied, and now Lewontin says that by focusing in on only the “regularities” or the comprehensibility of the universe *we exclude all miracles*, and of course, the God who works miracles. (Einstein vs. Lewontin)

Second, while Lewontin says that anyone who could believe in God could believe in anything, he admits that he and all other materialistic evolutionists *will* believe in anything, even “patent absurdities” to escape responsibility to a Creator God. (Could vs. Will)

Are you starting to understand why we shouldn’t be intimidated by all these “degreed” fools, men who say in their heart, there is no God? The evolutionary faith has produced not only Darwin, Einstein, Sagan and Lewontin, but shares major responsibility for the creation of Hitler, Stalin, Mao, Pol Pot and Castro. It has produced and is still producing rampant racism. Darwin’s book was explicitly based upon his evolutionary theory that certain races should and would become extinct due to the supremacy of one (White-his of course) race.

Racism is inescapably intertwined with the evolutionary faith, which is why it was inevitable that it spawned the eugenics movement that thrived in the first three or four decades of the 1900’s and why Margaret Sanger, an early admirer and advocate of Adolph Hitler, founded Planned Parenthood and was intensely driven in her pursuit to stop Blacks and Hispanics from reproducing. Wherever evolution is taught racism will result because of the hardness of man’s heart and ethnic/racial pride unchecked by God’s revelation that mankind (the entire human race) is made in His image, descended directly from a historically real Adam and Eve with the command to “love your neighbor as yourself.”

Incredibly, philosophers and mathematicians know that evolution is not even remotely possible based squarely on numbers. While not agreeing with all, or even most of the conclusions of his book, David Foster performs a genuine service by pointing out that by investigating molecular biology he,

found that the chief feature was specificity (improbability). He found, further, that the protein hemoglobin is specific to  $10^{650}$ , and that the DNA of the T4 phage is specific to  $10^{78,000}$ . Since such specificities could not possibly be developed by Natural Selection in a universe only  $10^{18}$  seconds old, it followed that Darwin was Wrong.<sup>18</sup>

Incredibly, philosophers and mathematicians know that evolution is not even remotely possible based squarely on numbers. While not agreeing with all, or even most of the conclusions of his book, David Foster performs a genuine service by pointing out that by investigating molecular biology he,

. . . found that the chief feature was specificity (improbability). He found, further, that the protein hemoglobin is specific to  $10^{650}$ , and that the DNA of the T4 phage is specific to  $10^{78,000}$ . Since such specificities could not possibly be developed by Natural Selection in a universe only  $10^{18}$  seconds old, it followed that Darwin was Wrong.<sup>18</sup>

Now, set aside all the philosophy for just a moment, let me give you some practical ammo that should cheer you even as you pay record amounts for gas this weekend. What about gas and oil and evolution? The accepted and unchallenged paradigm has it that oil is a by-product of millions, if not billions of years of evolutionary process in which dead dinosaurs and prehistoric plants have been turned into a very limited and quickly dwindling resource.

Well, according to the Wall Street Journal, the experts are now discovering that oil seems to be a naturally and quickly renewing resource with old wells now refilled with better oil than first pumped out. Their front page headline declared: "Oil Field Grows Even as It's Tapped" and the story goes on to say this:

Conventional wisdom says the world's supply of oil is finite, and that it was deposited in horizontal reservoirs near the surface in a process that took millions of years. Since the economies of entire countries ride on the fundamental notion that oil reserves are exhaustible, any contrary evidence "would change the way people see the game, turn the world view upside down," says Daniel Yergin, a petroleum futurist and industry consultant in Cambridge, Mass.

It continues:

Doomsayers to the contrary, the world contains far more recoverable oil than was believed even 20 years ago. Between 1976 and 1996, estimated global oil reserves grew 72%, to 1.04 trillion barrels.

[M]ost geologists are hard-pressed to explain why the world's greatest oil pool, the Middle East, has more than doubled its reserves in the past 20 years, despite half a century of intense exploitation and relatively few new discoveries. ***It would take a pretty big pile of dead dinosaurs and prehistoric plants to account for the estimated 660 billion barrels of oil in the region, notes Norman Hyne, a professor at the University of Tulsa in Oklahoma.*** (emp. mine)

The bottom line, as David Sibley, a Chevron Corp. geologist states, is that, "these reservoirs are refilling with oil."<sup>19</sup>

Combine that with the May 16, 2000 MSNBC report of a "Vast oil field discovered in Caspian [Sea]." Its the largest find in 20 years and holds 32 billion barrels of oil, "or maybe more." This was followed up several days later when the Wall St. Journal reported that there is at least 10 billion more barrels of oil sitting in reserves off a coast of Alaska than previously realized, and that is easily recoverable. In other words, the world has more oil than it knows what to do with, and it's not due to dead dinosaurs and prehistoric plants! It is as if Psalm 2 is being played out before our very eyes with God laughing at the raging foolishness of the nations. Once again "the heavens declare the glory of God" and so too does the immense (and quickly growing) oil reserves. It's as if God is throwing down the challenge: "Evolve this!"

What I'm saying in practical terms to you today is to take the apostle Paul seriously! Don't be fooled or intimidated by the world's so-called wisdom and knowledge, for it is false wisdom and demonstrably false knowledge! Without doubting Dr. Ross's intentions or sincerity, trying to bring the two world-views together is an act of faithlessness and false humility that God specifically tells us to reject.

"Beware lest anyone cheat you through philosophy and empty deceit, according to the tradition of men, according to the basic principles of the world, and not according to Christ." Colossians 2:8

"For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ..." 2 Corinthians 10:6

May God grant that each one of us be constantly aware of the fact that the devil and his philosophies and competing faith systems are trying to cheat us and may we fight to pull down strongholds and arguments and every other high thing that exalts itself against our God and King. Amen.

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Kenneth Scott Latourette. A History Of Christianity: Chapter 1 page 1

<sup>2</sup> Two things stand out here. First, Ross unknowingly becomes an advocate of the Hegelian evolutionary model that declares that "whereby a given entity (thesis) was inevitably transformed into its opposite (antithesis), after which the combination of the two was resolved into a higher form (synthesis)." Ross implicitly declares this model to be true when the only conclusion he can reach is that both the Bible and modern, humanistic science have equal truths that must be harmonized or synthesized. Second, we should take note of Ross' burning desire for respectability and acceptance among his non-Christian peers. The desire for respectability in the eyes of non-Christian or anti-Christian intellectuals is nothing new, and you would think Christians would learn from history. Charlott Allen, in her outstanding book **The Human Christ** (from which the above quote was taken), documents that both Johann Gottfried Eichhorn and Friedrich Schleiermacher desperately sought the approval of an elite "scientific" establishment. Two-hundred years ago "Schleiermacher's life exemplified the struggle of a well-educated, upwardly mobile Christian to gain the acceptance of a secularized intelligentsia while somehow remaining true to his faith." He did this by delivering a series of lectures with the hope of making "Jesus intellectually acceptable to 'cultured despisers' . . . by promoting the image of Jesus as an individual who embodied the Kantian idea of human perfection ("the way, the truth, and the life"), he hoped to make him more palatable to the 19th century. Consequently, he delineated a Jesus who, despite his exalted status, had no superhuman powers and was unable to predict future events." (Page 140-141) Eichhorn too, struggled to maintain respectability by reconstructing and repackaging Christ so He would be tolerated by "informed and highly educated" cultural leaders. In 1804 he wrote, "By this freeing [from the miraculous] countless doubts with which Jesus, his life and his teaching have been assailed become completely meaningless . . . By separation of the apostolic from the nonapostolic which higher criticism—if only its gifts be not spurned—recommends for the most important of reasons, the means are found to establish the credibility and truth of the gospel story on unshakable foundations." (Page 129)

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Hugh Ross. Creation and Time; Introduction

<sup>4</sup> Ibid; page 80

<sup>5</sup> Henry C. Sheldon. The History of the Christian Church; Vol. 1, page 218

<sup>6</sup> Philip Schaff. The History of the Christian Church; Vol. 2, page 582

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. page 582-583

<sup>8</sup> Kenneth Scott Latourette. A History Of Christianity; page xix in preface

<sup>9</sup> Charlotte Allen. The Human Christ; Page 144

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. Page 143

<sup>11</sup> Again, this "new and improved" version that pushes the bounds of theistic evolution is not really new. A German theologian, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling, was appointed to his teaching post at the University of Berlin by the king of Prussia back in 1840 specifically to set forth a theory of the progressive development of God which would prove to provided the fundamental framework for what would come to be known as *process theology*.

<sup>12</sup> Alfred N. Whitehead. Process and Reality: Page 521

<sup>13</sup> Ibid. Page 523

<sup>14</sup> Gregory A. Boyd. God At War: The Bible & Spiritual Conflict; Page 148

<sup>15</sup> As quoted by James Nickel in Mathematics: Is God Silent?

<sup>16</sup> Ibid

<sup>17</sup> Richard Lewontin. Billions and Billions of Demons: New York Review of Books, January 9, 1997. I find it fascinating that Lewontin is so candid in his remarks. In the same article he concedes that we all act in faith when we accept *anything* as true that we haven't personally proved or can prove, in areas where we're outside of our expertise. Lewontin is willing to accept many unproven authorities as long as it's not God's, but he does have a fundamental problem: he also doesn't like some of the competing "authorities" in the realm of evolutionary theory! "When scientists transgress the bounds of their own specialty they have no choice but to accept the claims of authority, even though they do not know how solid the grounds of those claims may be. Who am I to believe about quantum physics if not Steven Weinberg, or about the solar system if not Carl Sagan? What worries me is that they may believe what Dawkins and Wilson tell them about evolution."

<sup>18</sup> David Foster. *The Philosophical Scientist*: Page 83. Foster's book is highly philosophical and mathematical and I don't pretend to understand all of the content, but again, while not endorsing his conclusion, this book should be read. He has one section on *the universe as thought* where Sir James Jeans sets forth this fascinating philosophical nugget: "Modern scientific theory compels us to think of the creator as working outside of time and space which are part of his creation, just as an artist is outside of his canvas." Can anyone say "Augustine?" Also, Foster's chapter on **The Problem Of Evolution—Monkeys With Typewriters** (Chapter 10) is worth the price of the book!

<sup>19</sup> Christopher Cooper. It' No Crude Joke: This Oil Field Grows Even as It's Tapped; Wall Street Journal 1999. I have the entire Wall Street Journal article on file. I failed, however, to post the date it appeared in the paper.