



“VITAL ARTICLES ON SCIENCE/CREATION”

February 2001

Impact #332

Evolution is Religion—Not Science

Henry M. Morris*

The writer has documented in two recent Impact articles^{1,2} from admissions by evolutionists that the idea of particles-to-people evolution does not meet the criteria of a scientific theory. There are no evolutionary transitions that have ever been observed, either during human history or in the fossil record of the past; and the universal law of entropy seems to make it impossible on any significant scale.

Evolutionists claim that evolution is a scientific fact, but they almost always lose scientific debates with creationist scientists. Accordingly, most evolutionists now decline opportunities for scientific debates, preferring instead to make unilateral attacks on creationists.

Scientists should refuse formal debates because they do more harm than good, but scientists still need to counter the creationist message.³

The question is, just *why* do they need to counter the creationist message? Why are they so adamantly committed to anti-creationism?

The fact is that evolutionists believe in evolution because they *want* to. It is their desire at all costs to explain the origin of everything without a Creator. Evolutionism is thus intrinsically an atheistic religion. Some may prefer to call it humanism, and New Age evolutionists may place it in the context of some form of pantheism, but they all amount to the same thing. Whether atheism or humanism (or even pantheism), the purpose is to eliminate a personal God from any active role in the origin of the universe and all its components, including man.

The core of the humanistic philosophy is naturalism—the proposition that the natural world proceeds according to its own internal dynamics, without divine or supernatural control or guidance, and that we human beings are creations of that process. It is instructive to recall that the philosophers of the early humanistic movement debated as to which term more adequately described their position: humanism or naturalism. The two concepts are complementary and inseparable.⁴

* Dr. Morris is Founder and President Emeritus of the Institute for Creation Research.

Since both naturalism and humanism exclude God from science or any other active function in the creation or maintenance of life and the universe in general, it is very obvious that their position is nothing but atheism. And atheism, no less than theism, is a religion! Even doctrinaire-atheistic evolutionist Richard Dawkins admits that atheism cannot be proven to be true.

Of course we can't prove that there isn't a God.⁵

Therefore, they must *believe* it, and that makes it a religion. The atheistic nature of evolution is not only admitted, but insisted upon, by most of the leaders of evolutionary thought. Ernst Mayr, for example, says that:

Darwinism rejects all supernatural phenomena and causations.⁶

A professor in the Department of Biology at Kansas State University says:

Even if all the data point to an intelligent designer, such a hypothesis is excluded from science because it is not naturalistic.⁷

It is well known in the scientific world today that such influential evolutionists as Stephen Jay Gould and Edward Wilson of Harvard, Richard Dawkins of England, William Provine of Cornell, and numerous other evolutionary spokesmen are dogmatic atheists. Eminent scientific philosopher and ardent Darwinian atheist Michael Ruse has even acknowledged that evolution *is* their *religion!*

Evolution is promoted by its practitioners as more than mere science. Evolution is promulgated as an ideology, a secular religion—a full-fledged alternative to Christianity, with meaning and morality. . . . Evolution is a religion. This was true of evolution in the beginning, and it is true of evolution still today. ⁸

Another way of saying “religion” is “worldview,” the whole of reality. The evolutionary worldview applies not only to the evolution of life, but even to that of the entire universe. In the realm of cosmic evolution, our naturalistic scientists depart even further from experimental science than life scientists do, manufacturing a variety of evolutionary cosmologies from esoteric mathematics and metaphysical speculation. Socialist Jeremy Rifkin has commented on this remarkable game.

Cosmologies are made up of small snippets of physical reality that have been remodeled by society into vast cosmic deceptions.⁹

They *must* believe in evolution, therefore, in spite of all the evidence, not because of it. And speaking of deceptions, note the following remarkable statement.

We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, . . . in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated commitment to materialism. . . . we are forced by our *a priori* adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counterintuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door.¹⁰

The author of this frank statement is Richard Lewontin of Harvard. Since evolution is not a laboratory science, there is no way to test its validity, so all sorts of just-so stories are contrived to adorn the textbooks. But that doesn't make them true! An evolutionist reviewing a recent book by another (but more critical) evolutionist, says:

We cannot identify ancestors or “missing links,” and we cannot devise testable

theories to explain how particular episodes of evolution came about. Gee is adamant that all the popular stories about how the first amphibians conquered the dry land, how the birds developed wings and feathers for flying, how the dinosaurs went extinct, and how humans evolved from apes are just products of our imagination, driven by prejudices and preconceptions.¹¹

A fascinatingly honest admission by a physicist indicates the passionate commitment of establishment scientists to naturalism. Speaking of the trust students naturally place in their highly educated college professors, he says:

And I use that trust to effectively brainwash them. . . . our teaching methods are primarily those of propaganda. We appeal—without demonstration—to evidence that supports our position. We only introduce arguments and evidence that supports the currently accepted theories and omit or gloss over any evidence to the contrary.¹²

Creationist students in scientific courses taught by evolutionist professors can testify to the frustrating reality of that statement. Evolution is, indeed, the pseudo-scientific basis of religious atheism, as Ruse pointed out. Will Provine at Cornell University is another scientist who frankly acknowledges this.

As the creationists claim, belief in modern evolution makes atheists of people.

One can have a religious view that is compatible with evolution only if the religious view is indistinguishable from atheism.¹³

Once again we emphasize that evolution is *not* science, evolutionists' tirades notwithstanding. It is a philosophical worldview, nothing more. Another prominent evolutionist comments as follows:

(Evolution) must, they feel, explain everything. . . . A theory that explains everything might just as well be discarded since it has no real explanatory value. Of course, the other thing about evolution is that anything can be said because very little can be disproved. Experimental evidence is minimal.¹⁴

Even *that* statement is too generous. Actual experimental evidence demonstrating true evolution (that is, macroevolution) is not "minimal." It is nonexistent!

The concept of evolution as a form of religion is not new. In my book, *The Long War Against God*,¹⁵ I documented the fact that some form of evolution has been the pseudo-rationale behind every anti-creationist religion since the very beginning of history. This includes all the ancient ethnic religions, as well as such modern world religions as Buddhism, Hinduism, and others, as well as the "liberal" movements in even the creationist religions (Christianity, Judaism, Islam).

As far as the twentieth century is concerned, the leading evolutionist is generally considered to be Sir Julian Huxley, primary architect of modern neo-Darwinism. Huxley called evolution a "religion without revelation" and wrote a book with that title (2nd edition, 1957). In a later book, he said:

Evolution . . . is the most powerful and the most comprehensive idea that has ever arisen on earth.¹⁶

Later in the book he argued passionately that we must change "our pattern of religious thought from a God-centered to an evolution-centered pattern."¹⁷ Then he went on to say that: "the God hypothesis . . . is becoming an intellectual and moral burden on our thought." Therefore, he concluded that "we must construct something to take its place."¹⁸

That something, of course, is the religion of evolutionary humanism, and that is what the leaders of evolutionary humanism are trying to do today.

In closing this summary of the scientific case against evolution (and, therefore, for creation), the reader is reminded again that all quotations in the article are from doctrinaire evolutionists. No Bible references are included, and no statements by creationists. The evolutionists themselves, to all intents and purposes, have shown that evolutionism is not science, but religious faith in atheism.

References

1. Morris, Henry M., "The Scientific Case Against Evolution—Part I," (Impact #330, December 2000), pp. i–iv.
2. Morris, Henry M., "The Scientific Case Against Evolution—Part II," (Impact #331, January 2001), pp. i–iv.
3. Scott, Eugenie, "Fighting Talk," *New Scientist* (vol. 166, April 22, 2000), p.47. Dr. Scott is director of the anti-creationist organization euphemistically named The National Center for Science Education.
4. Ericson, Edward L., "Reclaiming the Higher Ground," *The Humanist* (vol. 60, September/October 2000), p. 30.
5. Dawkins, Richard, replying to a critique of his faith in the liberal journal, *Science and Christian Belief* (vol. 7, 1994), p. 47.
6. Mayr, Ernst, "Darwin's Influence on Modern Thought," *Scientific American* (vol. 283, July 2000), p. 83.
7. Todd, Scott C., "A View from Kansas on the Evolution Debates," *Nature* (vol. 401, September 30, 1999), p. 423.
8. Ruse, Michael, "Saving Darwinism from the Darwinians," *National Post* (May 13, 2000), p. B-3.
9. Rifkin, Jeremy, "Reinventing Nature," *The Humanist* (vol. 58, March/April 1998), p. 24.
10. Lewontin, Richard, Review of *The Demon-Haunted World*, by Carl Sagan. In *New York Review of Books*, January 9, 1997.
11. Bowler, Peter J., Review of *In Search of Deep Time* by Henry Gee (Free Press, 1999), *American Scientist* (vol. 88, March/April 2000), p. 169.
12. Singham, Mark, "Teaching and Propaganda," *Physics Today* (vol. 53, June 2000), p. 54.
13. Provine, Will, "No Free Will," in *Catching Up with the Vision*, Ed. by Margaret W. Rossiter (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), p. S123.
14. Appleyard, Bryan, "You Asked for It," *New Scientist* (vol. 166, April 22, 2000), p. 45.
15. Morris, Henry M., *The Long War Against God* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1989), 344 pp.
16. Huxley, Julian, *Essays of a Humanist* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 125.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 222.
18. *Ibid.*



SINGLE COPIES 10¢

ORDER FROM: **INSTITUTE FOR CREATION RESEARCH** © 2001 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
P.O. BOX 2667, EL CAJON, CA 92021

This is not a polemical argument and it's not meant as an insult. But believing in the multiverse is logically equivalent to believing in god, therefore it's religion, not science. Scientists say that something exists if it is useful to describe observations. By "useful" I mean it is simpler than just collecting data. You can postulate the existence of things that are not useful to describe observations, such as gods, but this is no longer science. Universes besides our own are logically equivalent to gods. They are unobservable by assumption, hence they can exist only in a religious sense. You can believe in them if you want to, but they are not part of science.

4. Ambiguous Arguments, Fossils, and Other Discussions - Evolution is Religion Not Science.mp4 download. 374.6M. 5. The Age of the Universe- Should We Distort Scripture - Evolution is Religion Not Science.mp4 download. 411.7M. 6. The Age of the Universe- Evidence and Assumptions - Evolution is Religion Not Science.mp4 download. download 6 files. OGG VIDEO. Uplevel BACK. 171.2M. 1. Evolution is Religion Not Science.ogv download. 152.1M. 2. True Science is the Enemy of the Evolutionist (Part 1) - Evolution is Religion Not Science.ogv download. 175.1M. 3. True Science is the Enemy of the Evolutionist (Part 2) - Evolution is Religion Not Science.ogv download. 191.8M. The evolutionary worldview applies not only to the evolution of life, but even to that of the entire universe. In the realm of cosmic evolution, our naturalistic scientists depart even further from experimental science than life scientists do, manufacturing a variety of evolutionary cosmologies from esoteric mathematics and metaphysical speculation. Socialist Jeremy Rifkin has commented on this remarkable game. Cite this article: Morris, H. M. 2001. Evolution Is Religion--Not Science. Acts & Facts. 30 (2). Ken Ham, The Lie: Evolution. tags: evolution, religion, science. Read more quotes from Ken Ham. Join a former atheist and evolutionist in looking at the theory of evolution. One of the greatest deceptions perpetrated by atheists and humanists is that the theory of evolution is somehow "science." Dr. Mike Houts demonstrates in this 6 lesson program that, in reality, evolution is merely a tenet of the false religion of atheism. Evolution Is Religion Not Science Program. Join a former atheist and evolutionist in looking at the theory of evolution. One of the greatest deceptions perpetrated by atheists and humanists is that the theory of evolution is somehow "science." Dr. Mike Houts demonstrates in this 6 lesson program that, in reality, evolution is merely a tenet of the false religion of atheism. Videos in this Program. Watch Now. 1. Evolution is Religion Not Science.