

## Evolution Is Not Science – It's Religion

Evolutionists often insist that evolution is a proved fact of science providing the very framework of scientific interpretation, especially in the biological sciences. This, of course, is nothing but wishful thinking.

### The Religious Essence of Evolutionism

Many leading evolutionists have recognized the essentially "religious" character of evolutionism. Even though they themselves believe evolution to be true, they acknowledge the fact that they *believe* it! "Science", however, is not supposed to be something one "believes." Science is knowledge—that which can be demonstrated and observed and repeated. Evolution cannot be proven, or even tested; it can only be believed.

For example, two leading evolutionary biologists have described modern neo-Darwinism as "part of an evolutionary dogma accepted by most of us as part of our training."<sup>i</sup> A prominent British biologist, a Fellow of the Royal Society, in the Introduction to the 1971 edition of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, said that "belief in the theory of evolution" was "exactly parallel to belief in special creation," with evolution merely "a satisfactory faith on which to base our interpretation of nature."<sup>ii</sup> G. W. Harper calls it a "metaphysical belief."<sup>iii</sup>

Ernst Mayr, the outstanding Harvard evolutionary biologist, calls evolution "man's world view today."<sup>iv</sup> Sir Julian Huxley, probably the outstanding evolutionist of the twentieth century saw "evolution as a universal and all-pervading process"<sup>v</sup> and, in fact, nothing less than "the whole of reality."<sup>vi</sup> A leading evolutionary geneticist of the present day, writing an obituary for Theodosius Dobzhansky, who himself was probably the nation's leading evolutionist at the time of his death in 1975, says that Dobzhansky's view of evolution followed that of the notorious Jesuit priest, de Chardin:

*The place of biological evolution in human thought was, according to Dobzhansky, best expressed in a passage that he often quoted from Pierre Teilhard de Chardin: "(Evolution) is a general postulate to which all theories, all hypotheses, all systems must henceforward bow and which they must satisfy in order to be thinkable and true. Evolution is a light which illuminates all facts, a trajectory which all lines of thought must follow."<sup>vii</sup>*

The British physicist H.S. Lipson has reached the following conclusion:

*In fact, evolution became in a sense a scientific religion; almost all scientists have accepted it and many are prepared to "bend" their observations to fit in with it.<sup>viii</sup>*

*The man whom Dobzhansky called "France's leading zoologist," although himself an evolutionist, said that scientists should "destroy the myth of evolution" as a simple phenomenon which is "unfolding before us."<sup>x</sup>*

Dr. Colin Patterson, Senior Paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History, by any accounting one of the world's top evolutionists today, has recently called evolution "positively anti-knowledge," saying that "all my life I had been duped into taking evolutionism as revealed truth."<sup>x</sup> In another address he called evolution "story telling."<sup>xi</sup>

All of the above-cited authorities are (or were) among the world's foremost authorities on evolutionism. Note again the terms which they use in describing evolution:

- Evolutionary dogma
- A satisfactory faith
- Man's worldview
- All-pervading process
- The whole of reality
- Metaphysical belief
- A scientific religion
- The myth of evolution
- Anti-knowledge
- Revealed truth
- An illuminating light
- Story-telling

Charles Darwin himself called evolution "this grand view of life." Now such grandiloquent terms as these are not scientific terms! One does not call the law of gravity, for example, "a satisfactory faith," nor speak of the laws of thermodynamics as "dogma." Evolution is, indeed, a grand world view, but it is not science. Its very comprehensiveness makes it impossible even to test scientifically. As Ehrlich and Birch have said: "Every conceivable observation can be fitted into it—No one can think of ways in which to test it."<sup>xii</sup>

### **Religions Based on Evolution**

In view of the fundamentally religious nature of evolution, it is not surprising to find that most world religions are themselves based on evolution. It is certainly unfitting for educators to object to teaching scientific creationism in public schools on the ground that it supports Biblical Christianity when the existing pervasive teaching of evolution is supporting a host of other religions and philosophies.

The concept of evolution did not originate with Charles Darwin. It has been the essential ingredient of all pagan religions and philosophies from time immemorial

(e.g., atomism, pantheism, stoicism, gnosticism and all other humanistic and polytheistic systems). All beliefs which assume the ultimacy of the space/time/matter universe, presupposing that the universe has existed from eternity, are fundamentally evolutionary systems. The cosmos, with its innate laws and forces, is the only ultimate reality.

Depending on the sophistication of the system, the forces of the universe may be personified as gods and goddesses who organized the eternal chaotic cosmos into its present form (as in ancient Babylonian and Egyptian religions), or else may themselves be invested with organizing capabilities (as in modern scientific evolutionism).

In all such cases, these are merely different varieties of the fundamental evolutionist world view, the essential feature of which is the denial that there is one true God and Creator of all things.

In this perspective, it becomes obvious that most of the great world religions—Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism, Hinduism, Animism—are based on evolution.

Creationism is the basis of only such systems as Orthodox Judaism, Islam and Biblical Christianity. However, the liberal varieties of Judaism, Islam, Catholicism and Protestantism, as well as most modern pseudo-Christian cults, are all based on evolution.

All of this points up the absurdity of banning Creationist teaching from the schools on the basis that it is religious. The schools are already saturated with the teaching of religion in the guise of evolutionary "science." In the modern school of course, this teaching mostly takes the form of secular humanism, which its own proponents claim to be a "non-theistic religion." It should also be recalled that such philosophies as communism, fascism, socialism, nazism, and anarchism have been claimed by their founders and promoters to be based on what they regard as scientific evolutionism.

If Creation is excluded from the schools because it is compatible with Christian "fundamentalism," should not evolution also be banned since it is the basis of communism and nazism?

### **The Scientific Irrelevance of Evolution**

Some people have deplored the questioning of evolution on the ground that this is attacking science itself. In a recent debate, the evolutionist whom the writer debated did not attempt to give any scientific evidences for evolution, electing instead to spend his time defending such scientific concepts as atomic theory, relativity, gravity, quantum theory, and science in general, stating that attacking evolution was tantamount to attacking science!

The fact is, however, that the elimination of evolutionary interpretations from science would hardly be noticed at all, in terms of real scientific understanding and accomplishment. G. W. Harper comments on this subject as follows:

*It is frequently claimed that Darwinism is central to modern biology. On the contrary, if all references to Darwinism suddenly disappeared, biology would remain substantially unchanged. It would merely have lost a little color. Grandiose doctrines in science are like some occupants of high office; they sound very important but have in fact been promoted to a position of ineffectuality.*<sup>xiii</sup>

The scientific irrelevance of evolutionism has been strikingly (but, no doubt, inadvertently) illustrated in a recent issue of *Science News*. This widely read and highly regarded weekly scientific journal was commemorating its sixtieth anniversary, and this included a listing of what it called the "scientific highlights" of the past sixty years.<sup>xiv</sup>

Of the sixty important scientific discoveries and accomplishments which were chosen, only six could be regarded as related in any way to evolutionist thought. These six were as follows:

1. 1927. Discovery that radiation increases mutation rates in fruit flies.
2. 1943. Demonstration that nucleic acids carry genetic information.
3. 1948. Enunciation of the "big bang" cosmology.
4. 1953. Discovery of the "double helix" structure of DNA.
5. 1961. First step taken in cracking the genetic code.
6. 1973. Development of procedures for producing recombinant DNA molecules.

Four of these six "highlights" are related to the structure and function of DNA. Even though evolutionists have supposed that these concepts somehow correlate with evolution, the fact is that the remarkable DNA molecule provides strong evidence of original creation (since it is far too complex to have arisen by chance) and of conservation of that creation (since the genetic code acts to guarantee reproduction of the same kind, not evolution of new kinds).

One of the two other highlights showed how to increase mutations but, since all known true mutations are harmful, this contributed nothing whatever to the understanding of evolution. One (the "Big Bang" concept) was indeed an evolutionary idea but it is still an idea which has never been proved and today is increasingly being recognized as incompatible with basic physical laws.

Consequently, it is fair to conclude that no truly significant accomplishment of modern science either depends on evolution or supports evolution! There would certainly be no detriment to real scientific learning if creation were incorporated as an alternative to evolution in school curricula. It would on the other hand, prove a

detriment to the pervasive religion of atheistic humanism which now controls our schools.

---

- i. Paul Ehrlich and L.C. Birch, *Nature* (April 22, 1967): 352.
- ii. Matthews, L. Harrison. "Introduction," *Origin of Species* (London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1971): X.
- iii. G. W. Harper, "Alternatives to Evolutionism," *School Science Review* 51 (September 1979): 16.
- iv. Ernst Mayr, "Evolution," *Scientific American* 239 (September 1978): 47.
- v. Julian Huxley, J.R. Newman (ed.), "Evolution and Genetics," *What is Science?* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955): 272.
- vi. Ibid: 278.
- vii. Francisco , "Nothing in Biology Makes Sense Except in the Light of Evolution: Theodosius Dobzhansky, 1900-1975," *Journal of Heredity* 68: 3 (1977): 3.
- viii. H. S. Lipson, "A Physicist Looks at Evolution," *Physics Bulletin* 31 (n.d., 1980).
- ix. Pierre P. Grasse, *Evolution of Living Organisms* (New York: Academic Press, 1977): 8.
- x. Colin Patterson, "Evolution and Creationism," Transcript of Speech at American Museum of Natural History (November 5, 1981): 2.
- xi. Colin Patterson, "Cladistics," Interview on BBC Telecast with Peter Franz (March 4, 1982).
- xii. Paul Ehrlich and L.C. Birch, *Nature* (April 22, 1967): 352.
- xiii. G. W. Harper, "Alternatives to Evolutionism," *School Science Review* 51 (September 1979): 26.
- xiv. "Six Decades of Science Highlights," *Science News* 121 (March 13, 1982): 192.

## Creation and Evolution: Is Compromise Possible?

Over the last decades, theories of compromise between science and Scripture have become more common. However, the two worldviews—a literal six-day Creation and a naturalistic evolution—are mutually exclusive if we wish to accept them in their fullness.

For example, in 1949, leading evolutionist George Gaylord Simpson made it clear that evolution is a random and accidental process when he wrote this:

*Man is the result of a purposeless and natural process that did not have him in mind.<sup>i</sup>*

This view is in direct conflict with the plainest statements of Scripture, and any compromise here requires substantial intellectual gymnastics. The Scriptures plainly state that the origin of the physical and biological world lies with God, and that man was created in the image of God for a purpose:

*In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth (Genesis 1:1).*

*God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth (Genesis 1:27-28).*

### Models of Compromise

In his book *Origins: Linking Science and Scripture*, Ariel Roth lists and discusses models that have been proposed to bridge the gap between these two views.<sup>ii</sup> Compare Scripture with some of these popular theories to see for yourself that compromise between evolution and Creation simply doesn't work.

**The Gap Theory** proposes two cycles of Creation. In the first cycle, there is an initial six-day Creation. Everything is then destroyed by God, and a gap or period of time occurs. Then, the Creation described in Genesis occurs.

This interpretation allows for long time periods. However, there is no evidence of a gap in the fossil record and this model raises more questions than answers.

**Progressive Creation** suggests that God created numerous times, and that these Creation episodes were spread over long ages. Scripture does not support this theory.

**Theistic Evolution** says that God directs the process of evolution and helps it along when it comes to the difficult barriers.

Death, according to the Scriptures, is a consequence of sin, but according to the theory of evolution, death is the means of advancement. The survival of the fittest and the death of the less fit is the means of progress. Without the constant cycle of death and survival, no evolutionary progress is possible.

Once again, the two worldviews are in disharmony with each other. This however, is not the least of the compromises that the theistic evolutionists have to make in order to fit their worldview into the Scriptural texts.

**Deistic Evolution** adheres to the concept of some form of deity, but denies Scripture and the personal nature of God. God, according to this model, is not active in human affairs.

**Space Ancestry**, also called Panspermia or Cosmic Creation, proposes that life did not evolve on Earth but was transported to Earth via meteorites or other stellar sources. This idea originated in response to the fact that evolution on Earth is not a viable option. In a sense, this theory merely transports the problem to space.

These theories of compromise are not substantiated in biology or geology, and contradict the Word of God.

### Creation in Scripture

Jesus—God Himself—created the universe, the earth, and everything in it:

*In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God...All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made (John 1:1,3).*

*For thus saith the Lord that created the heavens; God Himself that formed the earth and made it; He hath established it, He created it not in vain, He formed it to be inhabited: I am the Lord; and there is none else (Isaiah 45:18).*

The heavens, according to Scripture, were not derived from an arbitrary process but were created by God and proclaim the glory of God:

*By the word of the LORD were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth... For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast (Psalm 33:6,9).*

*The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork (Psalm 19:1).*

*Thou, even thou, art LORD alone; thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth, and all things that are therein, the seas, and all that is therein, and thou preservest them all; and the host of heaven worshippeth thee (Nehemiah 9:6).*

---

i. George G. Simpson, *The Meaning of Evolution: a Study of the History of Life and of its Significance for Man* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949).

ii. Ariel A. Roth, *Origins: Linking Science and Scripture* (Review and Herald Publishing Company, 1998).



## Understanding The Creation Week

Compromise between Creation and evolution is not possible. The Bible clearly states that Creation occurred in one week, in a sequence that does not match up with natural selection or other evolutionary processes.

### Six Literal Days

Some scientists try to find common ground between Creation and evolution by converting the seven days of Genesis 1 into long time periods. This change allows for evolution to occur within the framework of the Creation story.

However, Genesis 1 clearly indicates that the Creation was in fact seven literal 24-hour days.

Consider verses 5, 8, and 13 as examples:

*And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning were the first day...*

*And God called the firmament Heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day...*

*And the evening and the morning were the third day.*

The use of the definite article "the" in the designation of the days implies a literal 24-hour day. Also, the specific mention of the day cycle, "the evening and the morning" further proves that the author implies literal days.

### The Order of Creation

Evolution clearly cannot fit into the Creation paradigm because of the time constraints of the seven-day Creation period. Moreover, the sequence of events suggested by evolution do not align with the order in which Creation occurred.

The first three days of Creation involve the physical environment, and the next three days involve the filling of that environment.

On day one God creates light, on day two He creates the sky. On the third day, God creates the terrestrial environment by gathering the water into one place and letting dry land appear in another. He then creates the plants, which are to serve as food for the life forms to be created on the subsequent days.

## The Days of Creation

<b>Make</b>	Day 1	Sunday	Light created and divided from darkness.
	Day 2	Monday	Atmosphere created and divided from oceans.
	Day 3	Tuesday	Land created and divided from water. Vegetation created.
<b>Fill</b>	Day 4	Wednesday	Sun, moon and stars created to fill the sky.
	Day 5	Thursday	Creatures created to fill sky and water.
	Day 6	Friday	Creatures created to fill land. Man created as pinnacle of Creation.
<b>Rest</b>	Day 7	Saturday	God rested from all His work.

*Adapted from Pastor Zack Terry's Six Day Creation Chart.*

This order of Creation leaves no room for co-evolution of plants and animals, which is a basic premise of the evolutionary theory. Here the plants are designed as a source of food and the animals that will make use of these for sustenance are specifically created to occupy the prepared niche. Any co-dependence is thus by virtue of Design rather than evolution.

On the fourth day, God creates the sun and the moon. If we were to suggest that the days of Creation represent long periods of time, our dilemma would be that the plants, created on day three, would have had to exist without a sun for millions of years.

On the fifth day, God creates all the creatures that swim and fly, and on the sixth day, He creates the land creatures. Here again we cannot reconcile the Biblical record of the days of Creation with the long time periods needed for evolution.

According to the theory of evolution, birds and mammals evolved from reptiles. However, birds and flying mammals were created on the fifth day—before the terrestrial reptiles created on the sixth day. Birds and flying mammals would thus have preceded their ancestors.

A similar problem is encountered when we consider the marine mammals such as the whales, dolphins, and seals which would also precede their ancestors. According to the evolutionary theory, these marine mammals evolved from land mammals that

were forced to move to marine environments. But we know that sea mammals were created before land mammals.

### **A Big God and a Good Creation**

As we can see from Genesis 1:2-5, God Himself is the source of light, and the source of life:

*And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning were the first day.*

The world was created intentionally by a loving, powerful God. We are no mistake—Earth is not the product of a series of cosmic accidents, nor is humanity the result of a million-year happenstance evolution. God loves every creature on Earth, and has a hopeful future waiting for you (Jeremiah 29:11).

## Geocentricity: It's Time to Face the Facts

In his useful little book *Better Thinking and Reasoning*, Ron Tagliapietra gives a good introduction to how one should approach evidence and draw reasonable conclusions. But he unwittingly gives an even better example of how one can be completely misled by starting with erroneous information to reason about.

There are two topics in particular, dear to the hearts of secular humanist scientists, which have been used repeatedly to "refute" the Bible—topics on which it is difficult to find genuine, unbiased, undistorted information. Unfortunately most Christians have not taken the trouble to search out the truth in either case, possibly because they have never realized they had been fed red herrings instead of real meat.

### Evolution

The prime example is, of course, evolution, which was no more than a dubious hypothesis when Darwin popularized it.

It has needed to be repeatedly propped up by half-truths, fraud and self-deception—as peddled by Ernst Haeckel, Teilhard de Chardin, Henry Fairfield Osborne, and numerous others—to maintain that status. It is being supported today by refusal to face hard facts of well established science such as the second law of thermodynamics, of informatics, and astounding findings of microbiology. Such difficulties are brushed over with red herrings. A favorite these days is variation within a kind; that is, dark or light peppered moths, fish with this or that color gills, or change in allele ratios.

Variation within a kind has little or nothing to do with evolution in the sense that we are led to think of—the progress of molecules to men. It also has nothing to do with what the Bible tells us—creatures are to reproduce "after their kind," while little is said about how much variation is possible within each kind.

Evolution, in the sense that we are supposed to accept, teaches reproduction from one kind to another, which is a process totally unknown to science.

### The Copernican Revolution

It is even more difficult to find the truth when it comes to the second favorite topic, the story of the Copernican revolution. It was such an important milestone in the fight against the Bible that few secular humanists are keen to allow the facts to actually emerge, and all is usually so skillfully disguised by half-truths, ridicule and obfuscation that even reasonably serious scholars like Ron Tagliapietra have been kept from even suspecting the reality. We see the first red herring in the very first sentence of his discussion:

*Copernicus is credited with the heliocentric theory. He proposed that the sun is the center of the solar system.*

Now the solar system is a recent concept which Copernicus never mentioned. Neither did Galileo, Ptolemy, or any of the other players in the drama. The solar system is irrelevant to the discussion. The Bible makes no mention of the solar system. It is a concept which could only be proposed once Newton's theory of gravity made such an idea possible.

The solar system can be thought about, but never actually isolated. One can write equations about it, but nothing absolute can be verified about their conclusions. One can make models of it, but they are deficient models, they ignore the vastly more massive and gravitationally important remainder of the universe.

Biblically it is foolish to talk about the "solar system" as any kind of reality since we know that Jesus is "upholding all things by the word of his power" (Hebrews 1:3). To examine the solar system and see how it would work on its own we would have to take that part of creation out of his hands. From a purely "scientific" point of view it might well collapse if it could be removed from the surrounding universe.

One can, however, convince oneself quite easily that in a purely hypothetical mathematical model of the solar system (where the rest of the universe is of necessity ignored completely) the sun would be at its center and the rest of the system, the earth included, would revolve around it.

Why is the irrelevant solar system sneaked in to the Copernican discussion at all?

Copernicus held that the sun was the center of the entire universe, as did Galileo and the rest of the protagonists.

Scientists assuredly do not believe that today. To admit that the heroes of the fight against Biblical inerrancy were wrong would not be good for the cause.

The next and equally popular deception passed off upon us comes in Tagliapietra's next sentence:

*The competing geocentric (or Ptolemaic) theory that the earth is the centre of the solar system.*

Now not only was Ptolemy concerned with the entire universe (not the solar system), but his system is not, as implied, the one and only model for geocentricity. Several have been proposed, some have never been refuted. It was Aristotle's model which Galileo sought successfully to refute, it was Tycho Brahe's against which Galileo was called to defend the Copernican. Galileo was unsuccessful, he could not demonstrate any fatal flaw in Brahe's model, nor superiority in that of Copernicus.

Two further deceptions about Ptolemy's method are found in the rest of the discussion. First, Copernicus' model was neither more accurate, nor less complicated than Ptolemy's. Copernicus had to use considerably more epicycles than Ptolemy. What those who would pull the wool over our eyes do is to compare an early version of Ptolemy's method of calculation not against that of Copernicus, but against that of Kepler and Newton after improvement by many years of research and refinement.

Second, Ptolemy and his epicycles are not the primitive and outdated objects of fun the humanists would have us believe. The most convenient means of calculating planetary positions today is still Ptolemy's, though his method has been modernized into "Fourier analysis", and his "epicycles" are now "terms in an infinite series." The most improved versions of Kepler's method are still not superior in accuracy and convenience.

### Is the Bible True?

Now most Christians, Ron Tagliapietra included, are side-tracked by the red herring of the solar system (where the earth clearly cannot be stationary at the center), fail to look any further, assume that the geocentric position is utterly untenable, and search for ways to "excuse" the Bible for its "mistaken" stand and interpret it to say something different.

To the Bible-believers of Copernicus's day there was simply no doubt about the Bible's geocentricity. Copernicus said, "surely it is more reasonable to assume that the earth rotates once each day than that the entire universe rotates around it."

Calvin countered with, "The heavens revolve daily; immense as is their fabric, and inconceivable the rapidity of their revolutions" (commentary to Psalm 93:1) in deliberate scripture-based contradiction.

Luther, speaking of Copernicus's idea said, "Even in these things which are thrown into disorder I believe the Holy Scriptures."

Galileo was so confident that the Bible puts the earth stationary at the centre of the universe that to disregard it he had to say, "In matters concerning the natural sciences Holy Writ must occupy the last place."

Why were they so certain of the Bible's stand?

Well, for one thing, Genesis 1 tells us that God created the unformed watery waste of the earth on the first day. On day two He separated the waters above from the waters below by an expanse called the "firmament," and on the fourth day He set the sun moon and stars in this firmament. Where is the possibility for the day-one-created earth to be circling around the day-four-created sun?

And why should the Bible say, "He...hangeth the earth upon nothing" (Job 26:7), if in fact the earth is not hanging on nothing, but whirling around at a hundred thousand

kilometres per hour on the end of a gravitational cord of billions of tons of attraction from the sun?

And again Psalm 19 says of the sun, he "rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race. His going forth is from the end of the heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it." This gives the sun a circuit round which to run, not the earth.

It is fairly clear why the Bible believers of the era saw Copernicus, Galileo, and their heliocentric theory as a challenge to Biblical authority. What is not so clear, until one looks a little deeper, is why today's supporters of heliocentricity have to resort to red herrings and an avoidance of the truth. Unfortunately for their case many experiments were performed specifically to demonstrate and measure the motion of the earth around the sun.

To everyone's surprise and grief all of them gave the speed of the earth's movement through space to be a stunning zero. No significant movement could be measured at all. The most famous of the experiments was done by Michelson and Morely. Typical of comments on their results are those of Bernard Jaffe:

*The data were almost unbelievable. there was only one other possible conclusion to draw, that the earth was at rest. This, of course, was preposterous.*

As "preposterous" as the measurements of Arago, Trouton and Noble, Airy, Thorndyke and Kennedy, Theodore de Coudres, and several others. They also found the earth to have a zero velocity through space.

One of South Africa's most highly respected scientists, world-renowned cosmologist Professor George Ellis, noted this:

*I can construct you a spherically symmetrical universe with Earth at its centre, and you cannot disprove it based on observations.<sup>i</sup>*

Nor can you prove it by observations. As with every Biblical question it is a case of "the just shall live by faith" (Romans 1:17). To disbelieve the Bible's geocentric stand takes just as much faith as to accept it—it cannot be disproved by any known observation. The only way to know for certain would be to stand on some fixed point outside the universe and look in. Unfortunately none of us is able to do that.

But we may chose to believe the testimony of the One who can.

---

i. George Ellis, "Thinking Globally, Acting Universally", *Scientific American* (October 1995).