

“IN HIM WE LIVE”

by James W. Ward

The Bible makes no formal arguments for the existence of God. Yet in its simple, direct style, it breathes His name and power on every page. Scripture is not a science textbook, but it accords with what we know of scientific fact. One area of harmony is on the origin of life. Holy Writ says that life came from life, specifically from Eternal Life: God. Science is more general, but it too declares that life came from life, a precept known as the Law of Biogenesis.

Though it is not addressed to atheists but to polytheists, it is surprising how pertinent Paul's Areopagus speech in Acts seventeen is to the former. Consider these statements: "...He gives to all life, breath, and all things" (v. 25); "...He has made from one blood every nation of men..." (v. 26); "...in Him we live and move and have our being..." (v. 28). The capper, however, is verse 29: "Therefore, since we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Divine Nature is like gold or silver or stone, something shaped by art and man's devising."

These remarks are directed at idolaters, who worshiped the creations of their own hands, but this concept is hardly less scientific than that of the atheist: that life came from non-living matter. Perhaps as you mull that statement over, it will occur to you that atheists must believe in spontaneous generation. Yes, in spite of the work of Pasteur and others disproving this once common notion, atheists still hold to it. Surely not, you say! Let's look at a few quotes from atheistic scientists.

In **The Implications of Evolution**, Dr. G. A. Kerkut listed seven non-provable assumptions upon which evolution is founded. He said, "The first ...is that nonliving things gave rise to living material, i. e., spontaneous generation occurred." In 1957 Dr. Harold Blum wrote: "That life was 'spontaneously generated' from non-living matter at some time in the very remote past, and that this process has not been repeated for a long time are two basic tenets accepted by the great majority of biologists" (**Scientific Monthly**, 11/57, p. 251).

The next couple of quotations will reveal just how unscientific some scientists can be when it comes to discussing the origin of life. Dr. George Wald, also in **Scientific American**, said, "Most modern biologists, having reviewed with satisfaction the downfall of the spontaneous generation hypothesis, yet unwilling to accept the alternative belief in special creation, are left with nothingTo make an organism demands the right substances in the right proportions and in the right arrangement. We do not think that anything more is needed--but that is problem enough. One has only to contemplate the magnitude of this task to conceded that the spontaneous generation of a living organism is impossible. Yet here we are--as a result, I believe, of spontaneous generation" (8/54, pp. 45-53).

In **The Immense Journey**, Dr. Loren Eiseley, himself an evolutionist, wrote this unsparing assessment: "With the failure of these many efforts, science was left in the somewhat embarrassing position of having to postulate theories of living origins which it could not demonstrate. After having chided the theologian for his reliance on myth and miracle, science

found itself in the unenviable position of having to create a mythology of its own: namely, the assumption that what, after long effort, could not be proved to take place today, had, in truth, taken place in the primeval past" (pp. 201 f).

It is clear from these statements that some atheists do not reject the notion of God because it flies in the face of the evidence, but because He does not fit their philosophy or their world view. Aldous Huxley, in **Ends and Means**, was honest enough to make the following admission: "I had motives for not wanting the world to have a meaning; consequently assumed that it had noneThe philosopher who finds no meaning in the world is ...concerned to prove that there is no valid reason why he personally should not do as he wants to do. For myself, as, no doubt, for most of my contemporaries, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation from a certain political system of morality. We objected to the morality because it interfered with our sexual freedom ...There was one admirably simple method of justifying ourselves in our political and erotic revolt: we could deny that the world had any meaning whatsoever."

How is that essentially different from the Athenians who made Gods in their own image? In both cases, it comes down to deifying man, his intellect and his passions. But Paul's observation still stands, theologically and scientifically sound, "...In Him we live and move and have our being, as also some of your own poets have said, 'For we are also His offspring.'"