

Is Jesus Greater Than Anti-Evolutionism?

S. Joshua Swamidass*

Jesus Christ is the end of all, and the center to which all tends.
Whoever knows Him knows the reason of everything.
—Blaise Pascal¹

I am a *confessing scientist*, a scientist in the church and a Christian in science, serving with a truthful account of what I have seen. Having searched all over, I have a simple message: Jesus is greater. Even if evolution is false, Jesus is greater than anti-evolutionism. Even if evolution is true, it cannot restrain the One who rose from the dead. Even while evolution is a mystery, nothing in science darkens the light of Jesus.

Whatever we believe about evolution, Jesus invites us to trust in Him. He can be our confidence. We can leave the creation war. The gospel does not require our defense. Instead, let us bear witness, and turn to confessing in science that He is risen.²

A Christian in Science

I am a science professor at Washington University in Saint Louis, a leading science university. I lead a research group that uses math and computers to understand biology, chemistry, and medicine.

I am also a Christian. I affirm the historical Creeds (Apostles' and Nicene) and the more recently written Lausanne Covenant. I believe that Jesus, a man in first-century Palestine, died for our sins and was buried. Three days later, God bodily raised Jesus from the dead and He was seen by many.

This is how God chose to reveal Himself to all mankind; He exists, is good, and wants to be known. To this self-declaration, I respond with trust. Because of this historical event, I trust the Bible as God's authoritative written word to all of us. It is inerrant and infallible in all that it affirms. The One who rose from the dead is entirely able to preserve His written message to us through history.

* S. Joshua Swamidass is Assistant Professor in the Department of Pathology and Immunology at Washington University, St. Louis, MO; swamidass@wustl.edu.

¹ Pascal—*Pensées*, edition de Port-Royal, 1670, PD-1923.

² “When people utter the sentence, ‘I confess that Jesus is Lord,’ they are confessing. They are not stating a fact about Jesus. They are enacting a commitment by speaking. By making the confession, you bind yourself to what you confess.” Joel Okamoto, “Making Sense of Confessionalism Today,” *Concordia Journal* 41, no. 1 (2015): 34, Article 5.

From His written word, then, I believe that God created us; He designed us all. He brought us all into existence with providential purpose, forethought, and care. According to Scripture, His way of creating us was not instantaneous and was part of an indirect process; He asked the land to “give forth” many kinds of life (Gn 1:11 and 1:24). This might tell us something about what the land is capable of producing.

Next, He created Adam and Eve: real people from our past, to whom we all trace our lineage. According to Scripture, He did not make them out of nothing, popping them into existence. Rather, He made Adam from the “dust of the earth” and Eve from Adam's “rib,” or literally his “side,” with the capacity to reflect God’s image. He created them as the first beings with opportunity to communion with Him. It was good for a time, but not perfect. Then, moving from naivety, Adam and Eve chose to understand good and evil for themselves, and this brought them into accountability and judgement for their sin. In the scientific details, I am an imaginative agnostic, but I confess the theological facts as true.

Just like them, we also reflect “God’s image,” but our substance is of the “dust.” We live under the same judgement, if not for the grace demonstrated to us through Jesus. The ultimate end of mankind remains the same as it was in the beginning—to enter into communion with God.

In this world, we can only understand God clearly through what He chooses to reveal to us. No human effort can bring us to Him, not even science. We are dependent on His self-revelation. And in this world, we find His clearest revelation in the Living Word: the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus.

As for me, I encountered Jesus. He is greater than anything I find in this world, including science. He reorders my entire world. He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life (Jn 14:6). Nothing compares to Him. I follow Him.

Finding Confident Faith³

My story in science is a search for confident faith.

Growing up, I first believed because my family believed. My mother told me of Jesus when I was a toddler and I believed. This was enough at first, but not enough. When I was about ten, I decided that I would only follow Jesus if this faith was true. But how could I know this?

Here, I first encountered the Resurrection and how God left us evidence as a sign that Jesus rose from the dead. Reading about evidence grew my faith, and I began to trust this act of God. My trust was rooted in God’s work in history, but my faith was not mature. I was tempted away.

I doubted Jesus and placed my trust in scientific arguments. Raised as a young earth creationist, I was threatened by and fearful of evolution. It unsettled my confidence. In high school, I placed my trust in creation science. This human effort to study nature built my confidence with scientific arguments. At first it worked. My faith, however, became insecure

³ Parts of this section are adapted from S. Joshua Swamidass, “Finding Confident Faith in Science,” *Didaskalia* 27 (2017): 165–88.

faith, subject to the human effort to study nature. My faith was threatened by anyone smarter or more informed than I. In college, I trusted in the scientific arguments of Intelligent Design. It emboldened me to study science, and here I found my calling. I soon found, however, that these human arguments were sinking sand, always threatened and unstable. I was putting my trust in the wrong things, in human words and effort.

Something needed to change, and it did. Over the course of several years, I came again to root my confidence firmly in Jesus. At first it was in the evidence for the Resurrection. God raised Jesus from the dead to demonstrate He exists, is good, and wants to be known. This is the “one sign” He offers the world, and became enough for me.

All this is true, but there is more. I still struggle to explain this. Somehow, there is this presence that pervades my life. My awareness of it developed slowly over the decades. It is not unique to me and it is not controlled by me. I cannot scientifically prove it. I do not understand it. Some may write this off as unverifiable and unscientific babble. I understand that this all may seem simple-minded, and not nearly sophisticated enough to explain a professor’s faith. I do not have an intellectual argument to offer that might compare with Jesus. I agree, this is not science, but it is an invitation to come, taste, and see. I myself do see Him.⁴ I see His hand, shaping me as a potter shapes clay, in my past, my present, and my future. I follow Jesus because He is alive. He is real. He is good.

Here, the gospel’s prophetic voice in science is most clear. Our world sees science as the most trusted source of truth. In this scientific world, scientific arguments are esteemed above all others. But what can science say about the Resurrection? What can science say about God? What can science say of the darkness in this world? What can science say of our destiny? No experiment can guide us here. Science is silent on these most important questions. All my scientific training is meaningless. All my scientific arguments are shifting. All my scientific evidence is fading. All my wise and persuasive words are inadequate. Thus, at the cross, my idolatry of science comes to die. As science fades away, I am left with an effortless, proper confidence. I am brought back to the same gospel that my mother shared with me as a toddler. I see Jesus, and He silences my doubt.

Still, my younger self puzzles me. An insecure faith, building on science’s shifting sand, puzzles me. An impoverished gospel in want of scientific assurance puzzles me. A threatened gospel needing scientists’ defense puzzles me. Even deeply embedded in science as a professor, I do not need scientific arguments to follow Jesus.

⁴ For those that want a philosophical defense of personal experience as an important source of knowledge, I point to the philosophy of science expressed by Michael Polanyi’s *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958) and Alvin Plantinga’s trilogy: *Warrant: The Current Debate* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); *Warrant and Proper Function* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); and *Warranted Christian Belief* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Rethinking Science

With this confidence, my understanding of science began to change. How could I add to God's work to reveal Himself? How could I add to God's perfect revelation? What other signs beyond the "one sign" could there be?

I no longer looked to science for proof of God. There was no need to do this when Jesus was so clearly seen. I could finally read Scripture without insisting from the outset on rejecting evolution. As I studied the Bible, I found that nothing in evolution contradicted my faith. For the first time, I could understand nature on its own terms, knowing my faith was on solid ground without need of arguments for God. As I studied science, I saw more and more evidence for evolution. Through this process, I came to believe that evolution is the way God created us, the way He designed us.

My objections to evolution were resolved by reading Scripture. For example, evolution in science does not explicitly acknowledge God's role in creating us. However, God's providence governs all things. If and when and how God acts in this world, science cannot see. Somehow, if God is involved, He is hidden here.

I can accept God's hiddenness in creation because I see the same hiddenness in the cross. In His last days, the world conspires to murder Jesus. The religious leaders plot; Pilate orders the innocent to die to appease the crowd, and the disciples flee. We see Jesus die with common criminals. He is buried because no one expects him to rise again. Through Scripture, however, we find that God is working here, and Jesus is laying His life down willingly. But who can give account for God's action here? How exactly did His providence govern this event? How could we know this was God's work at this moment? No, God is hidden here, in the cross, at this point of most importance.

It is no surprise, therefore, that a detailed account of His action is hidden from view in creation. If evolution is true, it would just be the incomplete, human description of the process by which land gives forth life of many kinds (Gn 1:11, 24). Just as the Bible discusses God's providence over lots (Prv 16:33), science discusses randomness in poker, dice, and genetic mutations. We do this, however, knowing that we speak from a limited human perspective. God knows the outcome of all these "random" events, and governs them according to providential concerns.

In this way, I came to see evolution as God's way of creating us. I saw clear evidence for evolution and saw no contradiction with Scripture. My trust in Jesus led me here. Now, more than ever, I am convinced that nothing in science diminishes Jesus. Whether evolution is true or false, it does not threaten Him. Jesus is greater than science.

Anti-Evolutionism and Fear

Anti-evolutionism tempted me from trusting Jesus. In this way, anti-evolutionism was a *false* worldview rooted in fear and human effort. It teaches that our world is divided between accepting and denying evolution, between theism and atheism, where creation is God's sign and science becomes a "prize" in an epic culture war.

In this false worldview, rejection of evolution becomes a litmus test that exposes true loyalties in a great ideological war. Opposition to evolution becomes the organizing philosophy within the church; scientific arguments against evolution build our confidence, define our witness, unify our community, and direct our devotion. In anti-evolutionism, we doubt the power of the gospel among those that believe in evolution, hoping that evidence for creation will point our world to God.

To be clear, the problem here is *not* specific models of our origins. Young earth creationism or progressive creationism itself is not the problem. Many reject evolution because they feel it is incompatible with Scripture, or because they are not convinced by the scientific evidence. These beliefs usually reflect honest effort to follow God. Whether right or wrong, these honest beliefs are not wrong.

The real problem is the fearful way Jesus is understood. In anti-evolutionism, Jesus is hidden. He is irrelevant to the debate, but threatened all the same. Jesus is a helpless bystander in need of our defense. When Jesus is mentioned, it is to claim that creation is the foundation of the gospel, and that those who follow Jesus must fight against evolution too. This fight depends on our effort, our study of nature, and our arguments. We are right to fear because this emphasis on human effort is frightening.

The real Jesus, the one we find in Scripture, does not need our defense. He is not a helpless bystander. No, He is powerful. We go to Him for protection, and He does not need our arguments.

Seekers in Science

Anti-evolutionism does not just destabilize our faith; it also directs our attention away from the gospel. We offer scientific arguments as the reason for our hope instead of pointing to Jesus.

Recently, a science graduate student from China was curious about Jesus. His wife had been talking to Christians and reading the Bible, and before long she encountered Jesus. He was compelling, and she wanted to follow Him. She began to talk to her husband, the scientist, about her path to faith. He was curious and wanted to know about Jesus. He started meeting with a campus minister, reading the Bible, and spending time with Christians. Like most seekers in a scientific world, He was uncertain how to think about science if He chose to follow Jesus. He got two conflicting messages.

On one hand, the campus minister reassured him that the gospel came first. He encouraged the student to focus on Jesus, and to trust Him. Evolution, as well as the age of the earth, was something Christians disagreed about and

was not the foundation of our faith. Maybe this would make sense down the line, but it was a mystery now. Jesus was still worth his trust.

On the other hand, the Chinese church he was exploring with his wife argued that rejecting evolution was necessary to follow Jesus. They taught him that there was no reason to follow Jesus if he would not reject both evolution and affirm a young earth. If Genesis was not true, as this pastor interpreted it, then Jesus did not really die for his sins. He could only follow Jesus if he would also believe in six-day creation, less than ten thousand years ago.

The student went back and forth in confusion for over a year. He would talk to the campus minister, and be encouraged on his path to follow Jesus. Then he would talk to the church's pastor, and here encounter insurmountable barriers to his belief. He tried to engage the church's arguments and to take them seriously. These arguments, however, were not convincing. His heart could not believe what his mind rejected.

After a year of effort and confusion passed, the student just gave up, returned to his work, and stopped seeking Jesus. He was nearing the end of his PhD, and the workload was sharply increasing. He needed to focus his efforts there. Our argument about evolution did not make sense to him. He found Jesus compelling, but could not trust our argument.

The campus minister was heartbroken. He described it as "the most depressing thing" he had ever witnessed in ministry. I know that the church pastor was doing the best he could. I am sure he was disappointed, too. Still, I cannot help but think of Jesus's words,

If anyone causes one of these little ones—those who believe in me—to stumble, it would be better for them if a large millstone were hung around their neck and they were thrown into the sea. (Mk 9:42).

Our arguing does not encourage trust. Our anti-evolutionism is not kind. It is cruel to insist that seekers reject evolution before they know and trust Jesus. It is wrong to ask them to trust our arguments instead of trusting Jesus. Such insistence injures them, and hides the true gospel from their view. Ideas are not worth following. Preformed worldviews are not compelling, but Jesus is trustworthy. I wish the pastor had said something like this,

Even if you believe in evolution, trust and follow Jesus. He is worthy.

He is not diminished by anything in science. Of course, many Christians, including me, think evolution is wrong. I am happy to explain why I reject it. At the same time, many Christians think God used evolution to create us, and maybe this is the type of Christian you will become.

Do not let our debate about evolution stop you from trusting Jesus. He is worthy of your trust.

This assurance directs the seeker to Jesus, the One who is greater than both evolutionism and anti-evolutionism, the One greater than all our arguments. He truthfully teaches the diversity of the church. While acknowledging his opposition to evolution, the pastor could have worshipfully submitted this opposition to the gospel.

Seekers in science usually do not trust the Bible when we attempt to prove science wrong. Often, seekers start by trusting Jesus, and then they trust the Bible, because this is where they find Him. The doctrine of evolution can remain an unanswered mystery for a long time. There is no rush.

Defending Jesus

My anti-evolutionism was driven by both fear and a desire to defend Jesus. I Peter 3:15 tells us, “Always be ready to give a defense for the hope that lies within us.” Maybe a better translation of *apologia* in this passage is “explanation” rather than “defense.” In my anti-evolutionism, I wanted a reason to hold onto my arguments. I preferred to read this as a “defense.” But does Jesus need to be defended?

John 18:10 tells us that the night that Jesus was taken, Simon Peter, who had a sword, drew it and struck the high priest’s servant, cutting off his right ear (the servant’s name was Malchus). Jesus said to him,

Put your sword back in its place, for all who draw the sword will die by the sword. Do you think I cannot call on my Father, and he will at once put at my disposal more than twelve legions of angels? But how then would the Scriptures be fulfilled that say it must happen in this way? (Mt. 26:52-54)

And He touched the man’s ear and healed him (Lk 22:51). Then all the disciples fled—Jesus was taken, and soon He went to the cross. Though we see the Romans forcibly taking Jesus, we know that He willingly laid down His life for our sins. This was His purpose, and it did not match Peter’s.

In this story, Peter thought he was honoring Jesus. Peter thought the time for war has come, and hoped to install Jesus as a political leader. He was wrong. Jesus did not come for power. He came for peace. He came to suffer and die.

The explanation Jesus gives is important. First, He reminds Peter that he is not called to war. “Put your sword back in its place.” As much as we bend toward fighting, Jesus reminds us that fighting is not what we are made for, and it can lead to our deaths. Second, He reminds Peter that He is powerful, with “more than twelve legions of angels” at His disposal. The reason He is taken, it seems, is not His powerlessness. Third, He reminds Peter that He has a purpose here different than ours. We are inclined to human power, but Jesus has a different purpose.

Why does Peter leap to defend Jesus? He forgets his calling to peace, to rest in the power of Jesus, and the purpose declared in Scripture. Why do we leap to defend Jesus, thinking of him as a helpless bystander in our human debates? We also forget our calling to peace, forget His power, and forget the purpose He declares in Scripture.

What is His purpose? Jesus is the Way and the Truth and the Life (Jn 14:6). God’s eternal power and divine nature is clearly seen in nature (Rm 1:19–20), even *without* modern science. But Jesus is even more clear than creation. He alone is the “exact representation” of God’s being (Heb 1:3). Through Him, we see God’s identity. This is His purpose. It is through Jesus that God clearly makes known to the whole world that He exists, is good, and wants to be known.

Our scientific world is skeptical and asks for evidence. Anti-evolutionism offers arguments against evolution, the products of a human effort to study nature. We find that Jesus has only “one sign” for skeptics: not creation, but the Resurrection (Mt 12:38–45). Our choice is between human effort and God’s. Will we look to human efforts to study nature, or God’s perfect work in Jesus? Where will we place our confidence?

Honestly Guiding Seekers

When we focus our message on Jesus instead of anti-evolutionism, we truthfully explain the real reason for our hope. We find that Jesus is compelling in our scientific world.

In 1999, I was a senior undergraduate student at the University of California–Irvine. Another science student found out that I was a Christian in science. He was a year behind me and was in science, too. A girl he liked followed Jesus, and he wanted to know more about her faith. He found the gospel compelling, and was considering trusting Jesus. The problem, though, was our argument about evolution. None of our arguments against evolution were as compelling as the gospel. To him, at least, the arguments against evolution did not make sense. What was he to make of this?

We talked for about an hour. Evolution and science was a stumbling block. He wanted to believe Jesus. The argument about evolution, however, was unconvincing and befuddling. “Is this what it means to be a Christian?” I answered with the truth about the church and my beliefs:

The foundation of our faith is Jesus: His life, death, and resurrection. Trust and follow Him, even if the rest does not yet make sense.

Right now, there is disagreement in the church about evolution. Some feel they can prove evolution is false and think it is incompatible with the Bible. Others are convinced evolution is both consistent with the Bible and God’s way of creating us. Here, I see a mystery. I accept the Bible as inerrant and infallible, but I do not know yet how this fits with evolution.

Whatever you come to believe, do not let evolution stop you from trusting Jesus. He is worthy of your trust.

After this, we did not meet again for many years. A bit self-absorbed, I wondered, “Why did he not want to explore more with me about how faith and science interacted?” Later, I found out that this conversation removed evolution as his stumbling block. He did not need to talk any more. He decided to follow Jesus soon after. He married the girl he liked. He went to graduate school to become a scientist. Currently, he follows Jesus as a professor at a leading secular university. Now, after the gospel has taken root, would be a time to enter the doctrine of our origins, and understand together what to think of evolution. The gospel, though, had to come first.

This is exactly how it is supposed to be. The conversation about evolution and science is not supposed to be an argument. Most seekers only need gentle reassurance that Jesus is worthy of trust and a truthful explanation of the full range of Christian belief. Evolution should never be the stumbling block to trusting Jesus.

Years later, my friend told me this conversation was “one of the most significant and important in his life.” We do best for seekers by silencing the argument. We do best by truthfully agreeing that evolution is inconsequential in our early steps of faith.

*Evolution and the Light of Jesus*⁵

Jesus is still compelling in science. Nothing in science diminishes His power.

This is clear in my own faith, and in the way scientists, seekers, and skeptics come to follow Jesus in the scientific world. Usually, they are driven by curiosity, not personal or scientific deficiency. Usually, they do not come to Jesus by rejecting or doubting evolution. Usually, they come to follow Jesus for the same reasons as the rest of us. They encounter Jesus, and He illuminates their world. They trust Him.

They encounter Jesus in the Bible, seeing His life, teachings, death, and resurrection. They encounter Him in great Christian classics like C. S. Lewis’s *Mere Christianity*, Josh McDowell’s *More than a Carpenter*, and Augustine’s *Confessions*. They encounter Him in surprising moments with Christians, as He seeps through from deep within. They encounter Him in loneliness and pain, when He meets them in their storms. They encounter Him at home and on holidays, when family shares their unvarnished journeys to faith. They encounter Him in colleagues and students, those who follow Jesus in the scientific world. They find that Jesus is compelling. He is beautiful. He is unique. Nothing in science compares with Him. Nothing in science diminishes Him.

I like to tell the story of how Dr. Francis Collins came to faith. Collins is now the head of the National Institute of Health, one of the most influential and significant positions in science. Scientists know him as one of their own, and they trust him. Collins is also a Christian. He tells his colleagues this story in his book *The Language of God*.⁶ Like me, he spent nearly a decade in graduate school in a combined MD and PhD program. This included four years in medical school and an extended apprenticeship in science. He was an atheist and believed in evolution. He was in his late twenties, doing well, and in his last years of medical school. He was entirely unimpressed by scientific arguments for God. Most would assume he was entirely beyond the gospel’s grasp.

Then, in a rotation in medical school, He encountered a patient. She had cancer and was dying. But in her Collins encountered an otherworldly peace. She explained her faith in Jesus and asked Collins, “What do you believe?” He did not know, and from that moment Jesus haunted him.⁷ Collins was

⁵ This section was adapted from the article first published in S. Joshua Swamidass, “Finding Confident Faith in Science,” *Didaskalia* 27 (2017): 165–88.

⁶ Francis S. Collins, *The Language of God: A Scientist Presents Evidence for Belief* (New York: Free Press, 2006).

⁷ I use the word “haunt” in a way that echoes James K. A. Smith in *How (Not) to Be Secular* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014). Our secular age is “haunted” with awareness of the spiritual

confused and struggled to understand. A Methodist minister he met smiled and said to him, “I think you’d learn a lot if you’d read this book on my shelf. It was written by somebody who has traveled the same path—a scholar who was an atheist at Oxford and tried to figure out whether there was truth or not to religion.” The minister pointed Collins to C. S. Lewis’s classic *Mere Christianity*.

In *Mere Christianity*, Collins was struck by two specific truths. First, even if science turns out to be correct about evolution, Lewis explains that a scientific description of the world would still be incomplete. For example, we all know that ethics is important and speaks to a type of truth: racism, genocide, and eugenics are all morally wrong. But nothing in science can reliably derive moral statements and principles, or even make sense of why these things are wrong. Science, therefore, is not a complete understanding of the world. This argument from morality is not a scientific argument against evolution, but a clear explanation of why the science-only worldview of “evolutionism” is incomplete.

Lewis also explains the gospel. Jesus is the embodied message of an immortal God who is beyond our understanding, beyond our science. God proves Jesus is His messenger by raising Him from the dead. God offers His sign through this act in our world, and not through science. The gospel resonates with Collins, and explains the cancer patient’s hope. Jesus completed his view of the world. Soon after, immersed in nature’s beauty, Collins also responds with trust. Now in him the gospel continues.

Scientists hear Collins’s story and puzzle over it. His path follows no scientific logic. It makes no scientific sense. His story is like a movie missing its key scene. It is like seeing an answer without knowing the question. How could one interaction with a dying patient be so significant? We, as Christians, understand. This was an encounter with the infinite, a transcendent thing, when eyes were opened. Collins encountered Jesus.

Nonetheless, Christians hear Collins’s story and they too puzzle over it because Collins continues to believe in evolution. Yet Jesus is undiminished by his belief in evolution. For Collins to come to faith, no scientific arguments were needed. We do not understand, but we should. We trust Jesus because the resurrection reveals an unimaginably good God, not because evolution is right or wrong. Nothing in science can overcome the light of Jesus.

Collins is not unique. Science is secular in the sense that it does not consider spiritual things, but it still is haunted. A living God is here; he is found by those who seek him.

One of my colleagues, an atheist professor, recently came to trust in Jesus. While she is not a scientist, she lives in a scientific world and believes in evolution. Reading about the faith of others, she was curious. She started reading the Bible, and there encountered Jesus.⁸ As she puts it, Jesus was so

that is not often understood or named. There are “thin places” where we are more aware that there is more to our world than secularism acknowledges.

⁸ She read the Gospels, the four books in the Bible that tell the story of Jesus’s life, including Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.

clearly real and a person of His own time, but He also spoke from outside of it. He could not be only a product of first-century Palestine. He was attractive. He was “gripping.” In this person, she put her trust. Of course, she believes He died and rose again, but not because she could find no better explanation. Rather, knowing Jesus made easy her belief.

I asked, “Do you believe the Bible because of Jesus, or Jesus because of the Bible?” After some careful thought, she explained that she did not start reading the Bible believing it was true. It is not as if she read “Jesus was God,” and then therefore believed “He is God.” No, she encountered Jesus in the Bible, and came to trust in Jesus. Her trust in the Bible followed, because this is where she found Him. Just as the infallible, useful, and authoritative Bible teaches, the Bible itself is not the foundation of the gospel; only Jesus is the cornerstone (Eph 2:20; 1 Cor 15:14; Acts 17:31).

In both stories, two atheists in science trusted in Jesus, without first believing in God. Of course, they believe in God now, but they do so because they trusted Jesus and He made easy their belief. The most that scientific arguments can do is encourage theism, but belief in God is not trust in Jesus. The gospel is different and stands alone. It does not depend on arguments for God; Jesus Himself unsettles atheism. He Himself is proof enough that God exists. As the great scientist Pascal writes,

We know God only by Jesus Christ . . . All those who have claimed to know God, and to prove him without Jesus Christ, have had only weak proofs. But in proof of Jesus Christ we have the prophecies, which are solid and palpable proofs. In him, then, and through him, we know God . . . through Jesus Christ, and in Jesus Christ, we prove God, and teach morality and doctrine.⁹

The light of Jesus overcomes the darkness in our scientific world. Even evolution, even atheism cannot dim it. He is our proper confidence.

Jesus is Greater

Science is grand and beautiful. It brings us into close contact with the beauty and mystery of nature, leaving us in awe and wonder. I devoted my career to science, and spend every day studying nature in this community.

Science is beautiful and grand. Still, I find nothing in science that diminishes Jesus. Nothing threatens Him, the One whom God raised from the dead. Jesus is greater than anything we find in science, greater than both evolutionism and anti-evolutionism.

Let us put our trust in Him.

⁹ Blaise Pascal, *Thoughts*, trans. William F. Trotter; *Letters*, trans. Mary L. Booth; *Minor Works*, trans. Orlando W. Wight (New York: P. F. Collier & Son, 1910), 547.