

Godless Evolution Part III

Restoration Summary

1. The restoration, according to Scripture, was accomplished as a series of divine acts. They were done in six literal days. These acts were highly organized and completely functioning from the beginning, and could very well have been formed with an appearance of age.
2. The restoration was completed and finished during a special period in the past, following which God "rested" in the sense that he had done everything good for man.
3. Thus, there remains no reason why we cannot or should not accept the creation and restoration recorded in Genesis as an historical, literal and factual account of the specific events which took place just as God declared. I would offer again, a caution to our brothers and sisters in Christ.
4. In our study I hope you noticed there is no indication of how long the planet has been around. Given the fact we have no idea how long the Earth existed in perfection before the fall of Satan, and given the fact we have no idea how long it took Satan to destroy God's perfection, we must not assert an age for the planet nor should we attempt to describe what was occurring on earth during either the age of perfection or the age of chaos. There is plenty of room for dinosaurs in the age of chaos.
5. Now that we know a little about Creation by Fiat, let's return to evolution the modern alternative.

Other Evidence of Evolution

1. Under the heading of "other evidence of evolution" we will look at some assumptions designed to stimulate your thinking.
 - 1.1 The evolutionist would dearly love for you to be convinced that change within various genres is scientific proof of evolution. It is a theory with no proof even after hundreds of years of determined searching.
 - 1.2 The proponents of evolution like to assert that evolution means "change over time." Such an assertion begs the question and is without controversy and change over time is not what all the hoopla is about. After all, don't animals change over time? Of course, they do.
 - 1.3 Evolution is not selective breeding, which produces thorough-bred race horses, pedigreed dogs, colored cotton, resistance to DDT or dark and light-colored moths etc.

2. Darwin's theory of evolution declares "life on earth began with a single cell life form, which evolved into multicell life forms, which as the result of the change process of random mutation, followed by natural selection, all without guidance or assistance from any intelligent entity like "God."

2.1 In other words, very complicated developments like, the human eye, morality, thumbs and a consciousness of mortality just happened by accident. The Darwinians will quickly say "but that's why it took billions and billions of years."

2.2 What Darwin's theory stresses is an accidental process which gave us the very complicated world in which we live. The two tools the evolutionist uses to support his basic theory are natural selection and random mutation.

Natural Selection

1. Natural selection was first credited to Charles Darwin a (preacher) it later became synonymous with the term "survival of the fittest." Darwin proposed that nature was constantly improving plants and animals in the sense that those best suited to the environment were surviving.

2. Darwin went much beyond this by asking his readers to believe this process explains how all life, both plant and animal, came into existence. Even if nature followed this process, which it does not, it takes a leap of faith to imagine that natural selection is a mechanism for evolution given the following problems:

3. Many useful characteristics would be liabilities instead of assets while in an incomplete state of evolution. As a result, the evolving species would probably not survive unless "nature" intervened with some type of protection or plan. Many species have characteristics which work against their best interest and some of these species are our oldest.

3.1 For example, the opossum feigns death and is often eaten rather than flight or fight. Professor Osmond Breland, a University of Texas Biology Professor says, "Whatever the reason for this performance it appears decidedly disadvantageous to future generations of opossums."

3.2 Many animals have developed deleterious effects which have resulted in the demise of the species. These evolving characteristics are supposed to get them into another species better fitted to the environment but since this has never been seen, we are left only to ponder what might we find in the future.

3.3 Some scientists have therefore felt obligated to offer a reason for the lack of evidence. The explanation is the old stand-by "things just happen too slowly, it takes millions of years." Many have asked, "How long must we wait for a single example?"

3.4 Clearly, many species change as environments dictate, but such changes are always intra-species changes and not “new species.” There have been cases where a reversal takes place, when environmental conditions change. A species may in fact change and then return to its original form because the environment changes.

3.5 Example: In England the number of dark colored moths of a certain genus disappeared. Taxonomists feared this disappearance was permanent—evidence of a lost species. Soon, however, the same genus of moths reappeared but as light-colored moths. An English medical doctor named H.B.D. Kettlewell gave up his lucrative practice of fifteen years to investigate this color change as evidence of evolution facilitated by natural selection.

3.5.1 He concluded in an article that appeared in *Scientific American Magazine* “this was the most striking change ever witnessed by man.” This event occurred just before the industrial revolution when the trees were light in color. It seems the birds found it easier to see the dark colored moths against the light-colored tree bark and thus the dark moths soon disappeared.

3.5.2 It was noted that the same genus of moths later appeared as light colored and thus declared to be evidence of a new species caused by natural selection. In some text books this case has been used to prove a change in species because of natural selection and yet it was stipulated by all concerned that the species was the same. Just the color of the moths changed.

3.6 Another widely reported change in a species because of natural selection was the observed ability of flies to develop resistance to DDT and this development was thought to be passed-on to their descendants. The next generation however did not cooperate fully because they were still just flies who resisted the poison.

4. In the May 24, 1995 addition of the *Wall Street Journal* there appeared a special front page report entitled *The Prehistoric Past Casts Ills in New Light*. The article written by Dr. S. Boyd Eaton contained many very interesting facts about prehistoric man, and how modern medicine had adopted practices which did not permit man to any longer evolve.

4.1 The major problem seemed to be, at least in the mind of the author, that the practice of medicine did not let the weaker members die off, therefore, natural selection was not permitted to refine and evolve a “better” human specimen.

4.1.1 One quote was particularly revealing, “Those who couldn't cope tended to be culled before they could mate and pass on their unfit gene variants. But somewhere around 100,000 years ago, our increasingly brainy forebears learned how to talk and use tools to block the cruel culling. Physically, we have changed little since.”

4.2 Interestingly the lack of evolution observed in man is now man's own fault. It would appear Dr. S Boyd Eaton is hard up for scientific data to support his lack of evolutionary sightings. So, we just keep on being the same old “unevolved” people.

Random Mutation

1. This is the Darwinians’ mechanism to carry out the natural selection. For example, the average textbook will say something like this: "Charles Darwin by natural selection had the theory of evolution almost complete but not being a geneticist, he lacked “the how to” of the theory.”

1.1 One such work goes on to say "today we have through the advancement of genetics the answer for a complete explanation—the “how to” is called mutation."

2. According to Webster a mutation is "a hypothetical change in heredity producing new individuals basically unlike their parents.” The text book writer will go on to give examples of how the color of an animal will change from that of its progenitors.

2.1 This, remember, is the great scientific area where Darwin needed training. This is what many textbook writers will glibly declare. The problem is our children and grandchildren will be taught by teachers who believe this stuff. The 1973 West Lake High School 10th grade biology textbook stated: "the following two examples are proof of evolution via natural selection, mutation and adaptation or ecological factors working together" and then we get the fly and DDT scenario already reviewed.

2.1.1 When evolutionists are making so much about examples like this you know they are in a "world of hurt for proof.”

3. Mutations are in most cases adverse or harmful to the species, even fatal or crippling. In 99 percent of the cases or as Huxley stated "more than 99 percent of all mutations are harmful.” Evolutionists use this circuitous logic to support their theory.

4. Even though by their own admission, more than 99 percent of mutations will harm the animal or insect by either killing or crippling it. You might ask, “How could that be?” Easy they just say, “See I told you it takes a long time because we have to wait on the less than one percent and that is why you never see any of this happening.”

Dating the Planet

1. Dating methods for geological time have nothing to do with the theory of evolution. The subject is often used in discussions among the evolutionists just to try to discredit the Bible. Repeatedly bringing up the subject is merely a diversionary tactic. The reason Darwinians continue to bring up the subject is because it is widely reported the Bible limits planet earth to about 8000 to 10,000 years. As we have earlier studied such is not the case.

2. Nothing could be further from the truth. In our categorical study of creation, chaos and restoration we saw that there is no scriptural basis for questioning what science now believes is a very old earth.

2.1 Recall our previous study: there is no one who knows how long the earth existed as a perfect creation, no one who knows how long it took Satan and his minions to “mess-up perfection,” and there is no one who knows how long Adam and Eve lived in the garden. Clearly, therefore, the old earth theories may be true.

3. Dating methods may suffer from inherent problems but such should be of little concern to the Christian.

4. Let’s review a few of these methods with the understanding the review is not designed to argue the age of the planet. The aim is simply to recognize the methods and a few of their weaknesses. Planet earth may indeed be millions of light years old given what we have just learned of the creation, the chaos and the restoration.

5. Fluoride-- as a body dies it begins to take-in fluoride and thus geologists have measured the amount of fluoride in a fossil as evidence of age. There is an obvious problem, however, the amount of fluoride is not distributed equally over the earth's surface. For this reason, this method is now discredited.

6. Carbon 14-- is produced as cosmic rays bombard nitrogen atoms in the atmosphere and carbon 14 is absorbed into the body during a life span. At death a body begins giving off carbon 14, the less carbon 14 the younger the specimen. Carbon 14 is a much-publicized dating method and one with much purported accuracy.

6.1 The truth of the matter, however, is not all that clear. There are some members of the scientific community who are somewhat skeptical: Professor William Lee Stokes in his book *Essentials of Earth History* writes, "The original enthusiasm over Carbon 14 dating was followed by a period of more cautious evaluation when many obviously incorrect dates came to light."

6.2 Ernest Antevic writing in the *Journal of Geology* said: "The apologist try a little too hard to make the geology fit the dates ... An informed geological estimate is better than a Carbon 14 date lacking geological support, even though the latter may appear attractive by giving an impression of definiteness ..."

6.3 Charles B. Hunt, President of The American Geological Institute said: "... radiocarbon dates are sufficiently scattered and erratic to provide some determinations that will support almost any proposed correlation." An example: "An island in the near Pacific (this little island was Kilauea) with a known short-lived life was dated by Carbon 14 and said to be between 0 to 22 million years. Experts when queried about the "scientific slop" responded:

‘Because the island was underwater so long before it rose cataclysmically from the ocean, there was a shielding by the water of cosmic radiation, therefore less Carbon 14 buildup due to very few cosmic rays bombarding nitrogen atoms.’”

6.4 Little did these experts realize at the time that this very accurate statement explains the great disparities of Carbon 14 dating’s when antediluvian versus postdiluvian dates are compared. There are other reasons why some scientists believe radiogenic methods such as Carbon 14 are inconsistent:

6.5 Dr. Bolton Davidheiser, a zoologist and geneticist, believes cosmic radiation has not been constant because of changes in the earth's magnetic field and radiation flux itself. Geologists agree that the effect of carbon dioxide released by volcanic action over the last 50,000 years alone would be very difficult to measure.

6.6 They all agree that CO₂ affects radiogenic methods. In the future, care must be taken to evaluate the effect of neutrons released into the atmosphere by nuclear testing. It is estimated that carbon 14 in the atmosphere is 3 to 4 times greater today than in 1962 as a result of such testing.

7. Isotopic ---The problems encountered with isotopic dating methods are vast and recently great doubt as to their validity has been cast in much of the scientific community. Decay rates of radioactive materials over geological time have changed. This is startling because the whole system of isotopic dating is based on the assumption that such decay rates are constant.

7.1 For example, Robert V. Gentry in the October 1957 issue of *Medical Opinion and Review* has written, ..."my investigation of the Uranium and Thorium halos disclosed a startling circumstance: the radioactive decay rates have probably changed considerably during geological time."

8. Potassium-Argon is a dating method where rocks located near fossil remains are measured as to the content of potassium compared to the amount of argon. It is assumed that potassium decays at a fixed rate producing a gas known as argon. This method has certain inherent disadvantages.

8.1 Like other methods, there is a great deal of authority indicating the rate of potassium decay has not always been constant. Results from potassium-argon dating have given some rather bazaar and discrepant results.

8.1.1 For example, the "nutcracker man" found by L.S.B. Leakey was dated at 1,750,000 years. The stratum just below the skull tested 1,500,000 years which should be older rather than younger. Further, G.H. R. von Koenigswald, a noted anthropologist, tested a layer of basalt below the second stratum and found the "life" measured 1,000,000 years younger than the test shows.

8.2 Dr. Hunt previously on page three above has written of dating methods in general: "No one seriously proposes that all the determined dates are without error, and we do not know how many of them are in error. We do not know which dates are in error or by what amounts or why." Now compare these scientific opinions with a purported "fact" found in the October 1961 issue of *National Geographic*, "... no ordinary mechanical clock - not even the finest Swiss watch - can match our laboratory instruments for precision."

9. Dating methods in general do not conflict with the Bible, however, to the evolutionist time is very necessary because:

a. to the evolutionists the mechanism of mutation is the only viable method for genetic progression caused by natural selection.

b. 99 percent of all mutations result in either death or crippling and thus a 1 percent effective rate requires a great deal of time if evolutionary progress is to be "made."

c. for the tools of evolution (natural selection and random mutation) to be viable billions of years are necessary.

Interesting Facts-Mysteriously Hidden

1. Teleology

1.1 Teleology is the study of evidence of design in "nature." Textbook writers are cautioned to never provide students with an implication of intelligent design. The science editor of *Newsweek* in the December 23, 1963, issue reported that geologists at a meeting of The American Geological Society "were advising the rehabilitation of catastrophism without recourse to a supernatural agent."

1.2 In other words, intelligent design must never be offered to students as a possibility.

1.2.1 For example, many teachers are urged to say things like "Turtles come out of the water and happen to lay their eggs on the beach" as opposed to "turtles come out of the water to lay their eggs on the beach" and yet any biologist or good taxonomist will tell you there are certain species of turtle who never come on to the beach ever except to lay their eggs.

1.3 Many proponents of evolution are deathly afraid intelligent design might be equated with God or a supernatural power rather than "happen chance." As a good student this should make you fighting mad that someone is attempting to mold your "plastic mind" in a preset mold consistent with someone else's preset standards. Whatever happened to the age-old axiom that "a scientist must think inductively and not deductively."

2. Taxonomy

2.1 Taxonomy is the study of classifying species. There is a prevailing argument on the part of evolutionist that the book of Genesis tells us that every species was created in its own kind and every creature was to reproduce after its kind. Interestingly this is exactly what we see happening today.

2.2 No data has ever been presented to indicate such reproduction ever stopped. It is a wonder any evolutionist would ever bring up the subject, but they do. Because some animals resemble one another like a zebra looks like a horse and a coyote looks like a dog, the evolutionist with great pomposity makes much of what they call "theoretical progressions" based solely on similarity of looks. Let me explain:

2.3 There is a great reliance on taxonomy. It is assumed that any good taxonomist knows for sure what is a specie and can therefore tell if animals are moving from one to another. Let's look at the history of classification or the wonderful world of taxonomy.

2.3.1 Although there are numerous changes within most species; there has never been a change even alleged to have occurred between species, and this after hundreds of years of careful scrutiny by multitudes of biologists seeking desperately to find such a phenomenon.

2.3.2 Evolutionists have duped students with clichés such as "the gap is all we have need to fill and then it will be all over." The trite but powerful "gap" is that discovery of inter-specie movement. This gives the insouciant student the impression that all but minor proof has been found when in reality the only proof available is nothing; since no one even purports to find movement from one species to another.

2.4 Much has been left to the taxonomist to arrange hard and fast species definitions. Quite to the contrary, taxonomy has been unable to agree on definitions of species. They vary and change even as we speak.

2.4.1 Let me illustrate--Quoting from a Heutschel and Cook textbook, *Biology for Medical Students*, "To explain the presence of so many different kinds of plants and animals, two theories have been propounded. The traditional idea was that of special creation in which all organisms as we know them today were invented and made in the beginning of time with the same structure as we now find them.

2.4.2 Such is the primitive human conception of the origin of the species as exemplified in the first chapter of Genesis and similar ideas also current in the cosmologies of most religions of the world. The "facts" of biology, however, do not allow us to accept this view."

2.4.3 Hegner and Stiles in their book, *College Zoology*, "The doctrine of special creation, that is that each species of animal was specially created, is sufficiently refuted.

2.4.4 Gairdner Moment in his textbook *General Biology*, "One of the oldest ideas and, until recently, the most widely accepted, is the theory of special creation. Certainly, very few, perhaps no biologists now believe that each species was separately created and has existed since the beginning of the world."

2.5 Much is made of the use of the Hebrew word "**LAMINAH**" translated "kind" as meaning every species was created exactly as it was ordained and divinely prohibited from change. Nothing could be further from the truth.

2.5.1 The word translated kind is very subjective and might better read "after the general likeness of one another." The kind described in Genesis is far from being restrictive as most Darwinians allege. It will surprise even Christians to learn that the KJV leaves a little to be desired. Let's take a look at a few Scriptures.

2.6 Gen 1:21 uses the word **TANIN** meaning land mammals after their kind, living creature or **NEPHESH** meaning all animal life, cattle or **BEHEMAH** meaning tame or domesticated animals after their kind, creeping things or **RAMAS** meaning living things that glide on the earth.

Gen 1:21 So God created the great creatures of the sea and every living and moving thing with which the water teems, according to their kinds, and every winged bird according to its kind. And God saw that it was good.

2.7 Much then is made by the evolutionist that God said something He never said. God obviously left room for animals to operate sexually within their general kind (subject to certain chromosome limitations).

2.8 Please remember we find nothing offered by the evolutionist as evidence of inter movement of species but rather a diversionary tactic of an alleged prohibition by God that "species were separately created and must exist as originally created from the beginning of the world." This is again done by the evolutionist to merely discredit the Bible because obvious intra-movement of species has always been a fact—not inter-species movement.

2.9 Please keep in mind the evolutionist is a master at scientific legerdemain. The evolutionist is devious because his arguments are most often made by men with knowledge of biological science and should know one cannot at any given time properly define the term species.

2.10 Since the experts frequently disagree among themselves and change their minds as to what is a species, it is absurd as well as dishonest to imply that men who are not taxonomists can do this. What they try to do is to portray creationists and people who believe the Bible as stupid.

2.11 Textbook writers charge that special-creationists believe every species was created separately and then they themselves admit the number of creations change over time. Let's look at a few examples:

a. Fresh water clams were formerly believed to exist in 251 species but these have now been reduced to one. See Ernst Mayer's, *Systematics and The Origin of the Species*.

b. In 1931 Swarth studied ground finches and classified them into 5 genre, 317 species and subspecies but confessed it would be logical to place them in one. See Julian Huxley's *The Living Thoughts of Darwin*.

c. In Ruggles Gates *Human Ancestry* the species of birds were said to be reduced by changes of opinions from 27,000 to 8,500.

d. Fishes of North America have moved from 670 to 795. See Michael Guyers' *Animal Biology*.

e. In 1955 the Rana Kandivehi frog formerly classified in 1922 was determined to be only a mutant form of the common leopard frog. It differed only with reference to a single mutant gene.

2.12 This list of quotes could go on *ad infinitum*. This is perhaps why Harvard Professor Hooten was quoted as saying, "I am convinced that a zoological classificationist may be as dissolute and irresponsible as a lightning rod salesman." See Ernest Hootens' *Apes, Men and Morons*.

2.13 Had Richard Nixon known how the taxonomist can adjust species to fit their needs or how strong the environmentalist lobby would become; I doubt the Endangered Species Act would ever have been signed into law. Today we find progress being stopped and property rights taken as genera are adjusted to fit the needs of "mother earth."

3. DNA and Evolution—Much found in this section will repeat what has earlier been discussed, however, there is a major difference. As you know I started my study of evolution several years earlier and much has changed since then.

4. Knowledge has evolved but it is still knowledge. My library has grown and I have been forced to read additional books, acquire a new vocabulary to include terms like biochemistry, micro-biology, crystallography, cilium and flagellum etc.

5. Don't Believe All You Read in Your Newspaper

5.1 The purpose of this section is to record several comments about an article which appeared in the Austin American Statesman in October 2005. The article is a reprint from the WASHINGTON POST. The authors are Rich Weiss and David Brown. I want to review the article with comment. My comments will be high-lited after each paragraph.

5.2 The headline read **Evolution of Evidence, DNA Tests say Darwin Was Right.** The article begins with a definition of what is evolution? "Evolution is a genetic change in a species over time.

6. Evolutionist also use the term common descent e.g.: Humans and chimps, for example, are thought to share a common ancestor. Evolution is driven by several processes, the best known of which is natural selection," a driver described by Charles Darwin in his 1859 book, *The Origin of Species*.

6.1 The article then asks "What is natural selection?" The author then answers, "Species evolve from common ancestors as genetic mutations give rise to new physical traits."

6.2 The author provides two definitions of evolution. The first "Evolution is a genetic change in a species over time." As we have seen, this is not a definition of evolution. We often see intra specie changes over time. The second definition is a good one and one accepted by most Darwinians.

6.2.1 As earlier noted evolutionists believe there are two facilitators of evolutionary change. They are natural selection and mutation. The author stipulates natural selection and random mutations are necessary for evolution to occur. It has long been established that mutations are usually detrimental.

6.2.2 Approximately 95% to 99% of all mutations result in something bad. We see it most often in deformed children although it is often seen in animals. When there is a mutation, it generally will result in a physical problem or even death of an offspring.

7. Let me again quote from Bolton Davidheiser's book *Evolution and Christian Faith*:

"Mutations are the bane of evolutionary theory; mutations are said to be the method by which species have evolved. If, however the vast majority of mutations result in deformities or death, it is difficult to see it as a mechanism for changes in species. Traits that improve a species' ability to survive and reproduce are passed to new generations, while traits that hinder reproduction and survival fade away.

"Natural selection can be ecological (driven by competition for food and habitat) or sexual (driven by competition for mates). Sexual selection can result in features that appear contrary to ecological survival; for example, the tail feathers of a peacock. Another example is the possum playing dead. The possum is one of the oldest species and yet one of the characteristics of the possum which is said to be a result of natural selection is "playing dead." The possum that plays dead is often eaten. None the less the opossum as it is called in scientific terms continues to exist and prosper."

7.1 The article tries to answer the question is evolution just a theory? "Scientific theories are not mere hunches.

7.2 A theory in science is a structure of related ideas that explains one or more natural phenomena and is supported by observations from the natural world. Evolution is a 'theory' in the same way that the idea that matter is made of atoms is a theory or that some bacteria cause disease is a theory."

8. Keep in mind no advocate of evolution has ever purported to have seen evolution at work therefore it is somewhat dishonest to make a statement that the theory of evolution is like observing that bacteria cause disease.

8.1 We know from observation that various bacteria can cause diseases. Evolution is certainly a theory since there is no proof natural selection and/or mutation cause inter specie movement and there is certainly no proof that humans and chimps share a common ancestor.

8.2 Given the similarity of 96% of the monkey's genome to 10% of the human genome, Philip E. Johnson, author of the best-selling book *Darwin on Trial* has asked the question, "Why does the chimpanzee look like a chimpanzee and act like a chimpanzee and a human being looks and acts like a human?"

9. There are numerous scientists from disparate fields who take exception to the many bizarre exceptions common to evolutionary theory. The most formidable are: Michael J. Behe, professor of Biochemistry at Lehigh University, Bolton Davidheiser a zoologist and geneticist and professor at Westmont College in Santa Barbara, California, Werner Gitt a professor at the prestigious Technical University at Aachen.

10. These men have written extensively about evolution and its theory. In his book *Darwin's Black Box* Michael J. Behe, Professor of Biochemistry at Lehigh University, makes clear there is no way evolution could be a practical theory because of the complexity of the human body.

11. Darwinians devote most of their time explaining how, a dog became a coyote, which turned into a wolf, etc., as opposed to the various mechanisms in the body which would also have to evolve. The blood clotting system and the human eye are extremely complex. Behe describes this complexity in great detail:

"The time required for these systems to evolve says Behe is just not there. He estimates that a thousand billion years would be required just for the complex systems found inside the body which is roughly a hundred times the current estimate of the age of the universe."

12. Behe in his book conjectures that the odds are better that a tornado could roar through a junk yard and create a super computer than for random mutation to evolve the human eye. Behe is only one of many scientists today who strongly reject evolution as a plausible theory. What makes evolution a scientific explanation is that it makes testable predictions" There are no testable predictions when it comes to evolution."

I want to conclude this doctrine with several quotations.

Michael Behe, Professor of Biochemistry at Lehigh University in his book *Darwin's Black Box* has written, "Albert Lehninger, a fine teacher has written a very successful biochemistry text book ... the new addition ... contains two references to evolution ... We find that the new addition uses the word evolution as a wand to wave over mysteries ... For example, one citation is to "evolution, adaptation of sperm whale." When we flip to the indicated page, we learn that sperm whales have several tons of oil in their heads which becomes more dense at colder temperatures. This allows the whale to match the density of the water at the great depths where it often dives and so swim more easily. After describing the whale, the textbook remarks, "Thus we see in the sperm whale a remarkable anatomical and biochemical adaptation, perfected by evolution." "But that single line is all that's said! The whale is stamped "perfected by evolution" and everybody goes home. The authors make no attempt to explain how the sperm whale came to have the structure it has.

David Bolton Davidheiser, a biology professor with a Ph.D. from John Hopkins University has written in his book *Evolution and the Christian Faith*. "Opinions about some of the things *related to evolution* may still change, but the point is that when it comes to evolution, scientist are not all objective or even honest in their approach to problems ... It is the opinion of evolutionists, expressed over and over, that only the uninformed, the ignorant, and the bigoted do not accept evolution as a fact. This has been repeated so many times that people are afraid of being called ignorant if they express any doubts about the truth of evolution.

Ann Coulter in her New York Times best-selling book *Godless* has written, "Evolution is not selective breeding, which produces thoroughbred horses, pedigreed dogs ... and so on. Evolution is not the capacity of bacteria to develop antibiotic resistance, but which never evolves into anything but more bacteria. Evolution is not the phenomenon of an existing species changing over the course of many years ... In fact; evolution is not adaptive characteristic developing within a species at all. Darwin's theory says we get a new species, not a taller version of the same species. Evolutionists call such adaptations "microevolution" only to confuse people."

Dr. Hoyle and Dr. Wickramasinghe (winners of the Dag Hammarskjold 1986 God Medal for Science award) are both atheists. Consequently, they have some odd ideas about the origin of life—but they know enough about science to know Darwin's theory does not provide a viable explanation for the creation of life. Hoyle ran some numbers to determine the mathematical probability of the basic enzymes of life arising by random processes. They concluded that the odds were 1 to 1 followed by 40,000 zeroes, or "so utterly minuscule" as to make Darwin's theory of evolution absurd.

We do not authorize any third party to solicit donations on behalf of the Westbank Bible Church.