

# Getuigenissen van Wetenschappers die de Bijbel geloven

Bron: <http://wayoflife.org/files/ec91e76262537ee6f1f48a9ef768d3de-847.html>, 9-8-2011

Vertaling (behalve de getuigenissen) door M.V.

Middelbare scholen, hogescholen en universiteiten onderrichten typisch slechts één theorie over de oorsprongen, en dat is evolutie, en de studenten worden niet vertrouwd gemaakt met een creationistisch standpunt of zelfs maar “intelligent design”. In feite wordt hen dikwijls het idee gegeven dat geen ware wetenschapper vandaag een creationist is.

Toen de National Academy of Sciences in Amerika in 1998 een didactisch hulpmiddel publiceerde, met de titel *Teaching about Evolution and the Nature of Science*, stelden zij deze vraag: “Wijzen niet veel wetenschappers evolutie af?” Het antwoord hierop was: “Nee, de wetenschappelijke consensus rond evolutie is overweldigend”.

Richard Dawkins, een brutale atheïst en anti-creationist, zegt in zijn boek *The Greatest Show in Earth*:

“Evolutie is een feit. Boven redelijke twijfel, boven ernstige twijfel, boven gezonde, geïnformeerde, intelligente twijfel, is evolutie een feit. ... Evolutie is een feit, en [mijn] boek zal dat aantonen. Geen fatsoenlijke wetenschapper betwist dit, en geen onbevooroordeelde lezer zal wegens twijfel het boek sluiten”.

Als u volgens Dawkins evolutie afwijst, bent u onintelligent en uw geestelijke gezondheid moet in vraag gesteld worden, en hij verkondigt dat geen fatsoenlijke wetenschapper dit betwist.

Maar in feite werd moderne wetenschap uitgevonden door mensen die in goddelijke schepping geloofden. In zijn boek *Refuting Evolution*, zegt Jonathan Sarfati, Ph.D. in physical chemistry van de Victoria Universiteit in Wellington (<http://creation.com/dr-jonathan-d-sarfati>), Nieuw Zeeland:

“Het is bedrieglijk te beweren, zoals vele evolutionisten doen, dat geloof in wonderen betekent dat laboratoriumwetenschap onmogelijk zou zijn. In feite werden de meeste takken van de moderne wetenschappen gesticht door mensen die in het Bijbelse scheppingsverslag geloofden”.

Beschouw enkele voorbeelden:

*Natuurkunde* -- Newton, Faraday, Maxwell, Kelvin, Joule

*Chemie* - Boyle, Dalton, Ramsay

*Biologie* - Ray, Linnaeus, Mendel, Pasteur, Virchow, Agassiz

*Geologie*- Steno, Woodward, Brewster, Buckland, Cuvier

*Astronomie* - Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, Herschel, Maunder

*Mathematica* - Pascal, Leibniz, Euler

In 1979 bracht *Science Digest*: “wetenschappers die evolutie volkomen afwijzen zijn misschien een van onze snelst groeiende controversiële minderheden”, en stelde dat “Velen van de wetenschappers die deze positie innemen indrukwekkende wetenschappelijke geloofsbrieven bezitten” (Larry Hatfield, “Educators Against Darwin”, *Science Digest Special*, Winter 1979, pp. 94-96).

Uiteraard, zelfs als GEEN wetenschapper evolutie zou betwisten, betekent dit nog niet dat ze juist zou zijn. De Bijbel zegt: “God is waarachtig maar ieder mens een leugenaar” (Romeinen 3:4); en Jezus zei: “Ik dank U, Vader, Heere van de hemel en van de aarde, dat U deze dingen voor wijzen en verstandigen verborgen hebt, en ze aan jonge kinderen hebt geopenbaard” (Mattheüs 11:25).

Maar, feit is dat duizenden mannen en vrouwen met hogere graden evolutie afwijzen en de Bijbel geloven.

Het **CREATION RESEARCH SOCIETY** ledenbestand bestaat uit meer dan 600 mannen en vrouwen die geavanceerde graden bezitten en die zich toewijden aan bijbels creationisme.

Het **KOREA ASSOCIATION OF CREATION RESEARCH** ledenbestand omvat 450 wetenschappers, waarvan 150 met Ph.D's in wetenschappen. De president van KACR, **YOUNG-GIL KIM**, Ph.D. in Materials Science, behoort bij de Koreaanse Advanced Institute of Science & Technology en is de uitvinder van verscheidene hoogtechnologische legeringen

En dit is slechts een korte lijst.

Hierna volgen een aantal wetenschappers met doctoraten (er zijn twee uitzonderingen) die geloven in een letterlijke zes-dagen schepping.

We hebben hierbij selecties toegevoegd van hun getuigenissen en geschriften. Deze omvatten verklaringen van de vele bewijzen tegen evolutie en vóór schepping.

Dit alles kan gebruikt worden om ongelovigen te tonen dat vele hoogopgeleiden de Bijbel geloven en evolutie van zijn voetstuk stoten op basis van het beschikbare bewijsmateriaal. Deze getuigenissen kunnen ook gebruikt worden om jonge christelijke mensen aan te moedigen in hun geloof.

### **JAMES ALLAN**

Ph.D. in genetics from the University of Edinburgh, former senior lecturer in genetics at the University of Stellen Bosch in South Africa

“As a biologist in the field of population and quantitative genetics, I had believed in the theory of evolution for nearly 40 years. ... When, at a fairly advanced stage of my career, I became a Christian I began to read the Bible reverently and as intelligently as I was able. ... I must admit that the six days of the creation presented some difficulty for me. The apparent logic of conclusions from observations and measurements in various fields of science had previously led me to doubt the little I had known of the Word of God, to the extent that I had agreed with attempts to replace it with an alternative concept of God. But God does not say aeons or years or months or weeks--he says days, and we generally understand days to be 24-hour periods. I then realized that had God wanted to say a billion years rather than six days, He could have said it ... I now believe that God means literally what He says and writes, and that there is no reason to look for symbolism. ... It is also clear to me that if one wishes to believe in the theory of evolution, a great deal of Scripture, including Jesus' own spoken word (Matt. 19:4; 25:34; Mark 13:19; John 5:46-47), has to be discounted, so, whom must we believe, God or man? I believe that God gives us the answer when He says, ‘Stop trusting in man, who has but a breath in his nostrils. Of what account is he?’ (Isa. 2:22)” (*In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton p. 127, 128, 133).

### **PAUL BACK**

D.Phil. in engineering science from Oxford University

“In my early teens, I began to develop an interest in science and often read books on science. I came across an article on evolution and the writer excitedly explained that with the finding of the Piltdown skull, all arguments against our evolutionary links to apes had been settled. This article left me with two clear thoughts. First, evolution is true and second, that only an unscientific fool could possibly think otherwise. Once I reached university, I no longer went to church and decided that Christianity was irrelevant to life. ...

“I came across a book by Whitcomb and Morris titled *The Genesis Flood* that, in my mind, began to unravel the seemingly impregnable fortress of evolutionary dogma. Evolutionism was not the only explanation. The book inspired me to dig deeply into the whole edifice of evolutionism, and the more I dug, the more it seemed that it was built on sand--on wishful thinking, on gross extrapolations of observations that could better be interpreted from a creation worldview. The other significant thing I noticed was the anger and animosity of evolutionists that was directed against those who dared to challenge their viewpoint. My studies led me to the ever greater conviction that evolutionism was a deeply flawed theory sustained not by science, but by those who were determined to find any explanation--no matter how absurd--that banished God from the scene” (*Persuaded by the Evidence*, edited by Doug Sharp and Jerry Bergman, p. 117).

## **JOHN BAUMGARDNER**

Ph.D. in geophysics and space physics from UCLA, technical staff member in the theoretical division of Los Alamos National Laboratory, chief developer of the TERRA code, a 3-D finite element program for modeling the earth's mantle and lithosphere

“Despite all the millions of pages of evolutionist publications--from journal articles to textbooks to popular magazine stories--which assume and imply that material processes are entirely adequate to accomplish macroevolutionary miracles, there is in reality no rational basis for such belief. It is utter fantasy. Coded language structures are non-material in nature and absolutely require a non-material explanation. Just as there has been glaring scientific fraud in things biological for the past century, there has been a similar fraud in things geological. The error, in a word, is uniformitarianism. ... Just as materialist biologists have erroneously assumed that material processes can give rise to life in all its diversity, materialist geologists have assumed that the present can fully account for the earth's past. In so doing, they have been forced to ignore and suppress abundant contrary evidence that the planet has suffered major catastrophe on a global scale. ... As a Christian who is also a professional scientist, I exult in the reality that ‘in six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth’ (Exod. 20:11). May He forever be praised” (*In Six Days*, pp. 230, 231, 239).

## **JERRY BERGMAN**

Ph.D. in human biology from Columbia Pacific University and Ph.D. in measurement and evaluation from Wayne State University, with a 4.0 grade average in both doctorates; has taught biology, genetics, chemistry, biochemistry, anthropology, geology, and microbiology at Northwest State College.

“I became involved in the atheism movement and soon knew (and counted as friends) many of the leading atheists of the day, including Gordon Stein, PhD; Gary DeYoung, PhD; and of course, Madalyn Murray O’Hair. I have also published scores of articles in their various magazines. ...

“I reviewed many books on Darwinism and from them outlined the chief evidence for evolution, which included vestigial organs, homology, ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny, beneficial mutations, evidence of poor design, the fossil record, atavisms, nascent organs, the argument from imperfect, natural selection, microevolution versus macroevolution, shared genetic errors, the backward retina, junk DNA, and other topics. ... Slowly, but surely, I was able to eliminate all of the main arguments used to support evolutionism by researching secular literature only. At some point I crossed the line, realizing the case against evolutionism was overwhelming and conversely, so was the case in favor of the alternative, creationism.

“Another factor that moved me to the creationist side was the underhanded, often totally unethical techniques that evolutionists typically used to suppress dissonant ideas, primarily creationism. Rarely did they carefully and objectively examine the facts, but usually focused on suppression of creationists, denial of their degrees, denial of their tenure, ad hominem attacks, and in general, irrational attacks on their person. In short, their response in general was totally unscientific and one that reeks of intolerance, even hatred” (*Persuaded by the Evidence*, edited by Doug Sharp and Jerry Bergman, chapter 4).

## **EDWARD BOUDREAUX**

Ph.D. in chemistry from Tulane University, professor emeritus of chemistry at the University of New Orleans.

“... the geological, biological, and cosmological sciences have been established as ivory towers, from which so-called proofs of evolution emanate, while the scientist practitioners within these disciplines are the gurus who promote, preach, and publish what is regarded as scientific data supporting evolution. But there is not one single instance whereby all the tests essential to the establishment of the scientific validity of evolution have been satisfied. There are hypotheses, grandiose

models, suppositions, and inferences, all of which are formulated and reinforced within the collective and self-serving collaborations of the evolutionist gurus. However, none of this amounts to true scientific evidence for evolution. It was in the 1970s that, to my great surprise, bewilderment, and disgust, I became enlightened to this. Up until that time I had not given the evolution matter very much thought. On the contrary, I presumed that researchers committed to the study of evolution possessed the same integrity as that expected of any credible scientist. ... Subsequently, the greatest embarrassment of all was for me to find that there simply was no valid science whatever, in any of these numerous publications touting evolution” (*In Six Days*, pp. 205, 206).

## **WALT BROWN**

Ph.D. in mechanical engineering from MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); he is a graduate of West Point, a former Army Ranger and paratrooper, and a retired Air Force colonel; he directed the Benet Laboratories, a 450-person research and development laboratory, was Chief of Science and Technology Studies at the Air War College, and was a tenured professor at the U.S. Air Force Academy.

“Walt Brown received Christ as a teenager, but like many Christians, accepted evolution simply because it permeated secular and educated society. To harmonize evolution with the Bible, he assumed (like many others) that evolution was merely God’s way of creating. One day Walt heard claims that Noah’s ark might be on Mount Ararat in Turkey. That piqued his curiosity; was it possible the Genesis flood really was a worldwide event, not just a legend? If so, where did the water come from? Where did it go? Through long and careful study, Walt learned that the scientific evidence for creation and the Flood was overwhelming. He also began to conclude that the Genesis flood explained most of the characteristics of the earth, including the fossil record that he had earlier supposed supported evolution. Creation science became the passion of his life. ...

“Walt’s research is encapsulated in a book that has gone through multiple revisions and expansions since its fledgling edition: *In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood*. [It] begins with 135 categories of evidence that support creation and oppose evolution. ...

“When Walt was an evolutionist, among the hindrances to his acceptance of the Genesis global flood were two questions: Where did the water come from, and where did it go? For years, Walt studied many disciplines as he pondered these questions. The result was a global model of the Flood, faithful to the biblical record, involving physics, math, geology, biology, and astronomy, which Walt believes convincingly answers these two questions. ... Walt was also the first to propose ... that the Grand Canyon was formed from a specific dam breach in a large post-Flood lake that he identified via a number of techniques. ...

“Walt has made a standing offer to evolutionists. He invites a qualified evolutionist to join him in a written, strictly scientific debate on the scientific case for creation versus evolution. The debate must be restricted to scientific evidence alone--no religious arguments are allowed. Each side would have the opportunity to read the other’s arguments and respond with a written rebuttal. All the results would be published ... For more than 25 years no one has taken Walt up on his debate challenge” (*Persuaded by the Evidence*, p. 181, 182, 183, 184, 186).

In regard to his debate challenge, Dr. Brown says:

“The best way, I believe, to clarify the creation-evolution controversy is to have a thorough, written, publishable, strictly scientific debate. Both sides would lay out their case, much as I have in *The Scientific Case for Creation* on pages 5-101 [of his book *In the Beginning*]. Then each side would respond, point-by-point, to the case for the other side. Both sides would have the right to publish the finished exchange. I have sought such an exchange since 1980, but have not had a serious, qualified taker. When I speak at universities and colleges, I offer students a \$200 finder’s fee if they can find an evolutionist professor who will complete such a debate” (*In the Beginning*, p. 406).

As to the historical authenticity of Genesis 1-11, Dr. Brown testifies:

“Hundreds of topics and scientific discoveries supporting creation and the flood fascinate most people and are easy to discuss, even with strangers. In effect, this becomes a powerful pre-

evangelistic tool. While no one has all the answers concerning our origins, be assured that the scientific evidence is overwhelmingly consistent with Genesis 1-11. ... What better way to establish the accuracy and authority of Scripture than by showing that Genesis 1-11 (the most discredited portion of the Bible to the secular world) is remarkably accurate? Understanding Genesis helps the Bible come alive” (*In the Beginning*, pp. 316, 317).

### **STUART BURGESS**

Burgess is a professor who has taught engineering design at Cambridge University and Bristol University. He has carried out spacecraft design for the European Space Agency. In 1993 he received the Turners Gold Medal for the design of the solar array deployment mechanism on the \$2.5 billion ENVISAT satellite.

“The Design Argument argues that design reveals a designer and the attributes of the designer. The Design Argument is very important because design provides positive evidence for a Creator and not just evidence against evolution. Following modern discoveries of the staggering complexity and beauty of nature, the Design Argument is stronger than ever before. I have presented the Design Argument by concentrating on hallmarks of intelligent design. The supposed process of evolution is inherently severely limited in the amount of order that it could produce because of the huge restrictions of incremental change and natural selection. In contrast, an intelligent designer has no such restrictions and can create extreme levels of order, beauty and purpose. My book *Hallmarks of Design* describes six hallmarks that can only be produced by an intelligent designer: Irreducible mechanisms, complete optimum design, added beauty, extreme similarity in features, extreme diversity of kinds, and man-centred features” (*Hallmarks of Design*, 2002, p. 8).

### **JOHN CIMBALA**

Ph.D. in aeronautics from the California Institute of Technology, professor of mechanical engineering, Pennsylvania State University.

“I was raised in a Christian home, believing in God and His creation. However, I was taught evolution while attending high school, and began to doubt the authority of the Bible. ... I eventually rejected the entire Bible and believed that we descended from lower creatures, there was no afterlife and no purpose in life but to enjoy the short time we have on this earth. ... Fortunately, and by the grace of God, I began to read articles and listen to tapes about scientific evidence for creation. Over a period of a couple of years, it became apparent to me that the theory of evolution has no legitimate factual evidence, and that scientific data from the fossil record, geology, etc., could be better explained by a recent creation, followed by a global flood. Suddenly I realized that the Bible might actually be true! It wasn't until I could believe the first page of the Bible that I could believe the rest of it. Once I accepted the fact that there is a creator God, it was an easy step for me to accept His plan of salvation through Jesus Christ as well. ... Since then, I have devoted much time to studying the evidence for creation and a global flood. The more I study, the more convinced I become that there is a loving God, who created this universe and all living things” (*In Six Days*, pp. 200, 201).

### **LOWELL COKER**

Ph.D. in microbiology and biochemistry from Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; he has received five U.S. patents and authored numerous technical papers in his field; retired after 40 years as a scientist of industrial research specializing in enzyme systems.

Dr. Coker is the author of *Darwin's Design Dilemma: How 20th Century Science Supports the Account of Creation in Genesis*. In this he states:

“Evidence in this book has been largely obtained from current collegiate textbooks and other reliable sources as cited. ... Taken together, the evidence gives overwhelming scientific support confirming and supporting the accuracy of the historical account of creation in Genesis. ...

“I am a trained research scientist with more than 45 years of experience in multiple disciplines. During the research for this book, it was thrilling, not only to relive some of the discoveries of my own lifetime, but also to learn details of other mechanisms that were less familiar. It was exciting to learn how this information had been extended to show even greater design and complexity than I had imagined within some of the systems such as that of photosynthesis. Clearly the workers who gathered this evidence knew that their work was good. Their conclusions were supported by their results. Often, their excitement and appreciation showed through, such as when one writer referred to the Citric Acid Cycle as ‘an ingenious series of reactions....’ These authors clearly see the incredibly complex and beautiful designs that are commonplace in living systems.

“It is therefore puzzling and disappointing to read sections in which the authors attempt to give explanations for these irreducible complexities and incredibly intricate designs according to the theory of evolution as if evolution was fact. ... It is sad that otherwise beautiful, clear, and accurately supported scientific writing in textbooks is marred by the presentation of such speculation as fact ... How can a student be expected to be able to determine truth when unsupported conclusions are falsely presented as true facts and mixed among true facts? How effective can he be as a future citizen when his educational background contains so much humanist philosophy? Science is the search for truth. The true scientist will always endeavor to walk this straight and narrow pathway wherever it leads and never deviate in his search for truth” (pp. 16, 176, 177).

## **RAYMOND DAMADIAN**

M.D., biophysicist; the recipient of the Lemelson-MIT Achievement Award as “the man who invented the MRI scanner”; in 1988, he was awarded the National Medal of Technology, America’s highest award for applied science, and a year later, he was inducted into the Inventors Hall of Fame, an honor he shares with Thomas Edison, Samuel Morse, and the Wright Brothers.

The first MRI scanner that Dr. Damadian and his colleagues built in 1977, “THE INDOMITABLE”, resides at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C. Damadian is a Bible-believing Christian and attends a Baptist church in Long Island, New York.

“To me, the highest purpose a man can find for life is to serve the will of God. That is what motivates my work as a scientist: exploring and applying the laws of nature and of nature’s God for the benefit of mankind. I am convinced that the Bible is the reason for the advancement of science and the blessings of Western civilization. ... I told *Creation* magazine in 1994 that acceptance of the unqualified Word of God ‘has been the foundation for Western civilization since the printing of the Gutenberg Bible in the fifteenth century.’ The Christian worldview has brought centuries of blessing in all aspects of society. But that blessing is now imperiled by greed for the almighty dollar and the widespread teaching of Darwinism.

“I personally experienced the cost of maintaining a creationist position in a dogmatically evolutionist scientific community. I believe it cost me the Nobel Prize. The record is clear: I had priority on discovering the NMR signal in pathological biological tissue (the discovery that makes MRI possible), was the first to publish this discovery and mention its potential for medical imaging, and I was the first to make a working MRI scanner and produce the first scan on a human body. Historians have called me ‘the Father of the MRI’--but the Nobel Prize for Physiology or Medicine in 2003 for MRI went to two physicists who learned about my discovery from *Science* and made important refinements to the imaging process. ... Even some evolutionists were surprised and alarmed at the rebuff given me by the Nobel committee. ... several commentators, including pro-evolution secular sources, have speculated that the committee didn’t want their prestigious award to go to an outspoken creationist. ... Creationism has become so politically incorrect as to disqualify exceptional scientific achievement if the scientist or inventor does not pay homage to Darwinism. ...

“Unfair and disappointing as it was to me to be passed up by the Nobel judges, I know the more valuable earthly reward is to see millions of lives helped by MRI. And that’s just the beginning. Through faith in Christ Jesus, we are promised an inheritance that is incorruptible, undefiled, and will not fade away (2 Peter 1:4), reserved for us in heaven. The epitome of my satisfaction will not be just to be vindicated personally, but to see Jesus Christ glorified, and His will done on earth as it

is in heaven. That, to me, is worth more than any temporal reward of fame” (*Persuaded by the Evidence*, pp. 190, 191, 192).

## **DON DEYOUNG**

Ph.D. in physics.

Dr. DeYoung is a member of ICR’s RATE team of scientists (Radioisotopes and the Age of The Earth).

In the book *Thousands... Not Billions*, DeYoung argues for a young earth. He shows, for example, that carbon-14 actually supports a young earth rather than an ancient one.

“Rocks and fossils containing carbon occur in abundance throughout the earth’s strata. Once living organisms now buried in these strata incorporated some carbon-14 within themselves while they were alive. For earth materials classified as ancient, all of this original C-14 content should be completely decayed away. ... any carbon-containing materials that are truly older than 100,000 years should be ‘carbon-14 dead’ with C-14 levels below detection limits. This fact gives rise to a major challenge to the long age assumption for rocks and fossils. In recent years, readily detectable amounts of carbon-14 have been the rule rather than the exception. This is true for samples from throughout the fossil-bearing parts of the geologic record with presumed ages extending to hundreds of millions of years. The unexpected carbon-14 was initially assumed to be a result of contamination, most likely from the experimental counting procedures, but as this problem was aggressively explored, it was realized that most of the carbon-14 was inherent to the samples being measured” (*Thousands ... Not Billions*, pp. 48, 49).

## **SHEM DHARAMPAUL**

M.D. from the University of Alberta, FRCPC (Fellow of the College of Physicians of Canada) and trained in Nuclear Medicine.

“I want to share with you the account of a day that began as the worst day in my life and ended as the best day in my life. I will tell you first how I got to that day, and then I will tell you what happened on that day. I was born in a small country in South America, although my grandparents were from somewhere in the Indian subcontinent. I often attended a Lutheran Church with my mother when I was a child. My parents divorced when I was eleven years old, and my mother, two brothers, and I, immigrated to Canada when I was fourteen years old. I did not go to church for years after we came to Canada. By the time I finished High School, I was questioning the existence of God. I went to university, and by the time I finished my four year degree in Science, I was very much a secular humanist/atheist. That’s a person who does not believe that there is a God, and believes that humans are the ultimate and best product of evolution.

“In university, I became more and more involved in a sinful way of life. I finished the fourth year in Science and then enrolled in Medical School at the same university. There, two things started to happen to me. First, I started hating myself for sinning, but I still kept on sinning. Then, I started to question my disbelief in God. I think that I was starting to realize that there was more to life than evolution. I was looking at what I learned in Medical School about how complex the human body is, and thinking that this couldn’t happen by chance. Then I realized that if humans were the ultimate in evolution and were the only ones that could fix all the problems in the world, then there was no hope. Why? Because I was a human and was such a terrible person, that I couldn’t help myself, much less the world.

“These thoughts became more and more consuming in my mind. I started having doubts about a lot of things. I would try talking to God, saying in my mind, that ‘if you’re there, then do something to let me know.’ I would look at the sky in the night, and say, ‘OK God, I am looking right at that star, make it go super nova, then I will know that there is a God.’ Of course, nothing like that happened, but with time, I became more and more convinced that there was a God. I talked to many people in university of different religions and was most impressed with Christians for their love for those that

hated them. I felt that if there was a God, it must be the God of the Bible. However, I did not want to submit to God. I would say as if speaking to God, ‘God, when I die, I don’t want to go to heaven, or hell. I just want to die and disappear into nothingness’.

“One day, I was alone in my bedroom, and no one else was at home. I could no longer bear the weight of my sins, and decided to take my life. I was about to, when I remembered one of the clients that I had met that week on the job seemed like a nice person. For some reason, I decided to phone her. She started telling me about how God had worked in her life to overcome some difficulties. After I hung up the phone, I knelt down beside my bed and prayed to God. I said I now fully believe in Him and all that I had heard about how Jesus died for me. I remembered a verse in the Bible that a Christian friend from the Science program had written to me. Matthew 11:28 ‘Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.’ And when I finished praying, I was no longer crying, and I felt a peace in my heart that I had never felt before. The burden of my sins had been lifted! My sins were forgiven. I was washed clean by the pure, sinless blood of Jesus Christ, by placing my faith and trust in Him. I went to the window and raised the blind and the sun came into my bedroom, and I heard a bird singing. And I said aloud, that from that time forth, I wanted to live for the things of God, and not the things of man, because all that man touched was spoilt”.

### **JOHN DOUGHTY**

Ph.D. in physics from the University of Arizona, a member of the original group of scientists who worked on chemical lasers at which is now the Air Force Research Laboratory.

“In graduate school back in the 1960s, one particular lecture in advanced thermodynamics stuck in my mind. The professor, Dr. Rogers, gave the class the following scenario: You are given all the raw materials to make a Cadillac. You place them inside a protective hemisphere. The hemisphere is filled with a nonreactive noble gas. A shaft is allowed to penetrate the hemisphere to provide mechanical energy. While the hemisphere can exchange heat with its surroundings, the interior remains at essentially a constant temperature. Dr. Rogers then asked the class, ‘How long will it take for the materials to assemble themselves into a Cadillac?’ That was a clever way of asking the question--given enough time and chance, will an ordered state arise on its own? Almost in unison we cried out, ‘It will never happen!’ Dr. Rogers replied strongly, ‘Give me a scientific reason why you say that it won’t happen!’ It was quiet for a moment and then several of us said, ‘It violates the second law, sir.’ However, at the time I didn’t connect the thought problem with the need for a designer, a comprehensive plan, and the right form of energy at the right time, the right amount, and the right place to be able to build that Cadillac. ...

“In 1976, I read *Scientific Creationism* by Dr. Henry Morris. When I came to the section on thermodynamics, I recalled my graduate thermodynamics class with Dr. Rogers and suddenly things started making a whole lot of sense. I concluded that, even with all my education, I had been cheated. I had never heard or read that there was any other scientific option to evolution. ... By now, the reading of the Bible plus the *Battle for the Bible* and *Scientific Creationism* converged and merged in my mind and spirit. I became a committed young-earth creationist. ... Now, with the exciting new developments that have come forth from the RATE (Radioisotopes and the Age of The Earth) project, it is spiritually and intellectually satisfying (and fun) to be involved in the search for scientific truth. My own foray into the world of geochemistry and isotopic analysis has been, and is now, both the most challenging and rewarding work in my 40 years of scientific research” (*Persuaded by the Evidence*, edited by Doug Sharp and Jerry Bergman, pp. 173, 174, 178, 179).

### **GEOFF DOWNES**

Ph.D. in tree physiology from the University of Melbourne, senior research scientist with the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation.

“In 1984 I commenced a Ph.D. degree in tree physiology. Increasingly, I wonder at how anyone can look at the complexity of a living organism and believe that it arose by natural processes. The who-



le of the biological sciences leads to the conclusion that a Creator was necessary. ... The complexity of not just living organisms but the communities within which they exist cannot be explained satisfactorily without the conclusion that there is a Creator. ... Over the past 15 years of research experience, my views have only become stronger. I have come to realize that evolution is a religious view founded on the assumption that we can discern truth by using the abilities of our mind to reason and think logically through the evidence perceived by our five senses. However, if we pursue that reasoning, we ultimately arrive at the conclusion that we have no logical basis for believing that we can reason logically. We cannot prove that our thought processes are not just random chemical reactions occurring without our brains” (*In Six Days*, p. 332, 333).

### **DANNY FAULKNER**

Ph.D. in astronomy from Indiana University; associate professor at the University of South Carolina, Lancaster, where he teaches physics and astronomy; he has published about two dozen papers in astronomy and astrophysics journals.

When asked whether it is important to believe in a six-day creation, Dr. Faulkner replies:

“We have a very clear indication from Scripture that the creation really took place in six ordinary days. And if you think it didn’t, then you are going to have to ask the question, ‘How do you *know* that it didn’t happen that way?’ Good biblical exegesis will simply not allow for a much greater length of time. And once you decide you are going to let ‘science’ dictate how you are going to interpret Scripture, then there is no end to it. I recently read that former U.S. President Jimmy Carter was quoted as saying that he believes in the virgin birth, but he doesn’t believe that the world was created in six days. I think if asked why not, he would say, well, because of overwhelming scientific evidence. And I think I would reply to that, the overwhelming scientific evidence is that a virgin birth is not possible. So be consistent on this point; one’s a miracle, so is the other. If you don’t believe in recent six-day creation, then it opens the door to serious doubts about the virgin birth, about the Resurrection; those would also be scientific ‘impossibles’” (“He Made the Stars Also”, *The Genesis Files*, edited by Carl Wieland, p. 64).

### **DWAIN FORD**

Ph.D. in chemistry from Clark University, Emeritus Professor of Chemistry, Andrews University.

“Chemical evolution, based on random activity of molecules, fails to adequately account for the origin of the proteins required for even the simplest known free-living organism, *Mycoplasma genitalium*. ... I see no compelling arguments, based on chemical evolution or Darwinian evolution, which make it more reasonable for me to believe in evolution than in creation” (*In Six Days*, pp. 139, 142).

### **WAYNE FRAIR**

Ph.D. in biochemical taxonomy from Rutgers, professor emeritus of biology at The King’s College.

“As a Christian, I accept the historicity of the Bible, this being supported by much external empirical evidence, and I have found no reasons from science to reject the Bible” (*In Six Days*, p. 338).

### **DUANE GISH**

Ph.D. in biochemistry from the University of California, Berkeley; worked for many years in pharmaceutical research at Cornell University Medical College and the Upjohn Company; he was one of the founders of the Creation Research Society (1963) and the Institute for Creation Research (1972).

“After I received my doctorate, I spent three years in research at Cornell University Medical School as a member of a team of chemists working on the synthesis of arginina vasopressin, a posterior

pituitary hormone. I then returned to Berkeley, where I served for four years on the research staff of the virus laboratory, during which time I was part of a team that worked out the amino acid sequence of the protein coat of tobacco mosaic virus. While there I was given a booklet that changed my life. This booklet, authored by a Canadian physician who chose to remain anonymous to protect his career, was titled *Evolution: Science, Falsely So-Called*. It was an excellent summary of the scientific evidence from various fields of science that described the weaknesses of evolutionary theory and provided solid evidence for creation. This material greatly excited my interest in creation versus evolution. When I mentioned the contents of this booklet to my Sunday school teacher, it happened that the next Sunday he had planned to begin a series of lessons on the Book of Genesis, and invited me to speak to his class. I related to the class much of what I had learned from the booklet. Our pastor was in the class that day and arranged for me to speak to the faculty at Western Baptist Bible College, which was located near Berkeley at that time. My lecture was not only attended by the faculty, but also by several pastors who served as part-time faculty. From several of these pastors I received invitations to lecture in their church services, Sunday schools, men's groups, etc. Thus, my career in lecturing on the scientific evidence for creation had begun. As a biochemist, I was particularly interested in theories on the origin of life. ... I also was aware of the great importance of the fossil record and the field of thermodynamics as related to the question of origins, so I began to read books and articles on these subjects.

“Altogether I probably have had nearly 300 debates, the majority of which took place on university campuses. They have proven to be popular, drawing large audiences, some with several thousand in attendance. ...

“The process of metamorphosis is one of thousands of examples in biology that cannot be explained by any naturalistic evolutionary process and can only be explained as the product of an agent whose intelligence is unfathomably greater than human intelligence. ... There is much more scientific evidence that informs us that the best scientific statement we can make about our origin is still ‘In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth’” (*Persuaded by the Evidence*, pp. 232, 235, 250).

### **WERNER GITT**

Ph.D. in engineering from the Technical University of Aachen, Germany, director and professor at the German Federal Institute of Physics and Technology.

“The creation account of the Bible stands alone in its declarations. Here we find none of the ancient mythical imaginings of the world and its origin, but here rather we find the living God communicating reality, the truth about origins. ... I believe it can be shown from a biblical and scientific viewpoint that one can have full confidence in the biblical account of a creation in six ordinary days” (*In Six Days*, pp. 365, 370).

### **D.B. GOWER**

Ph.D. in biochemistry and D.Sc. from the University of London, emeritus professor of steroid biochemistry at the University of London.

“It was about this time, in the mid-1960s, that my ideas of the greatness of God were transformed. No longer was He a ‘pocket’ God who did things as I could imagine from my ‘human viewpoint,’ but He had staggeringly great power, far beyond anything I could possibly comprehend. If God is so great, then there is nothing He could not do. This realization of the almighty power of God having come to me, I began to study the ‘creation-type’ literature available at that time. ... This has stimulated me to criticize evolutionary theory in three areas which are of particular interest to me: [1. evolution’s isotopic dating methods. 2. evolution’s doctrine of spontaneous formation of biochemical life. 3. evolution’s failure to recognize the complexity of life as intelligently designed]” (*In Six Days*, pp. 266, 267).

### **JOHN GREBE**

D.Sc. from Case Institute of Technology (now part of Western Reserve University), former director of Dow Chemical Company Physical Chemistry Research Laboratories.

In 1969, Dr. Grebe made a challenge before the Texas State Board of Education, offering \$1000 (more than \$10,000 in today's money) to anyone able to provide any first example of physically verifiable evidence (or even a basic mathematical model) sufficient to elevate the then hypothesis of macroevolution up to the status of scientific theory as then being proposed for inclusion in new textbooks under consideration. The challenge was made to the leading evolutionary scientists. So far the money remains unclaimed. One man who tried to collect was atheist David Bradbury. He had been a brash defender of evolution for 20 years since his university days. Not only was he not able to find the evidence to defend evolution. Bradbury eventually became a Bible-believing Christian and he re-offered Grebe's challenge. On January 28, 2002, he wrote:

"This \$1,000 challenge remains open (and uncollected). Until someone (teacher, board member or professor) can cite even a single example of empirically confirmable evidence that random shifts in gene frequency acted upon by natural selection can (or does) cumulatively collect to produce macro-evolutionary change, it would appear only reasonable to responsibly refrain from introducing such conjecture as proper scientific theory to students and to the public" ("Report on Comments on Proposed Modifications to Draft of Ohio Science Academic Content Standards", <http://www.arn.org/docs/ohio/ohioreport020402.htm>, viewed April 5, 2010).

### **STEPHEN GROCOTT**

Ph.D. in organometallic chemistry from the University of Western Australia, general manager, Research and Development, Southern Pacific Petroleum.

"Science is a wonderful thing. I enjoy it a great deal. As a scientist, I count myself lucky to be able to do science and to be good at it. And as a scientist, I have far more trouble trying to perform the mental gymnastics necessary to explain the world from an evolutionary, long-age viewpoint than I do from the young-earth, creationist viewpoint" (*In Six Days*, pp. 154).

"I see the beauty of the way that molecules go together, the systematic nature of chemical structures, and the laws that govern their formation and arrangement. I look at that and I say, 'Man, this is complex, but it fits together by all these really neat rules. Where do they come from?' The chemistry of life is scarily complex. That people can even contemplate it making itself staggers me. Speaking to colleagues about it, they often get themselves into a logical corner, and then it gets down to the bottom line--a spiritual issue. It is willful unbelief" ("The Creation Couple", *The Genesis Files*, edited by Carl Wieland, p. 70).

### **PETER W.V. GURNEY**

M.D. from the University of Bristol; fellow of the Royal Colleges of Surgeons and of Ophthalmologists.

In an article in 1999, Dr. Gurney explained how the "inverted retina" is not a "bad design" as some evolutionists claim. In the following excerpt he answers the charge that the octopus' eye is wired correctly as opposed to the human eye.

"Some evolutionists claim that the verted retinae of cephalopods, such as squids and octopuses, are more efficient than the inverted retinae found in vertebrates. But this presupposes that the inverted retina is inefficient in the first place. As shown above, evolutionists have failed to demonstrate that the inverted retina is a bad design, and that it functions poorly; they ignore the many good reasons for it.

"Also, they have never shown that cephalopods actually see better. On the contrary, their eyes merely 'approach some of the lower vertebrate eyes in efficiency' and they are probably colour blind. Moreover, the cephalopod retina, besides being 'verted', is actually much simpler than the 'inverted' retina of vertebrates; as Budelmann states, 'The structure of the [cephalopod] retina is much simpler than in the vertebrate eye, with only two neural components, the receptor cells and efferent

fibres'. It is an undulating structure with 'long cylindrical photoreceptor cells with rhabdomeres consisting of microvilli', so that the cephalopod eye has been described as a 'compound eye with a single lens'. The rhabdomeres act as light guides, and their microvilli are arranged such that the animal can detect the direction of polarized light—this foils camouflage based on reflection.

“Finally, in their natural environment cephalopods are exposed to a much lower light intensity than are most vertebrates and they generally live only two or three years at the most. Nothing is known about the lifespan of the giant squid; in any case it is believed to frequent great depths at which there is little light. Thus for cephalopods there is less need for protection against photic damage. Being differently designed for a different environment, the cephalopod eye can function well with a 'verted' retina” (“Is our 'inverted' retina really 'bad design'?” Technical Journal, April 1999, <http://www.answersingenesis.org/tj/v13/i1/retina.asp#r49>).

### **JOHN HARTNETT**

Ph.D. in physics from the University of Western Australia; he has published more than 30 papers in refereed scientific journals and holds two patents; he works as part of a team developing technology for very precise atomic clocks that gain or lose one second every 400 million years; these clocks tick at a rate of 10 billion times per second.

He is co-writing a book with Alex Williams about the big bang from a creationist viewpoint.

He says:

“Modern ideas about the origin of the universe contain lots of complicated mathematical theories and formulas. Many people are duped into thinking that because two plus two equals four, the math of the big bang must be right. But in most cases, these formulas are not provable or testable—they remain completely theoretical, and the models they support are based on unprovable starting assumptions. Christians, in particular, should not be worried about this” (“Exploding the Big Bang”, *The Genesis Files*, edited by Carl Wieland, p. 87).

### **BOB HOSKEN**

Ph.D. in biochemistry from the University of Newcastle, Australia, senior lecturer in food technology at the University of Newcastle.

“I have regarded my early research experience in the area of protein structure and function as a privilege, not only because it provided me with wonderful insights into molecular design and function, but also because it provided the insights to appreciate the subsequent advances that were to take place in biochemistry and molecular biology. I could now appreciate more than ever the complexity of the molecular control mechanism involved in metabolism and the immunological defense systems of the body. ... I cannot possibly conceive how such [systems] could ever evolve. There has to be an intelligent designer, and this is my personal God” (*In Six Days*, p. 126).

### **RUSSELL HUMPHREYS**

“Aside from Dr. Humphreys' achievements in secular research, he has also used Biblical presuppositions to accurately predict the strengths of magnetic fields on Uranus and Neptune (predictions made on the basis of evolutionary presuppositions were way off the mark). See 'Beyond Neptune: Voyager II supports creation', <http://www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-203.htm>; and 'The Creation of Planetary Magnetic Fields', *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 21(3):140-149, 1984, [http://www.creationresearch.org/crsq/articles/21/21\\_3/21\\_3.html](http://www.creationresearch.org/crsq/articles/21/21_3/21_3.html) (“Creationist Scientists”, John Mark Ministries).

### **EVAN JAMIESON**

Ph.D. in hydrometallurgy from Murdoch University, research chemist for Alcoa World Alumina, Australia.

“... while studying for my Tertiary Admittance Exam (years 11 and 12), I couldn’t help but notice the religious passion that teachers put into their discussions on the theory of evolution. In fact when I raised some scientific inconsistencies (e.g., polystrate fossils, young earth ages for non-radioactive dating methods, and complications for Miller’s ‘chemicals of life’ experiment), often there was an angry reaction and feeble, if any, explanations. ... The lack of credible answers made me quite skeptical of the theory of evolution. After all, it wasn’t an obscure theory; it was basically accepted worldwide and had been studied for many years. Simple and obvious questions should have been given simple and obvious answers--so where were they? ... By the time I went to university, I was a budding creationist. I was expecting to encounter serious scientific argument from the ‘enlightened ones,’ but what I found was more of the same. ... instead of a rational debate, I was bombarded with highly emotive statements that included ‘people who do not believe the theory of evolution as fact have no right to be studying science.’ ... As the years passed, there were many questions posed regarding the validity of creation. However, these have always been answered to my satisfaction and have strengthened my foundations” (*In Six Days*, pp. 324-326).

### **GEORGE JAVOR**

Ph.D. in biochemistry from Columbia University, Professor of Biochemistry, School of Medicine, Loma Linda University.

“If we don’t understand how a world like ours could be created in six days, we need to ask how a world like ours could be created at all. We will have to admit that we just do not know. ... For the believer who is also a scientist, the words of the Bible: ‘For in six days the Lord made the heaven and the earth, the sea, and all that is’ (Exod. 20:1) still make wonderful sense” (*In Six Days*, p. 137).

### **ARTHUR JONES**

Ph.D. in biology from the University of Birmingham, science and education consultant.

“During my undergraduate days when my ‘heretical’ views became known, my professor (Otto Lowenstein, Professor of Zoology) made a point of telling me that no creationist would be allowed to do research in his department! However, he did allow me to do research. From the pressure that was put on me, I can only assume that it was thought that I could be convinced of the error of my ways. If that was the intention, then it badly backfired. Many a visiting scholar was brought into my laboratory to convince me, from their area of expertise, that evolution was indisputably true. Of course, hardly knowing their field, I never had an answer at the time, but after they had gone I would look up the relevant research and carefully analyze it. I always found the evolutionary case was much weaker than it had seemed and that alternative creationist interpretations were available which were just as or more convincing. My position was further strengthened by the results of my own research” (*In Six Days*, pp. 242, 243).

### **RAYMOND JONES**

Ph.D. published 140 research papers; found the solution to detoxify the *Leuceana* tree for cattle production; retired from Australia’s Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO).

Raymond Jones became a Christian at age 17 through the ministry of a grocer who ran a kids’ club. He led a gang to try to break up the meetings but ended up being converted. He was a theistic evolutionists for awhile, but this eventually gave way to a complete rejection of evolution. He says:

“As I looked at the evidence--trying to be a dispassionate scientist--I could not find the evidence for the multitudes of intermediate forms which should exist if evolution was true” (“Standing Firm”, *The Genesis Files*, edited by Carl Wieland, p. 28).

When asked about the idea that science would fall apart without the theory of evolution, Jones replies:

“I don’t see that it’s the driving force that enables breakthroughs, or that it features much in most scientists’ daily work. Is having an evolutionary paradigm more enabling of research? I don’t think so. In fact, believing in an almighty all-knowing God, rather than chance, behind everything could be more of a driving force for your scientific work. It gives you confidence that something will be found when you search, because behind it all is a mind greater than your own--‘thinking God’s thoughts after Him’ [to quote Kepler]” (Ibid.)

## DEAN H. KENYON

Dean H. Kenyon has a Ph.D. in biophysics from Stanford University and did post-doctoral work at the University of California Berkeley, Oxford, and NASA. He was a professor of biology at San Francisco State University from 1966 until he retired as professor emeritus, teaching both undergraduate and graduate courses. He co-authored with Gary Steinman the book *Biochemical Predestination* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969), one of the best-selling books on chemical evolution. The preface to the Russian edition was written by A. I. Oparin, who was the author of the theory that life arose in a primordial soup. Kenyon contributed a chapter to *The Origin of Life and Evolutionary Biochemistry* and has published numerous articles to publications such as *Photochemistry and Photobiology*, *Laboratory of Chemical Biodynamics Quarterly*, *Enzymologia*, *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, and the *Journal of Molecular Evolution*.

Kenyon’s view changed in about 1976 after he was exposed to the writings of creationists such as A. E. Wilder-Smith and Henry Morris. He says:

“Then in 1976, a student gave me a book by A. E. Wilder-Smith, *The Creation of Life: A Cybernetic Approach to Evolution*. Many pages of that book deal with arguments against Biochemical Predestination, and I found myself hard-pressed to come up with a counter-rebuttal. Eventually, several other books and articles by neo-creationists came to my attention. I read some of Henry Morris’ books, in particular, *The Genesis Flood*. I’m not a geologist, and I don’t agree with everything in that book, but what stood out was that here was a scientific statement giving a very different view of earth history. Though the book doesn’t deal with the subject of the origin of life per se, it had the effect of suggesting that it is possible to have a rational alternative explanation of the past” (“Up from Materialism: An Interview with Dean Kenyon”, *Bible-Science Newsletter*, September 1989).

Because of his creationist views, Kenyon was relieved of his teaching duties by San Francisco State University, but he was reinstated after the Academic Freedom committee ruled in his favor and the full university senate supported the committee’s decision. He was thereafter treated as a second-class instructor, though, and not provided with any further research grants in spite of his impressive credentials, thanks to the Darwinian gestapo.

In 1984 he made the following statement:

“It is my conviction that if any professional biologist will take adequate time to examine carefully the assumptions upon which the macro-evolutionary doctrine rests, and the observational and laboratory evidence that bears on the problem of origins, he/she will conclude that there are substantial reasons for doubting the truth of this doctrine. Moreover, I believe that a scientifically sound creationist view of origins is not only possible, but is to be preferred over the evolutionary view” (Dean H. Kenyon, professor of biology at San Francisco State University, “The Creationist View of Biological Origins”, *NEX4 Journal*, Spring 1984, p. 33).

In 1989 he coauthored (with Percival Davis) the book *Of Pandas and People: The Central Question of Biological Origins*.

In an Affidavit filed on September 17, 1984, in the trial *Edwards v. Aguillard*, Kenyon stated:

“It is my professional opinion, based on my original research, study, and teaching, that creation-science is as scientific as evolution, although it currently does not have the benefit of the volume of research that has been carried out under evolutionist presuppositions. It is my conviction that if any

professional biologist will take adequate time to examine carefully the assumptions upon which the macroevolutionary doctrine rests, and the observational and laboratory evidence that bears on the problem of origins, he/she will conclude that there are substantial reasons for doubting the truth of this doctrine. Moreover, I believe that a scientifically sound creationist view of origins is not only possible, but is to be preferred over the evolutionary view.

“Although students generally hear only one side on the origins question, increasing numbers of scientists are now abandoning evolution for a new scientific version of creationism. Creationist scientists now number in the hundreds, possibly in the thousands, in the States and in other countries. This extraordinary development, I believe, has resulted largely from analysis of new scientific data not available to Darwin (or to his followers until relatively recently), especially chemical information bearing on the origin of first life and paleontological and other information bearing on biological origins. In sum, biological creation is scientific, and in fact is scientifically stronger than biological evolution”.

### **JOHN KRAMER**

Ph.D. biochemistry from the University of Minnesota, completed three years of post-doctoral studies as a Hormel fellow at the Hormel Institute and as an NRC fellow at the University of Ottawa, research scientist with Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada.

“Dr. Kramer has identified, characterized and synthesized the structure of numerous food, bacterial, and biological components and has published 128 refereed papers and numerous abstracts and book chapters. He was one of the core scientists who evaluated the toxicological, nutritional and biochemical properties of canola oil and demonstrated its safety. He presently serves as associate editor of the scientific journal LIPIDS”. Dr. Kramer is another scientist whose creationist presuppositions contributed to good science outcomes. See

<http://www.answersingenesis.org/home/Area/isd/kramer.asp> (“Creationist Scientists”, John Mark Ministries).

“I believe in a Creator because I see the Creator’s designs in nature everywhere and evidence of intelligence in the DNA of each cell” (*In Six Days*, p. 54).

### **ATOMIC CHUAN TSE LEOW**

Ph.D. in toxicology.

Dr. Leow says:

“I’ve examined the intricacies of the brain under the electron microscope, magnified 50,000 times. The complexity and the design is staggering. ... There are 100 billion nerve cells (several times more glial cells) all integrated and functioning and connected to many others in complex circuits. Something like that cannot have come by itself, it has to be designed. I see the wonder of God everywhere in my work, it could not have come by chance. In fact, I see God everywhere in science. The stars, the complexity of DNA, the harmony of how everything all ties together” (“Atomic Power”, *The Genesis Files* edited by Carl Wieland”, p. 33).

### **JASON LISLE**

Ph.D. in astrophysics from the University of Colorado.

Dr. Lisle is the author of *Taking Back Astronomy* and *Ultimate Proof of Creation: Resolving the Origins Debate*.

He observes that if God’s Word were not true reality would make no sense:

“We would not have a good reason to believe in the preconditions of intelligibility; the basic reliability of memory and senses, laws of logic, uniformity of nature, morality, personal dignity and freedom, and so on. ...

“Rational reasoning involves using the laws of logic. ... For example, the statement ‘My car is in the garage and it is not the case that my car is in the garage’ is necessarily false by the law of non-contradiction. Any rational person would accept this law. But few people stop to ask, ‘Why is this law true? Why should there be a law of non-contradiction, or for that matter, any laws of reasoning?’ .. The Christian can answer these questions. ... According to Genesis, God has made us in His image (Gen. 1:26) and therefore we are to follow His example (Eph. 5:1). The laws of logic are a reflection of the way God thinks, and thus the way He expects us to think. The law of non-contradiction is not simply one person’s opinion of how we ought to think, rather it stems from God’s self-consistent nature. God cannot deny Himself (2 Tim. 2:13), and all truth is in God (John 14:6; Col. 2:3), therefore truth will not contradict itself. Since God is constantly upholding the universe by His power (Heb. 1:3), the consistent Christian expects that no contradiction will ever occur in the universe.

“Laws of logic make sense in a Christian worldview. But other worldviews cannot account for them. For example, apart from the Bible, how could we know that contradictions are always false? We could only say that they have been false in our experience. But our experiences are very limited, and no one has experienced the future. ... Only in a biblical worldview can we know that contradictions cannot occur in reality; only the Christian has a basis for the law of non-contradiction, or laws of logic in general. ...

“How can the evolutionist account for absolute standards of reasoning like the laws of logic? In an accidental evolutionary universe, why would there be universal, unchanging standards? ...

“There cannot be a single universal set of laws of logic if there is more than one god. Therefore, no polytheistic religion can account for laws of logic” (Jason Lisle, *The Ultimate Proof of Creation*, pp. 40, 41, 52, 54, 56).

## **RICHARD LUMSDEN**

(1938-97), Ph.D., converted from Darwinian atheist to Bible-believing Christian at the apex of his professional career when, challenged by one of his students, he decided to check out the evidence for himself.

A professor of parasitology and cell biology, Lumsden was dean of the graduate school at Tulane University. He trained 30 Ph.Ds, published hundreds of scholarly papers, and was the winner of the highest award for parasitology.

The following is excerpted from “The World’s Greatest Creation Scientists” by David Coppedge, which is available from Master Plan Association, <http://www.creationsafaris.com/products.htm> --

“Dr. Richard D. Lumsden was fully grounded in Darwinian philosophy, and had no reason or desire to consider Christianity. Science was his faith: the facts, and only the facts. But at the apex of his professional career, he had enough integrity to check out the facts, and made a difficult choice to go where the facts led him, against what he had been taught, and against what he himself taught. His life took a dramatic turnaround, from Darwinist to creationist, and from atheist to Christian.

“All through his career he believed Darwinian evolution was an established principle of science, and he took great glee in ridiculing Christian beliefs. One day, he heard that Louisiana had passed a law requiring equal time for creation with evolution, and he was flabbergasted--how stupid, he thought, and how evil! He used the opportunity to launch into a tirade against creationism in class, and to give them his best eloquence in support of Darwinism. Little did he know he had a formidable opponent in class that day. No, not a silver-tongued orator to engage him in a battle of wits; that would have been too easy. This time it was a gentle, polite, young female student.

“This student went up to him after class and cheerfully exclaimed, ‘Great lecture, Doc! Say, I wonder if I could make an appointment with you; I have some questions about what you said, and just want to get my facts straight.’ Dr. Lumsden, flattered with this student’s positive approach, agreed on a time they could meet in his office. On the appointed day, the student thanked him for his time, and started in. She did not argue with anything he had said about evolution in class, but just began asking a series of questions: ‘How did life arise? . . . Isn’t DNA too complex to form by chance? . . .



Why are there gaps in the fossil record between major kinds? . . . What are the missing links between apes and man?’ she didn’t act judgmental or provocative; she just wanted to know. Lumsden, unabashed, gave the standard evolutionary answers to the questions. But something about this interchange began making him very uneasy. He was prepared for a fight, but not for a gentle, honest set of questions. As he listened to himself spouting the typical evolutionary responses, he thought to himself, ‘This does not make any sense. What I know about biology is contrary to what I’m saying.’ When the time came to go, the student picked up her books and smiled, ‘Thanks, Doc!’ and left.

On the outside, Dr. Lumsden appeared confident; but on the inside, he was devastated. He knew that everything he had told this student was wrong.

“Dr. Lumsden had the integrity to face his new doubts honestly. He undertook a personal research project to check out the arguments for evolution, and over time, found them wanting. Based on the scientific evidence alone, he decided he must reject Darwinism, and he became a creationist. But as morning follows night, he had to face the next question, Who is the Creator? Shortly thereafter, by coincidence or not, his daughter invited him to church. It was so out of character for this formerly crusty, self-confident evolutionist to go to church! Not much earlier, he would have had nothing to do with religion. But now, he was open to reconsider the identity of the Creator, and whether the claims of the Bible were true. His atheistic philosophy had also left him helpless to deal with guilt and bad habits in his personal life. This time he was open, and this time he heard the Good News that God had sent His Son to pay the penalty for our sins, and to offer men forgiveness and eternal life.

“A tremendous struggle was going on in Dr. Lumsden’s heart as he listened to the sermon. When the service ended, the pastor gave an invitation to come to the front and decide once and for all, publicly, to receive Christ. Dr. Lumsden describes the turmoil he was in: ‘With flesh protesting every inch of the way, I found myself walking forward, down to the altar. And there, found God! Truly, at that moment, I came to know Him, and received the Lord Jesus Christ as my Lord and Savior.’ There’s room at the cross even for know-it-all science professors, if they are willing to humble themselves and bow before the Creator to whom the scientific evidence points.

“Dr. Lumsden rejoiced in his new-found faith, but found out there is a price to pay also. He was ejected from the science faculty after his dynamic conversion to Christ and creationism. The Institute for Creation Research invited him to direct their biology department, which he did from 1990 to 1996. Dr. Henry Morris said of him, ‘He had a very vibrant testimony of his conversion only a few years ago and of the role that one of his students played in confronting his evolutionism with persistent and penetrating questions. He became fully convinced of the bankruptcy of his beliefs and realized that the only reasonable alternative was that there must be a Creator.’ Dick Lumsden was also appointed to the science faculty of The Master’s College, and used his intimate knowledge of electron microscopy to help the campus set up an operational instrument for training students. There was a joy present in his life and manner that made his lectures sparkle, and he loved to demonstrate design in the cell that could not have arisen by Darwinian processes. In discussions with evolutionists, he knew ‘just where to get them’ (he would say with a smile), having been in their shoes. His students appreciated the training his depth and breadth of knowledge and experience brought to the class and to the lab”.

Before he died his testimony was video recorded and it is now available at the following location: <http://www.wayoflife.org/database/lumsden.html>.

## **IAN MACREADIE**

“Dr Ian Macreadie is a highly regarded Australian researcher in the fields of molecular biology and microbiology. Author of more than 60 research papers, he is a Principal Research Scientist at the Biomolecular Research Institute of Australia’s Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO), and national secretary of the Australian Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology. In 1997 he was part of a team which won the CSIRO’s top prize, the Chairman’s Medal. In 1995 he won the Australian Society for Microbiology’s top award, for outstanding con-

tributions to research. He is also adjunct professor of the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology” ([http://www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/bios/i\\_macreadie.asp](http://www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/bios/i_macreadie.asp)).

When asked about whether mutations add new genetic information, Dr. Macreadie, one of the southern hemisphere’s top AIDS scientists, replies:

“All you see in the lab is either gene duplications, reshuffling of existing genes, or defective genes (with a loss of information) that might help a bug to survive--say by not being able to find the drug as effectively. But you never see any new information arising in a cell. Sometimes a bacterium can ‘inject’ information into another one, so its ‘new’ to that bacterium--but that information had to arise somewhere, and we just don’t observe it happening. It’s hard to see how any serious scientist could believe that real information can arise just by itself, from nothing” (“Creation in the Research Lab”, *The Genesis Files*, edited by Carl Wieland, p. 36).

## JOHN MANN

John Mann was Entomologist to the Government Department of Lands in Australia, a Fellow of the Royal Zoological Society, and Director of the Alan Fletcher Research Station, among other things.

Mann was awarded the M.B.E. by the Queen of England for solving the cactus problem in Australia. The cactus was brought to the country in 1839 and by 1914 had covered 60 million acres in Queensland so densely that it was impossible to do anything productive with the land. This was formerly good land for grazing, dairying and grain production. Families were actually driven off their farms and ranches, and no type of machinery or chemical was effective. Mann figured out how to mass breed the *Cactoblastic cactorum* caterpillar, which is a natural enemy of the cactus.

In an interview in 1982, Mann reminisced about the debate over evolution in the 1920s and how he decided not to accept evolution because it was not based on solid scientific facts.

“[O]ne man who influenced me was the Professor of Anatomy at the University of Adelaide. He wrote the Progress Prize Memorial Lecture, ‘The Ancestry of Man.’ He wrote about the discovery of an exceedingly early fossil anthropoid in America. This fossil animal was named ‘Hesperopithecus.’ Not only was it named but its complete form, both male and female, were shown as a whole page illustration in an English illustrated weekly, as part of an article on ‘The Early Humanoid in America’, by Professor Elliot Smith. But the anatomy professor pointed out the only evidence on which this was based, consisted of a single water-worn molar tooth, and that there were other learned authorities of the day such as Dr. Smith Woodward, who had suggested that it was the tooth of a bear. When I read that in 1923, I thought to myself, ‘Well, evolutionary theory appears to have been built upon 99% imagination and 1% fossils’ so I maintained that as a Christian I would believe in the Bible until somebody could come up with any definite proof that men had evolved from animals. ...

“One gentleman had built up a key for flies. It was a fine looking tree. However after he had sent it to the Linnaean Society in Sydney for publication, he found more insects which altered his whole concept, so he sent them a telegram and told them not to publish his key until further notice. Finally he almost turned it upside down with his next key. So I said to myself, ‘Well I believe God; and I believe the Bible; and these men are not producing anything concrete that would make me disbelieve. Until they do I am just going to go on as I am’” (“Famous Creation Scientists: Interview with John Mann”, *Answers in Genesis*, October 1982).

Mann used his field of entomology (study of insects) to illustrate one of the powerful evidences of creation, which is the amazing inter-relationship of the entire system of life.

“When God created organisms He created their food too. If they are deprived of that specific food they die. Our specific tests on *Cactoblastis* showed that. The list of plants that we tried to get *Cactoblastis* to eat was absolutely enormous, and I would say that 85% of the plants that we had to test were almost a waste of time. Firstly because cactaceae as a group of plants are quite separate from most other groups. It was fairly safe to say that insects feeding on cactus would not eat any other type of plant and secondly, we fairly well knew that the insects wouldn’t be able to live on most of them, simply because the *Cactoblastis* was a gregarious internal borer. To begin to test it on wheat

and oats and things like that was simply ridiculous, but we had to do it, just to prove it was safe to use them. Our results showed without a doubt that these insects had a group of plants which they could live on and nothing else. And that's usually what is found right throughout the insect kingdom. Organisms keep to one group of plants for their feeding. ... To me that was overwhelming evidence that they had a particular group of plants to live on and would not live on any others. We also found they were confined to certain types of cacti. There are quite a lot of groups of cactus that they will not feed on" ("Famous Creation Scientists: Interview with John Mann", *Answers in Genesis*, October 1982).

## **GEORGE MARSHALL**

Ph.D. in Ophthalmic Science from Glasgow University, Sir Jules Thorn Lecturer in Ophthalmic Science at Glasgow.

When asked by *Answers in Genesis* if accepting the Genesis account of creation is essential to his Christian faith, he replied:

"Yes! On not literally accepting the Genesis account of creation one is left with a major problem—what Scriptures do you accept as true and what Scriptures do you reject as false? Only by accepting the whole of Scripture as the inspired Word of God does one avoid this dilemma. There are Scriptures that are a source of stumbling to the intellect. My practice is to 'pigeon-hole' them temporarily and never allow them to be a stumbling block to my faith. It's amazing how many of these knotty problems have subsequently resolved themselves. Thus Genesis creation may initially appear to be hard to accept, but it strikes me that evolution is equally if not more problematic to believe" ("An Eye for Creation: An Interview with Eye-disease Researcher Dr. George Marshall", *Creation*, September 1996, <http://www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v18/i4/eye.asp> ).

To the question what advice he would give to Christian students, or to Christians in a science course or teaching situation he replied:

"First, recognize that science can become a 'religion' in its own right. Scientists say something, so the general public (the 'worshippers') accept it without question. Scientists are much more cautious about one another's findings. Second, science is not static. The science of today is quite different in many ways from the science of yesterday, and will probably bear little resemblance to the science of tomorrow. People once believed in 'spontaneous generation' which could be 'proved' by putting an old sack and a few bits of cheese in a dark corner. Mice spontaneously generated out of the sack. We laugh at such notions, but I suspect that in a hundred years' time people will laugh at some of our scientific notions. Third, one can still become an eminent scientist without accepting evolutionary dogma; the ability to produce sound science in the laboratory is not diminished by one's stance on creation".

## **ANDREW MCINTOSH**

Ph.D. in the theory of combustion from the Cranfield Institute of Technology, and D.Sc. in mathematics from the University of Wales, Reader in Combustion Theory, Department of Fuel and Energy, University of Leeds, U.K.

"As a scientist, I look at the world around me, and observe engineering mechanisms of such remarkable complexity that I am drawn to the conclusion of intelligent design being behind such complex order. ... It is not scientific to argue, on the one hand, for the obvious design of a Boeing 747, and then rule design 'out of court' when considering the far more versatile flight of an eagle, falcon, or the remarkable hummingbird. Modern minds within the secular media are presenting an unscientific duality of thought when praising engineering complexity in man-made machines, glorying in the great creative advances of mankind, but presenting the complexity in the world around us (of often far greater intricacy than man-made machines) as due to a gigantic unplanned cosmic experiment, with no Creator. ... As a scientist, I see nothing to discount straightforward belief in Scripture, when considering the mechanisms in nature" (*In Six Days*, pp. 155, 166, 169).

## JOHN MARCUS

Ph.D. in biological chemistry from the University of Michigan, research officer at the Cooperative Research Centre for Tropical Plant Pathology, University of Queensland, Australia.

“Two things that confirm my belief in creation are the clear evidence of design in nature, and the vanishingly small probabilities of life coming about by change. ... Truly, the thought of even one single functional protein arising by chance requires blind faith that will not or cannot grasp the numbers! Such thoughts are pure fantasy and have nothing to do with science. It is no wonder that evolutionists have not come up with any specific scenarios that would explain how life arose from non-living chemicals. The stories that are put forward are like fairy tales with some science thrown in to make them sound educated. ... the many deceptive evolutionary scenarios seem to be nothing short of biased myths arising from the desperate desire to exclude God from lives and consciences” (*In Six Days*, pp. 172, 179, 180).

## JOBE MARTIN

Dr. Jobe Martin is a dentist. He graduated from the University of Pittsburgh Dental School in 1966. While in the military, he served on Airforce One, the presidential jet. He worked for NASA in Houston, Texas, and held a teaching position at Baylor College of Dentistry.

A Darwinian evolutionist until he put his faith in Jesus Christ in 1976, he is the author of “Incredible Creatures that Defy Evolution” and “The Evolution of a Creationist”.

The following is his testimony:

“In the fall of 1971 I went to Baylor University in Dallas and gave my first lecture. It was on the evolution of the tooth. I talked about how these fish scales gradually migrated into the mouth and became teeth. A couple of students came to me after the class that day and said, ‘Dr. Martin, have you ever investigated the claims of creation science?’ I had never even heard of it. So I said, ‘Sure, I’ll look into this with you.’ And I’m thinking, kind of as a cocky young professor, ‘I’ll blow these guys away’.

“Well, they asked me to study the assumptions that the evolutionists make. In all of my eight years of scientific education, I had never had a single professor tell me about an assumption. So we started looking at the assumptions. I began to realize that evolutionists are making some claims that are based on assumptions that aren’t valid, when they tell us that rocks are so old and these kinds of things.

“Then they asked me to start studying some animals and see if I thought that animal could have evolved. The first thing that we studied together was this little bug called the bombardier beetle. This little insect, which is about a half inch long, mixes chemicals that explode. I began to think, O.K. how would that evolve? If evolution is true it had to somehow evolve that. Let’s assume it is evolving this defense mechanism, but the first time that it finally produces the explosion, what happens to the bug? Well, it is destroyed by the explosion, and we know that splattered bug pieces don’t evolve. So I thought, how could this have happened? Well, [because of the intricate way it is built] it doesn’t blow itself up. It has another little factory inside itself and it manufactures a chemical that acts as a catalyst, so when it squirts that chemical into these other chemicals that are in a suspended state it produces the explosion. And it has an asbestos lined firing chamber to protect itself. And it has two little twin tail tubes, and it can aim these tubes out the side, even out the front. Let’s say a spider is coming up toward its side and it doesn’t have time to turn around and shoot. It can just take its little gun turret, aim it out to the side, and shoot. If you are listening to the explosion all you hear is a single pop, but scientists have now put that sound into slow motion, and it is like about a thousand sequential little explosions that are so fast that all we hear is one pop. So you think, why would that be? It was a curious thing for the scientists that are studying this little bug. A lot of them are at Cornell University and some other places. What they discovered was that if it were just one big explosion, the little bug would be jetted away by the force! But as long as it is a se-

quential explosion, the bug with his little legs can hang on. How would evolution explain a sequential explosion?

“This little bug messes with all of the theories of evolution. There is no way a slow, gradual process is going to produce this bug. There is no way, even, that the newer theories, such as punctuated equilibrium, can explain this bug. I began to realize that this little bug needed to have all of its parts there at once or you just don’t have the animal.

“And my stomach started to churn. My wife will tell you that my stomach churned for five years. It took a five-year struggle for me to begin to flip the way I think, from thinking in an evolutionary way to thinking that this creature was created fully formed just like it is. That went against everything I had ever learned” (Jobe Martin, *Incredible Creatures that Defy Evolution 1*, Exploration-Films.com, 800-964-0439).

### **ANGELA MEYER**

Ph.D. in horticultural science from the University of Sydney, former research scientist at Hort Research, Mount Albert Research Centre in New Zealand.

“I believe the biblical account of creation because it is the best explanation for the complexity of life. I have never seen any evidence for evolution. All that I see around me in nature points to a divine designer” (*In Six Days*, p. 143).

### **COLIN MITCHELL**

Ph.D. in desert terrain geography from Cambridge University, former international consultant in the development of arid lands.

“Like so many others, I found it difficult to harmonize the evolutionary ideas in which I had been educated with the basis of the Christian faith that I had learned. ... How secure is the idea that there is an uninterrupted creative sequence from the big bang through the formation of the solar system, the solidification of the earth, the spontaneous generation of life, and the evolution of plants, animals, and humans to end in the world around us today? Is this scheme impregnable? By no means. It has fatal gaps and inconsistencies. A few questions can reveal this. Who or what provided the material for the big bang? Why did it not implode rather than explode? How could it coagulate into stars and how could these generate planets? How could life appear spontaneously? How could one kind of living creature change into another when the fossil record shows no evidence of such changes? How could intelligence and mind develop in the face of the second law of thermodynamics which denies such possibilities? None of these questions can be satisfactorily answered. ...

“... our response to the idea of a six-day creation governs our vision of the cosmos, and beyond this, of our ultimate destiny. The impossibility of harmonizing today’s scientific world view with Scripture leaves a stark alternative. This is between seeing the world as having no meaning and human life as having evolved from primitive beginnings through upward struggle with a view of the future which at best provides some material and cultural advancement for the race, at worst to its destruction, and in either case to oblivion for the individual. On the other hand, all nature can be seen as part of a benevolent divine plan. Our life, both here and hereafter, can depend on the answer” (*In Six Days*, pp. 318, 319, 320).

### **HENRY MORRIS**

(1918-2006), Ph.D. in hydraulics and hydrology from the University of Minnesota; thirteen years Professor of Hydraulic Engineering and Head of the Civil Engineering Department of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and University; a Fellow of the American Association for Advancement of Science; author of the textbook *Applied Hydraulics in Engineering*.

“[In the early 1940s] Irwin Moon came to El Paso with his very impressive ‘Sermons from Science.’ Although his visual electrical displays impressed me, it was a sermon dealing with fossils as a

result of the Flood, and its implications, that got me thinking. I had never heard of this before, and suddenly I realized that it was possible to not only defend the Bible against its scientific critics, but to also use it as a guide to aid in scientific discovery. As a result of his talk, I realized the need for answers in science and apologetics and began to read everything I could find that seemed relevant. ... I no longer believed there was any validity to Darwinism, having become convinced of this as much by the evolutionist literature I had read as by the creationist books. The standards of evidence supporting evolution seemed trivial compared to the evidence on which engineers have to base their work and also compared to the evidences for the divine origin of the Bible (such as fulfilled prophecy, the resurrection of Christ, etc.). ...

“My verse-by-verse study of the Bible confirmed that everything was created and made in the six days of the creation week, several thousand years ago. There may be some uncertainty in the precise date, and different Bible scholars (all following the same premises) have arrived at different dates, but there is no legitimate way the Bible can be made to yield anywhere near an age of millions of years ago for the date of creation. Neither the gap theory, nor the day/age theory, nor the allegorical theory, nor the revelation-day theory, nor any other theory that tries to accommodate the evolutionary ages can satisfy the straightforward teaching of the Bible on this vital subject. ... This conviction became the basic premise of my own creationist studies and has continued ever since, after once it was settled in my own mind that this was the firm teaching of Scripture. Furthermore, this has been the basis of the strength of the modern creationist movement, and uncertainty on this point has been the real reason why earlier creationist defenses (including that of William Jennings Bryan) have fallen by the wayside” (*Persuaded by the Evidence*, pp. 221, 222, 223).

### **JOHN MORRIS**

Ph.D. in geological engineering from the University of Oklahoma, president of the Institute for Creation Research.

“As a Christian and as a scientist, my confidence in God’s Word is confirmed every time I look at the scientific evidence, and every time I look at the scientific evidence, my understanding of God’s Word is enhanced. Truly God’s Word and God’s world are both accurate self-authenticating and mutually reinforcing records of the unobserved past” (*In Six Days*, p. 313).

### **TERRY MORTENSON**

Terry Mortenson, who has a Ph.D. in the History of Geology from Coventry University in England, is a staff member of the Creation Museum in Kentucky. He is the author of *The Great Turning Point: The Church’s Catastrophic Mistake on Geology*. He also contributed to the book *Coming to Grips with Genesis: Biblical Authority and the Age of the Earth*.

In an interview with me at the Creation Museum on June 23, 2009, he said:

“I got a math degree from the University of Minnesota. Then I was a missionary for many years in Eastern Europe. I went back to school and got a Masters of Divinity in theological studies. Then from there I went on and got my Ph.D. in the History of Geology, looking at the origins of this idea of millions of years of earth history. As I became a Christian, as a math major, I was interested in science and one of the first questions I had was, ‘What do I do with evolution?’ because that was what I had been taught in school. The more I read, I could see that evolution is one of the greatest myths ever foisted on the minds of men”.

When I asked him Dr. Mortenson if he knows of any scientific facts that contradict the Bible, he replied:

“I have studied a lot of arguments from evolutionists; I have had seven formal debates with evolutionary professors at universities, and I have never read or heard any scientific fact that contradicts what the Bible says. There are evolutionist’s interpretations of the facts, but the facts themselves are not contrary to Scripture”.

In a blog entitled “Origins Views and the Assemblies of God”, dated Dec. 11, 2010, Dr. Mortenson wrote:

“It is not the ‘findings of science’ that seem to contradict “traditional interpretations” of Genesis 1-11. Science has not found anything that contradicts the straightforward, literal understanding of Genesis, and it is remarkable that a Christian chemist and biologist would say that science has. Science has not found a living cell spontaneously evolving into existence by chance from non-living matter, as evolutionists claim has happened 3.5 billion years ago. Science has not found transitional forms between different kinds of plants and animals, either living or in the fossil record, to support evolutionist claims that all life is descended from a common ancestor—the first living cell. And science has not found millions of years of time in the rocks or a gas cloud collapsing to form a star. None of those things has ever been observed by any scientist, so they are not findings of science.

“Rather, evolutionary scientists using anti-biblical (naturalistic and uniformitarian) assumptions and imagination have interpreted some of the observations of the natural world (while ignoring other observations) to invent a story about the past that contradicts the time-tested, historically orthodox and exegetically sound interpretation of God’s inerrant Word. It is not a conflict between the ‘findings of science’ and ‘traditional interpretations’ of the Bible. It is rather the conflict between the atheistic and deistic interpretations of God’s creation by people who are suppressing the truth in unrighteousness (Romans 1:18–20) versus the sound interpretation of God’s Word by godly leaders and pastors in the church down through history”.

## **GARY PARKER**

Ed.D. in biology/geology from Ball State University.

“I wasn’t just teaching evolution, I was preaching it. ‘It was millions of years of struggle and death that brought mankind and all the other animals and plants into being,’ I told my college students. I praised Darwin for being the first to understand how evolution worked. ... I let students freely express their religious beliefs, but would not let them use their personal faith to challenge what I considered the rock-hard science of evolution. I thought it was part of my duty as a science teacher to deliver my students from silly old superstitions, like taking the Bible literally and trying to refute evolution with ‘creation science’.

“The change began when Dr. Charles Signorino, a chemistry professor at the college where I was teaching biology, invited my wife and me to his home for Bible study. ... I started studying the Bible, primarily to criticize it more effectively. ...

“Make no mistake about it--creation/evolution is a salvation issue. I do not mean you have to have a detailed knowledge of creation science to be a Christian; I simply mean that belief in evolution can be for many, as it was for me, a powerful stumbling block to accepting (or even considering) the claims of Christ. Paul warned Timothy to avoid the oppositions of science falsely so-called, which some have erred concerning the faith (1 Tim. 6:20-21). Evolution is really ‘humanism dressed up in a lab coat,’ a man-centered worldview that uses scientific jargon to put man’s opinions far above God’s Word (as Eve did in the Garden).

“My extensive knowledge of, and zeal for, evolution certainly prevented me from even considering God might be real and the Bible true. So what happened. Well, Dr. Signorino, the colleague who invited me to the Bible study, was not only a superb Bible teacher, he was also a scientist respected internationally for his work in chemistry. He challenged me to look again at the science I thought I knew so well. Confident that science would support evolution and refute ‘4C’ biblical literalism, I gladly accepted the challenge.

“The battle began. For three years, we argued creation/evolution. For three years, I used all the evolutionary arguments I knew so well. For three years, I lost every scientific argument. In dismay, I watched the myth of evolution evaporate under the light of scientific scrutiny, while the scientific case for Creation-Corruption-Catastrophe-Christ just got better and better. It’s no wonder that the

ACLU (actually the anti-Christian lawyers union) fights by any means to censor any scientific challenge to evolution! ...

“About that time, I got a copy in the mail of the first book I ever wrote, a programmed science instruction book called *DNA: The Key to Life*. Up until that time I thought people who wrote books, especially textbooks in science, knew what they were talking about. I had a nearly straight A average and earned numerous academic awards, and my book had been reviewed by experts on DNA, but I knew all the uncertainties that went into it. (Indeed, when I published the second edition five years later, I put the first edition aside and started fresh; so much additional knowledge about DNA had been gained.) It finally dawned on me: if experts in science can write books that have to be continually corrected, revised, and updated, perhaps God could write a Book in which He said what He meant and meant what He said: eternal and unchanging truth, an absolutely sure foundation for understanding life useful to all people at all times in all places!

“Looking now at the Bible as the truly true ‘History Book of the Universe,’ I was lifted out of the prison of time, space, and culture, and enabled to see past the shallow and ever-changing words of human experts to the deep and never-changing Word of the Lord God, Maker of heaven and earth! I experienced who Jesus is and what Jesus meant when He said, “You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free” (John 8:32).

“... I could now look at familiar facts in unfamiliar ways--ways that made more sense scientifically and helped me to solve some of the origins problems that had puzzled me as an evolutionist. As I looked at biology with the blinders of evolution finally removed, the biblical theme of Creation-Corruption-Catastrophe-Christ was reflected everywhere! ...

... some said that if I only knew more about fossils, I would give up this ‘creationist nonsense’ and accept the ‘fact of evolution.’ Then the Lord did something fabulous for me: a fellowship from the National Science Foundation for 15 months of full-time doctoral study. With fear and trembling, I added a doctoral minor in geology, emphasizing paleontology and origins, to check out the fossil evidence firsthand. I had excellent professors, including some Christians, but all assumed evolution without question. However, what they taught me about fossils made it hard to believe in evolution and easy to accept the biblical record of a perfect creation, ruined by man, destroyed by the Flood, restored to new life in Christ. ...

“At the end of my geophysics unit on radiometric dating, the professor was going over the long list of assumptions required to convert any measurement of radioisotope amounts into some estimate of age. Midway through the list of unwarranted assumptions and inconsistent results, the professor paused to joke that if a Bible-believing Christian ever became aware of these problems, he would make havoc out of the radiometric dating system! Then he admonished us to ‘keep the faith’.

“Keep the faith. At bottom, that is all there is to radioactive decay dating: a faith the facts have failed. At bottom, that’s all there is to evolution: a faith the facts have failed. Evolution was only able to get a toe-hold on science because of 19th-century ignorance of molecular biology, cellular ultra structure, ecology, and systematics. Discoveries in these fields completely crushed evolution as a science, but it persists only too well as a secular religion protected from contrary evidence by the anti-American censorship lawyers united” (*Persuaded by the Evidence*, pp. 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 258, 260, 261).

## **J. H. JOHN PEET**

Ph.D. in photochemistry from Wolverhampton Polytechnic, traveling secretary for the Biblical Creation Society.

“If we are to take the Bible account seriously, then we must recognize that the days of Genesis 1 are normal days, i.e., the period of the rotation of the earth about its axis, defined by ‘the evening and the morning.’ I believe there is no scriptural reason for believing otherwise. There is no relevant scientific need for reinterpreting God’s revelation” (*In Six Days*, p. 361).



## **DAVID PENNINGTON**

M.D., the first surgeon in the world to successfully reattach a human ear; he is at the forefront of developing the “TRAM flap” which allows replacement of parts of limbs, noses, ears, etc. that have been severed and has many other reconstructive uses.

When asked whether his non-believing medical colleagues are awed by the design in the human body, Dr. Pennington replies:

“Yes, a lot of these so-called evolutionists are constantly using words like ‘wonderful’ and ‘design.’ They are almost unconsciously having to accept that things look marvelously designed. The more you look, and the smaller you look, the more you find. The tiny, tiny things we get down to--the molecules in the cell--are miraculous, just unbelievable. As medical students 30 years ago, we were told, ‘We don’t understand this; we don’t understand that...’ and now that we’re understanding some of these things, they are astonishingly more complex than we ever thought” (*Reshaping People*”, *The Genesis Files*, edited by Carl Wieland, p. 42).

## **RICHARD PORTER**

Porter was Professor of Orthopaedic Surgery at the University of Aberdeen, Scotland and Director of Education and Training for the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh; he has published over 120 papers in peer-reviewed journals and is author of five textbooks; he was awarded a D.Sc. degree in 2001 by Edinburgh University for his research on spinal stenosis and the Syme professorship for work on congenital talipes.

When asked whether it is possible to do research science apart from an evolutionary framework, Dr. Porter replies:

“It is just the opposite. A person who begins with the premise that God has made an excellent design is at an advantage--he is able to ask questions that the evolutionist never thought about. The most important thing in research is to begin by asking the right question. For example, the curve of the lumbar spine toward the front--the lordosis--was thought by evolutionists to be a problem, the result of man having recently adopted an upright position. So, some researchers blamed back pain on this, saying the spine had not yet evolved satisfactorily. If therapists have the wrong starting assumption, then it’s not surprising that treatments for lordosis are unhelpful.

“I start from quite a different position. From my understanding of human anatomy and physiology and my understanding of God, I say that the form of God’s creation always matches its function. So you can be sure that the form of the spine is perfectly designed for its function. God has made a wonderful spine. If you start with that premise, it gives you a head start when trying to understanding the mechanism of the spine” (“Standing Upright for Creation”, *The Genesis Files*, edited by Carl Wieland, p. 45).

## **GEORGIA PURDOM**

Ph.D. in molecular genetics, researcher and speaker for Answers in Genesis.

Dr. Purdom says:

“DNA is the instruction book for living organisms. It contains the information necessary to allow an organism to grow, develop, and mature. ... Information in DNA (such as how to make a protein) could not arise naturally. All information requires an intelligent, immaterial source” (*Evolution: The Grand Experiment*, Vol. 1, p. 193).

## **JOHN RANKIN**

Ph.D. in mathematical physics from the University of Adelaide, senior lecturer in the Department of Computer Science and Engineering, La Trobe University.

“After all the research to date, we are still unable to explain the origin of galaxies as inhomogeneities in the universe from the perspective of evolution. We seem, in fact, to be further away from a satisfactory explanation of evolutionary galactic origins than we were when we started to study the subject, using modern physical theory. As in one field of science, so in all others, we are unable to explain the origin of the beautiful and complex realities of this world from an evolutionist approach. .... The creationist approach allows us to have an exceedingly intricate and beautiful world at the outset, ready for us to explore its wonders scientifically. This is the approach that puts us on a firm foundation, and this is why I believe in creation rather than evolution” (*In Six Days*, p. 122).

### **JOHN SANFORD**

Ph.D. in plant breeding and genetics, University of Wisconsin, professor at Cornell University.

“Genesis 1-11 was a great challenge to my faith. Creation, the Fall, and the Flood seemed impossible--and it stood in direct defiance of my old religion, evolution. ... To accept this would result in a total overthrow of my entire mental framework. It would mean that the whole story of evolution, which had come to permeate every field of knowledge, was a lie--a monumental deception. ...

“Ironically, after becoming a creationist (by faith, not by knowledge), my mind has been renewed. An overthrow of my old mind was exactly what was needed to make room for a new mind and a new understanding. I have not had to turn off my mind--indeed, the challenge of understanding and defending Genesis has been the most exciting and stimulating phase of my entire scientific career. ... Now that I have become a creationist, I have experienced a renaissance of my interest in all the sciences, including cosmology, astronomy, geophysics, geology, biology, genetics, paleontology, linguistics, and more. ...

“I can now see the Bible as the only reliable source of deep truth in a world filled with so much deception and false teaching. I now see God’s creation around me in a totally different light. ... Rather than making it harder for me to defend my faith, the acceptance of Genesis 1-11 has actually given me more confidence and boldness” (*Persuaded by the Evidence*, pp. 151, 152, 153).

### **JONATHAN SARFATI**

Ph.D. in physical chemistry from Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, research scientist for Answers in Genesis.

“Upon seeing the wonderful works of design in this world, I believe that the intellectually honest person must conclude that they were made by a great designer. This is so, even though we live in a sin-cursed world (Gen. 3:16-19; Rom. 8:20-23), where many designs are no longer benevolent and others have deteriorated because of mutations. But even a fallen design is still a design. There are plenty of structures that still retain their physical perfection. ... The dolphin’s sonar system is so precise that it’s the envy of the U.S. Navy. ... Even the simplest self-reproducing organism contains encyclopedic quantities of complex, specific information ... There are complex rotary motors in living organisms. ... The complex compound eyes of some types of trilobites, extinct and supposedly ‘primitive’ invertebrates, were amazingly designed” (*In Six Days*, pp. 78-81).

### **JOE SEBENY**

aerospace engineer with the Raytheon Company; over 20 years of experience in the defense industry; he has two degrees from MIT and a master’s degree in electrical engineering from the University of New Hampshire; he was one of the lead engineers in the design and testing of the AE-GIS-ER surface-to-air missile which is used by the U.S. Navy.

He says:

“I like to describe myself as someone who makes telephone poles fly. Our missiles have proportions not too dissimilar to telephone poles. ... If it were true that time makes all things possible, then indeed I could interpret the laws of thermodynamics any way I wanted to, and it would be concei-

vable that energy from the sun could, given enough time, transform telephone poles into the most complex of flying machines. But it won't happen, and the same laws make the evolution of a living thing from lifeless raw ingredients equally impossible, not matter how much time is imagined" ("It Doesn't Take a Rocket Scientist", *The Genesis Files*, edited by Carl Wieland, p. 83).

### **EMIL SILVESTRU**

Ph.D. from the Babes-Bolyai University in Transylvania; world authority on the geology of caves; he has published 23 scientific papers.

He says:

"Once I became a Christian, I knew I had to 'tune up' my scientific knowledge with the Scriptures.' He briefly tried to maintain belief in an old earth via a 'gap' theory, but this was an unsatisfactory compromise. He says, 'Although philosophically and ethically I accepted a literal Genesis from my conversion, at first I was unable to match it with my 'technical side.' [E-mail discussions with qualified creationist geologists, creationist books, *Creation* magazine and *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal*] were immensely important in my conversion and my Christian life. I am not convinced of a six-day, literal, recent, Genesis creation. That doesn't mean that there are not still some unanswered problems, but researching such issues is what being a scientist is all about" ("Caving in to Creation", *The Genesis Files*, edited by Carl Wieland, p. 93).

### **ANDREW SNELLING**

Ph.D. in geology from the University of Sydney in 1982.

"The evidence that persuaded me has not changed through all these years and continues to persuade me that the scriptural account of earth history alone explains the world in which we live. This evidence persuaded me years ago, but there is now even more evidence that is stronger and more powerful, leaving those who reject the evidence (and the Scriptures) without excuse. From the standpoint of a geologist, most of the fossilized creatures in the strata record bear all the same attributes and qualities as their modern counterparts, and they too show all the evidence of having been designed as integrated working 'machines' that functioned perfectly while they lived in their respective biological communities. The fossil creatures appear suddenly in the strata record, fully formed and fully functioning, without any hint of an evolutionary ancestor, or of how their uniquely designed features could have evolved by time, natural law, and chance.

"Furthermore, the formation and exquisite preservation of so many remarkably complete fossils, many with delicate structures and soft tissues meticulously fossilized, required special conditions and virtually instantaneous burial. Such beautifully preserved fossils are not isolated specimens but are found by the countless thousands over vast areas in what are known as 'fossil graveyards.' This required a scale and magnitude of catastrophic deposition to bury so many organisms over such vast areas of the earth's surface, so nothing less than a catastrophic global flood could have accumulated (and preserved) the fossil record. Indeed, the most extensive fossil graveyards, such as the chalk and coal beds, stretch right across continents and have a global distribution" (*Persuaded by the Evidence*, p. 273).

### **TIMOTHY STANDISH**

Ph.D. in biology and public policy from George Mason University, associate professor of biology at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan.

"Progressing in my studies, I slowly realized that evolution survives as a paradigm only as long as the evidence is picked and chosen and the great poll of data that is accumulating on life is ignored. As the depth and breadth of human knowledge increases, it washes over us a flood of evidence deep and wide, all pointing to the conclusion that life is the result of design" (*In Six Days*, p. 117).

## **BERT THOMPSON**

Ph.D. in microbiology from Texas A&M University; former professor in the College of Veterinary Medicine at Texas A&M, where he also served as the Coordinator of the Cooperation Education Program in Biomedical Science.

Thompson co-edited *A Study Course in Christian Evidences* with Wayne Jackson. The preface says:

“Paul, and untold millions of others down through the ages, served Jehovah God because they had seen, and examined, the evidences which stand incontrovertibly behind the God of the Bible and the Christian religion He instituted through His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ. Christianity is deeply rooted in historical fact” (Preface to *A Study Course in Christian Evidences*).

## **KER THOMSON**

D.Sc. in geophysics from the Colorado School of Mines, former director of the U.S. Air Force Terrestrial Sciences Laboratory.

“If the evolution or creationism discussion were decided by sensible appeals to reason, evolution would long ago have joined the great philosophical foolishnesses of the past, with issues such as how many angels can dance on the head of a pin, or the flat-earth concept. ... evolution is not adhered to on scientific grounds at all. Rather, it is clung to though flying in the face of reason, with an incredible, fanatical, and irrational religious fervor. It loudly claims scientific support when, in fact, it has none worthy of the name” (*In Six Days*, p. 217).

## **WALTER VEITH**

Ph.D. in zoology from the University of Cape Town, professor and chair of the Department of Zoology at the University of Western Cape, South Africa.

“Evolutionary scientists argue that creationism is not science, as it is based on a preconceived ideology, which excludes it from the realms of science. However, if the facts fit the biblical paradigm, cannot it then be argued that the creation account could be right, or would ‘right’ be excluded on the grounds of having been preconceived? In my own life I have been confronted with this dilemma and have become convinced that the alternative view of origin by design is worthy of support. For most of my academic career, I was a committed evolutionist and presented the theory of evolution to my students as an established fact. My university training and subsequent scientific endeavors had exposed me exclusively to the evolutionary paradigm and this had molded my thinking. It may well be asked: why the change of heart? In my religious experience I came to accept the Word of God as the most trustworthy book I have ever read. This Word has power to change lives, to lift people up and to give hope. It makes one willing to listen, to compare notes, it challenges one to test its trustworthiness. ‘Come let us reason together’ (Isa. 1:18), says the Word. My change of view regarding evolution was not instantaneous, not emotional, but the result of a long and often hard road in search of truth. I now believe that the available facts support the concept of origin by design” (*In Six Days*, p. 269).

## **JEREMY WALTER**

Ph.D. mechanical engineering, Pennsylvania State University, head of the Engineering Analysis and Design Department with the Energy Science and Power Systems Division at the Applied Research Laboratory.

“The principles and observations of true science do not contradict a literal interpretation of Genesis 1, but in fact offer support for the creation of all things in six days!” (*In Six Days: Why Fifty Scientists Choose to Believe in Creation*, edited by John Ashton, pp. 21, 22).

## **KEITH WANSER**

Ph.D. in condensed matter physics from the University of California, Irvine, professor of physics, California State University, Fullerton.

“In 1976 I recommitted my life to Jesus Christ, and shortly thereafter began studying the scientific, historical, scriptural, and other evidence for a literal six-day creation and worldwide global flood, as described in Genesis. In the intervening 24 years since then, I have studied these bodies of evidence in some detail, and I am firmly convinced that there is far more scientific evidence supporting a recent, six-day creation and global flood than there is an old earth and evolution. ... Over the last 35 years, scientists who believe in a recent, six-day creation have made some very interesting discoveries and convincing arguments for a young earth and worldwide Noahic flood” (*In Six Days*, pp. 103, 104).

### **A.J. MONTY WHITE**

Ph.D. in gas kinetics from the University College of Wales, dean of students office, University of Cardiff.

“My parents brought me up to be an atheist, but as a result of discussions with Christians during my first year at university, I came to the conclusion that there was a God, that the Bible could be trusted as both a history book and a book of prophecy, and also that Christianity was a miraculous life-transforming religion. My conversion experience came some months later and I became a Christian. ... The question I now asked myself was, ‘Is it possible, intellectually, to reject evolution?’ Over the next two years, I came to the conclusion that it was possible not only to reject the idea of evolution but also to accept the historicity of the early chapters of Genesis without committing intellectual suicide. ... At the time, I was totally unaware of any other creationist and I did not know of the existence of any anti-evolution/pro-creation book, article or organization. It may therefore come as a surprise that I became a creationist as a result of reading about evolution! ... I became convinced that people believe in evolution because they choose to do so. It has nothing at all to do with evidence. Evolution is not a fact, as so many bigots maintain. There is not a shred of evidence for the evolution of life on earth” (*In Six Days*, pp. 257, 259, 260, 263).

### **A.E. WILDER-SMITH**

(1915-1995), Ph.D. in physical organic chemistry from Reading University, England, Ph.D. in pharmacology from the University of Geneva, and Ph.D. in pharmacological sciences from ETH, a senior university in Zurich, Switzerland; a Fellow of the Royal Society of Chemistry and a NATO three-star general, Dr. Wilder-Smith was an expert on chemotherapy, pharmacology, organic chemistry, and biochemistry; he authored more than 70 scientific publications and more than 30 books, some of which have been published in 17 languages.

“The Intelligent Design movement is much in the news today, but did you know much of the scientific reasoning behind it came from a European organic chemist? ... Dean Kenyon, the evolutionary origin-of-life researcher turned creationist, called Dr. Wilder-Smith one of the two or three most important scientists in his life. Much of the literature coming out of the modern intelligent design movement contains echoes of powerful arguments made by A.E. Wilder-Smith decades ago.

“In his books and tapes, Arthur Edward Wilder-Smith stressed the importance of information in biology, stressing that the materialist’s formula for life--energy plus matter plus time--was deficient because it left out the information factor. He convincingly argued that the information transfer from DNA transcription to protein synthesis had to follow a language convention. In other words, it presupposed an agreement between parties needing to communicate with one another. For example, he explained how SOS is a meaningless sequence of letters unless there has been a convention (a ‘coming together’ agreement in advance) that it is a signal for distress. Similarly, the DNA triplet codon for alanine, GCC, looks and smells nothing like alanine by itself. Unless both the translation mechanism (the ribosome) and the DNA code both have a convention that GCC means alanine, the system will not work. This, he explained, was prima facie evidence of intelligent design. ...

“As a highly qualified organic chemist, A.E. Wilder-Smith was uniquely positioned to critique so-

called ‘chemical evolution.’ ... His effectiveness stemmed not from vituperative ability or rhetoric, but rather because of his intimate acquaintance with the facts of chemistry. No knowledgeable chemist could deny Dr. Wilder-Smith’s calm, rational application of scientific principles. His skill at dismantling the philosophical and scientific assumptions underlying his opponents’ errors was original and effective. Dr. Wilder-Smith was one of the first scientists to emphasize the necessity for one-handed molecules to hold genetic information, and to apply the laws of thermodynamics and equilibrium to discussions about the origin of life” (David Coppedge, *Persuaded by the Evidence*, pp. 275, 276).

Dr. Wilder-Smith made the following statement about the evolutionary icon of a primeval soup:

“It is emphatically the case that life could not arise spontaneously in a primeval soup of any kind. ... Furthermore, no geological evidence indicates an organic soup ever existed on this planet. We may therefore with fairness call this scenario ‘the myth of the pre-biotic soup’” (Wilder-Smith, cited in White and Comninellis, *Darwin’s Demise*, p. 30, 31).

## **PATRICK YOUNG**

Ph.D.; technical service manager at the DuPont Laboratories in Ohio; holder of patents related to the process of manufacturing Kevlar (used for bullet proof vests, among other things) and Mylar.

Dr. Young says:

“Probably 90-95 percent of the people who tell me they believe in evolution, when I ask them to tell me why, cannot do so. They can’t explain it in a scientific manner, but when they come across somebody who can explain creation in a scientifically valid manner, they kind of just turn around and walk away.

“Most of the scientists I come across, I believe that they wake up in the morning, look in the mirror and see their god. I think there is a level of arrogance in the scientific community and that is probably the reason why they don’t have the belief system needed for God--because they would first have to crucify that arrogance” (“Bullet Proofing Belief”, *The Genesis Files*, edited by Carl Wieland, p. 104).

## **HENRY ZUILL**

Ph.D. in biology from Loma Linda University, professor of biology at Union College in Lincoln, Nebraska.

“When we look broadly at the panorama of life and ecological relationships, we see that ecological complexity is built on layer upon layer of complexity, going all the way down through different hierarchical structural and organizational levels to the cell and even lower. ... we are talking about an essential multi-species integrated service system--an entire integrated system. There seems to be no adequate evolutionary way to explain this. How could multiple organisms have once lived independently of services they now require? ... Biodiversity is a powerful testimony about the Creator that confirms Romans 1:20. ... Biodiversity does not specify a six-day creation, it is not that finely focused, but it strongly supports such a possibility. It suggests that ecosystems were assembled during a very short time indeed. Otherwise, life could have failed for lack of mutually benefiting multi-species ecological services that are now requirements” (*In Six Days*, pp. 67-69, 72, 73).

Of course, even if every “reputable” scientist believed in evolution, as that blustering atheist Richard Dawkins claims, this would not mean it is correct. The Bible says, “Let God be true, but every man a liar” (Romans 3:4), and Jesus said, “I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes” (Matthew 11:25).

**Zie hierbij ook:**

- Wetenschappers-dissidenten: <https://www.discovery.org/m/2019/02/A-Scientific-Dissent-from-Darwinism-List-020419.pdf>
- Darwin-sceptici: <http://www.verhoevenmarc.be/PDF/dissidentenDarwinisme-Bergman.pdf>

[verhoevenmarc@skynet.be](mailto:verhoevenmarc@skynet.be) - [www.verhoevenmarc.be](http://www.verhoevenmarc.be) - [www.verhoevenmarc.be/NieuwsteArtikelen.htm](http://www.verhoevenmarc.be/NieuwsteArtikelen.htm)

Rubriek “Schepping vs. Evolutie”: <http://www.verhoevenmarc.be/schepping.htm>