

**BIBLE AND TRUE SCIENCE
V/S**

ATHEISTIC THEORY OF EVOLUTION

DEBUNKING THE ATHEISTIC PAGAN MYTH OF EVOLUTION

“God has created and made everything beautiful in its time”.

*“Also He has put eternity in their hearts,
Except that no one can find out the work
That God does from beginning to end. ”*

(Ecclesiastes 3:11)

“Science cannot answer the questions relating to the Genesis of Matter and Life; or, prove that there has been ever any evolution of life from inert matter; or, that animate primordial life forms actually evolved from inanimate matter. Only Philosophy based on Natural Revelation and beyond that Theology based on Biblical Revelation can arrive at an answer to any question of Origin of Matter and Life that is intellectually and scientifically satisfactory.

Philosophically speaking, ‘Effect’ cannot be greater than the ‘Cause’. Now, that rules out the possibility of any blind chance (a lesser cause) giving rise to matter (a greater effect), and inanimate matter (a lesser cause) giving rise to animate life forms (a greater effect). Therefore, theologically speaking, GOD, as the Prime Mover and Uncaused Cause, is the Creator of Matter and Life including Human Life as well as the Unseen or Invisible Spirit-life.”

~~~ Fr. Carmo Martins, Personal Notes, paraphrased.

“The agnostic and the atheist

*Do not seem to be in the least disturbed
By the fact that our entire organized,
Living universe becomes incomprehensible
Without the hypothesis of God.
Their belief in some physical elements,
Of which they know very little,
Has all the earmarks of an irrational faith,
But they are not aware of it.*

Some of them have remained slaves to a naïve verbalism

Lecomte Du Nouy

BIBLE and True SCIENCE v/s ATHEISTIC EVOLUTION

The **Answer** to the **Question** of **Origin** of **Matter** and **Life** is actually outside the realm of scientific enterprise or any other human investigating enterprise. No man can really ever find out (*cf.* Ecclesiastes 3:11) the real answers to the knotty questions relating to the *origin* of matter and life; nor explain the *purpose* for the existence of matter and life; nor provide any *meaning* to human life. At the most, men may philosophize; or, they may confidently lean upon *biblical* revelation. The pertinent questions relating to the *origins* are purely philosophical and theological issues and are, therefore, not within the realm of the *empirical* scientific enterprise.

Scientifically unfounded Theory of Evolution is technically *not a true science*. It is not even a philosophy but an illogical nonsense. The so-called theories of *Evolution* hailed as *scientific* realities and taught in almost all the fields of higher education have *fancily* occurred and still *occur* in the *minds* of the *atheistic- materialistic* scientists and evolutionists. These theories are then *blindly* accepted by the educated *elite* without questioning because there is no room for questioning. “*Thus saith the Atheistic Scientist*”... and that settles it, once for all...*to question* is to invite *antagonism*; or else, sound foolish and ignorant or downright stupid!

Evolutionism is more of a religion that includes atheistic theories of inorganic-cosmic evolution and organic-biological evolution. These theories encapsulate a ‘*family*’ of fallible ideas and myths to account for the *origins* of *matter* and *life* in a crude attempt to do away with a living Creator God. Subsequently, evolution of complex life forms over the course of *billions of years* culminating in the ‘*Descent of Man*’ from a Common Ancestor is firmly but blindly believed without any ‘*sting of conscience*’!

Frankly speaking, most “*People believe the ideas of the evolutionary development of life on earth for many reasons: it is all that they have been taught and exposed to, they believe the evidence supports evolution, they do not want to be lumped with people who do not believe in evolution and are often considered to be less intelligent or “backward,” evolution has the stamp of approval from real scientists, and evolutionary history allows people to reject the idea of God and legitimize their own immorality.*”¹ Next, “*Evaluating the presuppositions behind belief in evolution makes for a much more productive discussion. Two intelligent people can arrive at different conclusions using the same evidence; so their starting assumptions are the most important issue in discussing historical science.*”²

However, the vague unfounded Theories of Evolution have been constantly ‘*mutating*’ and ‘*evolving*’ into new *revised* forms and will further ‘*evolve*’ into yet newer modified versions. At the moment, “*Classical Darwinism has been replaced by an enlarged theory of natural selection which (purportedly) does greater justice to the facts of the living world. With the rise of twentieth-century biochemistry an evolutionary approach to the subject of the origin of life (purportedly) became possible. A most influential hypothesis was stated by A. I. Oparin (1924), and by Haldane (1929). According to a recent modified version of this hypothesis, life originated by a process of chemical evolution on the earth, before there was free oxygen in its atmosphere. Through the action of ultraviolet light, inorganic material gave rise to organic molecules, which in turn evolved into complex polymers having a primitive capacity to reproduce. From these diffused polymers, specific closed organisms developed, culminating in the nucleated cell. At this stage, chemical evolution was succeeded by organic evolution.*”³

Both the archaic or the historical and the modern *modified* versions certainly sound like fancy fiction-stories! Next, '*Naturalism*' and '*Materialism*' are based on *beliefs* that "*scientific laws are adequate to account for all phenomena*" (naturalism) and "*physical matter is the only fundamental reality and that all organisms, processes, and phenomena can be explained as manifestations of matter*" (materialism). As such, those indoctrinated with *naturalism* and *materialism* cannot entertain anything *supernatural*, including *supernatural biblical truth*.

Rather, as has been accurately pointed out by S. Hawking and L. Mlodinow, "...one's concept of reality can depend on the mind of the perceiver. That viewpoint, with various subtle differences, goes by names such as *antirealism*, *instrumentalism* or *idealism*. According to those doctrines, the world we know is constructed by the human mind employing sensory data as its raw material and is shaped by the interpretive structure of our brains. This viewpoint may be hard to accept, but it is not difficult to understand. There is no way to remove the observer – us – from our perception of the world."⁴

"As measuring devices, however, we are crude instruments"⁵ No wonder, fallible scientific theories keep on changing! On the other hand, the Word of God is permanently unchanging, infallible and inerrant, absolutely trustworthy and foundational to all true knowledge.

As logically commented by Lecomte Du Nouy: "*Science struggles constantly against the imperfections of our sensorial system, the rhythms of which are not always in unison with outside phenomena.*"⁶ Given such a drawback he advises: "*Let us try not to transpose facts belonging to one scale of observation in our own universe onto another, and, above all, let us beware of casting human judgments on events which transcend our experience.*"⁷ (*italics, mine*)!

Whether scientists freely admit it or not, the vague fancy Theory of Evolution is still a theory; it is "*what fallible scientists think or speculate*" whilst *claiming* they are searching for truth about the *origins* of *matter* and *life* based on what they observe in nature. Unfortunately, it is an *eternally incomplete* search for truth. And, it will remain an eternally incomplete search, because the study of the *origins* of *matter* and *life* includes *truth* that cannot be purely ascertained by the use of the '*five senses*'. Nor it can be ascertained by mere *rationalism* as is the case in all empirical sciences. Anyway, "*evolution cannot be truly scientific as it cannot be observed experimentally or repeated to prove the validity of its conclusions*".

Any unbiased scientist, who is objectively rational, will do well to accept without prejudice that "*The evolution of living beings, as a whole, is in absolute contradiction to the science of inert matter. It is in disagreement with the second law of thermodynamics, the keystone of our science, based on the laws of chance. To account what has taken place since the appearance of life, we are obliged to call in an "anti-chance" which orients this immense series of phenomena in a progressive, highly "improbable" direction (incompatible with chance), resulting in the human brain.*"⁸

Accordingly, Lecomte Du Nouy doesn't fail to confront fellow but erring scientists by stating as follows: "*Should we keep our blind confidence in human reason and intelligence, we will attribute these contradictions to our momentary ignorance and will say: In a near or distant future, new facts or new interpretations will enable us to shed light on these obscurities, due to our imperfect knowledge of reality'. But in so doing, we cease to think rationally, scientifically. We simply express a hope based on a sentimental trust in science. What is more, we completely lose sight of the fact that when these contradictions, as in our example, are not with details, but with a set of fundamental concepts, which constitute the foundations of our science, we have*

actually shaken the whole scientific edifice in the name of which we have condemned (Biblical) Faith, and have been driven, by an irrational faith in an unaccountable abstractive intelligence, to demonstrate its failure.”⁹

Obviously, the imaginary evolution of man from some ‘common ancestor’ is scientifically untenable. For, “Just as there seems to be an impassable gap between the irreversible ‘evolution’ of electrons and that of atoms (built up of electrons); between the irreversible ‘evolution’ of atoms and that of life (built up of atoms); so also there seems to be an intellectually impassable gap between the ‘evolution of life’ and that of ‘man’ as such.”¹⁰

Atheistic scientists are prone to foolishly think that the universe has evolved from some primitive material atoms, call it ‘soup of hydrogen atoms’. But, from what did the original hydrogen atoms evolve? Analytically, “Material atoms are made up of sub-atomic particles: protons, electrons and neutrons. But between the realm of the atoms and that of electrons there is today an impassable chasm; the laws which explain the motion and behavior of the electrons are not the same as those which govern the atoms.”¹¹ Obviously, “right at the beginning, there is a break in the continuity of the history of the evolution of the universe, or rather in man’s interpretation of this history.”¹²

Next, some biased scientists blindly assume that life came into existence from lifeless inert matter some billions of years ago by spontaneous generation (abiogenesis). Others assume and theorize inorganic matter gave rise to organic matter under the action of ultraviolet rays, eventually evolving into a ‘nucleated cell’. But they cannot account for the origin of primitive matter they begin with whilst theorizing. Instead, they fall back on ‘chance’; but then, the laws of chance cannot account for the origin of any primitive life.

On the whole, realistically and objectively speaking, “It is impossible to lay down the basis for a calculation which would enable one to establish the probability of the spontaneous appearance of life on earth”¹³ ‘by chance’. Still, wonder and worship the goddess of ‘chance’ ‘and ‘gasp’, ‘How Great Thou Art?’ Moreover, in accordance with the known laws of chance, “The probability for a single protein molecule of high dissymmetry to be formed by the action of chance and normal thermal agitations remains practically nil”. Accordingly, “An explanation of the evolution of life by chance alone is untenable today. It does not permit the incorporation of man and of his psychological activities into the general pattern of things.”¹⁴

If it be scientifically and logically impossible for even a “simple” protein molecule to evolve by chance, how can one account for any evolution of complex phenomena of Life and that of Man by mere chance? Does it mean that Mother Nature chose to “cheat” or violate the laws of chance to make evolution from simple to complex forms somehow still possible, when logically arguing it could never be possible by “chance”, lawfully? As otherwise, “It is totally impossible to account scientifically for all the phenomena pertaining to Life and its development and its so-called progressive evolution, and that, unless the foundations of modern science are overthrown, they are unexplainable.”¹⁵

Unfortunately, this is rather pretty difficult for biased minds to digest and honestly accept and thereby uphold one’s scientific integrity and that, even after realizing the fancy theory of evolution stands debunked on its own for lack of evidence! Nevertheless, in their misguided zeal to deny God, “Evolutionists seem pathetically eager to find some way of accounting for the universe and its life forms without resorting to God and creation. But they must inevitably fail, and some at least sense they will fail. ‘In our attempts to understand the nature of the universe, theorists must often admit to reaching a possible dead end – a question we may never

satisfactorily answer’; James M. Cline, *The Origin of Matter, American Scientist*. Vol.92, March-April 2004; p. 156’. It is obvious that Genesis 1 is a satisfactory answer, but our atheistic physicists and astronomers keep trying since they feel they must find an answer that does not involve God.”¹⁶

The so-called *evidence* for evolution is absolutely irrelevant to logically account for the *origin* of *matter* and *life*. Nor is it substantially valid and credible to scientifically explain the *origins* or the basal *first cause* - which is the *root* and the *trunk* necessary to *nourish* and *support* the *Tree of Evolution*. Next, Louis Pasteur has disproved the *theory* of *spontaneous generation*. Yet, scientists have not given up that *theory*. They still maintain that *life* gradually came into existence *from* lifeless inert *matter*. But they cannot explain *precisely how*; instead, they keep on guessing, thereby only displaying their unholy biased ignorance.

It has been theoretically stipulated that everything observable and subject to scientific experimentation and scrutiny deals with the *five* known existing categories: *time*, *force*, *action*, *space* and *matter*. Scientists cannot account for the *origin* of these basic *five scientific categories* and the *Laws of Nature* that *govern* their relationships as arising out of *nothing* by mere ‘*blind chance*’. The actual *origin* of these five prominent categories can only be accounted for by the biblical witness of Genesis 1:1 wherein Time (*In the Beginning*), Force (*God*), Action, (*created*), Space (*heavens*) and Matter (*and the earth*) rightly fit in.

Atheistic Scientists are frenetically working overtime to explore the *origin* of *matter* and *life* so as to account for the existence of *life* and *matter* without the need of a Creator God! And, even if scientists do somehow succeed in creating *life* in the laboratory, it will only prove that it requires an *intelligent* mind to create it and that *nothing* can come from *nothing* by ‘*chance*’. As such, to be scientifically precise, *nothing* has ever evolved or can ever evolve of its own *out of nothing* by *chance*. True science rejects the theory of evolution rooted in the assumption that “*Nothing working on nothing by nothing, through nothing, for nothing begat everything*”¹⁷ including the *super-intelligence* of the atheistic scientists.

Next, the theory of *biological evolution* contradicts known laws of nature. “*It is a law of nature that nothing reproduces anything greater than itself. There can be no evolution without the power of reproduction in living things. Since reproduction is a prior condition to evolution, it cannot be a product of it. Hence we face the logical necessity for the creation of life and its power of continued reproduction.*”¹⁸ Unfortunately, biased evolutionists are not willing to weigh the facts that are in favor of creation and change. In a way, they somehow demonstrate that God has given them over to hold on to the blatant evolutionary lies. Accordingly, they further indulge in formulating and reformulating the so-called scientific but *vague* irrelevant speculations which make sense only to those who have *no fear* of God.

Life comes only from the pre-existing life and non-living matter can never give birth to life. If we do not allow our prejudice to *blind* us, we will conclude “*The laws of chance, in their actual state, cannot account for the birth of life*”. It is scientifically impossible to explain the ‘*birth of life*’ by resorting to the operation of the laws of chance. Instead, we should be quick to honestly admit that the *laws* of chance actually “*forbid any evolution other than that which leads to less and less dissymmetrical states.*”¹⁹ Such a relevant conclusion necessarily goes against the theory of evolution. For, according to evolutionary thinking “*The history of the evolution of life reveals a systematic increase in dissymmetries, both structural and functional*”. Therefore, such a “*... formidable contradiction stands today as an insurmountable obstacle in the path of materialism*”²⁰ – or evolutionism, or naturalism, or religious fanatical atheism and communism.

The intelligent unbiased minds have no other option but to *believe* in the Self-existent Creator God of the Bible as the *uncaused First Cause* of everything that exists. Accordingly, it is rationally sound and scientific to believe that “*In the Beginning, God created the Heavens and Earth*”. God is the *Uncreated* Source that has brought the *Heavens and Earth* into existence not during the *six days* of the creation week, 6000 or 10,000 years back, but by *fiat* in the *dateless* pre-historical past. The ‘*work of the six days*’, the truth of which is challenged by the evolutionists in vain and because of which challenge *theistic evolutionists* have bowed down to them by compromising with the biblical truth of Genesis 1 and 2 is a much later work of renewal and restoration through re-creation.

Atheistic Scientists and Evolutionists unduly feel threatened by the Biblical account of *Creation* because as absolute *revealed* truth along with Natural Revelation it strikes at the *root* of the Tree of Evolution. And once you strike and chop off the root and the trunk at its very base the whole tree falls flat. If evolution ever worked, then scientists should be able to prove how the *first* forms of *matter* and *life* came into existence *out of nothing*. Apart from it, evolution is nothing but downright myth and as such, the Theory of Evolution stands automatically debunked!

Anyway, those who blindly believe the vague Theories of Evolution know that there is no real substance in the theories that presume to explain the *origin* of even simplest forms of life. Admittedly, “... *there is not a single fact or a single hypothesis, today, which gives an explanation of the birth of life or of natural evolution. Willy-nilly we are, therefore, obliged either to admit the idea of transcendent intervention, which the scientist may well call God as anti-chance, or to simply recognize that we know nothing of these questions outside of a small number of mechanisms. This is not an act of faith but an undisputed scientific statement. It is not we, but the convinced materialist who shows a powerful, even though negative, faith, when he obstinately continues to believe, without any proof, that the beginning of life, evolution, man’s brain, and the birth of moral ideas will some day be scientifically accounted for. He forgets that this would necessitate the complete transformation of modern science, and that, consequently, his conviction is based on purely sentimental reasons.*”²¹

Moreover, as is very well known to educated atheists and atheistic scientists, “*The ideas of natural selection, speciation, adaptation, and evolution are often used interchangeably by secular scientists*”. This they formidably do so, so as to unjustly suppress Biblical Truth as well as Natural Revelation. And, instead of honestly acknowledging the truths of which they are fully aware they not only stubbornly hold on to evolutionary lies but unjustly further propagate these lies in the Name of Science clothing themselves with a scientific garb.

But “*When scientists and authors use evolution to mean both “change in features over time” and “the history of life on earth,” it is difficult to know which definition is being used in each instance. This is often used as a bait-and-switch technique (equivocation). When small changes that arise as a result of the loss of information are used as evidence for molecules-to-man evolution, the switch has occurred.*”²² Anyway, the foes of rational biblical faith are in no way without any excuse!

Upholding the well-established structural design in creation, “*Biblical creationists consider major structures to be part of the original design provided by God. Modifications to those structures, adaptations, occur due to genetic recombination, random mutations, and natural selection. These structures do not arise from the modification of similar structures of another kind of animal. The beak of the woodpecker, for example, did not arise from the beak of a theropod dinosaur ancestor; it was an originally designed structure. The difference in beak*

*shapes among woodpeckers fits with the idea of natural selection leading to changes within a population of woodpeckers—within the created kind.”*²³

Furthermore, “*The rationalist, who in the last forty years has had reason to doubt the all-mightiness of reason, accepts without tremor the overthrow of physical theories considered unshakable in his youth. He admits the inconceivable space in which the electrons move. He admits that the electron is a “wave of probability”. He admits the existence of particles such as the “Neutrino”, and the “Anti-neutrino” which were invented for reasons of pure mathematical symmetry. He admits, without resistance, the existence, the reality of these paradoxical entities which he is forbidden to visualize---*”²⁴ “*... yet he obstinately refuses to admit the possibility of a supernatural, creative power without which the greatest scientific problems are incomprehensible, simply because the models furnished by his sensorial experience do not enable him to conceive or visualize it even though he is quite aware of their limits. He knows and does not even discuss the fact that the image he has built up of the universe rests on reactions determined in him by a minute fraction (less than 1 per thousand billions, or 0.000,000,000,001 per cent) of the vibrations surrounding him and which go through him without leaving a trace in his consciousness. **There is nothing more irrational than a man who is rationally irrational.***”²⁴ Unashamedly, the atheistic highly biased cocked rationalists and evolutionists along with the atheistic scientists take pride in being wholly rationally irrational.

The fact that the CREATOR GOD of the Bible exists and that He is the FIRST CAUSE of everything that exists is a *basic spiritual reality*. But then, just as in the case of unseen but known physical ‘*paradoxical entities*’ one is ‘*forbidden to visualize*’, so also we are expressly ‘*forbidden to visualize*’ known and unknown spiritual realities.

Nevertheless, “*whether or not you think God exists is not a concern at the moment. What should concern you is maintaining logical and clear thought. If you say ‘There is No God’ you are being arbitrary and foolish (Psalms 14:1; 53:1-2).*”²⁵ “*A logical statement might be, ‘On the basis of rationalism and empiricism, God does not exist. But if you dogmatically say ‘I do not believe God exists...’ you demonstrate inconsistent thinking. If you truly do not think God exists, at least express the concept by making a statement that shows you are a logical thinker*”²⁶ Notwithstanding biased *speculations*, scientific discovery, at the most, has only disproved wrong *traditional beliefs* claimed to have been derived from the Bible.

The Bible’s view is that God is the unchallengeable Almighty Creator of the universe and all that is in it. And that our vast incomprehensible universe is maintained by His almighty power with an utmost scientific precision that defies the imagination of our crude scientists. “*This is no happenstance. The regularity of nature is the constancy of God who sustains the physical, moral and spiritual order. Nature or Science is a tribute to the Majesty, to the wisdom and to the Benevolence of God.*”²⁷

The Almighty Creator God of the universe reveals Himself to us in the Bible in a well organized logical sense “*because God is totally organized*”²⁸. God not only makes *organized sense*, “*but His organized sense is presented in the Bible in the form of a plan we can understand. God not only has a plan but His plan is perfect and His plan includes you. You are the object of God’s plan. If you can say: ‘I am a person, I am a human being, I belong to the human race’, then you can say ‘God has a personal plan for me’. That is why you are here on this earth.*”²⁹

But if you deny the *reality* that you are a *human being* and instead claim, without any *proof*, that you or your ancestors have evolved from some ‘*common anthropoid monkey*’, then

you have no other option but to *live* as a monkey, or else ‘*mutate*’ into a donkey. Now, you will quickly admit, if you are a logical thinker, of course, by ‘*chance*’ that it is not at all possible for a monkey to mutate into a donkey. But the very fact that you can *think* logically and critically and, therefore, not *dumb*, should prove to you that you have not descended from monkeys but that you are a PERSON created in the Image and Likeness of God.

Nevertheless, contrary to facts that can be relied upon to ascertain spiritual realities, “*The agnostic and the atheist do not seem to be in the least disturbed by the fact that our entire organized, living universe becomes incomprehensible without the hypothesis of God. Their belief in some physical elements of which they know very little, has all the earmarks of an irrational faith, but they are not aware of it. Some of them have remained slaves to a naïve verbalism.*”³⁰

And, slaves to “naïve verbalism” they are! And, as long as *scientists choose* to remain enslaved to naïve *verbalism* they can as well be labeled as *pseudo-scientists* who are clever at *concealing their ignorance*. If we are rational and objective then we will openly *confess* that “*The Omnipotence of God does not enter into the restricted pattern of our actual scientific thought. It is no more shameful to confess it than to confess our incapacity to conceive the electron which we have domesticated.*”³¹ As such, atheistic scientists and evolutionists are without excuse.

“*What is science? It is the method by which man tries to conceal his ignorance. It should not be so, but so it is. You are not to be dogmatical in theology, my brethren, it is wicked; but for scientific men it is the correct thing. You are never to assert anything very strongly; but scientists may boldly assert what they cannot prove, and may demand a **faith** far more credulous than any we possess. Forsooth, you and I are to take our Bibles and shape and mould our belief according to the ever-shifting teachings of so-called scientific men. What folly is this! Why, the march of science, falsely so called, through the world may be traced by exploded fallacies and abandoned theories. Former explorers once adored are now ridiculed; the continual wrecking of false hypotheses is a matter of universal notoriety. You may tell where the learned have encamped by the debris left behind of suppositions and theories ... as broken bottles.*”³²

Somehow, it is very encouraging to know that there are scientists who understand biblical creation truth and are, therefore, *convinced creationists*. And, “*Clearly, creationists can indeed be real scientists. And this shouldn’t be surprising since the very basis for scientific research is biblical creation. The universe is orderly because its Creator is logical and has imposed order on the universe. God created our minds and gave us the ability and curiosity to study the universe. Furthermore, we can trust that the universe will obey the same physics tomorrow as it does today because God is consistent. This is why science is possible.*

“*On the other hand, if the universe is just an accidental product of a big bang, why should it be orderly? Why should there be laws of nature if there is no lawgiver? If our brains are the by-products of random chance, why should we trust that their conclusions are accurate? But if our minds have been designed, and if the universe has been constructed by the Lord, then of course we should be able to study nature. **Yes, science is possible because the Bible is true.**”³³*

The Living Creator God is very much actively involved in the human affairs! Like it or not! And, “*It is because God created a logical, orderly universe and gave us the ability to reason and to be creative that technology is possible.*”³⁴ As such, to come to a logical conclusion: Here is the point: “*If there is a God, if He has revealed Himself, if He makes sense, if He has a perfect plan, and if He has perfect plan for every human being, including you, then YOU owe GOD a hearing.*”³⁵ Will you, please, stand up and listen to the God of the Bible?

Please, for your very own sake, listen to the Living God Who speaks to **you** in the *First Person*, saying: “*The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool... for ALL those THINGS hath Mine Hand hath made, and all those things have been, thus saith the LORD, (regardless of your latest theory of evolution or the particular phase of evolution); but to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and TREMBLES at MY WORD*” (Isaiah 66:1-2).

And, to those who really listen and tremble at God’s Word and humbly obey Him, they are promised an eternal inheritance in His Kingdom and further, ruler-ship under the Risen Christ in the *new* eternal heavens and earth! “*Well, the universe has not existed from eternity past, but it will exist eternally in the future. There was a beginning, but there will be no end. . . ‘The new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord’ (Isaiah 66:22)... Peter says that we can then "look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelled righteousness" (II Peter 3:13)."*³⁶

1: Roger Patterson: *Natural Selection vs. Evolution* March 8, 2007, www.answersingenesis.org.

2: Roger Patterson, *ibid.* 3: J. D. Bernal, *The Origin of Life*, New York, 1967.

4: Hawking, S. & Mlodinow, L., *The (Elusive) Theory of Everything*, Scientific American India, October 2010, p.50.

5: Lecomte Du Nouy, *op. cit.* p. 140-141, 145. 6: *ibid* 7: *ibid* 8: *ibid.* p. 157. 9: *ibid* , pp. 137-138;

10: *ibid* , p. 76. 11: *ibid.* p. 25-26, 12: *ibid*, p. 26 13: *ibid.* p.19; 14: *ibid*, p. 41. 15: *ibid*, p. 37.

16: Henry Morris, PhD, *The Eternal Future of Time, Space, and Matter*; www.icr.org.

17: Finis Jennings Dake, *op. cit.* 83. 18: Dake J. Finis, *op. cit.* p.83.

19: Lecomte Du Nouy, *op. cit.* 40 20: *ibid* 21: *Ibid*, p. 98.

22: Roger Patterson, *Natural Selection vs. Evolution, Evolution Exposed*, March 8, 2007 www.answersingenesis.org.

23: R. Patterson, *ibid.* 24: Lecomte Du Nouy, *op. cit.* p.100.

25: R. B. Thieme, *op. cit.* p. 3 26: *ibid.* p. 3. 27: Urlic Jelinec, *Bible and Science*; *op.cit.*, p. 7.

28: R. B. Thieme, *op. cit.* 4. 29: *ibid* 30: Lecomte Du Nouy, *op. cit.*. 134. 31: *ibid*, p. 134

32: Charles Haddon Spurgeon. 33: Jason Lisle, Ph. D., *Can creationists be scientists?* www.icr.org.

34: Jason Lisle, Ph.D, *ibid.* 35: R. B. Thieme, *op. cit.* p. 4.

36: Henry Morris, Ph.D., *The Eternal Future of Time, Space, and Matter*, www.icr.org
