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Evolutionists claim that creation scientists are biased in their examination of evidence, but that evolution scientists are neutral. They also claim that there can be no such thing as “creation science,” since creation is religion and evolution is science.¹

The truth is that everyone, including every creationist and evolutionist, interprets facts based upon his own prior beliefs — including his world view. Everyone has a world view, and the world view of an evolutionist is very different from the world view of a creationist. This is why a creationist can believe that a particular observable fact clearly

¹ Here is an evolutionist’s point of view, as quoted by Raju Chebium: “Creationism has no place in public schools because it is not science. ‘In science you start with a hypothesis and test it. You can go out and collect fossils to figure out if evolution is true. If you start with the premise that creationism is true, that is not subject to scientific scrutiny,’” said Wayne Carley, executive director of the National Association of Biology Teachers. CNN, July 13, 2000, “75 years after the Scopes trial pitted science against religion, the debate goes on,” http://archives.cnn.com/2000/LAW/07/13/scopes.monkey.trial/index.html (accessed March 16, 2010).

Mark Bergemann, a retired electrical engineer, serves on the LSI board. He is an evangelism leader at Good Shepherd's in West Allis, WI, and holds a B.S. from UW–Milwaukee.
confirms creation, while an evolutionist can believe that the same observable fact clearly confirms evolution.²

**Competing World Views**

The creation world view summarized below is that of a Christian who takes the Bible literally. There are many variations in evolution world views. The evolution world view summarized below contains some of the more commonly held evolution beliefs.

Creationists start with the belief that there is a God who created all the “kinds” of plants and animals in six days of ordinary length as recorded in the Bible. Plants and animals reproduce within their own biblical kinds, but there is significant variation within each kind. Some kinds have gone extinct. Creationists believe that the universe is young (fewer than 15,000 years old) and there once was a worldwide flood which covered all the land, plants, animals and people — except for those who were on the ark. Observable evidence (rocks, fossils, plants, animals, stars, etc.) is interpreted in light of these beliefs.

Evolutionists start with a belief that, if there is a god, he had nothing to do with origins. Many Christians believe that God used evolution as a means of bringing everything into existence. Even these “theistic evolutionists” normally interpret facts as though God had nothing to do with origins. Evolutionists believe that all things — living and non-living — came into existence naturally, by chance, during the billions of years since a few elements were produced by a “big bang.” The few elements produced by a big bang condensed into stars, and the stars made heavier elements, which then became planets. Living things came naturally from non-living chemicals. The first one-celled life forms gradually changed into all the plants and animals which we see today. Evolutionists do not believe that there was ever a worldwide flood, and they interpret evidence which they observe today (rocks, fossils, plants, etc.) is interpreted in light of these beliefs.

² Dr. Jason Lisle, *The Ultimate Proof Of Creation: Resolving The Origins Debate* (Green Forest, Arkansas: Master Books, 2009). See chapters 2 and 3 (pages 31-66) for a much more complete presentation of this position.
animals, stars, etc.) in the light of these beliefs.³

The population of the United States is fairly evenly split between these two competing world views, with half leaning toward the creationist view, and the other half toward the evolutionary view.⁴

One of evolution’s most sacred beliefs is that everything came about by means of natural causes. This *a priori* belief — an unsupported presupposition — arbitrarily rejects the possibility that a Creator God exists. Either believing in a Creator God, or to believing that no such God exists, is a religious belief based upon faith. It is impossible either to prove or disprove the existence of God by means of human logic and reasoning. The belief that God exists, or that he does not exist, is a matter of faith; therefore both creation (which says that there is a Creator God) and evolution (which says that there is no Creator God) are both faith based beliefs. Both creation and evolution use science to interpret observable evidence in a way that conforms to their respective faith.

Neither creationists nor evolutionists will interpret any observable evidence in a way that goes against their faith-based world view. It does not matter how massive the evidence is for a young earth and a worldwide flood, an evolutionist will never accept either one, since to do so would go against the evolutionist’s faith that there is no Creator God.

**Neutral Ground**

Evolution scientists claim that they are neutral in examining evidence. They say, “We impartially look at the evidence. Let the cards fall where they may.” Yet they have stacked the deck in their favor! The evolutionist says to the creationist, “Let us debate origins on neutral ground. You give up any reference to God and the Bible so that we can begin our discussion.” With this request, the evolutionist is asking the creationist to accept the evolutionist’s own world view of natural causes.

³ Lisle, 32-34.

without any Creator God. Creation and evolution are mutually exclusive, since one says there is a Creator God, and the other says that there is no Creator God. Such opposite positions can be represented in formal logic by “p” and “not p.” It is logically fallacious to request that both sides accept “p” as true before they debate whether “p” is true or “not p” is true, yet that is what evolutionists ask creationists to do!

Most of our media and government have accepted the idea that belief in evolution is neutral and scientific, while belief in creation is biased and religious. Consequently, evolution is usually preached as the only reasonable view of origins in almost every realm of society including schools, television, radio, newscasts, newspapers, magazines, museums, and even by most religions and in most Christian churches. Evolutionists accuse creationists of “imposing their views on others,” yet the evolutionists’ view is imposed on others far more often. Most Americans believe that both creation and evolution should be presented side by side.  

In summary, everyone, both the creationist and the evolutionist, is biased in his examination of the evidence. The creationist has a religious belief that there is a Creator God. The evolutionist has a religious belief that there is not a Creator God. Scientific investigation can be used to examine evidence in light of the creationists’ faith-based world view or in light of the evolutionists’ faith-based world view.

The creation/evolution debate is a competition between two incompatible faith-based world views. [8]


The Flood According To Rehwinkel

A Book Review by Warren Krug
In 1961 a book was published which many scientists consider the launching pad for the current creationist movement. This classic scientific treatise, entitled *The Genesis Flood*, was co-authored by Reformed theologian Dr. John C. Whitcomb and engineer Dr. Henry M. Morris. They wrote in a scholarly style which seemed to appeal to many Christians who felt under attack from the faith-destroying theories of evolutionists.

Yet, this was by no means the first attempt to show that science — correctly understood — was in harmony with a literal reading of the first chapters of Genesis. Ten years before *The Genesis Flood* appeared, Dr. Alfred M. Rehwinkel, a confessional Lutheran professor at Concordia Seminary in St. Louis, had written a book called *The Flood in the Light of the Bible, Geology, and Archaeology*.

Rehwinkel’s book was among the creationist writings which were very helpful to keep me, when I was a naïve college student, from caving in to the doctrines of Darwinism. Doubts about the creation account as presented in the Bible had been planted in my mind by an evolutionist “Lutheran” biology professor during my freshman year at an Indiana university, and it was enlightening to hear the other side of the story. I recently decided to reread *The Flood* to see what a half century of scientific discoveries and creationist thinking might have done to the

---


---

Warren Krug, a retired teacher, is the editor of the *LSI Journal* and is currently serving as president of the Lutheran Science Institute. He holds a B.S. in Education from Concordia University Chicago and a M.S. in Education from Oklahoma State University. He is a member at Trinity, Caledonia, Wisconsin.
validity of Rehwinkel’s work. It should come as no surprise that some of his ideas are today considered outdated. However, much of what he presents in his book has stood the test of time well.

**THE BOOK.** Having lost my original copy of *The Flood*, I was happy to see that it’s still available for purchase. It is 374 pages long (including the index), and its bibliography contains over 100 entries. Judging from their titles, many publications in this list appear to fall under the heading of “creation science,” showing that creationism as a science has been with us much longer than many realize.

**FLOOD GEOLOGY.** Like *The Genesis Flood*, Rehwinkel’s *The Flood* presents the idea that many or most of the Earth’s geological features today can be traced to the global deluge often called “Noah’s Flood.” Even in 1951, flood geology was not a new concept. Some aspects of this idea have been around since the early centuries of the Christian era. But the modern revival of flood geology has been traced to the writings of George McCready Price, a Seventh-Day Adventist geologist, who wrote a book in 1923 that supported this idea. Rehwinkel lists several of Price’s books in his bibliography. What follows are some of the highlights of *The Flood*.

**THE NATURE OF THE FLOOD.** Rehwinkel leaves no doubt as to where he stands on the matter of the severity of the Flood. He regards it as a disaster “unparalleled in all the history of the earth” (page 67), “the most destructive catastrophe this world has ever experienced” (84), and a “violent cataclysm” (101). When he mentions the “breaking forth of the fountains of the great deep” (Gen 6:11 kjv), he says that we should not think of this event like babbling brooks or refreshing streams quietly welling forth out of the earth. Instead, “it means that the earth was rent, that great fissures and chasms appeared on the surface of the earth” (101). Also, “the earthquakes of the present day are certainly but a faint reminiscence of those telluric (i.e. terrestrial)

---

movements to which the structure of almost every mountain range bears witness” (103).

THE FLOOD WATERS. The author certainly recognizes two sources for the waters which flooded the earth — the waters which fell from the sky and the waters which came gushing up from underground when the earth’s surface broke apart. Rehwinkel believed the Hebrew expression “the windows of heaven were opened” meant “incessant torrential rain pouring down upon the face of the earth” (98). He believes the atmosphere of the antediluvian (i.e. pre-Flood) earth was much more humid than today’s atmosphere, stating, “It is quite possible that the water contained in the prediluvian (sic) atmosphere and that which floated over the earth in clouds was equal to the total amount of water on the face of the earth” (98). If he means the total amount of water on the face of the earth today, I believe many scientists today including creationists would have trouble accepting that statistic. (Cf. below for a discussion of the water vapor canopy theory).

Rehwinkel also mentions the possibility of volcanoes accompanying the Flood which could have created clouds that would have added to the rainfall (99). Previously he had quoted from the Babylonian tradition of the Flood which talked about terrible “water spouts” (87). This reasoning fits in well with the thinking of many current creationists who believe that volcanoes may have been one source, or even the major source, of water which fell from the sky. Reportedly, up to 70% of what comes out of volcanoes is water, often in the form of steam.4

CLIMATE CHANGE. Rehwinkel understands that the world’s climate before the Flood was far different than what it is today. He quotes Martin Luther as calling the pre-Flood climate “a veritable paradise compared with the world that followed” (2). Rehwinkel accepts the idea that the climate was more uniform before the Flood, and, as evidence, points out how fossils of warm weather flora and fauna have been found in areas too cold for them today. He says there was more habitable living space because deserts had yet to develop, neither the oceans nor mountains covered nearly as much surface area as they do today, and apparently there was no tundra nor ice-covered land. The mountains that did exist, he says, were much lower than they are today and did not influence the climate as much as today’s higher peaks. Rehwinkel does not seem to recognize the possibly of tectonic plate movement at the time of the Flood, as some modern creationist geologists believe may have happened. However, he does appear to hold out the possibility that the “lost continent” of Atlantis may actually have existed prior to the global deluge (5).

Rehwinkel provides three possible scientific reasons which have been suggested for what caused the warmer climate in the pre-Flood world (9-13). First he mentions the theory that the earth’s axis tilted 23½ degrees during the Flood. If its axis had been exactly perpendicular to the plane of its orbit before the Flood, every point on earth would have received the same amount of heat and sunshine throughout the year, resulting in a more uniform climate. Today, some creationists urge caution before accepting this idea. The second theory proposes that warm ocean waters may have kept the climate warmer, possibly by means of ocean currents such as today’s Gulf Stream. Thirdly, Rehwinkel talks about the water


vapor canopy theory — the idea that a heavy layer of water vapor which covered the planet diffused the sun’s rays to such an extent that all parts of the globe had a similar climate. Once very popular, this theory has now been put on the back burner for various reasons, such as the immense heat such a canopy would have caused on the earth’s surface and the failure to explain what would have kept the canopy suspended.7 Of the three theories Rehwinkel thinks the first two are the most reasonable, though he admits it is impossible to know whether any of the three are correct.

FOSSILS. Rehwinkel has a high regard for fossils and considered them convincing evidence for Noah’s Flood. Of the fossils, he writes, “This (fossil) record is reliable and true and is written in large and legible letters in the very foundation rocks of our present world.” He mentions that Tertullian (an early Christian apologist) and Luther both wrote about fossils and interpreted them correctly (7). He mentions the evidence that fish had to be buried suddenly to leave such perfectly-preserved fossils as we frequently see and refers to experiments he personally undertook that showed fish can’t last more than five or six days before decaying (204). Rehwinkel writes, “I merely wish to refer to (the fossils) as evidence and conclusive proof that the physical condition of the world of Noah, the climate, animals, and plant life, was vastly different from that of our world today” (7).

DINOSAURS. Rehwinkel quotes some unnamed writers as claiming that dinosaurs, which he described as being “dragonlike,”

once may have been as numerous as the buffalo (American bison) at their peak. He points in particular to the “Bad Lands” and the Red Deer Valley in Alberta as being sites where dinosaur fossils are numerous (13). He refers to the large variety of dinosaurs known even at that time, although he errs innocently in claiming that the brontosaurus was the largest of the great beasts (14). We now know that the brontosaurus never existed, being instead a mistake in which a scientist put the wrong head onto the body of an Apatosaurus. Although Rehwinkel notes that some dinosaur varieties were as small as dogs, he seems to link the great size of the larger beasts to the fact that other species found in fossil form were also much larger than their modern day counterparts. In particular he mentions discoveries of a ten foot tall bird, a snail with a shell a foot in diameter, and a six-foot long lobster (20).

CAVEMEN. The author criticizes the view which prevailed at the time (and which is still generally true today) that early humans or alleged pre-humans were all

Two Views of Neanderthals. The top outdated artist’s depiction of a Neanderthal, made in 1888, shows the ancient man looking only semi-human. The bottom view is a recent computer rendering of a young Neanderthal female made by scanning a skull found in Gibraltar. (Pictures from Wikipedia.)
savages and dimwits. He says that while archaeology has shown the Bible to be an absolutely reliable book, scientists refuse to consider seriously the Bible’s description of all the accomplishments of Adam and his descendants (43).

Rehwinkel seems to accept the notion that because some early humans lived in caves, they must not have been as sophisticated or civilized as other humans (42), though he blames this on degeneration and did not consider them to be some kind of pre-human beings. Perhaps he accepted the prevailing view that Neanderthals were grunting savages. In any event, today we know that Neanderthals could speak, used tools as advanced as those of other humans, probably mated with other humans, and even wore makeup.  

**NOAH’S ARK.** The exact nature of the gopher wood (gopher is a transliteration of the Hebrew word according to Rehwinkel) which was used to build the ark is unknown, but he mentions that some scholars thought it may have been cypress, a common wood used in shipbuilding in ancient times (58). Concerning the size of the ark, Rehwinkel writes that the ships of the ancient Phoenicians and Romans and even those of the Middle Ages were “mere toys” compared to the ark. Even though the exact length of the cubit which Genesis uses to provide the measurements of the ark is not known, Rehwinkel’s estimate that the ark was at least 450 feet long, 75 feet wide and 45 feet high is similar to measurements for the ark provided by authors today (58-60).

Rehwinkel answers some questions about Noah’s vessel. Did Noah’s family have the strength and know-how to build the ark? He answers that concern by pointing out other ancient building accomplishments such as the Egyptian pyramids (65).

Was the ark large enough to hold representatives of every species of the animals alive at that time? Rehwinkel would agree with modern creationists that not every species of animal would have had to get onto the ark, because the Biblical word “kind” (Gen 6:20) is a broader term than “species” (67-71). How did all those animals get to the ark? God planted a “special instinct” in these creatures, he says, which caused them to come to Noah at the right time, just as the animals in the Garden of Eden came to Adam to be named (72).

THE RECORD IN THE ROCKS. Our author discusses the hypothetical nature of the geologic column and the dates assigned to the various layers by secular scientists. He notes several discoveries which contradict the standard interpretation. First, the so-called younger rock layers are frequently found on top of rocks considered to be millions of years older; yet there is nothing in the way of erosion layers separating the younger from the older. This is evidence, he says, that the rock layers were laid down rapidly (268). He points out that the older rocks sometimes are found on top of the younger rocks without evidence that any disturbance had flipped the layers (272). He also mentions the discoveries of fossilized trees standing in upright position and passing through several strata, something that could not have happened had it taken millions of years for each layer to develop (287). All these observations are frequently echoed by creationist geologists today.  

THE ICE AGE. Like today’s creationist scientists, Rehwinkel supports the idea that the global deluge caused a major change in climate, a radical cooling period that could have produced large masses of floating ice which

likely changed the earth’s topography. But what about glaciers? While he asserts that one can either accept or deny the glacial theory without violating Scripture, he personally does not favor the idea. He writes, “Water in a volume sufficiently great and sufficiently disturbed by great upheavals, such as might be caused by earthquakes, volcanoes, and great storms, is capable of becoming a force so cosmic in proportion that it is quite able to accomplish most or all of the changes ascribed to the action of great mountains of moving ice” (329). By doubting a major Ice Age, Rehwinkel would be out of step with current creationist thinking.  

This review covers only some of the highlights of *The Flood*. Alfred Rehwinkel has much more to say about science and the Flood, such as accounts of a worldwide flood found in the ancient writings of other cultures and some reports that the Ark has been discovered. It is very important that he reminds us about the limitations of science as a source of truth by quoting Thomas Aquinas:

> There is a point, however high it may be, beyond which reason must confess its inability to understand, but it is just at this point that faith comes to the rescue of reason, the mind in matters of faith gives the assent to truth upon the authority of God manifested through revelation and thus man completes the edifice of his knowledge with the structure of supernatural truth. The realm of faith then is not to be conceived in opposition to the realm of natural truth but as the culmination, for in both reign supreme the same divine intelligence.  

While science can never provide the assurance of truth which the Bible affords, a study of God’s world alongside God’s Word can help answer attacks which skeptics all too often level against the Scriptures. In this respect, creation science as represented in books such as *The Flood* can be very helpful.

---


Weird and Wonderful: Weaver Ants

Ants are fascinating insects that live in communities, where they work as a team. All ants build some kind of nest, often from soil, but the most amazing are the weavers which build nests from leaves. A weaver ant colony begins when a queen lays some eggs on a leaf. When the larvae hatch, she feeds them until they grow into workers. Then they build a nest and help the queen rear more larvae, building more nests as they are needed.

The way weaver ants build their nests is truly wonderful. They form a chain to pull the living leaves together, then sew them together by using their young larvae like a needle and thread. The workers squeeze the larvae, and they produce a sticky silk thread which is strong enough to hold the nests together.

It seems impossible to believe that the weaver ants’ method of nest-building could have come about by thousands or millions of years of evolution, or that the larvae gradually evolved a way to produce sticky silk thread, and that the workers then gradually learned how to use them to sew the leaves together. The ants couldn’t afford to practice nest-making—they had to get it right from the very beginning!

Weaver ants work by instinct — they don’t think about what they do. The whole community works as a team, following a plan which was “programmed” into them by God, when He created them. [LSI]

Left: a weaver ant worker. Right: ants collaborating in pulling nest leaves together. (Photos from Wikipedia)
Well Designed: Weaverbirds

Most birds build some kind of nest, but weaverbirds must surely qualify as master nest-builders. There are over 170 species, living mainly in southern Africa, with a few in Asia and Australia. As their name suggests, most weaverbirds build intricately woven nests, using strands of grass. They can even tie knots! The nests are suspended from branches.

Some species build long tunnels leading into their nests, and others build their nests in colonies — the sparrow weavers build “apartments” in which 100 to 300 pairs of birds have separate flask-shaped chambers entered through tubes at the bottom. If a nest is damaged during building, rather than repair it, the bird will tear the nest apart and begin all over again. So the ability to weave their nests must be coded into the weaverbirds’ DNA. The idea that they gradually evolved this skill doesn’t make sense, since trial and error would have resulted in the loss of eggs and risk to the species’ survival. They had to get it right from the very beginning!

Both the birds and their nests show evidence of design by a wise Creator, not the result of chance mutations over a long period of time. LSI

Articles reprinted with permission from publications of the Creation Resources Trust, England; Geoff Chapman, editor.
The Chaotic State of Evolution Cosmology

Anyone who thinks secular scientists have cosmology all figured out should read an article titled “Who Wrote the Book of Physics?” from the April issue of the pro-evolution Discover magazine. Here’s a quote from the article:

The problem is that physics appears to be leading us not to resolution but into an Alice in Wonderland world of increasingly bizarre theories, each farther removed than the last from our experience of the everyday world. In recent years cosmologists have posited that our universe is just one among an untold number of universes that bubble up constantly from quantum foam. Theoretical physicists have looked to the exotic mathematics of string theory, which suggests the existence of seven extra dimensions beyond the four we already know about. Experimentalists have built the $10 billion Lange Hadron Collider in part to understand why we can observe only a portion of what our theories of matter predict.

If scientists have to dream up dimensions that nobody has ever seen and universes that nobody may ever find, perhaps it is a sign that we are headed down a blind alley. If we are indeed getting closer to knowing nature’s immutable laws, a few renegade physicists are now asking, why does each step we take only seem to send us deeper into the rabbit hole?

Toward the end of World War II, the people of Warsaw, Poland were picking through the rubble of their city. Bombs and shells had leveled virtually every building, until only a few chimneys remained standing; grotesque and useless obelisks against the iron gray sky. But the Poles looked up in wonder at one wall of a building that was still standing. It was the only remaining wall of the British and Foreign Bible Society. The wall bore a sign with letters that were still clearly legible even after the many bombardments: "Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will never pass away."

Source: www.WhatAboutJesus.com (3/9/10)
Are You in a Happy State of Mind?

According to a survey of 1.3 million people by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the happiest states tend to be found in areas with lots of sunshine. They are:

1. Louisiana
2. Hawaii
3. Florida
4. Tennessee
5. Arizona
6. South Carolina
7. Mississippi
8. Montana
9. Alabama
10. Maine

The least happy states are:

42. Rhode Island
43. Ohio
44. Massachusetts
45. Illinois
46. California
47. New Jersey
48. Indiana
49. Michigan
50. Connecticut
51. New York

Source: The (Racine) Journal Times

Parent — Job Description

Positions: Mum, Mommy, Mama, Mom, Dad, Daddy, Dada, Pa, Pop

Job Description: Long term, team players needed for challenging permanent work in an often chaotic environment. Candidates must possess excellent communication and organization skills and be willing to work variable hours, which will include evenings and weekends and frequent 24 hour shifts on call. Some overnight travel required, including trips to primitive camping sites on rainy weekends and endless sports tournaments in far away cities! Travel expenses not included.

Responsibilities: The rest of your life. Must be willing to be hated, at least temporarily, until someone needs $5. Must be willing to face technical challenges such as small gadget repair, sluggish toilets, and stuck zippers. Must screen phone calls, maintain calendars and coordinate production of multiple homework projects. Responsibilities also include floor maintenance and janitorial work.

Possibility of Advancement: None

Previous Experience: None required, unfortunately. On-the-job training.

Wages and Compensation: Get this! You pay them.

Benefits: No insurance, pension, or paid holidays but lots of hugs and kisses possible.

Thanks to Craig Schwartz
Charles Darwin, the Skeptic

He wanted proof before accepting the paranormal and the claims of psychics and homeopathy.

SUMMARY: Charles Darwin has always been a polarizing figure, as seen by the fact the new movie about his life, *Creation*, had trouble finding a distributor in the U.S. The reason, according to the film's distributor, is that Darwin's theory of evolution is too much of a "hot potato" in America. The film focuses on Darwin writing his famous book, *On the Origin of Species*, but also portrays his deeply religious wife, Emma, and their torment over their daughter Annie's death.

Best known for his theory of evolution, Darwin did have a lesser-known side — his skepticism, which he shared with his father. He demanded that he see good evidence for extraordinary claims. His correspondence with friends, family, and colleagues shows he held very skeptical views about psychics, the paranormal, and alternative medicine.
In a Sept. 4, 1850 letter to a cousin, Darwin scathingly dismissed psychic powers (clairvoyance) and homeopathy (the method of treating diseases with small amounts of drugs that produce symptoms in a healthy person similar to those of the disease). Darwin was strongly opposed to the illogical homeopathic premise that tiny amounts of a drug are more effective than larger doses. He noted that for homeopathy to be scientifically tested, it would need to be studied against a control group.

A year earlier, in a letter dated March 19, Darwin wrote about the gullibility of physician James Manby Gully, who as a spiritualist had treated Darwin's father. "Dr. Gully was a spiritualist [a member of a group that regularly communicated with the dead] & believer in clairvoyance [also known as ESP or mental telepathy]. He bothered my father for some time to have a consultation with a clairvoyant, who was . . . reputed to be able to see the insides of people & discover the real nature of their ailments."

Darwin's father confronted a psychic who had impressed Dr. Gully and challenged her to read the number on a banknote which was inside a sealed envelope. The clairvoyant scornfully refused to try to do that and then went on to incorrectly claim Darwin's father had all sorts of horrible internal diseases,

(Pictures from Wikimedia Commons)

The referenced article was found on www.livescience.com.

**COMMENT:** Charles Darwin may have been a skeptic, but one wonders why he wasn't more skeptical of his own theory of evolution. To be sure, he at times raised some question marks.

Darwin wondered about how the human eye could have evolved. "To suppose that the eye with all its inimitable contrivances for adjusting the focus to different distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree," he wrote in Chapter VI of his famous book. His doubts, of course, were not enough to cause him to abandon his theory.
In the 1902 edition of *Origins*, Darwin wondered about the missing links. "The number of intermediate varieties which have formerly existed on earth must be truly enormous. Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory."

Darwin's skeptical nature raises the serious question of whether Charles Darwin would today be an evolutionist. We know far more today about the complexity of the universe to the point that even secularists are admitting it appears to be designed for human life. The Intelligent Design community is showing how complex and well-designed even so-called simple organisms and human cells appear to be, complexity which was far beyond about which Darwin knew. As for the intermediate links, unless one counts a handful of disputed fossils, they are yet to be found, this after 150 more years of searching since Darwin's book was published. Today, Darwin would probably be very discouraged.

While Christian creationists are often mocked for our beliefs, we have the Word of the One who was there when the world was created. The Bible has stood the test of time. It tells us where we came from and where we are going. Let the world be skeptical about our belief that all believers in Jesus Christ as Savior will inherit eternal life. Thanks to the faith God has given us, we know it to be the truth. LSI

—Warren Krug, blogger

2 Comments

**Mark wrote:** It always boggles my mind that evolutionists are so staunch in there beliefs that everything just happened. The evidence for design is overwhelming. Dawkins and Crick have thrown in the Directed Panspermia theory (http://www.ziztur.com/2009/04/richard-dawkins-believes-aliens-seeded.html) but yet just can't bring themselves to see that God is even a possibility. For the foolishness of God is wiser than man's wisdom, and the weakness of God is stronger than man's strength. 1 Corinthians 1:25

**Mark Bergemann wrote:** Well, Darwin and I do agree on homeopathy. On God and creation we hold opposing views.
Congratulations
Welcome to two new members on our Board of Directors—Dr. David Gorsuch from Bristol, Wis. and Mark Bergemann from New Berlin, Wis. They were elected to 2-year terms.

The New Journal
This LSI Journal marks the beginning of our change to an enlarged quarterly edition. It also is the first time the main articles in our magazine have been peer-reviewed. The committee responsible for this activity consists of Pastor David Peters, Patrick Winkler, an engineer, and Jeff Stueber, a free-lance writer.

Donations Help to Again Pay for Manuscripts
A generous donation to LSI has made it possible to again pay authors of manuscripts which we accept for publication. The rate is 3 cents per word. Manuscripts can be mailed to our address in Racine or e-mailed. In the past we have accepted most such manuscripts. Please ask for a copy of the Author Guidelines or see our Web site.

Also, we wish to thank our former president, Rev. George Enderle, for his very generous donation to LSI.

Next Meeting
Our next meeting will take place, God willing, on Sat., June 23 at 1 p.m. The editorial committee will meet at 12 noon. The meeting tentatively has been scheduled for the Holiday Inn Express at 11111 West North Ave. in Wauwatosa, Wisconsin. If you plan to attend, please consult our Web site (Member News) or call 262-639-4931 a few days before the meeting in case there is any change in plans.

Free and Reduced Rate Memberships Announced
The Board has announced the following new memberships: 1. Electronic membership. Individuals and groups willing to receive their Journals and Bulletins via e-mail in .pdf format can save 50% on new memberships and renewals. Electronic memberships mean you would not receive printed copies. 2. Free Church Membership. Any church conducting a door offering for LSI may receive a one-year free membership. This would include printed copies. 3. Free Electronic Memberships for Groups. Any church or other organization which posts a prominently displayed link to the LSI Web site on its Web site may receive a free electronic membership upon request.
Youth Oppose Abortion
Some 58% of adults 18-29 believe abortion is morally wrong, according to a recent Marist Institute for Public Opinion survey. Those in the 30-44 age bracket scored even higher, 60%. That compares to only 51% of people 45-64 years of age.—Clearly Caring (First Quarter, 2010)

NEA More Accepting Of Creationism
Creationism is having an impact on the officially atheistic National Education Association. For years creationist teachers and volunteers have manned a popular booth at the NEA’s annual convention. At this year’s convention in San Diego there was a record number of Christian and creation-based booths. Organizers at the largest of these booths reported that they found more support and less hostility than they have experienced in the past.—Answers (Jan.-Mar., 2010)

Schools Prefer Recess Before Lunch
Schools that have rescheduled recess before lunch instead of afterwards are reporting benefits to the switch. Less food is wasted, more fruit, vegetables, and milk is consumed, and some teachers say there are fewer discipline problems. There are also reports of fewer headaches and stomachaches. Lunch after recess also provides a cool-down period and helps students get ready for academic work immediately after eating.—Milwaukee Journal Sentinel (1/27/10)

Military Divorces Rise
Despite many programs designed to help struggling military couples, the divorce rate in military homes continues to rise. There were an estimated 27,312 divorces among 765,000 married members on active duty in the Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps during the budget year that ended September 30, 2009. That’s a rate of 3.6% compared to 3.4% a year earlier, a full percentage point above the rate of 2.6% that existed in 2001 when the U.S. began sending troops into Afghanistan.—(Racine) Journal Times (11/28/09)

Early Humans Cared For Their Handicapped
The “530,000-year-old” deformed skull of a child found in Spain suggests early humans nurtured and cared for disabled members of their tribe. The child, estimated to be 10 at the time of death, suffered from a condition in which the joints in the skull fused before the brain had finished growing. A paleontologist said the child would never have been able to live as long as it did without social care for the handicapped.—Discover (January-February, 2010)

Find Remains of Huge Croc-Crunching Snake
The remains of a 43-foot, one-ton behemoth of a snake were found early last year in a Colombian coal mine. The Titanoboa, the largest snake of all time, could crunch crocodiles. Scientists estimated Colombia’s temperature averaged about 10°C higher at the time the snake was alive.—Discover (January-February, 2010)

Ancient Bone Flute Rivalled Modern Flutes
More than “35,000 years ago” humans in present-day southwestern Germany were playing sophisticated music. U. of Tübingen archaeologist Nicholas Conard found an ancient bone flute in a cave in the Swabian mountains that produced sounds almost identical to today’s instruments. In fact, the five-holed flute, which was carved from the bone of a griffon vulture, might have been able to express greater harmony than the modern flute, he says.—Discover (January-February, 2010)

Sauropods Could Hold Their Heads High
Scientists at the U. of Portsmouth, UK, are claiming that sauropod dinosaurs held their heads up high after all, like they were originally depicted. The researchers compared the dinosaur vertebrae with the vertebrae of living mammals and birds, which all hold their heads up high. In recent years, these animals have been shown with heads out front level with their necks on the assumption that their blood pressure would have been too high otherwise.—Creation (January-March, 2010)
Safer Pain Reliever
Acetaminophen is still the safest nonprescription pain reliever available, but when more than the recommended dose is taken, even only slightly more, the result could be serious or even fatal liver damage. Mayo Clinic doctors say most people need not bother switching to other pain relievers, but they should be aware of all the products that contain the drug so that they don’t overuse.—Mayo Clinic Health Letter (December, 2009)

Prostate Cancer Vaccine
Prostate cancer vaccines are under development that are different from traditional vaccines. Rather than offering protection to people who don’t have a disease, these vaccines are therapeutic. They are designed to train the immune system to attack cancer cells in men who already have prostate cancer. One vaccine, Provenge, has been found by one study to be as effective in extending life as chemotherapy without as serious side effects.—Mayo Clinic Health Letter (December, 2009)

Hopes Dashed for Another HIV Drug
Once again, high hopes for a microbicide designed to prevent HIV infections have been crushed. A small study had suggested a vaginal gel called PRO 2000 might prevent the AIDS virus from entering human cells. But a much larger 4-year $44 million study at six sites in Africa, which involved nearly 9500 women, found those who got the gel were slightly more likely to get infected than women who received a dummy gel.—ScienceNow Daily News (12/14/09)

Aspirin & Colon Cancer
Colon cancer patients who took aspirin reduced their risk of death from the disease by almost 30% according to a study reported in the August Journal of the American Medical Association. The inexpensive drug is already known to help prevent heart attacks and strokes. According to Andrew Chan of Harvard Medical School, who led the study, it is too early for an across-the-board recommendation, but it is encouraging news which needs to be confirmed by additional experiments.—Milwaukee Journal Times (8/12/09)

40% of All Cancers Are Preventable
About 40% of all cancers are preventable if people stopped smoking and overeating, limited their alcohol intake, exercised regularly, and got vaccines targeting cancer-causing infections. So said officials at the International Union Against Cancer meeting in London on World Cancer day in February. Cancer is responsible for one out of every eight deaths worldwide, more than AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria combined. Vaccines to prevent some cancers are widely available in the West but are almost nonexistent in developing countries.—USA Today (2/6/10)

Retired People Sleep Better
Retirement can help adults sleep better according to a study published in the journal Sleep. The study found sleep disturbances declined 26% after people retired, probably due to less fatigue, depression, and work-related stress.—Consumer Reports OnHealth (February, 2010)

Whole Grains Fight High Blood Pressure
Men who eat more whole grains on a regular basis are less likely to develop high blood pressure. This was the conclusion of a study involving more than 31,000 men which was published in the September, 2009 American Journal of Clinical Nutrition. Researchers found that men who consumed the most whole grains — about 52 grams (g) daily — were 19% less likely to develop hypertension. Previous studies had linked more whole grain consumption to lower risk of mortality, heart disease, weight gain and diabetes, but most Americans eat far too little.—Mayo Clinic Health Letter (February, 2010)

The Power of Water
The power of water in changing the topography was shown by a flash flood in the Havasu Canyon, a side portion of the Grand Canyon. The floodwaters carved a new streambed, tossed RV-sized boulders around, and eliminated one waterfall while creating another.—Answers (Jan.-Mar., 2010) - quoting USA Today (Aug. 16, 2009)

More News Briefs Online
What man survived two atomic bomb attacks?
What dog captured the title as the world’s largest?
Where is the coldest known spot in the Solar System?
Find these and still more News Briefs online at www.lutheranscience.org
Jesus answered, "Everyone who drinks this water will be thirsty again, but whoever drinks the water I give him will never thirst. Indeed, the water I give him will become in him a spring of water welling up to eternal life." John 4:13

Jesus had a lot of say about water to a woman one day when he sat down by a well. But He was talking mainly about “living water,” the water that offers eternal life in heaven. We will be learning about the water we see around us on earth.

What is water? Pure water (water without anything else in it) is a clear liquid that has no taste, no smell, and, in small amounts, no color.

How common is water? It is the most common liquid on earth. Water not only covers about 70% of the earth’s surface, but it can be found in the air (atmosphere), in the ground, and even in our own bodies.

Where in our bodies is water found? Most of our skin and tissue is made up of water. About 92% of the liquid part of our blood is water, 60% of our red blood cells is water, and about 80% of our muscle tissue is water.

What chemicals are found in pure water? Surprisingly, two gases, oxygen and hydrogen, combine to form liquid water. Scientists often refer to water as H₂O because every molecule (tiny bit) of water contains two atoms of
hydrogen attached to one atom of oxygen.

**Is water always a liquid?**
No, when the temperature goes below 32° (0° Celsius), water freezes and becomes a solid we call ice. When water reaches a temperature of about 212° (100° Celsius) it begins boiling and steaming which turns it into a gas we call water vapor. Depending where you are on earth, these figures may be different.

**Why is water so valuable?**
We need it to stay alive. We can live longer without food than we can without water. Another valuable feature of water is that it is the best solvent we have. In other words, more things can dissolve in water than in any other substance.

Water is necessary for life on earth, but Jesus’s living water is absolutely necessary for life in heaven. When we believe in Jesus as our Savior, we are drinking the living water He offers.

**Activities:**

1. **Float a paper clip on water.** Place a small paper clip on a spoon and carefully lower it into a bowl of water. The paper clip should float because of something called *surface tension*, which is the ability of water to stick to itself.

2. **Break a spoon with water.** Well, not really. But place a spoon in a clear glass of water. When you look at the spoon through the side of the glass it may seem to be broken or bent. That’s because light travels more slowly in water than it does in air. You might also notice the water acting like a magnifying glass.
It is no surprise that theistic evolutionists or progressive creationists like Dr. Hugh Ross and Dr. Francis Collins are trying to make it acceptable to remain Christians while still agreeing with the evolutionism of mainstream science.

However, many Christians see these attempts as potentially destructive of faith if followed to their logical conclusions. In this respect, at least one atheist writer would agree. In its February, 2010 newsletter, the Creation Ministries International quoted one Richard Bozarth. Mr. Bozarth in the September, 1979 issue of American Atheist magazine had written:

It becomes clear now that the whole justification of Jesus’ life and death is predicated on the existence of Adam and the forbidden fruit he and Eve ate. Without the original sin, who needs to be redeemed? Without Adam’s fall into a life of constant sin terminated by death, what purpose is there to Christianity? None.

What all this means is that Christianity cannot lose the Genesis account of creation. Christianity is fighting for its very life.

There undoubtedly are a number of Christians who have not logically thought through this situation, as did Bozarth. If someone can believe we are descended from lower forms of life and still repent of his sins and believe in Jesus as his Savior, maybe we ought to rejoice and pray that person doesn’t do too much thinking.

Still, for Christians of weak faith, the dangers of coming to the same conclusion as did Richard Bozarth are real. It is at this point that scientists who believe in the Bible can be of great help in pointing out the serious problems which evolution has with not only the Bible, but also with observable science. (See Nuggets in this issue.)

Yes, Mr. Bozarth, Christianity may indeed be fighting for its life, but that has always been the case. Whether it was persecution in the Roman Colosseum, the evil deeds of false prophets, or attacks by modern science, the fight goes on. Yet the church will prevail.

“And I tell you that you are Peter, and on this rock (Peter’s confession of faith) I will build my church, and the gates of Hades will not overcome it.” (Matthew 16:18) LSI

—Warren Krug, editor
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