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A Letter From Grandpa: 
A Common Sense Discussion of Creation vs. Evolution 
By John Woidke
A great destroyer of the Christian faith has appeared which can have catastrophic effects on Christians of all ages, especially on young children of school age, the teaching of evolution in schools.
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By Jeff Stueber
The Creator is intelligent because he incorporates communication systems in each cell, uses the same processes in numerous animals, and inspires us to mimic him in our inventions.
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An LSI Reprint 
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The scientific information which is so devastating to atheistic evolution is equally devastating to theistic evolution.
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My View: When People Don’t Use Their Amazing Brains
My Dear Grandchildren and Great-grandchildren,

The Church has long recognized how accurate God is when in the Bible he tells us, “The love of money is a root of all kinds of evil” (1 Timothy 6:10). Of equal importance in the destruction of one’s faith is the pursuit of worldly pleasures. In my lifetime another great destroyer of the Christian faith has appeared which can have catastrophic effects on Christians of all ages, but especially on young people of school age. This challenge to our faith is the teaching of evolution¹ in our public schools. It began prior to 1900 and gained national attention with the “Scopes Monkey Trial” in 1925. Since then the teaching of evolution has become the only science instruction regarding the origins of life permitted in our

¹. Editor’s note:
The term “evolution” has been used to characterize two sets of ideas. The first idea might be described as change on a small scale (“micro evolution”). It involves the adaptation of living things to their environment and has been directly observed. The second idea involves change on a large scale (“macro evolution”). This involves extrapolating information from adaptation and natural selection backwards in time in order to explain the origins of plants, animals, humans and life itself. In this paper, the author uses the term “evolution” in this latter sense.

John Woidke is an LSI member living in Farwell, Michigan. He is a member of St. John Ev. Lutheran Church in Clare, Michigan. A retired engineer, John holds a B.S. in Mechanical Engineering.
I would like to discuss this “theory” of evolution with you. It is important for your eternal well-being that you understand what “evolution” is because you will be confronted by it throughout your life. In public grade schools, high schools and colleges, science teachers and professors will teach evolution as an established scientific fact. It is the very foundation on which they base their instruction in scientific theory, prehistoric history, philosophy, morality and life events. Educators of other disciplines and the textbooks that they use also have their foundations built, in part, upon the theory of evolution with all its implications. Educational magazines such as *National Geographic* and educational TV programs appear innocent as they invite us to learn about animals, plants and other aspects of nature. They are, however, potentially dangerous to your faith in Jesus because of their reliance on evolutionary theory. Even signs and markers in our national and state parks ascribe to evolution the formation of the natural wonders they describe. The list of references to evolution in our everyday life is overwhelming.

Evolution can be described in one word. It is a *lie*. Because of this lie, which is portrayed as scientific truth, many Christians have been led away from the truth of God’s Word and have lost their faith in Jesus Christ as their Savior.

A survey of Christian students entering high school or college science classes has shown that 60 – 80% of them leave their churches and their Christian faith as a result of evolution being taught in their science classes.²

Evolution is a lie – not only because the Bible (which is God’s Word) ascribes the establishment of all living and inanimate matter and all scientific laws and phenomena to our almighty God’s creation, but it is also a *scientific* lie. It is this “scientific lie” that I want you to understand. If you don’t understand the scientific aspect of this lie, there may be a lingering question in your mind as to the truth of God’s Word and how God’s Word and science relate to each other. Raising doubts about God’s Word (the Bible) is probably the most insidious and yet most common method that the

---

devil uses to destroy the faith of God’s children.

First you should understand that God, as part of his creation, also created and established all science and its laws. God’s creation and all of science are, therefore, completely integrated, and all living creatures, all inanimate matter and all of science point to a common designer, or creator, whom we acknowledge as God Almighty. Note here that the Bible says that the heavens (i.e. all creation, including science) declare the glory of God (Psalm 19:1) and, in so doing, declare his existence. Therefore, to use science to show believers and unbelievers that God is the creator of all things is not contrary to biblical teachings. Even Christ used physical evidence (science) to prove to Thomas and all his disciples that he had indeed risen from the dead on Easter morning and that he is indeed the promised Son of God.

Most science teachers, college professors and scientists simply describe creation as a tenet of religion. To them, creation is a matter of religious faith and science is a matter of facts and truth and the two subjects (religious creation and scientific evolution) cannot be discussed in the same context. Therefore, they reason, since creation is a matter of religious faith it cannot be taught as science in public schools. This is a major aspect of the evolution lie.

These same professors and scientists also claim that we cannot theorize God or consider God as the creator of all things simply because they cannot “prove” his existence, or his work of creation, scientifically. Does that mean that all “unprovable” scientific facts cannot be theorized or discussed scientifically until provable? Of course not. Science has always existed, but man simply was not always able to understand it or able to prove it for thousands of years, but it was always there. So it is with God. Today’s scientists do not accept any scientific proof of God’s existence, nor do they understand how he can create things. We should, however, be able to theorize God’s existence and his creation and to discuss it in science classes as a valid scientific alternative to the atheistic theory of
If Darwin’s theory of evolution can be classified as “science” based on unproven logic, then creation can also be a valid scientific theory based on the obvious intelligent design of all science and of all living species. The lack of evidence of evolutionary incremental changes in the fossil record and in all living species supports the Bible’s creation account. Stated in another way, and from the standpoint of a scientific discussion, if God does exist and if he did create the universe and everything in it, then that would be a scientific fact regardless whether or not today’s limited scientific knowledge can prove it. To theorize then that an intelligent being (i.e. God) created all living matter is therefore a valid scientific fact and not just a religious belief. As such, creation should be included in science class discussions. It should be noted here that evolution has been classified by science as a “theory” for 150 years and it is still not proven – nor do scientific facts support its claims.

The claim that God and creation cannot be proven scientifically can be disproven by science’ own tests and procedures for identifying and evaluating artifacts found in various archaeological excavations. One scientific procedure for identifying and scientifically evaluating an artifact is identical in many ways to what many creationists refer to as “intelligent design.” This can be seen by the following example: An archaeologist – a scientist – finds a simple prehistoric arrowhead in one of his excavations of an archaeological site. Does that scientist declare that this arrowhead evolved over billions of years? Of course not. His scientific evaluation of the arrowhead is that it was designed and made by an intelligent human being – not some animal or half animal/half sub-human, knuckle-dragging being. (If anyone questions the intelligence of the arrowhead designer and

\[\text{2. My use of the term “intelligent design” does not in any way refer to any organized anti-evolutionary movement. The use of the term “intelligent design” refers only to what these two words say, i.e. that an intelligent being (God) designed and made (created) all of nature, living and inanimate, including the universe.}\]
maker, I suggest that he, with his superior modern intelligence, go outside, without modern tools, and make an arrowhead of the quality found in all prehistoric arrowheads. That arrowhead designer and all arrowhead makers were geniuses by today’s standards! The scientific evaluation of the arrowhead was accomplished by a visual observation of its design and obvious man-made manufacturing techniques.

Using this same scientific evaluation procedure, we need only to look into our mirror and note the complex detailed design and integration of our own body components to realize that no haphazard chance happening of evolution could have devised the unique, complex system that we see in the mirror. Observe carefully the details of every body part, starting with the eyes, skin, mouth, etc., and note their detailed design, function and integration within the whole body. We can only exclaim that our body was designed and made by a very intelligent being – the Almighty God. So much wasted breath for the theory of evolution! Almighty God does exist, just as the Bible states.

As a young man, I tried to rationalize the biblical creation account in terms of the scientific “facts” of evolution. The usual idea that God started evolution seemed the most probable, except for one important fact. God would have to be a liar because the Holy Spirit testified to the biblical account of creation, and it was confirmed by God the Father and by Jesus. In looking to God for answers to the riddle of God’s Word versus science, I finally realized, with the Holy Spirit’s guidance, that the obvious answers were all around us. I want you to understand these obvious answers to the scientific question of creation versus evolution.

There are at least six avenues of logic which contradict the “theory” of evolution. They are:

I. The accelerated incidence of change required for evolution to occur.

II. The lack of fossil records which would show the detailed development and incremental progression of the evolutionary process.
III. The inability of the theory of evolution to explain how complex genetic systems evolved prior to simple life forms – genetics.

IV. The evidence of intelligent design and the mathematical improbability of intelligent design arising as a product of chance – e.g. the complex ID of every seed.

V. Darwin’s errors.

VI. The difficulty explaining what life is, or the inability of science to explain “life” and how “life” fits into the evolution of all of nature.

**The accelerated incidence of change required for evolution to occur.**

Life, according to the theory of evolution, began with a chance set of circumstances that resulted in a living cell which, after a long period of time, reproduced and became two cells. This process continued for many thousands of years (or even millions of years) until finally a living life form or creature resulted. As time continued, more and more different life forms or creatures appeared through random changes which gradually took place. From a mathematical standpoint, when only one living cell was present, development was very slow – perhaps only one cell in a hundred thousand years or even a million years. When two cells appeared we would expect the rate of cell reproduction to double, then triple, then quadruple, etc. The rate of development of new cells and life forms would therefore increase dramatically in proportion to the number of living cells or life forms available for change and with time. We would expect then that with the uncountable amounts of living matter today, evolutionary changes and new species would be seen in all stages of development in all living beings, creatures and plants. This expected massive evidence of accelerated evolutionary change, however, is **NOT** seen at all today, nor does history record any evidence of new species appearing or evolutionary changes occurring in any living item. If such massive evidence of evolutionary change did exist today, there would be no question about the validity of evolution and the theory of evolution would no longer be
classified as a “theory.” It would be called the “laws of evolution.” The “theory of evolution” is, therefore, inaccurate, and we can describe it for what it actually is – a scientific lie.

## The fossil record – or lack thereof

According to evolutionary theory, changes in the first living cells and in all subsequent life forms took place gradually and randomly. For example, a fish would develop various random protrusions on its body starting out as small bone or cartilage nubs. Eventually, over thousands of years, they would develop into fins or even leg-like extremities that, proven useful, would be kept and would continue to develop. The useless nubs/fins/etc. would eventually disappear. In the process of living, reproducing, changing and dying, this gradual, incremental development from one species to another would be permanently preserved in the fossil record. Obviously a fish could not give birth to an elephant or even a small mouse. These incremental changes, therefore, would continue over untold ages and the fossil record would consist entirely of these small, incremental changes. This is NOT the case, however. The fossil record does not show any intermediate or incremental stages but only fully developed species similar to those which exist in life today. (“Fully developed” are the key words here.) Evolutionary scientists are at a loss to explain these “gaps” in the fossil record as they describe this lack of intermediate or incremental fossil evidence. These gaps or lack of intermediate incremental development in the fossil record are, however, easily explained by creation. Fossils of completely developed species including completely developed present day species are simply the result of God’s perfect and complete creation. There never were intermediate species or incremental changes from one species to the next whose absence has caused the elusive “gap” which plagues evolutionists today. 

—To be Continued—
Before you begin reading this book, you ought to know that it is no light read. I took biology in high school in the early 1980s and am familiar with the essentials of the cell (the nucleus, DNA, mitochondria, and so forth) but this book goes well beyond a simple sketch of the cell. Nevertheless, it is well worth reading and, beyond the mere anatomy of the cell, one can glimpse a philosophy of religion which is very correct from a Christian understanding which supposes that God created life.

One aspect of supernatural design is what Rana calls the “watchmaker prediction.” This...
idea is derived from 18th and 19th century theologian William Paley who argued that if you were to find a watch on the ground, you would not suppose that it came into existence merely by chance because of the numerous inner components which have to exist in order to make it work. Recently Richard Dawkins borrowed this same mythical watch analogy to argue that nature is a blind watchmaker (hence the title of one of his books). Rana argues that many of the processes inside the cell could not have originated by chance, much as watch parts cannot originate by chance. These processes are similar to the contraptions we are creating now. As we discover more about the cell, we should expect to uncover more such processes. Hence, Rana concludes, the cell must have been designed by a Designer more creative and intelligent than we; and we are now, with our scientific technology, learning to mimic his creativity and intelligence. The following example should suffice.

Brownian motion is the random motion of particles suspended in a fluid. On the other hand, Brownian ratchets (conceptual machines with a gear on one end of an axel, which gear can move at will but in only one direction) are limited in their mobility, being restricted to moving only within certain physical limits. But before researchers developed this Brownian ratchet technology, it already existed inside cells. For example, the molecular motor kinesin, a protein which uses energy to create motion within a cell, resembles two golf clubs with intertwined shafts. Each “club” takes its turn detaching from the inside cell wall as the other stays attached and, as they work in unison to control its overall motion, it can transport cellular cargo.

Another aspect of intelligent design involves creating organs or processes which operate using precise timing. Messenger RNA are sequences of DNA that transfer information from the nucleus.

---

to amino acid sequences of proteins. If too many of these sequences are left around, they direct the creation of proteins beyond what is needed and impede cell function. Remarkably, only messenger RNA which is needed for short-lived cell processes have rapid decay rates while those needed for longer durations have shorter ones.

People who used computers during the computer bulletin board days remember uploading or downloading files using various error-checking protocols. Those protocols dealt with an odd or even number of computer bits which were turned either on or off. In even parity the number of “on” bits must be an even number, and in odd parity the number of “on” bits must be an odd number. Rana says the bases adenine, guanine, thymine, and cytosine are unique in that when they alone are used to create DNA, they impart the genetic code with error checking capabilities. This is because in DNA molecules guanine only joins with cytosine and adenine only joins with thymine. If the hydrogen bonds between the bases are considered analogous to electrical signals which are either on or off (either “1” or “0”), then when the bases are paired correctly the number of “on” bits is always an even number. Incorrect arrangements yield incorrect parity. No other group of four bases can do this.

Rana summarizes his arguments and examples near the end of his book and reveals the personality of the Creator in whom he believes. This Creator is capable of fine tuning and quality control, is intelligent because he incorporates communication systems in each cell, uses the same processes in numerous animals much as we might use the wheel in bicycles and cars, and inspires his creation (us) to mimic him in our inventions. While such evidence may not be sufficient to conclude that Christianity is true, the Creator of the Bible certainly comes to mind as a prime candidate for the task of creating what Rana describes.
theistic evolutionist, unlike an atheistic evolutionist, places God into the heart of the evolutionary process. He holds that God created the cosmos, life, living things, and human beings through the process of evolution. It was God, an intelligent Being, Who devised and controlled the whole process of evolution. Both theistic and atheistic evolutionists assume the same framework of evolutionary history and the same evolutionary mechanisms. Thus, theistic evolution is an attempt to reconcile biblical creation with atheistic evolution; it is a compromising position in respect to origins.

The theistic-evolution approach to ultimate origins is immensely popular; it abounds in most mainline Protestant churches and in the Roman Catholic Church. Ever since the rise of the Documentary Hypothesis in Protestant circles over two hundred years ago as a naturalistic way for accounting for the origin of the first five books of the Bible, there has been a pronounced tendency to understand the Genesis creation account as a purely human portrayal of how the world came into existence.

The late Darrel Kautz was an educator and an LSI member. Reprinted from his book, *The Origin of Living Things*, with permission of the family. This article originally appeared in the January/February, 2003 *LSI Journal*.
The following statement by Jaroslav Pelikan reflects the thinking of many theistic evolutionists. “Although the story of how God originally fashioned the world and all that is in it comes first in the sequence of the biblical narratives as we now have them, it is a mistake to interpret this story as the foundation for all the subsequent narratives. Indeed, literary analysis of the creation stories suggests that they come rather late in the history of the development of the Old Testament . . . The story or stories of creation in Genesis are not chiefly cosmogony but the preface to the history that begins with the calling of Abraham. Genesis is not world history but the history of the covenant people of God. And as the Book of Exodus is interested in Pharaoh only for his part in the Exodus of Israel and otherwise cares so little about him that the Pharaoh of the Exodus is still difficult to identify historically, so the Book of Genesis is interested in ‘the heavens and the earth’ as the stage for the essentially historical, rather than cosmic, drama it sets out to recount.”

In Roman Catholic circles theistic evolution entered that church body in a big way through Father Teilhard de Chardin, a Jesuit paleontologist and biologist who lived from 1881-1955. Malachi Martin states that Teilhard’s “starting point was Darwinian Evolution — he always ‘personalized’ the word [Evolution] with a capital letter — which he took to be fact, not theory.” In speaking of Teilhard, Prof. Wilder-Smith says that he “so extended evolutionary doctrine as to include the view that matter possesses a built-in force which causes it to automatically surge upward, slowly and irresistibly (to use Teilhard’s expressions), to more and higher complexity, ending in psychic pressure build-ups (Teilhard), cephalization and Point Omega. That is, God so constructed matter that it had to evolve. Many academically trained persons are willing to believe this type of theory and apply it to their religious beliefs.”

Although the papal encyclical *Humani Generis* (Origin of Man) issued by Pope Pius XII in 1950 warns Catholics against teaching evolution as fact, it does

---

condone the teaching of this view of origins in Catholic institutions with the understanding, however, that all theistic evolutionists must believe that the souls of people are created by God. In 1986 Pope John Paul II stated, “So long as we do not exclude divine causality as the explanation for creation, we can hold that Genesis is not opposed to the theory of natural evolution.”

According to current Catholic theology, God the Creator intervened at some specific moment in the evolutionary process, and infused a spiritual/immortal soul into what had already become a highly developed “higher animal.” Among the factors which contributed to the widespread acceptance of theistic evolution are the following:

1. The entrenchment of various forms of Darwinism in the academic circles of Europe and America ever since the publication in 1859 of Charles Darwin’s book, *The Origin of Species*.

2. The unrelenting flow of evolutionary propaganda from textbooks, newspapers, periodicals (including *National Geographic*), museum displays, books, national news commentators, and TV programs. Man’s natural disposition of enmity towards God and to sin renders each person a potential victim of evolutionary propaganda.

3. Fear on the part of some Bible-believing persons of being marked as anti-intellectual. One is not really an intellectual person, say some people, until one rises above legends about origins, and discovers for oneself the truth about ultimate origins.

4. The influences of coworkers and friends (peer pressure) which intimidate those who express confidence in the truthfulness of Genesis 1-2.

5. The necessity of educators and scientists, in particular, of accepting the evolutionary view

---

of origins to remain in good standing and eligible for promotions (job security).

6. The prevalence of the existential philosophy of life with its stress on subjectivity, individual experience, unlimited freedom, and on what is important for a person in his life right now. The existentialist asks, “Why am I here?” not “From where did I come?” or “To Whom am I ultimately responsible?” Matters such as ultimate origins, the distant past, and objective truth are not primary concerns.

7. Persistence in the view that passages of the Bible do not have one intended meaning, but can mean whatever a person thinks they mean — one of the characteristics of existential thinking.

8. The denial of divine revelation in the sense of God’s conveying specific information to man. The loss of the conviction that the Bible is God’s inspired Word, an accurate and trustworthy record of His redemptive involvement in the world from creation to the end of New Testament times.

9. The assumption that the first five books of the Bible came into existence after the time of King David (the Documentary Hypothesis), and that they do not record historical events in the normal sense of the word “history.” Correlated with this is the use of the historical-critical method of interpreting Genesis and other biblical books — a method which assumes that the Documentary Hypothesis is correct. It is to be noted that this hypothesis is itself based upon the theory of evolution; for religion, in general, and the Old Testament in particular, are assumed to be products of man’s evolutionary development.

10. The assumption that when interpreting the Bible, greater weight is to be given to the context (historical, cultural, and literary factors) in which the Bible developed than to the text itself — especially when interpreting the first books of the Bible. It is the context, it is claimed, which is the key to unlocking the meaning of the books of the Bible for people living in our times, not adherence to the biblical text.

11. The training of pastors in many seminaries to accept macroevolution as an explanation of origins superior to Genesis 1, because Genesis is assumed to be

a pre-scientific view of how the world came into existence — a view not worth serious consideration in our advanced scientific age.

12. The lack of knowledge on the part of pastors and Christians generally that the facts of science correlate well with Genesis 1-2, but do not correlate with macroevolution.

It is evident that macroevolution is without a solid scientific basis. The same can be said of theistic evolution; for all the scientific information which is so devastating to atheistic evolution is equally devastating to theistic evolution.

The era in which theistic evolutionists can be comfortable with both the Bible and with macroevolution appears to be drawing to a close. Just as the evolutionist Michael Denton, in his book *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, exposed the vulnerability of macroevolution on the basis of molecular biology, so the time is approaching when some perceptive theistic evolutionist will likely write a book which could be entitled, *Theistic Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*.

The former atheistic evolutionist Michael Pitman, in his book *Adam and Evolution*, writes as follows about the incredibility of both atheistic and theistic evolution. “*Adam and Evolution* should be controversial. The many issues it raises cannot all be dealt with, let alone in depth, in a single sweep. But the direction of the argument is clear — there has been neither chemical evolution nor macro-evolution. Nor, as some twentieth century churchmen bioologically accept, did God involve chance mutations in ‘creation by evolution’. No intelligent creator would leave matters to chance; on the contrary, his purpose would be to realize, in plan and in practice, his ideas. Pressing the logic to its conclusion, this book advocates a grand and full-blooded creation. The implications of this view necessitate a reappraisal of ourselves and of the whole world of organisms around us.”

Scientists are amazed how much fossil arachnids known as harvestmen look like their modern relatives.

**Summary:** Using X-rays that have produced 3D images of two “300 million year old” fossilized spiny arachnids called harvestmen (scientific name: *opiliones*), scientists have been amazed to discover how little the animals have changed in all that time.

Many of the features of the animals were buried in their host rocks and hard to study. So, Dr. Russell Garwood of the Natural History Museum in London put the fossils into a computed tomography (CT) scanner. The machine was able to generate more than 3,000 images of these two specimens from a series of two-dimensional X-ray images.

It is not surprising that the ancient harvestmen have a rather poor fossil record because they are so slight and spindly. Only about 33 fossilized species have been discovered so far and the quality of their preservation is poor. Therefore, the CT scanning technique is invaluable for helping scientists capture details, even the anatomical ones hidden inside the encapsulating rock. The scanning technique also has the
advantage of being non-destructive of the fossil.

One of the arachnids, *Ameticos scolos*, features two spine-like structures on its 9mm-long body which may have deterred predators, while the smaller *Macrogyion crono* is distinguished by its long legs, one of which has a big curve. Modern relatives, which have a very similar appearance, use the looped structures to grab on to leaf parts as they move through foliage.

"We can't actually say scientifically why harvestmen have changed so little through Earth history, but basically everything else around on land at this time in the Carboniferous was in a very primitive form," Dr. Garwood said. "These creatures, on the other hand, were pretty much as they appear now all the way back then."

*(Photo of a harvestman from Wikipedia, credited to Mehran Moghtadai, edited by: Arad)*

This summary was based on an article found at...

**Comment:** Fossils such as the ones under discussion are often called “living fossils.” There are hundreds of living fossil species, fossils which are supposedly millions of years old but which look pretty much the same as their living relatives. Examples of living fossils include plants such as the Ginkgo (270 million years) and horsetails (more than 360 million years) as well as animals like the horseshoe crab (250 million years) and cockroach (350 million years)

If I were an evolutionist, I would be embarrassed by all these living fossils. In fact, when I googled “living fossils,” almost all the links on the first page were to creationist sites. And did you note the surprise shown by Dr. Garwood? How do evolutionists explain living fossils? Charles Darwin said living fossils “have endured to the present day, from having inhabited a confined area, and from having thus been exposed to less severe competition” (*On the Origin of Species*, p. 49). The Talk.Origins website was quoted as saying, "In fact, in an unchanging environment, stabilizing selection would tend to keep an organism largely unchanged. Many environments around today are not greatly different from environments of millions of years ago."
The fact of the matter is that mutations and natural selection — the forces that are said to drive and control evolution — have been with us presumably since the beginning of the world. How could all the living fossils have avoided these forces for millions of years when mutations and natural selection supposedly have had the power to turn single-celled organisms eventually into people over that time? It is extremely difficult to believe, Mr. Darwin, assuming your theory is true, that over millions of years these living fossils have faced no competitors (or predators) that would have forced them to evolve into other creatures. As for the environment not changing over millions of years, is that what evolutionist geologists and climatologists are saying (think dinosaur extinction and global warming)?

If we stick to what we can observe, we must reject the idea that organisms can evolve into entirely different organisms. The living fossils confirm that. So do the creatures which we see today only reproducing creatures just like themselves. We see no in-between creatures, no creatures with partially-formed appendages or organs as they strive to become something else. And the so-called transitional forms in the fossil record tend to be subject to controversy.

What we see with our eyes confirms what the Bible says: organisms reproducing only “according to their kinds” (Genesis 1:24). There is one exception to this rule, however. There will indeed be some new creatures — those people who have repented of their sins and come to Jesus for His free forgiveness and salvation (2 Corinthians 5:17), who, when they enter heaven, will possess glorified bodies (Philippians 3:21) unlike the weak, sickly vessels we currently inhabit. We then also will possess holy souls, in contrast to the sinful souls that presently plague us. Praise God for these changes which will surely be ours — as long as we don’t reject the gift of salvation Jesus freely offers us!

**Question of the Day**

What part of a giraffe can be compared to human fingerprints?

The irregular brown markings that cover its body form a different pattern in every giraffe, just as no two humans have exactly the same fingerprints.

Source: *Creation* (October-December, 2011)
Surprises Emerge in a Survey of Christian Colleges

A survey of 100 Christian colleges revealed the following surprises:

- To the question of whether or not instructors believed in creation in six literal days, 71% of science instructors but only 57% of instructors in the religion department said “Yes.”
- To the question of whether or not instructors considered themselves “young-earth Christians,” 57% of the science instructors said “Yes” but only 15% of the religion instructors said so.
- On the question of whether or not the instructors thought their institution was teaching that the theory of evolution is true, 6% of science instructors said “Yes” but 31% of those in the religion department said so.
- On the question of whether or not the instructors accepted a worldwide flood, 56% of science instructors and 57% of the religion instructors said “Yes”. However, many instructors define “worldwide” to mean “the known world” and not the entire globe.

Source: Answers (July-September, 2011)

“Who will say with confidence that sexual abuse is more permanently damaging to children than threatening them with the eternal and unquenchable fires of hell?”
—Richard Dawkins, who wants religion eradicated — quoted in

Car Models Most Likely and Least Likely to be Stolen.

Most Likely—Cadillac Escalade SUV, Ford F-250 crew cab pickup, Infinity G37, Dodge Charger HEMI, and Chevrolet Corvette Z06

Least Likely—Volvo S80, Saturn Vue, Nissan Murano, Honda Pilot, and Subaru Impreza.

Source: Bottom Line Personal (August 1, 2011)
Is “None” a Singular or a Plural Pronoun?

Since “none” has the meanings “not one” and “not any,” some insist that it always be treated as singular and be followed by a singular verb: The rescue party searched for survivors, but none was found.

However, NONE has been used with both singular and plural verbs since the 9th century. When the sense is “not any persons or things” (as in the example above), the plural is more common: … none were found.

Only when NONE is clearly intended to mean “not one” or “not any” is it followed by a singular verb: Of all my articles, none has received more acclaim than my latest one.

Source: http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/none

Frog Facts

1. All toads are frogs, but not all frogs are toads.
2. Some frogs are big enough to eat birds and snakes, and others are small enough to hide behind a grain of rice.
3. Frogs should not really be touched, for the safety of both frogs and humans, but some species such as marine toads and White’s tree frogs can tolerate short periods of handling if you wear moist vinyl gloves without powder.
4. Frogs have permeable skin allowing them to both breathe and drink through it.
5. Frogs rarely live more than a few years in the wild, but in captivity can live longer than a cat or a dog.

Source: Edmonds, Devin, Frogs and Toads, quoted in (Racine) Journal Times (4/17/2011)
New Internet Words Approved by Oxford English Dictionary

LOL - Laughing out loud  ●  IMHO - In my humble opinion
BFF - Best friends forever  ●  TMI - Too much information
And sadly,
OMG - Oh, my God!

Source: Milwaukee Journal Sentinel (3/26/11)

“Since ancient times no one has heard, no ear has perceived, no eye has seen any God besides you, who acts on behalf of those who wait for him.”
Isaiah 64:4

Source: answersingenesis.org

CREATING A SAFER HOME FOR ADULTS

► Make sure there are handrails on both sides of stairways.
► Secure rugs with double-sided tape.
► Upgrade amount of lighting and wattage if needed in darker areas.
► Replace doorknobs with easier-to-operate lever handles.
► Attach reflective, no-slip tape to uncarpeted stairs.
► Place a bench near home entrances.

Source: American Profile (Jan. 30-Feb. 5, 2011)
DO YOU HAVE ADULT ADD (ATTENTION DEFICIT DISORDER)?

The following test is not foolproof, but 80% of the adults who score high do turn out to have ADD. For each of the six questions respond with N for never, R for rarely, S for sometimes, O for often, or V for Very Often.

1. How often do you have trouble wrapping up the final details of a project once the challenging parts have been finished?
2. How often do you have difficulty getting things done in order when you have to do a task that requires organization?
3. How often do you have problems remembering appointments or obligations?
4. When you have a task that requires a lot of thought, how often do you avoid or delay getting started?
5. How often do you fidget or squirm with your hands and feet when you have to sit down for a long time?
6. How often do you feel overly active and compelled to do things, as if you were driven by a motor?

For every S, O, or V on Questions 1-3, give yourself a point.
For every O and V on Questions 4-6, give yourself a point.
A score of 4 or higher means you may have ADD.

Source: Bottom Line Personal (February 15, 2011)

MEDICAL JOKES

● A patient at my daughter's medical clinic filled out a form. After Name and Address, the next question was "Nearest Relative." She wrote "Walking distance."

● Doing rounds, a new nurse couldn't help overhearing the surgeon yelling, "Typhoid! Tetanus! Measles!"

"Why does he keep doing that?" she asked a colleague.

"Oh, he just likes to call the shots around here." http://laughs.rd.com
Another Scientist Fired For Creationist Beliefs

Another scientist has been forced out of a position in a secular institution, apparently because he is a creationist. NASA’s Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) fired David Coppedge earlier this year after his nearly 14 years of stellar service — because of budgetary constraints, they said. However, Coppedge was the most senior member of the team overseeing the computers on JPL’s Cassini Mission to Saturn. Coppedge had filed a lawsuit in which he alleged discrimination because JPL had tried to prevent him from discussing creation-evolution issues with co-workers.—Creation (July-Sept., 2011)

Mixing Human DNA With Animal DNA Troubling

Concerned that medical and ethical boundaries might be crossed, British scientists want a new body of experts to regulate experiments in which animal and human DNA are mixed. Controversy erupted years ago in Britain after scientists announced plans to make human embryos with nuclei removed from cow and rabbit eggs. Some experiments that might cause controversy include human brain cells injected into animal brains, human eggs fertilized in animals and modifying animals to make them more human.—(Racine) Journal Times (7/24/11)

Percent of Children in Population Declines

Even a boost from immigrant families has not prevented a new low in the percentage of children in the American population. Data from 2010 show children of immigrants make up one in four people under 18, but children still only make up 24% of the population, lower than the previous low of 26% in 1990. This trend is expected to continue, which means a shrinking work force that will have to support the nation’s expanding elderly population in an era where the government may have to cut pensions and spending for health care. —Milwaukee Journal Sentinel (7/13/11)

Biology Teachers Avoid Evolution

Some 60% of high school biology teachers in the United States are reluctant to endorse either evolution or creation in their classes, according to a recent study. Many teachers apparently do so in order to avoid controversy. However, one in ten biology teachers advocate teaching creation or intelligent design in a positive light.—Answers (July-Sept., 2011)

All Genes are Important

Believing fruit flies had evolved from non-flies, evolutionists had proposed that “old” genes (those shared with non-flies) would be more important than “new” genes (those only in flies). But in a study in which they activated one gene at a time to find out which ones were essential they were surprised all genes seemed equally important. About one-third of inactivated genes caused death.—Creation (July-Sept., 2011)

Electric Hornets?

The hornet has been found to be more complex than previously imagined. Scientists from Tel Aviv University have surprisingly discovered that the Oriental Hornet can actually generate electricity from the sun. The yellow and brown stripes work together in trapping sunlight and converting it into electricity. Scientists are now studying this insect to find ways of developing a renewable source of energy.—Creation (July-Sept., 2011)

Placebo Effect Proves To be Powerful

The placebo effect is known as a beneficial effect experienced by a patient who thinks he is getting a drug but instead is getting only an inactive substance (the placebo). Now, a study of adults with irritable bowel syndrome has shown that even patients who knew they are taking a placebo benefited from a fake pill compared to a control group that was given no treatment. Published in the journal PloS One, the study indicated the placebo group scored significantly better in several measures of symptom and well-being improvement.—Mayo Clinic Health Letter (June, 2011)
Walking Can Cut Risk of Cognitive Problems
A new study suggests walking about six miles a week can cut in half the chances of older people developing cognitive difficulties. The study, published in the October 19, 2010 Neurology journal spanned 13 years. Researchers say the more an older adult walks over a decade or more, the more brain tissue is maintained in areas of the brain valuable to thinking patterns.—Mayo Clinic Health Letter (August, 2011)

Walking Can Help Control Prostate Cancer
Men with localized prostate cancer (cancer than hasn’t spread outside the prostate) who walk briskly for at least three hours a week have a 57% lower rate of cancer progression, according to the June 1 Cancer Research journal. Other vigorous exercises may also slow the progression of localized prostate cancer, but slow walking may offer no benefit.—Men’s Health Advisor (August, 2011)

Aspirin = Hearing Loss
Too much aspirin can cause hearing loss or tinnitus (ringing in the ears) according to the U. of California, Berkeley. Aspirin’s active ingredient, salicylic acid, can cause changes in the inner ear when eight to 12 tablets are taken in a single day. Even occasional high doses might result in hearing loss. Elderly people, those with kidney problems, people with a family history of hearing loss, and those regularly exposed to loud noises are most at risk.—www.WellnessLetter.com, quoted in Bottom Line Personal (8/16/11)

Food Poisoning Alert
Food poisoning may be more common than we think. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) estimates food borne illness causes 128,000 hospitalizations and 3,000 deaths per year in the U.S. And these reported figures don’t include the vast majority of sufferers who don’t seek medical help. Some foods associated with food poisoning include undercooked eggs and meat, jalapeño peppers, bean sprouts and tomatoes. Wash fresh fruit and vegetables thoroughly, wash hands, utensils and cutting boards with hot, soapy water if they contact fresh meat, cook food thoroughly, and refrigerate leftovers within 1-2 hours of serving.—Consumer Reports on Health (August, 2011)

Salt Still a Concern
A recent, well-publicized study that linked low-salt diets with a greater risk of heart attacks and strokes was flawed. Study participants were younger and slimmer than the typical American. Decades of solid research have shown that too much salt raises blood pressure in most people and is linked to renal disease, stroke and vascular disease.—Mark Houston, MD, quoted in Bottom Line Personal (7/15/11)

Alzheimer’s Risks
Alzheimer’s is more likely to be inherited from mothers than from fathers. And people with a parent having Alzheimer’s are four to 10 times more likely to come down with the condition than those with no family history of Alzheimer’s.—Robyn Honea, DPhil, quoted in Bottom Line Personal (7/1/11)

Early Winter Predicted For Much of the North
The northern plains and Great Lakes regions can expect an early winter—a cold, wet November and December, meteorologist Kenneth W. Reeves predicts. Washington and Oregon are also likely to be cool and wet. In addition, the Southeast may be slightly cooler than normal, but California and the Northeast may be slightly warmer than usual.—www.AccuWeather.com, quoted in Bottom Line Personal (8/15/11)

Almost Half of Mexicans Now Live in Poverty
A federally financed agency in Mexico says more than 46% of that country’s population, 52 million, now lives in poverty. Some 11.7 million of those people are said to live in extreme poverty. The government blames the global financial crisis, which has sent the nation into recession, and the worldwide hike in food prices for this situation.—(Racine) Journal Times (7/30/11)

More News Briefs Online
How many kids fall from house windows every year? Does when you eat affect how much you weigh? What fish seem to have super navigation systems? Find these and still more News Briefs online at www.lutheranscience.org
“They made their hearts as hard as flint and would not listen to the law or to the words that the LORD Almighty had sent by his Spirit through the earlier prophets. So the LORD Almighty was very angry.”
Zechariah 7:12

God was angry when the people refused to obey Him. They ignored what He had said through His prophets in earlier times, and now they were making their hearts as hard as flint by not wanting to listen to Him.

**What is flint?** Flint is a hard, sedimentary form of a mineral called quartz. Flint is called a sedimentary rock because it was formed from sediments, which are bits of minerals or once-living things that were dropped onto the ground by water, wind or ice before becoming hard rock.

Flint

**What does flint look like?** Flint can be dark gray, black, green, white, or brown in color. It often has a glassy or waxy appearance.

**How is flint formed?** Scientists do not know exactly how flint is formed but think it has something to do with chemical changes in sedimentary rock. Bible-believing scientists believe the sedimentary rocks were in large part created when Noah’s Flood deposited sediments upon the earth.

Old Flint Axe

**How have people used flint?** Flint was used to
make tools already long ago. Flint was also used to start fires when a flint edge was struck against steel to produce sparks. In addition, flint along with steel also became commonly used in making guns.

Flint has long been used as a building material. It can be combined with other rocks to build stone walls. Many churches, houses, and other buildings in England were built using flint.

Can flint be used in artwork? Yes, small pebbles of flint can be used in making glaze, which is a shiny coating or covering for ceramics. Ceramics are products made from clay such as pottery or bricks.

Sources: Wikipedia, dictionary.com; photos from Wikipedia.

It would be terrible if our hearts would become as hard as flint, so hard we would refuse to pay attention to God. By hearing and reading God’s Word regularly, we will keep our hearts open to all God wants to tell us, especially the good news that we are saved and will go to heaven by believing in Jesus.

Activity: Unscramble these important words from our story.

C O R K  ______________
L I N F T  ______________
S L O O T  ______________
D L O F O  ______________
S H A R E T  ______________
N E D I M E S S T  ______________

Flint Used on Church

An- HEARTS SEDIMENTS
Once again, secular scientists have become amazed at what they have discovered about God’s created world and the creatures in it.

This time it’s researchers at Stanford University School of Medicine who have been spending the past few years trying to learn more about the human brain. As reported on the CNET website, the scientists have engineered a new imaging model called array tomography which stitches together image slices of the brain into a three-dimensional image that can be rotated, penetrated and navigated.

With their new tool they are able to see things in the brain nobody has seen before. A typical, healthy brain houses 200 billion nerve cells connected to one another by hundreds of trillions of synapses, which are junctions between cells over which nerve impulses pass.

What they learned about these synapses amazed them. Team leader Stephen Smith, a professor of molecular and cellular physiology, said the brain’s complexity is beyond anything they could have imaged, almost to the point of being beyond belief.

One synapse, they found, is like a microprocessor with both memory-storage and information-processing elements. One synapse by itself may contain around 1,000 molecular-scale on/off switches. A single human brain has more of these switches than all the computers and Internet connections in the world added together.

So, the question is why are there so many people, including so many scientists, who seemingly are not using all this brain power? Shouldn’t all this obvious evidence of complexity and design be leading them to search out the Designer, the identity of Whom can be found in their nearest Bible?

God will not hold guiltless those who look at His wonderful world and yet deny Him. “The wrath of God is being revealed from heaven against all the godlessness and wickedness of men who suppress the truth by their wickedness, since what may be known about God is plain to them, because God has made it plain to them. For since the creation of the world God’s invisible qualities—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse” (Romans 1:18-20)

May these people stop resisting the Holy Spirit so that their hearts might receive the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ and in faith see the God Who gave us this amazing world, and the promise of salvation too. LSI

—Warren Krug, editor
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