

CRITIQUE OF RICHARD DAWKINS' BOOK: *The Blind Watchmaker*

Leslie McFall

18 May, 2006

Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker* (London: Penguin Books, 1986; Appendix, 1991). 340pp.

Dawkins states that the object in writing his book was/is to explain the origin and the complexity of life on earth. And fundamental to this, he believed, is that we don't need to postulate a designer in order to understand life (p. 147). He believed there are only two possibilities for the origin of life: God or evolution. Since God does not exist for Dawkins, this leaves only evolution to explore. He writes, "To explain the origin of the DNA/protein machine by invoking a supernatural Designer is to explain precisely nothing, for it leaves unexplained the origin of the Designer" (p. 141).

As far as Dawkins is concerned, Darwin and Wallace solved the mystery of life (p. xiii), it is just up to him (and others) to get it into the public domain and remove the misrepresentations that bar its way into a dominant place in the curriculum of every school that teaches biology. One of these misrepresentations is that life originated by chance. Another is that it is directed by a supernatural Force/Being. He gets round the problem of chance by lifting the 'one-step-at-a-time' development on to another level: the level of *cumulative selection*. For him all life started with the single-celled *amoeba* and ended in Man. How? By 'cumulative selection'. It would appear that he sees this as his biggest contribution to the on-going debate over evolution. It would also appear from different parts of his book that he is fighting an unidentified critic who has dubbed evolution a 'hit-and-miss' affair, or a sequence of freak mutations. How can evolution—a mindless mechanism—produce such exquisite forms and animals in such profusion, in the air, on the land, and in the oceans? It is a sharp criticism he never manages to answer and it remains a puzzle to the honest evolutionist.

DAWKINS THE BIOLOGIST

Here is the core of Dawkins view on the origin of life. The genetic code is universal. He regards it as near conclusive proof that all organisms are descended from a single common ancestor. The genetic dictionary has 64 DNA words of three letters each. The product of the genetic translating machine is protein molecules. Each protein molecule is a sentence, a chain of 'amino acid words from the dictionary'. Though all living things share the same dictionary, they don't all make the same sentences with their shared dictionary. Closely similar protein or DNA sentences can be assumed¹ to come from close cousins. Most evolutionary change, at the molecular level, is neutral (i.e., it produces no evolutionary change in the animal). Man has a definite common ancestor with the dog, and another definite common ancestor with the rat (based on the closeness of the DNA sentences).²

There is enough storage capacity in the DNA of a single lily seed, or a single salamander sperm to store the *Encyclopedia Britannica* 60 times over. Some species of the unjustly called 'primitive' *amoebas* have as much information in their DNA as 1,000 *Encyclopedia Britannicas*. Amazingly, only about one per cent of the genetic information in, for example, human cells, seems to be actually used, roughly equivalent of one volume of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Nobody knows why the 99 per cent is there.

DNA is ROM [read only memory]. It can be read millions of times over, but only written to once—when it is first assembled at the birth of a cell in which it resides. The DNA in the cells of any individual is 'burned in', and is never altered during that individual's lifetime, except by very rare random deterioration. It can be copied, however. It is duplicated every time a cell divides. The pattern of A, T, C and G nucleotides is faithfully copied into the DNA of each of the trillions of new cells that are made as a baby grows. When a new individual is conceived, a new and unique pattern of data is 'burned into' his DNA ROM, and he is then stuck with this pattern for the rest of his life. It is copied into all of his cells (except his reproductive cells, into which a random half of his DNA is copied).

The DNA is arranged along stringy chromosomes. All human beings have the same set of DNA *addresses*, but not necessarily the same *contents* of those addresses. That is the main reason why we are all different from each other. Other species don't have the same addresses. Chimpanzees have 48 chromosomes, compared to humans with 46. Addresses don't correspond to each other across species

¹ Note the word 'assumed'. It is there to open the door to the taxonomists' chart of evolution.

² See pp. 270ff.

barriers. Closely related species, however, like chimps and humans, have large chunks of adjacent contents in common. The thing that defines a species is that all members have the same *addressing* system for their DNA.

When a sperm fertilizes an egg, a full complement of 46 chromosomes is made up, and all 46 are then duplicated in all the cells in the developing embryo.

ROM cannot be written to, except when it is first manufactured and that is true also of DNA in cells, except for occasional random errors in copying.

Cows and pea plants have an almost identical gene called the histone H4 gene. The DNA text is 306 characters long. Cows and peas differ from each other in only two characters out of these 306. They had a common ancestor 1,000 to 2,000 million years ago. The copying of the DNA was so accurate over this time that it is the equivalent of making only one error in copying the Bible 250,000 times.

The probability of any one particular letter [of the DNA code] being miscopied on any one copying occasion turns out to be a little more than one in a billion. DNA replicates so accurately that it takes five million replication generations to miscopy one per cent of the characters. This is the equivalent of 20 billion typists each typing out the New Testament making only one error each. But the DNA-copying mechanism automatically corrects its own mistakes. It has its own 'proof-reading' drills. About 5,000 DNA letters degenerate per day in every human cell, and are immediately replaced by repair mechanisms. It is mainly 'proof-reading' that is responsible for DNA's remarkable accuracy and fidelity of information storage.

What was the basic ingredient needed for life to emerge? Answer: It is the property of self-replication. In modern life this role is fulfilled almost entirely by DNA molecules. The issue for Dawkins is that for evolution to occur "at least some of the DNA replicators had to exert *power* over their own future" (p. 129). And this is his basic problem: the DNA obey instructions; they do not create them. But who or what set up the instructions in the first place? Dawkins can only suggest it was chance. That is a big ask.

THE BLIND WATCHMAKER

Dawkins acknowledges that single step changes are random, but cumulative steps are not. This is a deceptive statement as we shall see. Darwinism is a theory of cumulative processes, he argues, so slow that they take between thousands and millions of decades to be noticeable (p. xv). He notes that all appearances to the contrary, the only watchmaker in nature is the blind forces of physics. A true watchmaker has foresight, with a future purpose in his mind's eye.

Natural selection, the blind, unconscious, automatic process which Darwin discovered, and which we now know is the explanation for the existence and apparently purposeful form of all life, has no purpose in mind. It has no mind and no mind's eye. It does not plan for the future. It has no vision, no foresight, no sight at all. If it can be said to play the role of watchmaker in nature, it is in the blind watchmaker (p. 5).

And again, "Natural selection is the blind watchmaker, blind because it does not see ahead, does not plan consequences, has no purpose in view. Yet the living results of natural selection overwhelmingly impress us with the appearance of design . . . with the illusion of design and planning" (p. 21). And again, "In the case of living machinery the 'designer' is unconscious natural selection, the blind watchmaker" (p. 37). The problem with this analogy is that blind watchmakers could make a watch every bit as perfect as a sighted watchmaker. So the force of the analogy is lost unless by it he means that a blind watchmaker is totally incapable of producing a watch at all, in which case he is not a watchmaker. 'Blind' and 'watchmaker' do not go together to make a meaningful entity, in Dawkins' analogy.

For the Christian, the 'Watchmaker' is God and He is not blind, but with infinite wisdom He has set the sun, moon and stars in their courses *to serve the Earth*. Nothing has come into existence which has not come through His hands. So detailed is God's interest in every creature that He created that although two sparrows are sold for a farthing yet not one of them falls to the ground without your Father knowing about it (Matt. 10:29). He is not a blind Watcher. Even the very hairs of our head are all numbered, and then comes the reassuring and logical conclusion: "Fear not therefore, you are of more value than many sparrows" (Luke 12:7).

The question evolutionists are unable to answer is this: If 'natural selection' is a purely random affair—because it is at the mercy of fortuitous mutations—then how come that millions of animals and plants have all come to the peak of their development *all at the same time*? Why are there not millions of animals still only half-way through their ultimate complexity? Where are the intermediate forms *today*?

Dawkins finds 'design' and 'evident planning' a paradox if evolution is without purpose. Evolution is not directional. Each single step in evolution is a random step, and the next step is also random, and so it goes on infinitum, and the evolutionist hopes that a sufficient number of these random steps will lead in an *upward* direction to greater complexity. But on this scenario one wrong step could undo a sequence of what looked like a single or even cumulative 'beneficial' step.

Because evolution is inherently directionless and purposeless, it is pure chance that any sequence of single steps could result in a minor cumulative 'development'. And if you have to string a million, individual, chance steps together to get a coelacanth to leave the deep ocean bed, where it is totally adapted to survive, and take its first faltering steps on land, it is a big ask. There is no science available today that could map out one single step of a journey involving a correct sequence of a million random steps to get from coelacanth to modern man.

DAWKINS' ESCAPE INTO 'CUMULATIVE SELECTION'

We noted above Dawkins' deceptive statement that single step changes are random, but cumulative steps are not. There is a fatal flaw at the heart of Dawkins' escape into 'cumulative selection'. The flaw is this. Cumulative selection is not an event, it is a summary of events, and those events can only be one-step-at-a-time steps. He dislikes intensely the argument that all came into existence by chance. He senses that this is not a winning argument, so the ploy is to group a series of single steps into one big *single* 'cumulative step' and get round the problem that way. It then *looks* as if chance has been ruled out. But what does he say? "Each successive change in the gradual evolutionary process was simple enough, *relative to its predecessor*, to have arisen by chance" (p. 43). He continues, "But the whole sequence of cumulative steps constitutes anything but a chance process, when you consider the complexity of the final end-product relative to the original starting-point. The cumulative process is directed by non-random survival" (p. 43). Hindsight is a wonderful thing! But even hindsight has to admit that it was a freak set of millions of chance mutations that produced every single end-product that has come through the process. Presumably billions of billions of end-products never made it. For 'natural selection' read 'freak set of circumstances' and this would capture the miracle of life on Earth. The evolutionist *believes* that life started with bacteria and then through millions of mutations moved from coelacanth to man. If a man can believe that, *which has no credible science to back it up*, he is no further on than the Lamarckian evolutionist.

Despite his protestations that evolution is not a random result, Dawkins is thrown back on Darwin's millions of microscopic changes over millions of years to make evolution credible. Dawkins cannot get away from this 'solution', even with his statement that his 'cumulative selection' is a non-random process (p. 49). *These are just words*. The proof is that *all* the end-products are random products of evolution, because evolution is inherently directionless, motiveless, purposeless, mindless. It is just a series of chance chemical reactions. It is just like a monkey bashing away on a typewriter, oblivious of what he is typing.

If Dawkins does not know it, the reader does, that while the *effect* may be cumulative, the process is made up of single-step changes. It is a fallacy to say that development moved from one 'cumulative selection' change to another 'cumulative selection' change, *because there is no such thing as a 'cumulative selection' change*, because change can only occur at a rate of one-step-at-a-time throughout the movement from the single-celled *amoeba* to the most complex of all creatures—Man. He makes the telling observation, "If evolutionary progress had had to rely on single-step selection, it would never have got anywhere" (p. 49). Also, "The 'watchmaker' that is cumulative natural selection is blind to the future and has no long-term goals" (p. 50).

What Dawkins should be arguing for, then, is 'multiple-step' mutations, but he knows only too-well that this is fraught with danger for evolutionary progress (cf. p. 233). Too much change too fast would leave the fish floundering on the beach gasping for air. He has no option but to retreat to single-step evolution because this is more believable and he feels he can bring along his readers provided he does not stretch their incredulity too far, too quickly. He is not so much searching for the truth about the origin of life, as searching for a theory that is intellectually plausible, and statistically probable. This is his favourite ploy.

DAWKINS' ESCAPE INTO STATISTICAL PROBABILITY

Because 'cumulative selection' is a *statement about progress*, at any point in the evolutionary development, Dawkins is thrown back on single-step, random mutations, which he desperately wants to avoid, to sustain momentum toward complexity. Aware that talk about 'non-random cumulative selection' is fatally flawed, Dawkins takes cover in statistical probability. He notes that for

one monkey to type the Shakespearian line, "Methinks it is like a weasel," the chances are 1 in 10,000 million million million million million (p. 46). The flaw in this analogy is that the monkey is randomly bashing away on his typewriter with a target to achieve. There is no such target, either near or distant, in evolution. Evolution is totally blind. All changes are purely fortuitous and if something happens which is not detrimental, then it is a freak outcome. Dawkins agrees, "If, after the aeons, what looks like progress toward some distant goal seems, with hindsight, to have been achieved, this is always an incidental consequence of many generations of short-term selection" (p. 50).

However long the odds, Dawkins still believes the monkey can achieve his goal. The aptness of this analogy is that just as a monkey can have no idea what he is typing, and couldn't even read it when he did achieve it, or have any sense of achievement, so likewise is it with evolution. It may be possible for the monkey to achieve his goal because he, at least, has a machine to work with, but he can never know when he has successfully managed to type out the sentence! He just keeps going past the successful moment without even being aware of it! But if our monkey was given an electric typewriter with no electricity, the odds are then zero.

There is a mechanism in nature whereby a mountain can evolve into a mole-hill over millions of years, but there is no mechanism whereby a mountain can evolve into a mole. So it is with the machinery Dawkins is attempting to use to get from an *amoeba* to Man. He is using a machine which is not 'switched on' to get the 'letters' of the genetic code into the right sequence. This is the dilemma he and all evolutionists are faced with. (But more on this topic below.)

Another statistical example is his observation that there are about 100 billion billion earth-like planets in the universe, but life, so far, has only succeeded on one of them. Fortunately, a colleague pointed out the fallacy of the analogy (p. 142) and so he dismisses the statistical probability as an assumption. Nevertheless, he still thinks life has occurred elsewhere in the universe!

The statistical probability of producing sonar is small. But it happened. The sophistication of bat sonar is summed up as the work of natural selection working on bats over a period of "tens of millions of years" (p. 23). Nothing is said of misdirected 'cumulative selection' resulting in the extinction of directionless evolution. Why is it that the evolution of all things so far has ended up in a stasis state, which is the terminus all living forms have arrived at today. *Evolution is not happening anywhere, in any plant or animal in the world today.* Each organism now stays within its allotted "kind". All creation has reached a stage that it cannot be improved upon. That is a fact of observation. That stage was a created stage, not an evolutionary stage. Both Creationism and Darwinian evolution are *interpretations* of a creation that *now* displays a pinnacle of near-perfect replication of itself. I trust evolutionists are not looking for a super-human to develop out of *homo sapiens*. Hitler's 'super-race' was fuelled by philosophical evolutionism. Huge variety of human beings exist (dwarfs and giants) but all share the same DNA addresses. Huge variety of dogs and cats exist. So what? If the capacity to vary was not inherent in the cell *from the beginning*, then the variety could not come into existence.

The Creationist (the 'spiritual man') looks at this pinnacle of near-perfect replicating 'after its kind' as being the same today as it was when it left the hand of its Creator 'in the beginning'. The evolutionist (the 'natural man') looks at the same pinnacle of replicating-perfection and believes it got there little by little over millions of years. But neither the Creationist nor the Evolutionist can deny that what they are looking at is replicating-perfection (within the context of a 'fallen' world) in every form of living organism on the planet Earth today. That is not to deny that the Creator has built in to His creation His wisdom to enable each species to *survive* within the limits of adaptation which He set for it 'in the beginning'.

Molecular taxonomists recognise that there are barriers in nature that cannot be crossed. "Chimpanzees, for instance, have 48 chromosomes compared to our 46. Strictly speaking it is not possible to compare contents, address by address, because addresses don't correspond to each other across species barriers" (p. 118). This is the hard fact of science that evolutionists have no way of getting round today, as Dawkins' writhings and twistings demonstrate in this book. He never did give his readers the solution to the origin of complexity that he said he was setting out to give them.

Darwin lived in an age of ignorance of what was going on at the DNA level, and consequently he could only work from the end-product, not from the beginning—from the constitution of the cell and the universe of complexity that science, since his day, has brought to light. Darwin may have hit on the right solution but it was not a scientific one. Some think he was right but for the wrong reasons. Modern evolutionists are running to catch up and give him a credible scientific basis for his intuition. But the science is falling short of being able to supply the missing link at the biological end, namely, the missing machine to create a self-replicating molecule, which the present DNA machine cannot fulfil. Science is stuck fast at this point. It has come up against a blank wall. But it still clings firmly to an out-dated, pre-scientific, Victorian theory which had its origin in bad science. Evolution is a hangover from a time when the gullible, academic community had to jump on its bandwagon or be

thought of as unscientific. It gave its follower academic respectability and that was more important than listening to God's revelation. Academic respectability is still keeping evolution alive today. It has no hard science behind it. Even Christians in science are still heard to say that it is "best theory we have for the origin of life". But the 'natural man' cannot let go of evolution. It is all he has got left to prevent him acknowledging that there is a Creator God, and that the creation reflects His power and His Godhead (Rom 1). Rather than fall down on his knees and worship the Creator, he would prefer to stay on his wobbly feet using the two wobbly crutches of Darwin's unscientific speculation under one arm, and the Neo-Darwinian crutch of so-called modern science under the other arm, to keep him off his knees. He is a pitiable sight—a pitiable creature, blinded by his own crumb of science. Always learning but never able to arrive at the Truth. "Walk in the light," Jesus urged His disciples. His total dependence on the written Word of God is the model to follow. The question Jesus will be asking the majority of Christians in science who favour evolution is: Why did you not trust what my Father wrote for you, as I did? Why did you prefer a mere, human *theory* over a clear *divine* statement of the facts? Evolution would never occur to a Christian who had faith in a Creator God and who trusted the revelation he was given in Genesis 1-3. Consequently, a Christian who holds to evolution is a damaged Christian, and damaged for life. He cannot ever be trusted to be a guide to the blind, because he himself is blind.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE BIBLICAL STATEMENT 'AFTER ITS KIND'

A bat would be deafened by its own out-going signal but it has an incredible 'send/receive' switching mechanism which prevents this. Now, since Dawkins ridicules Lamarckian evolution, how did the first bats avoid deafening themselves before they 'acquired' the safety mechanism? They should all be deaf. Lamarckian evolution believed that because giraffes kept stretching their necks to reach the upper leaves of trees, gradually their necks got longer and longer because there was a free meal to be had up there. This has rightly been ridiculed by all biologists. It is stupid, but not less so than the belief that a fish can somehow develop into a man by a process which is nowhere happening today, anywhere in the world, because the DNA machinery is an obstacle to it!

Environmentally acquired skills cannot enter the DNA machinery and be passed on to the next generation. Whatever is acquired *after* birth must continue to be acquired *after* birth in all species. And whatever is pre-programmed *before* birth will continue to be pre-programmed *before* birth in all species. That is the strength that lies in the biblical phrase "after its kind." It will never be otherwise. In this science and the Bible agree.

Take for instance the discovery in 1938 off the South African coast of a fish belonging to the coelacanth group. This fish has unusual leg-like fins. More of the same fish have been found since then, so it is not a one-off find. "It is a 'living fossil', in the sense that it has changed hardly at all since the time of its fossil ancestors, hundreds of millions of years ago," to quote Dawkins (p. 246). It was thought (to go by the absence of any fossils of it in all the later geological strata) to have died out with the dinosaurs, with whom it was contemporary, 250 million years ago. The discovery of the coelacanth was a huge embarrassment to evolutionists, but Dawkins dismissed it as an extreme case (cf. p. 246). Extreme or not, it is a hard fact of science. He goes on to speculate that other coelacanth "that emerged unto the land did evolve because natural selection . . . forced them to" (p. 246). But we saw above that 'natural selection' selects nothing. It is not a force and it forces no fish out of the water unto dry land.

On page 273 Dawkins gives a taxonomist's chart showing which animals have developed from what stock. From the Coelacanth the following modern day animals have descended through millions of mutations: cats, tigers, dogs, foxes, lemurs, baboons, Rhesus monkeys, gibbons, chimpanzees and *homo sapiens*. But there is a single, fatal flaw in this chart, namely, there is no mechanism whereby a single mutation can take place today between any two animals which could open the door to evolution. If evolution cannot make the first step, then how could it make millions of steps starting with a fish and ending up with a man?

In any case, dogs replicate dogs and not kittens. All taxonomy is based on the following subdivisions:

1. Phylum: Vertebrate
2. Class: Mammalia
3. Order: Hominoidea
4. Family: Hominidea
5. Genus: Homo
6. Species: Sapiens

The problem with such 'tree relationships' is that, "It has been calculated that the fastest of today's computers would take 10,000 million years, approximately the age of the universe, to discover the most parsimonious tree for a mere 20 animals" (p. 273). If there are millions of species how is it possible to incorporate them all into any tree relationship?

Pierre-P. Grassé has shown that once a development has reached the species level it cannot develop into any other species.³ God created 'species' not phylum or the other biologists/taxonomists categories. It is an artificial imposition to have these six categories, and in attempting to do so on the basis of DNA leads to silly tree relationships, such as that between the cow and the pea plant. Genesis only recognises one tree relationship for each plant and animal—that of distinct species—No. 6. Once you go beyond that categorisation you enter silly-land.

The polar difference between Creationism and Evolution is this. Evolution starts off with a single-celled organism which then evolved into millions of complex beings. Creationism starts off with millions of complex beings, which are gradually being reduced to extinction. Evolution moves from zero to millions; Creationism moves from millions to zero. For one the glass is half full; for the other the glass is half empty.

WHERE IS THE MECHANISM TO ACHIEVE SUCCESSFUL MUTATIONS?

Dawkins recognises that the only machinery which evolution can use today to manufacture mutations is the DNA/protein machinery. But he notes that the chances of a mutation occurring with the present DNA set-up is of the order of one in a million against a successful hereditary variation occurring. In Dawkins' own words: "In real life, the probability that a gene will mutate is often less than one in a million" (p. 57). If that is the odds *against* one mutation being successful, what must the odds be if this has to be repeated millions of time *and in the correct sequence*? The improbability is the nearest thing to zero that one could conceive of.

'NATURAL SURVIVAL' OR 'NATURAL SELECTION'?

Dawkins requires mutations to 'drive' evolution, but he puts his finger on the problem of mutation. He noted: "But natural selection doesn't choose genes directly, it chooses the *effects* that genes have on bodies" (p. 60). In other words mutations are random, but if they do not harm the host body, the mutated genes automatically survive because they are inside the body (p. 57). And this process can go on indefinitely so long as no mutation produces an effect that leads to its extinction. This is what Dawkins means by 'natural selection' acting like an agent, and choosing the *effects* that survive each mutation change. But Dawkins is aware that evolution cannot choose the mutation itself, as these are purely random. So it is a statement of the obvious to say that if a mutation is not harmful then it survives; and if it survives it is only because the mutation was not a damaging one! Call it 'natural selection' or call it common sense, the result is the same.

'Natural selection' selects nothing. It just tells us that the mutation did not lead to its extermination. What survives will only continue to survive up until a mutation comes along which leads to its extinction. On this scenario, every living thing is at the mercy of the next mutation. Every mutation is a potential exterminator, that is how fragile living with mutations is. Look again at Dawkins' statement: "But natural selection doesn't choose genes directly, it chooses the *effects* that genes have on bodies" (p. 60). 'Natural selection', he believes, chooses the genes *indirectly* but only in the sense that they survive in the mutated animal. If the mutated animal is not harmed by the mutation, then it survives. Again, this is a statement of the obvious. But 'natural selection' does not even choose the 'effects' that genes have on bodies.

The continuation or noncontinuation of any species should be called 'Natural Survival', not 'Natural Selection.' *Nature selects nothing.* A logical evolutionist would observe that it is single, random mutations that have determined, and will continue to determine what will survive and what will not survive. It is a misnomer to call this process 'natural selection', because selection involves choice. With mutating genes the issue is only between 'survival' and 'nonsurvival'; between (if we must state the obvious) 'natural survival,' and 'natural nonsurvival.' If an animal survives it is not because it was *selected* to survive, as if Nature selected it, but only because it did not undergo a mutation that halted or interfered with its survival state.

The theory should have been called the Theory of Natural Survival, and simply stated would read: *All living forms will survive up until a mutation occurs which leads to its nonsurvival, or until its means of sustenance is cut off, or a new predator hunts it to extinction.*

³ Pierre-P. Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms* (London/New York: Academic Press, 1977).

WHY DO MUTATIONS OCCUR SO INFREQUENTLY?

What does God say of His own creation? He states that He created the first of every plant, fish, bird, animal, and man, *individually*—"after its kind." He then commanded all the life forms to replicate themselves, each "after their kind." The phrase "after their kind" is the greatest barrier to species-mutations and especially to the evolution of the coelacanth to *homo sapiens*, that there is. And science confirms that all fauna, flora and living things, replicate themselves. If there are any mutations from 'its kind', these are 'mistakes' in the replicating system. Dawkins rightly rules out the Lamarckian brand of evolution. Cutting off the tails of a hundred generations of kittens will never produce a kitten with no tail. Deers watching and then imitating giraffes for a thousand generations will never be giraffes or grow longer necks, *if that capacity/ability is not there already in the genes*. To imitate giraffes can be an acquired skill, but it cannot be passed on to the genes, because these are already fixed at the moment of birth of every animal. As stated earlier, nothing acquired *after* birth is inherited. So we can rule out the Lamarckian brand of evolution as a non-starter. It has no part to play in, nor can it influence, the DNA and its protein-based replication machinery that every living thing carries in its reproductive system *from the moment of birth*. That system is immune from all external, environmental influence.

THE RATE OF MUTATIONS

Dawkins has produced a very valuable summary of what goes on at the biological level and how mutations can occur. It is worthwhile condensing his chapter at this point because it reveals a knock-down argument against the theory of evolution.

What is impressive about the cell is its complexity. It is so small that 10 million bacterial cells could sit on the surface of a pin's head. Within the human cell there are about one million molecules in 2000 varieties, each doing a specialised job in a kind of chemical factory. Each molecule consists of about 6000 atoms. Then there are the proteins. All biological proteins are chains made up of amino-acids. There are 20 different kinds of amino-acids.

Dawkins recognises that the immovable obstacle to evolution is to find a machine that could spontaneously generate a self-replicating molecule. If such a molecule could get going then evolution becomes a possibility. The trouble is, that even if such a self-replicating molecule could spontaneously spring into existence, it only pushes the problem further back, namely, how did the machine itself acquire the ability to produce molecules and not chemical rubbish? He makes an appeal to be allowed one small chance event that would allow evolution to begin to run its course (p. 142), and he has won his case.

Dawkins is in despair over the present DNA machinery. It has reached a level of sophistication that it is unsuitable for his purposes. Yet it is the only replication machinery known to science. He indulges in speculation to get round the obstacle. He muses that the present DNA machine must have come into existence over many generations of 'cumulative selection' (p. 141). He speculates that an earlier, primitive, self-replicating machine did duty in the past until the present DNA/protein machine took over from it and it then went out of existence (p. 148). He is forced to acknowledge, however, that no primitive, or inefficient DNA replication machine has survived in nature which would have the desired inefficiency that he requires to spontaneously generate a self-replicating molecule.

Dawkins then plunges into chemistry hoping to find there a mechanism or machinery, but draws a blank acknowledging that to-date "neither DNA or RNA has appeared in any laboratory anywhere in the world" that could give him the one chance start he is searching for (p. 148). *The missing link, he says, is still the origin of replication*. "The building-blocks haven't come together to form a self-replicating chain like RNA. Maybe one day it will" (p. 148). So there are not only missing links in the fossil record, but more disquieting is the fact that there are missing links at the biological level over the origin of replication.

HAS EVOLUTION THE CHARACTERISTICS OF A RELIGION?

Evolutionists are people who exercise great hope; hope that missing links will be found in the fossil record; hope that the early, inefficient missing DNA machines will be found. They have great faith. Against all the odds of finding either kind of evidence, they go on living in hope. Millions of them have lived and died and never seen the evidence. *The evidence is not forthcoming*. Their hope and their faith are groundless, because they have set aside the only revelation about the origin of life on earth that we have been given. And that revelation states quite categorically that God created each plant

and living organism “after its kind”; and “after its kind” is confirmed by all scientific observation since the time of Adam and Eve. It is a fruitless, mindless, pursuit to chase after the rainbow of evolution. It is not the kind of pursuit that any Christian worth the name would waste his time on, when he has the sure word of God to guide his energies, time and money, into more profitable pursuits with his God-given skills.

Evolution is for the man who has no faith in God. Evolution is for the man who has no awareness of God. Evolution is there to fill the gap that Truth should fill.

Evolution had its origin in a pre-scientific age. It became fashionable to go along with it, with the result that the whole scientific establishment fell in behind it like zombies, and even though we are now living in a more rigorous, scientific age, the legacy of evolution hangs over every scientific department with few daring to question it.

The following is typical of the prison that scientists have entombed themselves in. *The Guardian*, (Thursday, 13 April, 2006) reported that the Royal Society attacked Creationism with a lecture by Professor Steve Jones (University College London), “Why Creationism Is Wrong and Evolution Is Right.” He is reported to have said, “Science has proof without certainty, creationists — certainty without proof.” He added that “Evolution is as inevitable as gravity.” In *The Independent* (same date) reported that another “Missing Link” had been found. According to the report, Professor Tim White (University of California, Berkeley) claimed in the latest issue of *Nature* to now have “eight distinct species that represent different stages in the evolutionary transition from ape to anatomically modern man.” The “proof,” it turns out, is from fragments of teeth some of which had to be reconstructed!

When evolution became a belief that all scientists had to accept to ensure progress up the ladder of academic respectability, then it became a brain-washing procedure, so said a representative of the Creationists. I think there is a lot to be said for this analysis. Most scientists believe in evolution only because of the momentum it generated in the late 19th century in academic circles, when it became fashionable. It has retained that fashionableness to this day. It has escaped the rigorous tests that are normally applied to any theory because it arose and took root throughout the scientific establishment in a pre-scientific age.

Our young, potential scientists have visual charts on the classroom walls detailing the evolution of Man from the apes. Their young minds are being poisoned from an early age to believe in a form of evolution that is not possible given the structure of the cell, and given the accuracy of the DNA/protein self-replicating machine. But the brain-washing is going on to the detriment of the Truth.

For one of the foremost authorities to tell the members of the Royal Society that “Evolution is as inevitable as gravity,” and this is allowed to pass without any protest by any member shows the unscientific, poodle-like nature of that Society. The minds of these members have been shackled and conditioned to bow to the god of evolution. This Society, which is typical of the entire academic world, reminds me of the domineering hold that the Roman Catholic Church had on the academic minds of the 15th-16th century before the Protestant Reformation broke through and freed the world of its conditioning and brain-washing procedures. We need to see the same kind of Reformation in the Royal Society and in all academic institutions, and break the cycle of conditioning and brain-washing that is going on in our classrooms, poisoning young minds to transfer to evolution the praise and glory that rightfully belongs to God *directly*.

What fools men are to leave off the pure revelation of God and seek for the Maker in the god called “Evolution”.

THE DANGER OF BEING A THEISTIC EVOLUTIONIST

Because of the spiritual dangers inherent in the *theory* of evolution, this is where Christians must part company with Theistic Evolutionists. Theistic Evolutionists have to deny God’s revelation as containing the truth about creation. Can they be true believers and be so unbelieving?

In a recent work a theistic evolutionist asked the question, Is it possible to be a theist and accept the theory of evolution? And his answer was Yes.⁴ He argued that the options are to be a theistic evolutionist or an atheistic one. He added, in either case, evolution stays. He went on, the real difference is between the atheistic evolutionist, who operates consistently with a random nonpurposiveness to all evolutionary change, and the theist, who holds to a directedness and purposefulness of the development of life through the aeons. He believes that the evolutionary theory

⁴ Mark Hillmer, “Was Evolution Involved in the Process of Creation?” in *The Genesis Debate: Persistent Questions About Creation and the Flood*. Ronald Youngblood (ed.) (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1999 [Previously published by Baker Book House, 1990]), pp. 86-109, esp. p. 106.

can be held to, without belief in God, or a creator. But the believer can freely operate with and endorse the same theory without doing damage to his faith.

I would disagree with this. It is not true that “the believer can freely operate with and endorse the same theory without doing damage to his faith.” The first casualty in this approach is the trustworthiness of God’s revelation. The Christian evolutionist is not as consistent as his atheistic brother. He has more in common with him than he would like to think. Both distrust the Genesis account, and both distance God from His creation—the atheist by denying His existence in the first place, and the Christian evolutionist by denying God’s hands-on “after its kind” creation. God creates indirectly, not directly, argues the Christian evolutionist, which blatantly contradicts the Genesis account. The Christian evolutionist cannot trust Genesis any more once he embraces evolution. He is a damaged Christian. He is not to be trusted when he teaches any other doctrine, because having come to distrust one crucial part of Scripture, this gives him freedom to distrust some other part. He considers himself superior in knowledge to whoever wrote the Genesis account. He has now got deep reservations about one part of Scripture which he now knows for certain is not accurate, and, in fact, is misleading scientifically. It is inevitable that this mistrust in one part of Scripture will spill over into other parts, and he will be found following rationalist interpretations of Scripture, such as the historicity of Adam and Eve as real persons, the Exodus through the Red Sea, Jonah and the great fish, Job as an historical character, the origin of child-birth pain which only the human mother experiences, the origin of thorns and thistles, the origin of clothes, the longevity of men (Methuselah lived to be 969 years), the headship of man over woman, Jesus’ teaching on Divorce is anchored in Genesis 2:24, etc., etc.

A Christian cannot stand over Genesis 1 or any other part of Scripture and say with absolute assurance, “That is not how it happened,” and not damage his faith in the only God who can impart the true account of how life came into being on this planet. With God, Jesus said, *all things* are possible. Evolution was latched unto because it freed the atheist from being overwhelmed by God’s power, wisdom, design, and intelligence. It let him off the hook, yet many theistic evolutionists unwittingly encourage him to stay hooked to evolution which can only be the anti-truth to the Genesis record of creation.

Dawkins himself acknowledged that most of the major invertebrate groups are found in the oldest rocks—the Cambrian (600 million years old), “And we find many of them already in an advanced state of evolution, the very first time they appear. It is as though they were just planted there, without any evolutionary history” (p. 229). Dawkins commented: “Both schools [of evolutionists] agree that the only alternative explanation of the sudden appearance of so many complex animals in the Cambrian era is divine creation, and both would reject this alternative” (p. 230). Men with faith will look to God for knowledge on how He created the world. Men without faith will look anywhere but to God for an explanation. Dawkins represents the latter category. Men like him will always be in the majority in all walks of life and professions, but Truth is not to be found in head-counting but in the individual who said, “I am the way, the truth and the life.”

Theistic evolutionists are drawn inevitably into the rationalist’s mode of thinking. Having rejected the opening revelation of God a domino effect comes into play and other aspects of God’s revelation begin to be questioned. For example some Christian evolutionists overlook the detail that when God made Man he was vegetarian (Gen 1:29; 2:9), as were the animals (1:30). He also overlooks the significant detail that the first pair were naked and knew no shame, but after they sinned, they experienced shame in their nakedness (Gen 2:25). The ‘before’ and ‘after’ change of condition is linked directly to the loss of moral innocence.⁵

If, as Christian evolutionists believe, God took a naked, manlike animal and gave it His spiritual nature, and that spiritual being was content to be naked and experienced no shame, how come that when this spiritual nature was irretrievably altered in the Fall, nakedness became a shameful condition? If we look at the three stages of Man’s development, there was no shame in the manlike animal state, and no shame in the spiritual state, but shame only emerged when the spiritual state was altered in the consciousness of the pair. God did not create this state in them. It happened automatically, as soon as they disobeyed Him. They sewed fig-leaves to make girdles (3:7). In the course of time more permanent types of clothing would have been created through their own ingenuity, but the detail that God replaced their first flimsy covers with ‘coats of skin’ is very significant (3:21). Why did God need to do this when it would have happened anyway? Also, since they were the only pair of human beings in the world, who was to see their nakedness? They were husband and wife, after all!

⁵ Cf. Ernest Lucas, *Can We Believe Genesis Today? The Bible and the Questions of Science*. Pp. 192. 3rd edition. (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 2005 [1st edition. 1989]).

God knew that nakedness reflected a change in the perfect, sinless state that He created the pair in. It was the *evidence* of their sin. It was also the reminder and symbol of their sin. They tried to hide the evidence of their sin. God, in His mercy, took away the life of some animal(s) so that He could cover over the evidence of their sin in a more permanent way. This detail was surely intended to convey to the pair that a substitutionary death had taken place to provide them with proper covering and put out of sight the evidence of their sin. Behind this detail stood the substitutionary death of the Lord Jesus to provide all who believe in Him a permanent covering of their sin, and put out of sight the evidence of their sins once and for all through His substitutionary death on the cross.

A third, overlooked detail is the curse on the woman. The human mother is the only mother animal in God's creation who experiences excruciating pain when giving birth to her offspring. God introduced this unique pain as a direct consequence of Eve's sin against Him (Gen 3:16).

A fourth detail is the origin of language at Babel. This is just laughed out of court by Christian linguists, as are the biblical explanations for the names of "Adam" and "Eve" etc., which assume Hebrew to be the language of early man.

Christian evolutionists, because their faith in the Genesis record has been shattered, are vulnerable to fall for aetiological stories⁶ to side-line God's revelation. But the trend of their thinking is an inevitable, downward path to an undermined and defective Christianity. The idea is frequently put forward that being a Christian evolutionist makes no difference to the other Christian doctrines; that it has no knock-on effect on those doctrines. This is deceptive. The main casualty is trust. Trust in God. Trust in His revelation. Trust in His ability to produce creatures who can reproduce themselves 'after their kind'. Trust in His ability to work miracles in nature. Trust is thrust out and rationality reigns supreme. Belief in evolution cannot be isolated and put in a water-tight compartment as if it had nothing to do with the other major doctrines of the Christian religion. Revelation is one—a unity. Despise, devalue, degrade one part and the whole suffers.

SUMMARY

What I found very disappointing in Dawkins' book is the lack of a credible case for evolution. He is a light-weight. He is all talk and no substance. He produced no convincing case of one species changing into another. That was all he needed to win his case. He produced no convincing intellectual case for the possibility of evolution.

I have concluded from reading a number of works on evolution that evolution is a faction of the imagination. Its sum and substance is confined to the imagination of late Victorian gentlemen. It was a fiction then and nothing that science or biology has discovered since those pre-scientific days has given it any credibility. In my opinion, the theory had plausibility when viewing the external shape of things. It still has that plausibility because classroom charts and school textbooks artificially place monkeys and apes in a visual sequence of height and walking on two legs. Although this visual presentation is denied by some evolutionists, it suits their cause not to denounce these charts. They take the view that you cannot draw a straight evolutionary development from money to Man. Instead, monkeys, chimpanzees, apes and Man are distinct lines of development in themselves and none of them grew out of the other. It is like viewing the trunk of a tree and at one point four distinct branches all emerge at the same point but grow away from each other. One branch includes dozens of species of monkeys, another species of chimpanzees, another apes, and one *homo sapiens*. What caused this revision of Darwin's evolutionary chart was the discovery of DNA. This ruled out a direct development from money to man, via the chimpanzees and the apes. Dawkins' book shows that evolution is on the retreat. It has neither TIME nor the MECHANISM to trace the evolution of the *amoeba* to Man.

As a Christian, I am concerned to know how a *theory* could become so dominant throughout the academic world and yet escape being detected as a fraud and a deception. I can only assume that it is due to (1) academic laziness, and (2) the complexity of the subject. It seems that if enough people are prepared to believe something to be true, then this can result in a lemming-like following for it. History is replete with instances of mass-deception. For example, World War II showed that a whole nation could be duped into believing that the Jews were to blame for Germany's economic ills, and go along with Hitler's 'final solution'. Those who were not duped and protested were soon silenced. The history of ancient Israel records the example of the entire nation being duped into believing that by sacrificing and burning their infant sons and daughters to the non-existent gods of Canaan, that this would bring them prosperity. It is difficult to imagine a mother in any religion today sacrificing their infants in this way. But how could whole nations and communities be persuaded to go along with

⁶ These are made-up stories to explain the origin of customs.

these barbaric ideologies? But we are witnessing a similar deception being foisted on the entire academic community worldwide to accept evolution as 'certain as gravity'. Virtually all of the BBC's output on nature is propaganda for deceiving the nation into believing that evolution is no longer a theory but a fact of science. The academic community today is acquiescing in a deception, and assisting its growth in the classroom by its silence, as surely as the same circles acquiesced in Hitler's 'final solution', even though they knew it was morally indefensible. The only other alternative that I can think of is that the scientific community is asleep, or is sleep-walking.

Why will the academic community not state openly that evolution is just a theory, and a bad one at that because our knowledge of genetics and DNA has improved to such a degree that it rules out once and for all the idea of mutation being the *cause* of one organism changing into another, completely different one? I think Dawkins put his finger on the answer. He believed there are only two possibilities for the origin of life: God or evolution. Since the majority of scientists do not believe in God, they, like Dawkins, are left with evolution. To deny evolution is to open the door to the possibility that the God of the Hebrews and the Early Christian Church created all things after the pleasure of His good will. But they will never open themselves up to this conclusion. Yet they must know that evolution is no longer a credible or viable solution. Even Dawkins' case for evolution admits as much. Time and time again he retreats into statistical probabilities.

Dawkins theory of evolution comes down to statistical probabilities. This is his favourite ploy. He asks: What are the chances of life occurring on another planet given the billions of planets that there are "out there"? What are the chances that a monkey could type a sentence of Shakespeare? What are the chances that the human eye evolved from a non-existing eye? What are the chances . . .? What are the chances . . .? This is not a credible method to use to establish a scientific case for creation. This kind of approach might win over a class of school-children, but it will not win over the mature Christian who has come to trust in God and in His Word.

Dawkins recognises that the chances of life evolving on earth from a single-celled *amoeba* to reach man, and to go beyond man to some super-man in the distant future, you need two things (1) time, and plenty of it; and (2) a mechanism that will permit mutations to occur. Let us look at these two necessities.

TIME: GENESIS 1:2 IS THE CRUCIAL WATERSHED

There are literally millions of species of fauna, flora and living things on this planet. Each of these millions of living organisms had to pass through hundreds of thousands, if not millions of micro-mutations to get where they are today. This is going to take billions of years.

According to the revelation given by God to man, He made all the birds *before* He made the land animals. This is the opposite of what evolution 'reveals' to man. He created all the vegetation *before* He made the sun, moon and stars. This, too, is the opposite to what evolution 'reveals' to man. He made all the land animals and Man on the same day. He endowed each creature with its distinctive characteristics and He ordained that each thing He created would replicate itself 'after its kind'.

Commentating on His own creation in Job 39:13-18, God says of the ostrich,

The wings of the ostrich flap joyfully, but they cannot compare with the pinions and feathers of the stork. She lays her eggs on the ground and lets them warm in the sand, unmindful that a foot may crush them, that some wild animal may trample them. She treats her young harshly, as if they were not hers; she cares not that her labour was in vain, *for God did not endow her with wisdom or give her a share of good sense*. Yet when she spreads her feathers to run, she laughs at horse and rider.

Here, God Himself, says that He did not equip the ostrich with wisdom, and yet she survives. And she will survive, but only because God had equipped her in the first place to do so. From this we learn from God Himself, that He has distributed to each as we see it today. It is not the chance of mutation, but of deliberate design.

Dawkins looks to the geological column to give him the time he needs. Unfortunately, the column is not deep enough. Man is descended from a present day fish—the coelacanth—but this fish was contemporary with the dinosaurs and both became extinct about 250 million years ago. The same fish is still living today and has not changed into any other creature. How is that for over 250 million years this fish replicated itself "after its kind"? How is that this creature underwent no transformation into another creature, that we have any proof of? It stretches incredulity to breaking point to suppose that the lion in the African plains was once this fish swimming in the deepest parts of the ocean! This requires a leap of faith unknown and not expected in any religion on earth. Evolution is not so much a science-based belief system, as an unscientific belief system based solely on imaginative speculation and statistical probability of what *might* have happened in the past.

Dawkins noted that most vertebrates are represented in the second oldest rocks on earth—the Cambrian rocks. Yet all the animals found in these rocks are extremely complex, he admits. They would have needed millions of years to have evolved from single-celled *amoeba* to their finished state. Yet there are no fossils found the pre-Cambrian rocks which contain boney skeletons, such as we see fully developed in the coelacanth. So where are the missing millions of years and the missing millions of intermediate forms that gave rise to the coelacanth?

Since the present creation can only be dated from Genesis 1:2, theistic evolutionists have a problem with the biblical revelation of time (or chronology). The rise of human beings has been dated anywhere from half a million to two million years ago. The revelation given by God Himself is that He created the first pair of human beings—Adam and Eve—at the same time as He created all the animals. There are only 77 generation links between Adam and Jesus. Now granted that not every ancestor is mentioned between Adam and Jesus, by no stretch of the imagination could this genealogy be stretched out to two million years. The first 56 links, from Jesus' birth back to Abraham's birth, is 2,160 years. This gives an average of 38.6 years per generation. From Abraham back to Adam are 20 links. Now even if we allow 400 years per generation for each of the last 20 links, this would only give 8,000 years. Yet even with this inflated figure of 400 years per generation this would still not place Adam much before 10,000 BC. Once again, what evolution 'reveals' and what God reveals are irreconcilable.

The fossil record of early man. There are no records anywhere in the fossil record of *homo sapiens*. This is a scientific fact. We have beasts that bear a resemblance to apes, but none that bear a resemblance to modern Man. Consequently, since Adam's descendants have only been around from about 10,000 BC at the earliest, any fossil that looks man-like is not related to Adam's descendants. From this I draw the conclusion that these ape-like creatures belong to a previous creation, or previous creations. And if scientists think they can date these fossils to millions of years ago, then millions of years ago God was creating such animals to His heart's content. After millennia of creating and then destroying His creations (as the geological strata reveal), He then started afresh with Adam and Eve, and we are their direct descendants because in the new creation God decided that each of the millions of species of fauna, flora and living being would reproduce itself 'after its kind'.

If evolution existed in previous creations, it was ruled out in the present one. And the present creation has no direct connection with any previous creation(s). *It was a fresh start*. The entire planet was 'waste and void' and darkness was on the face of the deep. There was no land. There was no light. There was no sun, moon or stars. There was a sharp line of discontinuity drawn by God between the present creation and all other creations that preceded it. So what we see in the fossil record has nothing whatever to do with any living creature created in the seven days of creation. If God decided to re-create animals that belonged to previous creations, such as the coelacanth, and introduce them into the present one, why not? The evidence is that the coelacanth reproduces itself according to the law of the present creation which is to replicate itself 'after its kind'. And this is what we see happening to this very day. The Law is immutable.

If Dawkins does not have enough time in which to get from a single celled *amoeba* to Man, he is faced with an even bigger problem, namely, a mechanism whereby the single cell can start to mutate. *The mechanism does not exist*.

A MECHANISM FOR STABLE HEREDITARY MUTATIONS IS THE CRUCIAL 'MISSING LINK'

Evolution does not have a mechanism to generate mutations at a rate which would achieve evolution from the single-celled *amoeba* to the trillion-celled *homo sapien*, without any deviations, false starts, interrupted progress, and extinct developments, to produce Man at the end of the process. Dawkins admits it does not if we are confined to the present DNA/protein replication machine. He noted that there is only one such replication machine for all living forms on the earth today. (See the section above "Dawkins the Biologist".)

Dawkins assumes that the *Theory* of Evolution is a scientific fact; it just lacks the evidence. But he believes the evidence will come, as surely as gravity is a fact of the real world. While theistic evolutionists like to stress that the theory of evolution is still only a theory (how often have I heard that coming from the lips of Christian theistic evolutionists!), this belies their inner conviction. They are as committed as Dawkins that evolution is teetering on the brink of becoming a fact of science. The only problem is there is no mechanism that changes 'after its kind' into 'after another kind'. This is the major stumbling-block to evolution that is not spoken about among scientists. It is kept under the counter. It is something to hide. It is an embarrassment.

McFALL'S EXPLANATION FOR THE FOSSIL RECORD

I introduced my interpretation of the fossil record above. Here, for the benefit of the Christian I will explain how I read the Genesis Creation account.

Genesis 1:1 is a statement about the origin of all life, in all aeons, of the heavens and the earth. It is a blanket statement that covers everything.

Genesis 1:2, however, is a statement of the state of the present heavens and earth before they were created. It tells us either that (1) the previous creations BECAME 'waste and void'; or (2) that the 'waste and void' state was a preparatory state to the present creation. It is unlikely to be the latter, because the present creation is not that old. The rise of human beings has been dated anywhere from half a million to two million years ago. The revelation given by God Himself is that He created the first pair of human beings—Adam and Eve. There are only 77 generation links between Adam and Jesus, this would not place Adam much beyond 10,000 BC.

Yet, given that Genesis and geology cannot be in dispute, the best explanation is that fossil life predates Adam and Eve, and that they belong to a previous creation or creations. The present creation is contained in Genesis 1:3-31 and that is all God is concerned to reveal to us as being needful for us to know. What He did before the present creation is not revealed in Scripture. That man can discover more about planet Earth than is revealed in Scripture should not surprise us. We know more than any previous generation about almost everything. We can use our telescopes and microscopes to peer into worlds unimagined by the ancients. It should not surprise us if the fossil records are remnants or left-overs from previous creations, as the planet may be as old as the geologists think it is. How old the Earth is an irrelevance. Scripture is silent on the matter. What is relevant is the age of the present creation, and that is young if it is contemporary with Adam and Eve.

So, when I look at anything in the present rocks (fossils, minerals, etc.,) which are dated beyond 10,000–15,000 years BC, I date it as pre-Genesis 1:2.

Noah's Flood has nothing to do with the present geology of the Earth. It was a straight up and down affair, which wiped out all of the Adamic species, which were located in the Middle East.

END (9,941 words)
Leslie McFall
18 May, 2006