



## COMPANION GUIDE, PART 1

### Ray Comfort

*In Part 1 of this Companion Guide, designed to be used with “Evolution vs. God,” the purpose is to give you more information about the common claims of evolutionists. It will help you know how to counter those claims and give you greater confidence in addressing this vital issue. Much of this information has been adapted from How to Know God Exists: Scientific Proof of God, which you may want to read for further study.*

“When you’re talking about kinds or change in families, you’re actually talking about macroevolution.”

Evolutionists typically cite examples of natural selection and claim that they’re evidence of evolution. But natural selection, or adaptation, is simply variations within a kind and has nothing to do with Darwinian evolution. Though it’s sometimes known as *microevolution*, the fact is that nothing actually evolves during “microevolution.”

For example, look at the variety within the dog family, or kind—from the tiny Chihuahua to the huge Great Dane. They have incredible differences, but they are still dogs. Within the horse kind are the donkey, zebra, draft horse, and the dwarf pony.



Despite their distinctions, all are horses. There are huge variations within humankind, from Asian to African to Aboriginal to Caucasian. But we are all within the same species, *Homo sapiens*.

Darwin's theory of evolution, however, is based on the concept of *macroevolution*. This is the inference that small variations within a kind can accumulate and lead to large changes over long periods of time. One kind of creature (such as a reptile) will supposedly become another kind of creature (such as a bird), requiring the creation of entirely new features and body types.

As Stephen J. Gould said, "No one denies that selection will play a negative role in eliminating the unfit. Darwinian theories require that it create the fit as well."<sup>1</sup>

The first problem we find is that the variations we see in adaptation are always within limits set by the genetic code. Fifty years of genetic research on the fruit fly have convinced evolutionists that change is limited and confined to a defined population. Despite being bombarded with mutation agents for half a century, the mutant fruit flies continue to exist as fruit flies, leading geneticists to acknowledge that they will not evolve into something else. This confirms Gregor Mendel's findings in the 1800s that there are natural limits to genetic change.

Here's the second problem: Genetics professor Francisco Ayala is quoted as saying, "I am now convinced from what the paleontologists say that small changes do not accumulate."<sup>2</sup> About 150 of the world's leading evolutionary theorists gathered at a Macroevolution Conference in Chicago to consider the question "Are mutation and natural selection enough?" Evolutionist Roger Lewin sums up the conclusion of the conference:

The central question of the Chicago conference was whether the mechanisms underlying microevolution can be extrapolated to explain the phenomena of macroevolution. At the risk of doing violence to the positions of some of the people at the meeting, the answer can be given as a clear, No.<sup>3</sup>

## QUESTIONS

*Explain the difference between what is sometimes called "microevolution" and macroevolution.*

*Darwinian evolution requires changes of kind (one type of creature becoming another). Is natural selection the same as Darwinian evolution (molecules to man)? Why or why not?*

**"One great example [of observable evidence for Darwinian evolution] is the genetics of the stickleback."**

The genetic code (genome) for human beings has been described as a book, with four letters that compose our DNA story—all the traits that determine our eye color, sex, height, etc. But this is no small "book": the amount of information in the 3 billion base pairs in the DNA in every human cell is equivalent to 1,000 books of encyclopedia size.<sup>4</sup> Physical chemist Charles Thaxton explains:

The DNA code is a genetic “language” that communicates information to the cell . . . The DNA molecule is exquisitely complex, and extremely precise: the “letters” must be in a very exact sequence. If they are out of order, it is like a typing error in a message. The instructions that it gives the cell are garbled. This is what a mutation is.<sup>5</sup>

In our DNA book, the letters that define our features can occasionally be rearranged or lost through mutations, but none of this will account for the additions needed by macroevolution. In the molecules-to-man theory, everything evolved from simple cells to complex life forms. So if a fish were to grow legs and lungs, or a reptile were to grow wings and feathers, that creature’s genetic information would have to increase to create the new body parts. This would be equivalent to a “telegram” giving rise to “encyclopedias” of meaningful, useful genetic sentences.



Think how much more information there is in the human genome than in the bacterial genome. If evolution were true, where did all that vastly complex new information come from? *Scientists have yet to find even a single mutation that increases genetic information.* As physicist Lee Spetner puts it, “Information cannot be built up by mutations that lose it. A business can’t make money by losing it a little at a time.”<sup>6</sup> That’s why the *amount* of change (micro vs. macro) isn’t really the issue; more important is the *direction* of change. Evolution requires massive additions, which mutations cannot provide—regardless of how much time they’re given.

On the stickleback fish, researchers discovered a mutant gene that prohibits the growth of its “armor plating.” In studying the fish at Lake Washington, they learned that in the murky water, most of the fish lacked the bony armor that could protect them from predators. But after the lake’s polluted water was cleaned up and the fish could now be easily spotted by predators, the majority were found to have partial or full armor plating. Science Daily claims this is “a rapid, dramatic . . . example of evolution in reverse.”<sup>7</sup>

But is that what the evidence actually shows? Because the fish without armor made a tasty lunch for the larger trout, they were consumed in higher ratios—and therefore couldn’t reproduce. The armored individuals, however, avoided being eaten and were able to pass on their genetic code. The population of sticklebacks thus changed from mostly unarmored to mostly armored. Though their relative proportions changed, nothing new came into being. This is simply an example of natural selection, or adaptation within a created kind.

*Professor Myers stated, “These are changes of kinds . . . They’re distinctly different fish.” Has there actually been a change in “kind” in the stickleback? In what way have these fish become “distinctly different”?*

*Because the genetic mutation caused a loss of information, does this fish provide evidence for the information gain that’s required in molecules-to-man evolution? Why or why not?*

“It’s a change in the genetic makeup of the bacteria.”



Richard Lenski, an evolutionary biologist at Michigan State University, conducted 20-year experiment on bacteria in which he found one line of *E. coli* that could utilize citrate, something *E. coli* are not usually able to do. He hailed this as a “fascinating case of evolution in action.” However, the reality gives a different picture.

Dr. Georgia Purdom explains why this is not evolution but is rather adaptation: “Previous research has shown that wild-type *E. coli* can utilize citrate when oxygen levels are low... When oxygen levels are high, it is thought that the citrate transporter does not function or is not produced (even though they still possess

the enzymes necessary to utilize citrate). Thus, wild-type *E. coli* already have the ability to transport citrate into the cell and utilize it—so much for the idea of a ‘major innovation’ and ‘evolution... making a rare and complex new trait’! [as *New Scientist* proclaimed].<sup>8</sup>

“Since *E. coli* already possess the ability to transport and utilize citrate under certain conditions, it is conceivable that they could adapt and gain the ability to utilize citrate under broader conditions. This does not require the addition of new genetic information or functional systems (there are no known ‘additive’ mechanisms). Instead degenerative events are likely to have occurred resulting in the loss of regulation and/or specificity.”

As Dr. Purdom notes, “Molecules-to-man evolution requires an increase in information and functional systems,” and the changes in this experiment “do not lead to a net gain that moves bacteria in an upward evolutionary direction.” Lenski’s bacteria have not become “a new kind of bacteria” as claimed on the video.

## QUESTIONS

*Why are Lenski’s bacteria not proof of evolution?*

*What do they provide evidence of instead?*

“All the scientists pretty much agree with it.”

Although evolutionists often claim that science and religion are incompatible, the reality is that modern science was born of a belief in an unchanging God of order, purpose, and consistency. Most of the great

scientists of the past who founded and developed the key disciplines of science were creationists—men like Newton, Faraday, Kelvin, Pascal, Linnaeus, Mendel, Pasteur, Kepler, and Galileo.<sup>9</sup>

With all the growing evidence we have to disprove evolution, many scientists today also disagree with Darwin's theory. Michael Ruse, a preeminent evolutionist, wrote in *New Scientist*: "An increasing number of scientists, most particularly a growing number of evolutionists . . . argue that Darwinian evolutionary theory is no genuine scientific theory at all . . . Many of the critics have the highest intellectual credentials."<sup>10</sup>



Jerry Bergman, PhD, has compiled a list of almost 3,000 scientists and professors who reject evolution, most of whom hold PhDs in science. He believes that he could easily complete a list of 10,000 names.<sup>11</sup> In fact, according to Dr. Francis Collins, director of the Human Genome Project, 40 percent of working scientists claim to be believers. As a believer himself, Collins finds exploring nature to be "a way of getting a glimpse of God's mind."<sup>12</sup>

## QUESTIONS

*In what ways do evolutionists paint creationists as anti-science? How can you refute their claims?*

*How does the belief that "everyone agrees with it" influence people's thinking?*

**"Why do you think there's no one teaching Intelligent Design at UCLA?"**

In the documentary *Expelled*, Ben Stein discovered scores of biologists, astronomers, chemists, and philosophers who have had their reputations destroyed and their careers ruined by a scientific establishment that allows absolutely no dissent from evolution.

For example, Richard Sternberg, a double PhD biologist, allowed a peer-reviewed research paper describing the evidence for intelligence in the universe to be published in the scientific journal *Proceedings*. Officials from the National Center for Science Education and the Smithsonian Institution, where Sternberg was a research fellow, soon began a smear campaign to get the promising young scientist expelled from his position. This attack on scientific freedom was so egregious that it prompted a congressional investigation.



Astrophysicist Guillermo Gonzalez simply documented the design he observed in the universe, and was denied tenure at Iowa State University despite his extraordinary record of achievement. Caroline Crocker, a brilliant biology teacher, was forced out of George Mason University for briefly discussing problems with Darwinian theory, and for telling the students that some scientists believe there is evidence of design in the universe. The list goes on and on.

“Scientists are supposed to be allowed to follow the evidence wherever it may lead, no matter what the implications are,” Stein said. “Freedom of inquiry has been greatly compromised, and this is not only anti-American, it’s anti-science. It’s anti-the whole concept of learning.”<sup>13</sup>

## QUESTIONS

*Why do you think schools and universities want to squelch dissent about evolution?*

*What effect does it have on students when they hear only one side of the story?*

“There’s really not much I can tell you in terms of observable evidence. We would have to examine existing data to draw conclusions of our own.”

We like to think that scientists are objective and simply follow the evidence wherever it may lead. But the reality is that creationists and evolutionists all have the same evidence to examine, yet we’re interpreting it differently. We draw our own conclusions based on our worldview.



Harvard paleontologist Stephen J. Gould said he would “reject any claim that personal preference . . . does not play a key role in science.” He went on to make the following candid observation: “Our ways of learning about the world are strongly influenced by the social preconceptions and biased modes of thinking that each scientist must apply to any problem. The stereotype of a fully rational and objective ‘scientific method,’ with individual scientists as logical (and interchangeable) robots is self-serving mythology.”<sup>14</sup>

Science is often equated with naturalism, so scientists consider only materialistic explanations—even if all the evidence points to intelligent design. Prominent evolutionist Professor Richard Lewontin made an amazing admission about this bias:

We take the side of science *in spite* of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, *in spite* of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, *in spite* of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a prior commitment, a commitment to materialism. It is not that the methods and institutions of

science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our *a priori* adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is an absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door.<sup>15</sup>

## QUESTIONS

*How does an awareness of this bias affect your trust in scientists' conclusions?*

*Given the bias in interpreting facts, why is it important to ask for the evidence of claims, so you can examine it for yourself?*

**“Evolution is not testable over time.”**

Many scientists make claims about things that happened millions of years ago as “scientific proof” of the theory. But there is a difference between operational and historical science, and evolutionists often blur the lines.

Consider how this secular website addresses the question “Is Evolution Scientific?”: “Can the theory of evolution be tested? Evolution, when addressing common descent, is largely a historical science. This means that it relates to actions that are supposed to have happened in the distant past, and this makes testing the theory complicated because, unless time travel is invented, we cannot directly test the theory.”<sup>16</sup>

Operational science involves discovering how things operate in the present world—through repeatable and observable phenomena and experimentation using the scientific method. However, historical or origins science deals with the origin of things in the past—unique, unrepeatable, unobservable events. There is a fundamental difference in the two.



Studying how an organism operates does not tell us how it came into existence in the first place, yet scientists often present facts from observational science (like DNA or natural selection) as if they explained where the organism came from.

Because beliefs about the past cannot be observed, repeated, falsified, or subjected to experimental testing according to the scientific method, much of the “scientific” evidence for evolution is really outside the realm of science. When it comes to origins, the way the data is interpreted is strongly driven by the scientist’s worldview.<sup>17</sup>

## QUESTIONS

*What are the differences between operational science and historical science? Which can be used to directly test the claims of evolution?*

*What examples can you think of where evidence from operational science has been presented as “scientific” proof of Darwinian evolution? Explain whether or not it is valid proof according to the scientific method.*

“The fossils they have found of all the cavemen, *Homo sapiens*, dinosaurs—it shows clear evidence.”

If evolution were true, the fossil record should reveal millions of transitional forms, as life gradually evolved from one species to another. Darwin understood that evolutionary theory was dependent on these “missing links.” He wrote in *Origin of Species*: “Why, if species have descended from other species by fine



gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms? Why is not all nature in confusion, instead of the species being, as we see them, well defined?”<sup>18</sup>

Darwin attributed the lack of intermediates to the scarcity of fossils at that time—and he had faith that they would eventually be found. However, after scientists have searched diligently for a century and a half for evidence, we now have over 100 million fossils catalogued in the world’s museums, with 250,000 different species. Surely this should be enough to give us an accurate picture of our past. So do we see the gradual progression from

simple life forms to more complex? Did we find the millions of transitional forms that would be expected if evolution were true?

In a PBS documentary, Richard Leakey, the world’s foremost paleoanthropologist, admitted regarding human origins:

If pressed about man’s ancestry, I would have to unequivocally say that all we have is a huge question mark. To date, there has been nothing found to truthfully purport as a transitional species to man, including Lucy. . . If further pressed, I would have to state that there is more evidence to suggest an *abrupt arrival of man rather than a gradual process of evolving*.<sup>19</sup>  
(emphasis added)

Even the classic example of horse evolution is based on fiction rather than fact. Evolutionist Boyce Rensberger addressed 150 scientists at a Chicago symposium, which considered problems facing the theory of evolution. He describes what the fossil evidence reveals for horses:



But, as Carl Kerby points out, notice the fine print at the bottom of the chart: “Tinted areas indicate solid fossil evidence.”<sup>23</sup> Another way of saying it is “only the dark areas are proven fact.” The white areas have no proven evidence, so if they’re not fact, they’re merely speculation (fiction!). Keep in mind that these white areas are where evolution had to have taken place for Darwin’s theory to be true—and those are the areas with *no evidence*.

The actual observational evidence (the dark) shows that the animals stayed the same and didn’t change into anything else. And here’s another very important point: the bottom band shows how much change had to take place in just 30 million years for all these animals to have evolved from a common ancestor. They would have to change incredibly fast, but then all those new creatures remained the same for the next 150 million years. (Actually, the fossil record contains creatures that are dated back to 400 million years and they are exactly the same as what we see today!) So, in reality, what the fossil evidence shows is exactly what creationists expect: God created animals each according to its kind, with enough genetic variety to enable them to adapt, and they continue to reproduce after their kind.

## QUESTIONS

*The fossils do show “clear evidence,” but what does the evidence tell us about our origins?*

*Have you been taught that there are millions of transitional forms to prove evolution, or that there is an “extreme rarity of transitional forms” as the experts say? Why do you think there is a discrepancy?*

“The fossil record shows the common ancestors of all carnivores . . .”

Evolutionists claim there is abundant fossil evidence showing how creatures diversified, but the evidence is skimpy at best, usually based on a few bones and teeth. At most it shows only the sorting of existing information (variation within a kind), but not the change from one kind to another, which requires the origin of new information.

The way evolutionists present their evidence has a great impact on the way it is perceived—but it doesn’t affect reality. Consider an *Encyclopedia Britannica* article describing the turtle’s evolution:

The evolution of the turtle is one of the most remarkable in the history of vertebrates. Unfortunately, *the origin* of this highly successful order *is obscured* by the *lack of fossils*, although turtles leave *more and better fossil remains* than do other vertebrates. By the middle of the Triassic Period (about 200,000,000 years ago) turtles were numerous and in possession of basic turtle characteristics . . . *Intermediates* between turtles and cotylosaurs, the primitive reptiles from which turtles probably sprang, *are entirely lacking*.<sup>24</sup> (emphasis added)



At first glance, this could certainly give the perception that turtles are a marvelous example of evolution. But read it again. Rather than the exciting, clear-cut proof of evolution that it claims to be, here is what it's really saying: the turtle arrived out of nowhere fully formed, there are no fossils linking it to any other creature, and it's remaining as a turtle! Your perspective makes all the difference. Do you see a creature that gradually evolved from less complex life forms, linked to its ancestors by numerous transitional forms? Or do you see a creature that was created in its own distinct kind, and is consistently reproducing after its own kind?

Also, with “more and better fossil remains” for the turtle than other vertebrates, but transitional forms still “entirely lacking,” what does this say about the intermediates between all other vertebrates? And if this is “one of the most remarkable” examples of evolution available, and there's no evidence, this is the best there is!

Despite what you've been taught, the fossil evidence does not show that all life evolved from a single common ancestor through minor changes. Instead, during the period that paleontologists call the Cambrian Explosion, virtually all the major animal forms appear suddenly without any trace of less complex ancestors. No new body plans have come into existence since then. The Cambrian Explosion is also known as “The Biological Big Bang,” because the majority of complex life forms show up virtually overnight. If the entire period of life on earth was a 24-hour day, the Cambrian period would be less than two minutes. Like the Big Bang that supposedly began our universe, out of nowhere, nothing suddenly became everything.

T. S. Kemp, curator of the zoological collections at the Oxford University Museum of Natural History, is one of the world's foremost experts on Cambrian fossils. He writes about the sudden appearance of new species:

With few exceptions, radically new kinds of organisms appear for the first time in the fossil record already fully evolved, with most of their characteristic features present . . . It is not at all what might have been expected.<sup>25</sup>

In his book *Patterns and Processes of Vertebrate Evolution*, paleontologist Robert Carroll admits that life forms are strictly separated into very distinct categories:

Although an almost incomprehensible number of species inhabit Earth today, they do not form a continuous spectrum of barely distinguishable intermediates. Instead, nearly all species can be recognized as belonging to a relatively limited number of clearly distinct major groups, with very few illustrating intermediate structures or ways of life.<sup>26</sup>

So according to the evidence, life did not evolve gradually over a long period from simple to complex forms. Instead, the fossils show that all the major animal groups appeared fully formed, all at one time. This is exactly what we would expect to find if creation were true: each organism appears as fully developed, is genetically separated into kinds, and change is limited.

Regarding the Cambrian fauna, prominent evolutionist Richard Dawkins made the following observation:

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. Needless to say, this appearance of sudden planting has delighted creationists . . .<sup>27</sup>

Naturally, Dawkins surmises why there may be a lack of any intermediates and attributes the “very important gaps” to “imperfections in the fossil record.” He then goes on to say:

Both schools of [evolutionary] thought agree that the only alternative explanation of the sudden appearance of so many complex animal types in the Cambrian era is divine creation, and both would reject this alternative.<sup>28</sup>

Dawkins was right. Creationists are delighted that the scientific evidence so consistently reveals the truth about the origins of this incredible creation. But we would be delighted beyond words if atheists would overcome their bias against the truth and acknowledge our unspeakably incredible Creator.

## QUESTIONS

*What is the Cambrian Explosion, and how does it relate to the theory of molecules-to-man evolution?*

*Evolutionists claim that the fossil record provides proof of Darwinian evolution, but (to the unbiased) which explanation of origins does it fit the best?*

## NOTES

1. Stephen J. Gould, "The Return of Hopeful Monsters," *Natural History*, vol. 86, June/July 1977, p. 28.
2. Roger Lewin, "Evolutionary Theory Under Fire," *Science*, vol. 210, November 21, 1980, p. 884.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 883.
4. Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (Bethesda, MD: Adler & Adler, 1986), p. 250.
5. Charles B. Thaxton, PhD, "DNA, Design and the Origin of Life," November 13–16, 1986 <[www.origins.org/articles/thaxton\\_dnadesign.html#ref15](http://www.origins.org/articles/thaxton_dnadesign.html#ref15)>.
6. Lee Spetner, *Not by Chance* (Brooklyn, NY: The Judaica Press Inc.), pp. 131–132.
7. *News to Note*, AiG, May 24, 2008 <[www.answersingenesis.org/articles/2008/05/24/news-to-note-05242008#five](http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/2008/05/24/news-to-note-05242008#five)>.
8. Dr. Georgia Purdom, "A Poke in the Eye? Lenski and the adaptive acrobatics of *E. coli*," AiG–U.S., June 30, 2008 <[www.answersingenesis.org/articles/aid/v2/n1/a-poke-in-the-eye#fnList\\_1\\_5](http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/aid/v2/n1/a-poke-in-the-eye#fnList_1_5)>.
9. Henry M. Morris and Gary E. Parker, *What is Creation Science?* (El Cajon, CA: Master Books, 1987).
10. Michael Ruse, "Darwin's Theory: An Exercise in Science," *New Scientist*, June 25, 1981, p. 828.
11. Jerry Bergman, "Darwin Skeptics," September 11, 2006 <[www.rae.org/darwinskeptics.html](http://www.rae.org/darwinskeptics.html)>.
12. Dr. Francis Collins, interview with Jon Sweeny, 2007 <[www.explorefaith.org/speaking\\_collins.html](http://www.explorefaith.org/speaking_collins.html)>.
13. Andrew Hallway, "Expelled: New movie exposes persecution of anti-Darwinists," Creation Ministries International <<http://creation.com/expelled-new-movie-exposes-persecution-of-anti-darwinists>>.
14. Stephen J. Gould, *Dinosaur in a Haystack* (New York: Three Rivers Press, 1995), pp. 93–94.
15. Richard Lewontin, "Billions and Billions of Demons," *The New York Review*, January 9, 1997, p. 31.
16. "What Is Evolution?" <[http://atheism.about.com/library/FAQs/evo/blfaq\\_evo\\_science.htm](http://atheism.about.com/library/FAQs/evo/blfaq_evo_science.htm)>.
17. Don Batten, "It's Not Science," February 28, 2002, Creation Ministries International <<http://creation.com/its-not-science>>.
18. Charles Darwin, *On the Origin of Species* (London: John Murray, 1872), pp. 133–134.
19. Richard Leakey, in a PBS documentary, 1990 <[www.wasdawinright.com/earlyman-f.htm](http://www.wasdawinright.com/earlyman-f.htm)>.
20. Boyce Rensberger, "Ideas on Evolution Going Through a Revolution Among Scientists," *Houston Chronicle*, November 5, 1980, sec. 4, p. 15.
21. G. G. Simpson, *Tempo and Mode in Evolution* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1944), pp. 105–6.
22. Stephen Gould, *The Panda's Thumb* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1980), pp. 181, 189.
23. Carl Kerby, "Phylogenetic Charts—Dinosaurs," May 30, 2011 <[www.rforh.com/blog/debunked-blog/phylogenetic-charts/#sthash.fXEtvAaH.dpuf](http://www.rforh.com/blog/debunked-blog/phylogenetic-charts/#sthash.fXEtvAaH.dpuf)>.
24. "Evolution of Turtles," *Encyclopedia Britannica*, vol. 26 (Encyclopedia Britannica Pub., 1986), p. 750.
25. T. S. Kemp, *Fossils and Evolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 253.
26. Robert L. Carroll, *Patterns and Processes of Vertebrate Evolution* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 9.
27. Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker* (New York: W. W. Norton Co., 1987), pp. 229–230.
28. *Ibid.*



## COMPANION GUIDE, PART 2

### Ray Comfort

*In Part 2 of this Companion Guide, the purpose is to equip you to speak with people as I did in “Evolution vs. God.” It will address questions you will encounter when witnessing, teach you how to bring the knowledge of sin, and help people see their need for the Savior.*

“So you don’t think God exists?”

When we become Christians and God opens the eyes of our understanding, the thought that creation could have happened without a Creator is truly mindless. Isaac Newton called atheism “senseless.” It is a failure to use the senses of the eyes and the ears. It is to be intellectually tasteless, deaf to the sounds of nature, and out of touch with reality. Yet there are millions who proudly carry the label “atheist” somehow thinking that they are an intellectual cut above the naïve fools who believe in God.



This young man didn’t merely believe that God didn’t exist, he said he *knew* that He didn’t. What he apparently didn’t know is that no one can say definitively that God doesn’t exist unless he has absolute knowledge. We are not omniscient, and to say that there is no God we would need absolute knowledge—we’d have to know about absolutely everything.

If I said to you that I *know* there is no gold in China, to be truthful I must have absolute knowledge of everything in that vast country.

I must know what's within every rock, in every riverbed, in every home, in every tooth. If just one person has a gold filling or there's a fleck of gold inside a rock, I am wrong. For me to make an absolute statement that is true, I must have absolute knowledge. The best that this young man could have said, to be truthful, is, "I don't believe that God exists, but I really don't know."

Conversely, I don't need absolute knowledge to know that gold *does* exist in China. All I need is to have seen one person with a gold filling or wearing a gold ring. So those who know God don't need absolute knowledge to say that He does exist, but those who say that He doesn't exist do need absolute knowledge. Only God has absolute knowledge, and we can be certain He is never going to say that He doesn't exist.

So when you meet a proud know-it-all atheist, don't be fooled by his veneer. He's not an intellectual, but as the Bible so aptly puts it, he is a fool (see Psalm 14:1). This knowledge should ensure that you don't spend too much time arguing with him about whether or not God exists. He knows He does, because, as we will see later, God has given him evidence of His existence through creation and through his conscience.

## QUESTIONS

*If someone says that he doesn't believe in the existence of God (or of gods), how would you answer?*

*Explain why someone must have absolute knowledge to say, "There is no God."*

*How is it possible to say that God does exist when we don't have absolute knowledge?*

**"Are you comfortable talking about spiritual things?"**

In the United States, where around 80–90 percent believe in the existence of God, most people are comfortable talking about spiritual things. So never let your fears keep you from speaking with strangers. I have shared the gospel thousands of times (both one-to-one and in the open air) and although my fears are no longer out of control, they are still there. I am no different from you. There are many other things I would rather be doing than approaching strangers to share a message that I imagine they don't want to hear. Every little old lady looks like an angry Jezebel who is out to take my life, every man a mocking Goliath who wants to feed my flesh to the birds.

However, there is a way to deal with these fears. Think of a firefighter who hears a terrified child screaming inside a burning building. He knows that he has training on how to save that child, but the flames are hot and the smoke is thick. Is he fearful of being horribly burned or even losing his life? Would he rather be at home with his own kids? Of course, yet he ignores his fears and denies his desire for comfort—he's not thinking of himself but of the terrible fate of that poor child. That's what a firefighter does.

In Scripture, you are I are likened to firefighters. We are to have compassion and rescue sinners from the flames: “And on some have compassion, making a distinction; but others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire, hating even the garment defiled by the flesh” (Jude 22,23). So always keep in mind the terrible fate of the lost, and in light of that, ignore your fears and deny yourself fleshly comforts. That’s what a Christian does.

When you see someone to whom you should witness, greet them with a friendly “Good morning,” and if they respond warmly, tell them your name and enquire of theirs. That’s your first move.

In Professor Kennedy’s situation, I asked if she was comfortable talking about spiritual things. I usually ask for the person’s name, and use it when I ask the question, “What do you think happens after someone dies?” That question doesn’t mention God, Jesus, the Bible, Heaven, Hell, sin, etc.— words that may make people feel uncomfortable—and the person will reveal his comfort level by his answer. He may say, “I don’t know.” Just by the tone, you would know if there is offense. Then ask, “Do you think Heaven exists?” to which the person may reply, “Maybe.” “If it does, are you going there?” I have asked thousands that question and can assure you that most say something like, “I hope so.” This answer should dissipate your fears. It shows that the person isn’t the anti-Christ. It’s not nasty Jezebel or a God-hating Goliath who is out to kill you. This is just a normal person—someone who doesn’t want to die and who thinks about the issues of life and death.



You can now can push aside your fears, and follow up with, “Let’s see if you will make it. Do you think you are a good person?” and do what I did on “Evolution vs. God.” Take the person through the Ten Commandments. If you are not sure why this should be done, please go to [www.livingwaters.com](http://www.livingwaters.com) and listen to a free audio called “Hell’s Best Kept Secret.” It will help you.

## QUESTIONS

*You see someone sitting on a park bench looking bored and you feel compelled to share the gospel with the person. You are terrified and want to run in the other direction, but you know you must do it. How could you deal with your fears?*

*What would be your opening question, and why would you open with that?*

**“You are more than a machine. You are a living human being made in the image of God.”**

The reason Jacob believed death was the end is that when someone dies there are no brainwaves. It’s all over. What he didn’t realize was that he is a soul living inside a body. He is the same person today as he was when he was a small child, but his body is radically different in many ways. His bones, muscles, and brain



are larger. His voice is deeper. He looks completely different. It's not the same body he had as a small child—but Jacob is the same person. That “life” in him is his soul, and it's the soul that leaves the body when we die. It's because the life has left the body that it registers as having no brain activity. His body may be lifeless, but his soul is eternal.

It's important to understand why I didn't stay in the area of Jacob's intellect. I could have spent the whole day reasoning about the existence of God and of the soul, but I didn't. This is because the Bible tells us that the unregenerate human mind (the carnal mind) is in a state of hostility toward God and His moral government (see Romans 8:7). That is why people resist the gospel, hate Christians, blaspheme God's name, etc. Like the criminal who continually fumes with hatred toward the police, they hate the law because it stands for what is right, good, and just. So I do what Jesus did (see Mark 10:17–22): I direct myself to the conscience.

This is because the conscience is in harmony with God's moral Law (the Ten Commandments). Take Jacob, for example. He was resistant when it came to the existence of the soul, but began nodding in agreement as I took him through some of the Commandments. His God-given conscience tells him that it's wrong to lie, steal, commit adultery, murder, etc. It even tells him that God should be first in his affections. He may dull its voice, but when presented with the Commandments, the conscience is resurrected from its state of being “seared” and begins to do its duty.

#### QUESTION

*Someone says, “When you are dead, you are dead. Nobody knows what happens after we die.” How would you address that?*

“If you can't make a rose, and you don't believe that a rose is intelligently designed, where does that leave you on the intelligence scale?”

I had spent some time reasoning with this young lady about the impossibility of any human being making anything from nothing. However, my agenda wasn't to prove to her that God existed, because I knew she was already aware of that. God has given light to every person. Scripture says that they are without excuse when it comes to the existence of the Creator. The evidence of creation leaves them with no justification:

“For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse...” (Romans 1:20).



It is our profound knowledge of right and wrong that separates us from the animal kingdom. Whenever we do something morally wrong, we do it with knowledge that it is wrong, because of the presence of our conscience: an impartial judge in the courtroom of the mind that accuses or excuses us (see Romans 2:14,15). If we want to be effective witnesses, we must work with the Holy Spirit, who convicts the world of “sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment” (John 16:8). When we use the Ten Commandments to bring the knowledge of sin (see Romans 3:19,20; 7:7; 7:13), the sinner begins to understand its nature—for “sin is the transgression of the Law” (1 John 3:4, KJV). Once they understand that in God’s eyes sin is “exceedingly sinful,” the reality of Hell makes sense. Judgment makes no sense if we see sin from a horizontal viewpoint. But when we do what Nathan did after David had violated so many of the Ten Commandments, and say, “You are the man! Why have you despised the commandment of the LORD?” suddenly sin is seen as being vertical and personal. It was this that caused David to afterward cry, “Against You, You only, have I sinned and done this evil in your sight” (Psalm 51:4).

## QUESTIONS

*How would you describe the human conscience?*

*Why should we use the Ten Commandments to address the conscience?*

**“A judge must see that justice is done if he’s a good judge.”**

If you watch closely during the talk with Julia, you will see that her facial expression shows she is more than likely hearing biblical truths she’s never heard before. She was brought up in an atheist home, and so her concept of God was erroneous. Most atheists have a wrong image of what God is like, and are guilty of a form of idolatry. For instance, based only on the harsh judgments he found in the Old Testament, Richard Dawkins created a god who isn’t loving, kind, just, holy, or rich in mercy. Then he essentially held up the idol he created and said, “If this is your god, I don’t want to know him!” and tossed him away. And so he should. His god is just a figment of the professor’s fertile imagination. The god that Richard Dawkins doesn’t believe in doesn’t exist.

When we present the gospel explaining that God is a judge and that we are criminals who have violated His law and are therefore heading for a place called “Hell,” God’s prison, without parole, it often makes sense to those who understand our court systems. This seemed to be the case with this student.

I also asked Julia when she was going to die. This is because every person has a built-in fear of death (see Hebrews 2:14,15). Another way to phrase a “fear of death” is to call it a “will to live.” Each of us has a will to live, and if there was just one chance in a million that the Bible is right when it says that Jesus Christ has abolished death, we owe it to our good sense to look into it.



## QUESTIONS

*How could you respond if someone said that God is evil because He has created Hell?*

*Why do you think that it's good to confront someone about the issue of death?*

**“Would you sell one of your eyes for a million dollars?”**

Mike was an atheist who was open to talking about the things of God. However, he had no concern for his eternal salvation. Like most atheists he thought that not believing in something negated its reality. If I'm blind and don't believe in the sun, it doesn't change the reality of its existence. So, one way to show someone how much they should value their soul (their life) is to ask them the question about selling their eyes. Most people can relate to that.

Mike also mentioned that his brother had been earnestly witnessing to him. This is a strong consolation for us, because at times we don't seem to get anywhere with some people. But we have to remember that salvation is of the Lord. He is the one who saves people. We are simply planting seed. One sows, another waters, but it is God who brings the seed to fruition.



## QUESTIONS

*Does not believing in something change its reality? Give some examples.*

*What is one good reason we should never be discouraged when it comes to sharing our faith?*

**“The reason you choose evolution is because it gets rid of moral accountability.”**

Atheism gives license to sin. If there is no God, then there is no ultimate right or wrong. Without a holy God who dictates moral absolutes, man gets to say what is right and what is wrong. If society legalizes prostitution, abortion, homosexuality, and pornography, then those things are morally okay. If we are all simply apes, then our desires to procreate are instinctive and natural. We are just animals who want to mate.

Neither do we need the institution of marriage. That deals with the problem of adultery. If there is no God, there is no Judgment Day. There's no guilt. Anything goes. What a deliriously delightful thought for lust-filled, red-blooded humans!

But no one is getting away with a thing. Hitler will come to ultimate Justice. So will every one of the 100,000 killers who strangled, shot, or stabbed someone during the 1990s and were never caught. They got away with murder, but that will only be the case until Judgment Day, when God will bring every work to judgment, whether it is good or evil (see Ecclesiastes 12:14). This is why we

must warn every man, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus. God will not only punish murderers, but rapists, thieves, liars, fornicators, and adulterers—and He considers lust to be adultery and hatred to be murder (see Matthew 5:27,28; 1 John 3:15). To think that we can outrun the justice of almighty God is delusional. Consider what Scripture says about sinners:

“He who believes in Him is not condemned; but he who does not believe is condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that the light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For everyone practicing evil hates the light and does not come to the light, lest his deeds should be exposed. But he who does the truth comes to the light, that his deeds may be clearly seen, that they have been done in God” (John 3:18–21).

They stay away from the light, in case it exposes their sin. But notice what happens to this young man as he's asked, “Am I wrong?” As he thinks about it, physical light shines on his face, indicative of what may be happening to him spiritually.



## QUESTIONS

*Why does believing in evolution get rid of moral accountability?*

*Why is it that people don't want to come to the light of the Law and the gospel?*

“If you put your finger on it, and let's see if we can, your struggle at the moment is because of your love of sin.”

This student was on the verge of becoming an atheist because of the influence of Darwinian evolution. The struggle he was having was between his intuitive knowledge of God (his conscience) and his affection for sin.

It's good to use metaphors with the lost. Jesus often said, “The kingdom of heaven *is like...*” This is because the natural man cannot understand the things of the Spirit of God because his mind is spiritually dead. The



understanding is “darkened,” and he is “alienated from the life of God” because of the ignorance that is in him, because of the blindness of his heart (Ephesians 4:18). A person who is in that state can indulge in pornography (as James was) and feel little guilt because his conscience is seared. Consider the following verse in Ephesians 4: “In their spiritual apathy they have become callous and past feeling and reckless and have abandoned themselves [a prey] to unbridled sensuality, eager and greedy to indulge in every form of impurity [that their depraved desires may suggest and demand]” (Ephesians 4:19, Amplified Bible).

A simple metaphor can help to bring the light of understanding to a darkened mind. I used the illustration of an 80-pound money belt around the waist of a man who had fallen into the ocean, to try to show James his relationship to sin. Sin is darling to us and gives us great pleasure. We hold it dear and cling to it for our very life, but in truth it will drag us to death and Hell.

Never believe it when someone says that only Jesus can make you happy. That’s just not true. Fornication can make us very happy. So can adultery and pornography. According to Scripture, sin gives pleasure. The Bible says that in the last days men will be “lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God” (2 Timothy 3:4). Jeremiah 12:1 asks the question, “Why are those happy who deal so treacherously?” If you still think that only Jesus makes sinners happy, please take the time to read my book *God Has a Wonderful Plan for Your Life*. You can freely read it on [www.freeWonderfulBook.com](http://www.freeWonderfulBook.com).

The motive for sinners to respond to the Savior shouldn’t be to find happiness, because we will soon be disillusioned by the trials that continually come the way of the Christian. We should rather come to the Savior for righteousness—because we are criminals in the sight of a holy God and will end up in Hell if we die in our sins. It is righteousness that delivers from death (see Proverbs 11:4).

Never be afraid to use words like sin, Judgment Day, Hell, and repentance. Explain them, but never change them out of fear of rejection. Sin is the violation of the Ten Commandments (1 John 3:4), and Judgment Day is the day God reveals His anger against men like Hitler, rapists, murderers, etc. If God is good, He should believe in justice, and Hell is His terrible prison. And to “repent” simply means to turn from sin.

After hearing the gospel James said, “It’s very hard to believe that someone would be willing to pay off a debt that wasn’t His own.” Such talk is a sign that God is working in a heart. It is encouraging to hear this sort of thing, but often we have no idea when God is working in someone’s heart. The person may cuss at you and storm off, which can be discouraging. We might not realize it then, but his anger is a sign of conviction/guilt. So, again, never be discouraged when you share the gospel. Your labor is never in vain (see 1 Corinthians 15:58). The quality is in the seed and not in the skill of the sower. So every time you get to share the gospel, you have succeeded. The rest is up to God.

#### QUESTION

*Why should we never be afraid to use biblical terms when sharing the gospel with the lost?*

# BEHIND THE SCENES:

## The Professors' Interviews

During the making of our pro-life movie “180,” it suddenly dawned on us that God had allowed us to produce something very special. We had the same experience with “Evolution vs. God.” It just “evolved.” There was nothing, and over a period of a few months information was added, and we ended up with something we saw as being very unusual. The “big bang” was the way we were able to get evolutionary professors on camera. Those who agreed to be interviewed were:

Craig Stanford, Professor, Biological Sciences and Anthropology, USC

PZ Myers, Associate Professor, Biology, University of Minnesota Morris

Peter Nonacs, Professor, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, UCLA

Gail E. Kennedy, Associate Professor, Anthropology, UCLA

Here's what happened:

### Professor Craig Stanford



I was nervous to a point of seeing my hand shake as I held the microphone. Years ago, I had snuck into the world headquarters of the Jehovah's Witnesses and filmed with a spy camera, and also secretly filmed in an orthodox synagogue in New York for more than an hour before they discovered I was a Christian and threw me out. But I was nowhere near as nervous as I was with the USC professor.

I suspected that it was going to be a hot interview because of the questions I had in mind. I imagined that he would try to cloud the issue with definitions of “species,” so as I drove to the university I mentally rehearsed the definition of “kinds”: “There's the canine kind—the dog and the coyote. There's the feline kind—the domestic cat and the lion, and there's humankind or mankind . . . Darwin spoke of the change of kinds . . .” I was delighted when he conceded that what I was saying was legitimate. My concern was that he would say that “kinds” is a word made up by creationists. The truth is that it's a *biblical* word used ten times in the first chapter of Genesis. That's why evolutionists don't like it.

When the interview began to heat up I could see that my right hand was shaking, and it concerned me that the shaking might ruin the interview (fortunately it didn't, thanks to its “steady-cam” function). I knew how hard it was to get an evolutionary scientist on camera. Most ignored my requests; others said that they wouldn't do it. One said he would talk to me over lunch, as long as I didn't bring a camera.

But Professor Stanford kindly agreed, and gave me about 15 minutes before he showed me the door. That came about because I tried to witness to him.

During the interview, he asked if I had anything to do with the publication of *Origin of Species* that included a Foreword containing information about Intelligent Design. Three years earlier, our ministry had printed

around 200,000 copies and given them out at 100 top universities across the U.S., as well as in the U.K., Australia, and New Zealand. While editing this video, we noticed one of the books (ironically) was tucked into his personal library—third book from the right (pictured).



## Professor PZ Myers



Ask a “new” atheist if he believes in God and more than likely he will say, “I have no belief in any gods,” rather than the conventional response, “I don’t believe in God.” This modern definition is designed to confound those who believe that God exists. It’s in essence saying that our belief in one true God is no different than a belief in millions of other “gods” that people imagine.

PZ Myers is a biologist and associate professor at the University of Minnesota, Morris. He is also a popular atheist blogger, and he revealed that he had a longstanding embarrassment about

“Dictionary Atheists” who simply claim they lack a belief in gods. In an attempt to try to legitimize the philosophy of atheism, he distanced himself from those who don’t represent his personal convictions. But in his effort to swat those who bug him, he hit a hornets’ nest. The reaction was stinging.

He said, “Once again, I have proven my ability to drive people into a frothing rage against me. Only this time it isn’t a mob of religious fanatics and anti-choicers who have called me pond scum who will go to hell, an insect souled vile man, a black-souled amoral monster, pure evil, morally depraved, with a depraved mind, descend[ing] down the various stages into madness, and so forth...but I have this time managed to antagonize a bunch of atheists.”

In changing the definition of “atheist” from “someone who doesn’t believe in the existence of God,” modern atheists thought that they had outwitted the opposition. They believed that it was intelligent, but their “reasoning” wasn’t clever. It was stupid, and the learned professor said so.

In reference to the many atheists who say that they don’t have a belief system, PZ Myers betrayed their trust, when he said, “Boy, I really do hate these guys. You’ve got a discussion going, talking about why you’re an atheist, or what atheism should mean to the community, or some such topic that is dealing with our ideas and society, and some smug [obscenity] comes along and announces that ‘Atheism means you lack a belief in gods. Nothing more. Quit trying to add meaning to the term.’ As if atheism can only be some platonic ideal floating in virtual space with no connections to anything else; as if atheists are people who have attained a zen-like ideal, their minds a void, containing nothing but atheism, which itself is nothing. [He then uses profanity to call them dumb.]”

But the professor didn’t stop there. He also dismantled another foundational argument of modern atheism. One of their biggies is to say that we are all “born” atheists. As babes, we arrived with no belief in the existence of God. He said of such infantile beliefs, “Nope. Uh-uh. Same problem as the Dictionary Atheist—it

implies atheism is simply an intellectual vacuum. Babies aren't Christians or Muslims or Hindus, and they aren't atheists, either, because we expect at least a token amount of thought is given to the subject. If babies are atheists, then so are trees and rocks—which is true by the dictionary definition, but also illustrates how ridiculously useless that definition is. Babies might also have an in-built predisposition to accept the existence of caring intelligences greater than themselves, so they might all lean towards generic theism, anyway. Mommy is God, after all.”

No wonder angry bees came at him from all angles. He even spoke to the nasty prejudice some atheists have toward people of faith, putting them in with murdering terrorists. Regarding the atheists' claim, “Science flies you to the moon. Religion flies you into buildings,” he said, “The second sentence is false. Religion does not turn you into a terrorist. The overwhelming majority of religious people have similar values to yours; my church-going grandmother would have been just as horrified at people using their faith to justify murdering people as the most hardened atheist, and there have been atheist individuals who also think they are justified in killing people for the cause. So stop saying this!”

It was good advice from the professor. Those who love God don't hate anyone. They love atheists, and even love their enemies. The professor then tried to build up what he had just smashed down. He said, “You are an atheist—take pride in what you do believe, not what you deny. And also learn to appreciate that the opposition hasn't arrived at their conclusions in a vacuum. There are actually deeper reasons that they so fervently endorse supernatural authorities, and they aren't always accounted for by stupidity.”

Late in May 2013, an atheist friend asked if I wanted to visit an atheist convention being held about 15 minutes from my home in Southern California. He said that Professor Myers was one of the speakers. I told him that I would give it some thought. I did, and decided that I was too busy. Then I thought that it might be good to get PZ on camera, so I suggested it to my friend. He checked, and late in the afternoon I received a message saying that it was on. At 6:00 that night I arrived at the convention.



I wasn't at all nervous with this interview because although I knew that Professor Myers had a biting tongue in his writings, I suspected that he was a reasonable man. My thoughts about him were right. He was very friendly toward me, as were all the atheists who were there that evening. We had an interesting interview, and then posed for photos together. That was a little strange, but enjoyable.

## Professor Peter Nonacs



Sometime in 2011, I took a cameraman to UCLA and interviewed Professor Nonacs for about 40 minutes for Season Five of our TV program. The interview was average except for a short discourse between the two of us. I asked him if he believed in the soul. He said that he didn't, so I asked, “Did you know that the word ‘soul’ and the word ‘life’ in the Bible are synonymous?” He replied, “I believe in the soul then.” I could hardly believe my ears. He did a complete 180 in a second, showing he was open to reason. It was a great little sound bite and I decided that I wanted to use it in

“Evolution vs. God.” My problem was that no one knew where the footage was. We searched our archives a number of times and couldn’t find it. It seemed that it had completely disappeared. I finally gave up on it.

Some weeks later I had an idea. I called the professor and asked if we could redo the interview. He wasn’t at all interested, so I said, “I will take only two minutes of your time,” to which he replied, “Email me and I will get back to you.” To my surprise, he did.

When I showed up at UCLA, he ushered me away from his class out onto a balcony overlooking green trees. It was a perfect background. As we prepared to film I asked how long he could give me. He said that I could have an hour. He was about 6’4” tall. I didn’t want to interview his knees so I jumped up onto a chair and away we went.

I wasn’t nervous with Professor Nonacs because he knew that I was a Christian and I had interviewed him before. It was a good interview that ended very congenially with all of his students listening in and taking tracts after the interview.

### Professor Gail E. Kennedy



Professor Kennedy was one of just a few who responded to dozens of requests for interviews. She at first thought I was pro-evolution and said that she would do anything to further the cause. I didn’t feel like another trembling camera experience, so I decided that I would show my hand. I emailed her and said that a few days earlier I did an interview with Professor Peter Nonacs. I told her that he had said he would give me just a few minutes and ended up giving me an hour, and that it was my second interview with him. I then told her I was a creationist and I wanted people to understand what evolution is about.

Fortunately, she agreed to do the interview.

Gail was delightfully feisty, and I was very pleased with the footage. God bless her and the other three kind professors who allowed me into their world.

I sent each of them a very nice fruit basket and a note of sincere thanks.