

years ago in the United States.

Birkett's book is generally adequate in its basic research, although a major mistake appears where she tells us that Darwin's theory was that of '*natural selection*' (p. 120). It was not. It was the 'theory' that natural processes could explain the evolution of life as we see it from simple beginnings. This of course directly contradicts God, who has revealed to us in the Bible that He created all kinds of life within a few days.

Birkett also seems to accept without sufficient question what the theologian Wolfhart Pannenberg criticises as science's '*methodological atheism*'. Science does not need to assume religious naturalism to succeed. It needs to assume something more akin to the existence of design in the physical world and that its creator is consistent and not capricious. These are precisely the assumptions of those Christians who were instrumental in the formation of modern science. Birkett touches on this, but in her persistent avoidance of the Bible's reliability at the key point which it itself makes, that of our origin at God's hand, she misses the opportunity to provide a direction for what might be a Christian view of science. That would be, perhaps, a view that confines science to the examinable and accepts reliable historical information despite the discomfort which might be had by the metaphysicians of contemporary science with its implications.

Unfortunately *Unnatural Enemies* will occupy the reading time of the Christian public without giving it enough in the way of understanding of the religious issues of our time, despite essaying these issues as they developed last century. The book fails to adequately provide that information which the Christian public needs to proclaim a robust gospel, when its author obviously has the training and skill to do so.

References

1. Pacholczyk, A., 1997. God of the quantum vacuum. *New Scientist*, 156(2102):28—31.

Quotes

Darwinism - a political ideology

If the scientists ever had to retreat on this issue, the cultural consequences could be significant. Persons who now have prestigious status as cultural authorities would be discredited, and the political and moral positions they have advocated might be discredited with them. That is the fear of Michael Ruse, author of *Darwinism Defended*. Ruse proclaims proudly that Darwinism reflects "a strong ideology," and "one to be proud of." According to Ruse, contemporary Darwinians "show a strong liberal commitment" in both their politics and their sexual morality. Advocates of creation, on the other hand, want to restore a "morality based on narrow biblical lines" with respect to marriage and sexual behavior. Upholding Darwinism is therefore an important way of protecting political liberalism, feminism, and the sexual revolution of the 1960s. Ruse concludes his book with these stirring lines "Darwinism has a great past. Let us work to see that it has an even greater future."

Berkeley law professor Phillip Johnson writing in J. Buell and V. Hearn (ed.) *Darwinism: Science or Philosophy?* p. 11, Foundation for Thought and Ethics, Richardson, Texas, U.S.A., 1994.

Michael Ruse is quoted from his book *Darwinism Defended*, pp. 280, 328-329, 1982.

Evolution = materialism / atheism

'Let me summarize my views on what modern evolutionary biology tells us loud and clear ... There are no gods, no purposes, no goal-directed forces of any kind. There is no life after death. When I die, I am absolutely certain that I am going to be dead. That's the end for me. There is no ultimate foundation for ethics, no ultimate meaning to life, and no free will for humans, either.'

William B. Provine, Professor of Biological Sciences, Cornell University (*Origins Research* 16(1/2):9, 1994)