

scientists have proved there is no God. We don't have to look far therefore to find the reasons for such attitudes among our young people.

Until the evolution onslaught in the 1960s, most young people, even if they were not religious, entertained considerable respect for the principles and teachings of Christianity. This can be contrasted with the general attitude today, when even the elderly and the physically-disabled are subject to brutal and heartless assault by thugs. In the 1950s, even the most hardened criminal would shrink from attacking our most vulnerable citizens. Today, vile crimes such as the Sunshine Coast (Queensland) rape/murders of young female school-children are commonplace. The Anita Cobby and the Ebony Simpson cases of recent years in Australia are repeated annually.

The above statistics indicate that unemployment cannot be the main cause for the increasing rate of serious crime, pornography, family breakdown, divorce (see Figure 3), corruption in high places, material greed, selfishness, illegitimate births, and drug abuse. Even during the worst years of mass joblessness, citizens could sleep with windows and doors wide open on hot nights without much fear of break-ins. The unfortunate but inevitable outcome of mechanistic evolutionary theory is now reflected in the attitudes of society at large, where the general Christian essence in society has been replaced by a spirit of petty meanness and material greed which now exists from top to bottom in the community. If there is no God; there are no rules except selfishness; and there is no purpose in life. Neither the individual nor societies in general have any particular destiny, and a sense of hopelessness takes over.

It is therefore not surprising that Western society finds itself in a morass of lost dreams and lost innocence. The evolutionary 'dog-eat-dog', 'survival-of-the-fittest', and 'law-of-the-jungle' mentality of atheistic evolution now rules supreme at all levels, and there has been a general loss of honesty, integrity and security, which has been

replaced by a rise in personal anxiety, insecurity and stress levels among the population. In a recent edition of **Creation Ex Nihilo**, Dr Pieter van Oordt³ was scathing:-

'we have hardly uttered a sound when [extreme] capitalism, communism, and national socialism emerged as fruits of evolutionism'.

Biblical Christians would agree wholeheartedly with this succinct and historically-true statement.

We cannot blame evolutionary theory for **everything** bad in society, but there certainly is a clear link between its appearance in strength in the decade or so after World War II, and the sudden deterioration of the social order since then. If large numbers of people are brainwashed by the education system (and all too often by the media), then a general breakdown in the culture is inevitable. A population stripped of its sense of fairness and its destiny is bound to eventually suffer badly with disastrous consequences. History has shown this before — for example, the collapse of the former atheist Soviet Union and its empire.

Entire populations now operate on evolutionary principles, but history shows that civilisations lacking sound ethical and purposeful belief-foundations are societies in trouble. Bible-believing Christians know there is far more to life than what the transformists offer to mankind. Christ Himself befriended the poor and the oppressed, and He offers a future of hope and confidence.

The most grievous feature in the situation is that so many people are still unaware of just how weak the evidence for evolution really is. Evolutionists like to stress the 'fact' of evolution as did Lewontin in 1983,⁴ yet even the fossil record itself, once the 'golden showpiece' of the theory, is coming under increasing fire even amongst evolutionists themselves,⁵ as **not** being proof of evolution.

Knowing this, it behooves creationists to continue to fight this ungodly and pernicious teaching with

all the means at our disposal, until it is driven out of society altogether. If the English-speaking world continues down the present path, only disaster lies ahead, and Divine intervention in humankind's affairs would seem inevitable.

A. W. Mehlert,
Beenleigh, Queensland,
AUSTRALIA.

REFERENCES

1. Lewontin, R., 1983. Introduction. In: **Scientists Confront Creationism**, L. R. Godfrey (ed.), W.W. Norton, New York, p. xxv.
2. Cole, J. R., 1983. Scopes and beyond. Anti-evolutionism and American culture. In: **Scientists Confront Creationism**, L. R. Godfrey (ed.), W. W. Norton, New York, p. 24.
3. Van Oordt, P., 1997. A disgrace to biology. **Creation Ex Nihilo**, 20(1):40.
4. Lewontin, Ref. 1, pp. xxiii-xxiv.
Dr Lewontin uses the word 'fact' no less than eight times in two pages, when promoting evolution as against creation. Two pages later he writes approving that:
'Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature.... It is the opium [sic] of the people' (citing Karl Marx). Lewontin even got the word 'opium' wrong — Marx said *'opiate of the people'*
5. Schafersman, S. D., 1983. Fossils, stratigraphy, and evolution: considerations of a creationist argument. In: **Scientists Confront Creationism**, L. R. Godfrey (ed.), W. W. Norton, New York, pp. 234-235.
He wrote that:
*'Fossils do **not** provide the main evidence for evolution. This is a myth, not popularized I hope, by paleontologists . . . Some paleontologists today are suggesting that the fossil record is **not** consistent with the synthetic theory . . . '* (Emphasis added.)

WHO CREATED GOD?

Dear Editor,

Jonathan Sarfati has given an excellent reply to the critics' question, 'Who created God?'. I am teaching a Special Religious Education class, and I have tried to answer this question which has come up with my students.

I am sure there is material in Jonathan Sarfati's article which will be helpful in giving my primary school students a reasonable answer, although it might not be appropriate to give them Jonathan's article to read.

May I be permitted to express Jonathan Sarfati's article a little differently?

There are three possibilities :-

- (1) God, Who created the Universe, has always existed, as the Bible says.
- (2) The Universe itself has always existed, although it may change within itself over time.
- (3) The Universe sprang into existence from nothing (for example, quote 24 in **The Revised Quoted Book**).

If we choose the second of these alternatives, we are denying the inescapable conclusion from the laws of thermodynamics that the Universe is not infinitely old. We thus have to ignore what Eddington said was one of the most certain conclusions of science.

If we pick the third alternative, we are choosing something we know is unreasonable, as Jonathan Sarfati has said, because: *'Everything which has a beginning has a cause'*. Indeed, denying this is very serious. Consider this: According to Dr Kurt Wise as quoted in the article 'A philosophical attempt to define science',¹ one of the important presuppositions of science (number 5, in his list) is that we live in a cause and effect world. It is necessary to believe this, to gain any scientific knowledge. If we deny it, **all** established scientific results are in doubt, as Jonathan Sarfati pointed out.

Therefore the first alternative seems entirely reasonable; and philosophers of science had better be very wary about trying to rule such a possibility out of court with a definition of science that precludes the supernatural.

David Malcolm,
Maryland, New South Wales,
AUSTRALIA.

CEN Tech. J., vol. 12, no. 2, 1998

REFERENCE

1. Malcolm, D., 1997. A philosophical attempt to define science. **CEN Tech. J.**, 11(2): 167-180.

EROSION RATES OF ROCK

Dear Editor,

I read with enthusiasm Christopher Chui's article, 'An experiment on the erosion rates of rocks' in CEN Tech. J., 11(3). This is the first time I have seen anything written by Dr Chui, and I hope it will not be the last. This is a field in need of quantitative data, and Dr Chui's thesis that an imbalance exists between erosion and uplift is an important concept. Unfortunately, he fails to establish his thesis.

Dr Chui states that

'erosion rates determined by laboratory and uniformitarian-based field measurements do not agree' (p. 335).

In reading the article, the only 'laboratory' data provided appear to be his own, which I shall address shortly. Field **measurements** should not be affected by uniformitarian bias (though they may); perhaps he means **estimates**. One glaring problem with the research presented is a failure to understand that **erosion** refers to more than abrasion. **Erosion** refers to the combination of weathering and transport that results in removal of earth materials from their *in situ* state. It therefore includes both physical and chemical weathering of rock and unconsolidated sediments, whereby particles are freed from surrounding earth materials and transported by air, water or ice (including mass wasting) away from the point of origin. Dr Chui states that his objective was to determine how long it would take various rocks to 'erode' to 'sand, silt, or mud' (p. 336). He seems to equate erosion with abrasion.

The citations do indicate that evolutionists have seen that a disparity exists between observed rates of

erosion and inferred rates of uplift. Dr Chui has made a good contribution in bringing these citations to our attention.

The experimental method was well documented. Unfortunately, it was crude at best. From my knowledge of Southern California, the 'granites' may not all have been granite, since the Southern California batholith is granodiorite. And what, pray tell, is 'Mexican beach rock'? From Dr Chui's statement that it is metamorphic, from its relative resistance to abrasion and its smooth, dark appearance in the photograph, I guess that it might be a hornfels. One group of pebbles is simply called 'sandstone'. Dramatic differences in resistance to abrasion exist between a lime-cemented argillaceous sandstone and a silica-cemented quartz arenite. Not only were the lithologies not identified, but some of the samples were acquired from lumber yards! This seriously compromises the usefulness of the data. Nor were these lithologies matched to those in areas of Northern California mentioned in the article. The assumption that these pebbles are representative of fluvial sediments in Northern California appears tenuous. Even the abrasion method itself left much to be desired. No theoretical justification for the amount or type of fines and water added was provided. Dr Chui did compare the maximum linear speed of the particles with stream current speeds, but the differences between the rotating motion of the concrete mixer and particle transport in modern rivers were not addressed. There are several other sources of error in his experimental method, but they are not as glaring as these disparities in analogy.

This is not to say this method cannot provide a measure of relative resistance to abrasion. Such experiments have been conducted almost daily for decades in many laboratories, for where there is economic incentive, there are data. Resistance of aggregate to abrasion (typically pavements) is important in