

Evolution and Religion... or religion and religion?

Does science support evolution or creation?

For years we have been told in our public schools and the media that the theory of evolution is true. There have been very few who have said stop...look at the evidence. Here are some comments on the subject.

"As British philosopher Anthony Flew, once as hard-nosed a humanist as any, mused when turning his back on his former belief. 'It is for example, impossible for evolution to account for the fact that one single cell can carry more data than all the volumes of the Encyclopedia Britannica put together.'"

(UPI- March 3, 2005)

"Since the time of Darwin, paleontologists have found themselves confronted with evidence that conflicts with gradualism, yet the message of the fossil record has been ignored. This strange circumstance constitutes a remarkable chapter in the history of science, and gives students of the fossil record cause for concern."

(The New Biology, Page 175)

"None of the essential molecules of life, e.g., amino acids, could ever be formed under oxidizing conditions, and if by some chance they were, they would decompose quickly. Chemical evolution would be impossible."

(The Mystery of Life's Origin, page 162)

"If living matter is not, then, caused by an interplay of atoms, natural forces and radiation, how has it come into being?...I think however, that we must go further than this and admit that the only acceptable explanation is creation. I know this is anathema to physicists, as indeed it is to me, but we must not reject a theory we do not like if experimental evidence supports it?"

(Physics Bulletin, May 1980)

We could go on and on with **faith** statements from scientists who want to believe. But, I thought faith was a part of religion. Is this an issue of **evolution** and religion or **religion** and religion? If this is true, the national debate of whether to teach evolution and creation in public schools takes on a knew meaning.

Uncle Noah childrensbiblestudy.com