



# F.A.C.S. REPORT

FOUNDATION for the ADVANCEMENT of CHRISTIAN STUDIES  
P.O. Box 547, Ferny Hills QLD 4055

Vol. 15, No. 2

©Copyright, 1996

February 1996.

## An Open Letter to P.K.

by Murray McLeod-Boyle

### 1.0 Introduction

**R**ECENTLY, A SISTER in the Lord, Mrs Elizabeth Botting, sent me a cutting from the *Geelong Advertiser's* "Letters To The Editor" section, dated the 23/12/95. The letter was written by a Peter Killingsworth (Note: Not Archbishop Peter Hollingsworth). Who is Peter Killingsworth you ask? Well, I do not know, nor is it particularly relevant.

My main interest in responding to Mr K. is that the position espoused by him in his letter reads almost like a humanist manifesto, and is therefore in need of rebuttal. His letter denies almost every aspect of historic Christianity and ends with the typical humanist assertions that: (a) 'God is dead', and (b) man is capable of autosalvation (i.e. self-salvation).

Mr K's letter is titled "Prayer not the answer" and is written in response to an earlier letter by D. Kirkland, published on the 9/12/95. D. Kirkland seems to have pointed out that the current run of droughts, plagues and earthquakes etc, are God's judgement upon us for our godlessness. Hooray! Finally someone who has a high view of God. Someone who believes in a pure and Holy God whose righteous wrath needs to be propitiated. More importantly, a person who very much believes that the "wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who suppress the truth in unrighteousness (Romans 1:18).

Needless to say our humanist friend, Mr K., was not thrown into bliss and rapture over what he had read. Let us examine Mr K's position and see the errors that he has both perpetrated and propagated. His letter begins:

I was interested to read in D. Kirkland's letter . . . that "droughts, plagues, incurable diseases, earthquakes" are caused by our tardiness in acknowledging God and refusing His blessings. Let us examine the facts. . . .

### 2. The Facts

**T**HE FIRST ERROR Mr K. makes is his assertion that *he has the facts*. Make no mistake. This is the bona fide position held and publicly taught by humanists. Some time ago I watched a television show on which an evolutionist was drawing comparisons between humans and, if my memory serves me correctly, ants. After the evolutionist had made several points, the host asked him something like 'What does this mean for those who were brought up to believe in Adam and Eve?'. The answer: (Please hold on to your hats for this most humble of replies.) 'Science has *proved* evolution'.

Now this is real poison. To conservative Christians such a statement is at the very least bold, but stop to think of Mr Joe Average, and for that matter, of a lot of not so conservative Christians, who hear such a statement. What are they to make

of all this? Well, it is really quite simple. *They believe it.*

There is a need for Christians to be aware of this very cunning approach. Some may think me a little pedantic for focusing on these two words "the facts", yet there is a point to be made. Humanists/evolutionists will never make any compromise with regard to the existence of God or the origin of man. The humanist at this point is a true hypocrite for he will always ask of Christianity the very question that he will never ask of himself — namely, *Where is the proof?* I would expect that almost every Christian who reads this article would have been asked, at some time or another, to prove the existence of God. The challenge would have inevitably involved placing God into a laboratory, so as to make Him verifiable by empirical means. Of course these exact words would not have been used, but there is no doubt that this is what was meant.

The purpose of such a statement is to scare the Christian into being silent, because he, supposedly, has no 'hard proof' to back up his claim that God exists.<sup>1</sup> Yet, ironically, the humanist never seems to place such stringent requirements upon himself. He is able to stand up and claim that science has proved evolution — without the proof. This is illustrated by the position taken by David Attenborough the renowned evolutionist. An elder in the Presbyterian Church wrote to him thanking him for the work he had done, but also expressing concern that he did not give God, the

1. Unfortunately this tactic works all too often and too many Christians remain silent. Such Christians can only be intimidated because they have not established themselves upon a firm foundation — God's Word.

**F.A.C.S. REPORT** is published monthly by the **FOUNDATION for the ADVANCEMENT of CHRISTIAN STUDIES**, a non-denominational educational organization. A free six month subscription is available upon request. Donations are invited, and those who send a donation of \$15 or more will receive a full year's subscription. Foreign subscriptions: a minimum donation of \$30, payable in Australian currency, is required for a year's subscription. Cheques should be made payable to **F.A.C.S.**

**FOUNDATION for the ADVANCEMENT of CHRISTIAN STUDIES**

P.O. Box 547  
Ferny Hills, QLD 4055

©Copyright, 1996. All material published in **F.A.C.S. REPORT** remains the property of its author.

Permission to reprint material from **F.A.C.S. REPORT** in any format, apart from short quotations for review purposes, must be obtained in writing from the copyright owner.

concern that he did not give God, the Creator, the glory. Mr Attenborough responded by proclaiming that *evolution was a fact, but that science had not proven it yet.*<sup>2</sup>

This is now twice that we have seen such boldness. We have here an absolute, categorical, unequivocal fact — that has not been proven. What an absolute contradiction.

Science has never developed any hard evidence to prove evolution. Sure, there have been many missing links *imagined* but none *substantiated*. The media has often heralded some new and greater discovery that is supposed to be the final nail in the coffin of creationists. Yet, given time, this 'new discovery' is forgotten as it inevitably turns out to be either a hoax or a mistake on the part of science; and in the case where the evidence is worthy, science is divided on how to interpret it.

Christians must take a stand upon God's Word in faith. In the face of such an onslaught we need to present a very strong case that shows the real facts: *that the humanist theory of evolution is a theory in crisis*. No one has yet placed indisputable evidence in front of the scientific world that proves evolution — nor will they. Therefore, we should query

every statement made by an humanist/evolutionist that contains the words "the facts".<sup>3</sup>

### 3. Catastrophes

**O**NE OF THE "FACTS" that Mr K. is so sure about is the time for which catastrophes have existed.

Droughts, plagues, incurable diseases (plus tidal waves, horrible viruses, floods, famines, cyclones, volcanic eruptions and errant meteorites) have existed for eons of time.

Whilst not stating it exactly he no doubt alludes to the "fact" that catastrophes are as old as the earth itself. More importantly there is an absence of any statement that indicates how, why or when catastrophes started.

Scripture on this point is clear. God created the heavens and the earth and they were *good*.<sup>4</sup> It is only after the fall of man that sin and, by consequence, catastrophe enter. It is the fall of man into sin that brings death to creation. A cursory reading of Genesis 3:14ff shows the disturbance that the entrance of sin was to have upon the created order.<sup>5</sup>

Hence, chaos in creation is a direct result of the death that came upon it when man rebelled against God.<sup>6</sup> Catastrophes had a starting point and that was the day Adam, the federal head of man, rebelled against God's just and wise law.

Therefore, we must note the principle that was there enacted: *Peace with God means peace with creation; enmity toward God means enmity with creation*. In the creation order we may say that there were two levels of government. God ruled as absolute ruler with man ruling the creation as vice-regent. Man was under dominion (he was subject to God), whilst at the same time he had dominion (he ruled over creation). When man rebelled against God, and threw off God's rightful dominion, he lost not only

## Stress

**S**TRESS IS A FACT of modern life. In its right place, however, stress is not something that should necessarily be avoided.

The causes of stress have been known for some time. But a recent report indicates that the most stressful part of any job for a senior executive is firing a staff member.

One has to question why firing staff is such a stressful activity. Could it be because so many executives know they are not really giving other staff members a fair deal? This, on reflection, appears the only real reason why firing staff should raise the stress level.

Getting rid of staff can happen for many reasons. There might be very good legal and moral reasons to dismiss a member of staff. A person who is stealing from his or her employer does not deserve to be kept on the payroll, and we should not feel too badly about dismissing such a person. A staff member who is dismissed for not performing in his job can also be dismissed without too much stress. Unless, of course, the performance standards of the job have never been set out clearly in the first place.

This, unfortunately, is the problem in too many cases. The employer's expectations of employees is never addressed adequately. To be fair, there is a necessity to have the employee's expectations clarified as well.

Far too often, friction between people is created unnecessarily because of poor communication. The boss wants people who will work hard, just like he does. The worker, on the other hand, is prepared to put in a good day's work. But when the results do not meet the boss's expectations, friction results.

Too often, however, the reasons for the less-than-expected results are not analysed. It is too readily assumed that the employee is not a hard worker. "Let's

2. This is where it is important to understand the concept of "presupposition". All arguments have a "faith" starting point. A point that is presumed, not proved. For example, the Old Testament "fool" says in his heart that 'there is no God'. This is his presupposition and the point from which he shall view life.
3. Evolution is so shaky that special terms are invented to help cover the gaps. When my wife was doing her degree she had to sit through some evolutionary classes. Any time the teacher came to a problem she could not explain she would speak of "the unique event".
4. See Genesis 1:3-31. Note the escalation in the terms used to describe the creation. During the actual process creation is described as good. Yet when the completed work is observed by God He pronounces it to be "Very Good".
5. The New Testament counterpart is to be found in Romans 8:19ff. Here Paul expressly tells us that creation was subject to "futility" through the fall. Just as man groans under the weight of sin and looks for that great and glorious day when he shall be restored to glory, so does creation.
6. Here we might add that this is where evolutionists and theistic evolutionists fall flat. Their system requires a perpetual cycle of life and death in order that life may be sustained and enhanced. A perpetual cycle that finds no Biblical warrant whatsoever. Please also note the heresy that is involved in these two positions. In Scripture life and death are antithetical. Death is an intruder upon life. In evolution and theistic-evolution death is made a prerequisite not only of life, but of higher life. Hence, there is an explicit denial of the redeemer, Jesus Christ.

the right, but also the ability, to practice dominion. Rather than having dominion, the power to speak and be obeyed, man now became dominated. Those things that he had once ruled, now ruled him.

The result of this disruption means that "natural disasters" can indeed be used as a spiritual indicator. The created order was thrown into chaos by sin and it is now only the grace of God that restrains evil in this world. God now acts as umpire dispensing judgement to the people of this world.<sup>7</sup> That judgement being dispensed according to a formula: For without faith it is impossible to please God, hence the one who comes to God must believe that He is, and that He is the rewarder of those who seek Him (Hebrews 11:6). One of the obvious rewards that God gives to those that honestly seek his face is peace and prosperity. Thus, the principle enacted in Genesis was seen to be in use throughout the Old Testament and it is still in operation today.<sup>8</sup>

#### 4. Syncretism

**T**HE MOST STRIKING paragraph in Mr K's letter, is that which alludes to the millions of prayers that are offered each day. I say striking, because Mr K. lumps Christians, Buddhists, Hindus, Jews and Mohammedans together.

Each day millions of prayers are offered to God by devout Mohammedans, Christians, Jews, Buddhists, Hindus and others. There is absolutely no evidence that their supplications have had the slightest influence on the incidence of world disasters, which daily bring death and suffering to countless humans. Therefore we must conclude that whatever force drives the universe is completely indifferent to what happens to the billions of humans on this planet.

Such a conglomeration can only mean one of two things; 1. Mr K. is trying to make a subtle point, i.e. all roads lead to Rome or, 2. Mr K. is completely ignorant of the theologies that the different religions hold to.

I suspect that the reason is ignorance more than anything else. This is evi-

denced by the fact that in most Eastern religions prayer gives way to meditation. Eastern religions typically look within man for the answers to the questions of life, rather than to a being that is apart from him. This is why, with the influence of Eastern mysticism upon our society, we hear so much about men needing to be in touch with their feminine side and of people trying to find themselves.

More importantly we should note the one significant difference between Christianity and those other religions listed. It is this Christian distinctive that separates it from all other religions and that for which the Church is persecuted. It is the belief that *there is only one mediator between man and God and that is Jesus Christ the Lord* (See 1 Timothy 2:5; Hebrews 8:6; 9:15 and 12:24).

Prayer can only be addressed to God via the appropriate channel, and that channel is Jesus Christ. Christian prayer is not the begging of favours from a deity, as is the case in so many religions. Why? Because God Himself has already offered up His Son in order to clear the way so that a meaningful relationship might take place (John 3:16; 14:6; Acts 4:12; 1 John 3:1). Christianity is not stuck at an impasse still trying to figure out how to get God into a favourable mood so that a request can be made of Him. No! Christ sits at the right hand of God the Father in glory and there lives to make intercession for us (See Hebrews 7:25). When was it that He sat down at God's right hand? It was after he had made purification for sin (Hebrews 1:3). As a result, Christianity boasts claims that no other religion can match.

Therefore, such a syncretistic approach to prayer as given by Mr K. is without any warrant or justification. Christians pray because they enjoy an open relationship with God their Father, and not because they fear that He is going to wipe them from the face of the earth. The hindrance of sin has been (in principle) removed in Christ and therefore fellowship with God is available.

This leads us then to ask: what is the role of prayer given the fact that disasters happen and are apparent in this world?

replace him!" is an easy option for the boss. But when the problem occurs with the next employee and the one after him as well, it is time to stop blaming the workers and perhaps look at the way business is conducted to find, perhaps, other reasons, for the lower-than-expected performance.

In recent years, many people have been fired in downsizing operations. Companies have discovered they're overstaffed. So they get rid of the supposedly unnecessary workers. I say supposed, because it is often not determined how the company will survive with less staff. Surely, if it needed the people to perform the work last week, what makes management think it can do without them this week?

Still another question remains to be asked. Who put all these people on the payroll in the first place? Wasn't it the boss's (or management's) choice to employ these people? And if they were employed because the boss made a mistake, who should be fired for incompetence?

When senior staff are paid on profitability, it is easy to create profits by getting rid of a few staff members. But this practice should be banned. No executive should be paid on profits that are created by reducing staff levels. Instead, he should be made to explain why he allowed the company to get too many employees in the first place.

This, however, is not about to happen. Business, after all, seeks to serve the purpose of management, not the workers. Workers will thus continue to be "cannon-fodder" for executives who are feathering their own nest.

It is not surprising, therefore, that quite a few executives feel a certain amount of guilt over firing people. Underneath it all, they know the worker has not been well-treated.

According to the stress report, the second highest cause of stress is losing your own job. One would think, that since losing your own job causes a little less stress than firing other people, then executives would quit before they fire others. That they don't do so may indicate that the respondents in the survey have answered the question as to how they *think* they should respond, rather than indicate their true feelings. Or per-

7. Although we await the final judgement it is an error to believe, as many do, that the last judgement will be the only judgement. Scripture is clear; *God pours forth his wrath now*. Yes, God's hand is restrained but only by His own counsel. In relation to this topic, we need to note the difference between God showing "restraint" and God being "inactive".

8. See Deuteronomy 28ff, where the Theocracy is founded upon the principle of blessings for obedience and curses for disobedience.

Briefly, we must understand that Christians are salt and light and as such we should beseech God to stay His hand in certain cases. By this I mean that we should constantly pray for stability, peace, freedom and the like so that we may enjoy peaceable lives. We should pray for Christ's kingdom to be established in its fullness. We should pray for wars, famines and droughts to cease. We should pray that the Prince of Peace shall reign. This is our Christian duty.

However, we must also learn to pray against evil. Imprecations are something which are lost on the "God is love" Christians of our day. It is the Christians right, indeed it is his obligation, to pray against those God-haters who perpetrate evil on a grand scale. We are obliged to hate what God hates. We are no friends of God if we try to reconcile ourselves to those that God is at war with (James 4:4).

It is here that the lesson is to be learnt. God reveals Himself in judgement upon the wilfully ignorant. Scripture makes this clear throughout. Israel's history is clear testimony to this. As a people to whom God had revealed Himself Israel was bound by blessing and curse to obey God. When they failed, natural disaster, as well as foreign armies, bears and lions, quickly followed.

When Israel denied the knowledge of God, the "natural disasters" were unleashed against her.

So it must be seen that whilst prayer is a means of communication it is no substitute for heartfelt repentance. Therefore, even though these religions listed above (may) pray, they do not seek peace with God through Christ Jesus the only intermediary. As a result these people are dead in trespass and sin and God's Judgement will be kindled against them (Ephesians 2:1-3).

## 5. The Inventor

**A**S WE HAVE ALREADY SEEN, Mr K. is not given to understatement, and here again we have a repeat performance. Commenting on the "millions" of prayers that are daily offered, Mr K. claims that "there is absolutely no evidence that their supplications have had

the slightest influence on the incidence of world disasters".

Amelioration of the human condition over the last few hundred years is largely due to the dedicated research work of scientists and technologists. It is apparent that humans must rely on their own endeavors in attempting to cope with "Acts of God".

I can only assume from this that Mr K. has secretly invented both a prayerometer and a prayer-responseometer and that he has daily used these devices in his research. His obvious finding is that daily "millions" of prayers go up requesting God to relieve us of suffering, but sadly zero responses come down. Personally I tend to think that both the prayerometer and the prayer-responseometer are tuned into the wrong frequency, just like the inventor.

To argue with such statements as put forward here is pointless, therefore, we shall let Scripture speak for itself and thereby prove the assertion to be a fallacy.

In Genesis 4:26 "men began to call on the name of the Lord" thereby showing that prayer was very much a part of life. Men began to realise their dependence upon God and consequently began to call on His Name. Exodus 3:9 records the Lord as saying "behold, the cry of the sons of Israel has come to me", and in verses 16 and 17 He continues: "Go gather the elders of Israel together, and say to them 'The Lord, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, has appeared to me, saying, "I am indeed concerned about you and what has been done to you in Egypt. So I said, I will bring you up out of the affliction of Egypt . . . to a land flowing with milk and honey"'. "

On reading this short section it seems near nigh impossible to lay at God's feet a charge of delinquency in respect to answering prayer. Moreover, in the present context, this text has great significance as it exemplifies the fact that, contrary to Mr K., *God is, indeed, interested in alleviating suffering.*

This is, of course, only one of many examples. There is also the very vivid instance in 1 Kings 18:20-40 where Elijah challenges the prophets of Baal. Here again we see quite clearly that Elijah's

haps it is just that the stress difference is so little between losing your own job and firing someone else, that it is easy to choose firing rather than quitting as the preferred course of action.

In 1994, 753,000 Australian workers left their employment involuntarily, about 39.39% of all workers who left their jobs that year. This is a big change from 1992, when 810,000 workers were made redundant, and this amounted to 79.27% of workers who left their jobs that year.

One wonders how many workers are the victims of poor judgement on the part of employers. Perhaps it is time to end poor management rather than continue to kick the workers for management's mistakes. But this would require a revolution in thinking on the part of those who employ managers and who, in many instances, are not only the owners of the business but the key managers making the mistakes.

Seeking such a revolution in business management is, perhaps, the outcome of too much dreaming. But has anyone any better ideas?

supplication was made, heard and answered by God. Moreover, we see that the repentance from apostasy at this point in the narrative has the effect of bringing to an end a "natural disaster", in this case drought.

The Lord God had inflicted drought upon the land of Israel because apostate Ahab and God-hating Jezebel had caused the worship of Yahweh to cease. They had persecuted the prophets and exalted falsehood leaving God with no option but to act against Israel in Divine Judgement.

What we see clearly demonstrated in these passages is the fact that God does hear and answer prayer.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, these, and other, passages show that God is concerned with the welfare of the people upon this planet (See Ezekiel 33:11; 2 Peter 3:9). In fact the whole theme of Scripture is one of redemption. Scripture is nothing less than an historical record of God working to redeem a people for himself. So it is extremely far fetched to imply that Scripture, and more particularly, the God of Scripture, has no concern with suffering.

9. There are many examples of God answering prayer. See for instance the accounts of the many blind and lame that found healing after praying to Christ. Remember that Christ prayed before raising Lazarus from the dead, and that James (5:17-18) holds out Elijah as an example to us all.

God's Word shows us that whilst God is indeed angry with sin and willing to act against it, He is, nonetheless, compassionate and very much concerned with His creation. If He were not, He would not have offered up His Son to die for us.

## 6. God is Impersonal

**M**R K. APPEARS TO BE a "Star Wars" fan. For him there is no concept of a personal deity. All that exists is a mere impersonal force. This impersonal force can be equated with "karma", "mother nature" and a host of other impersonal forces that people claim rule this world.

At this point we encounter Mr K's grand conclusion. Based on the three stated propositions that have preceded, Mr. K. concludes that there is no real "God", only an impersonal and indifferent force that drives the universe according to predetermined norms, (and even this last part is more implied than stated).

Again, it would seem that Mr. K. is claiming far more than his case can prove. If we were to look at Mr. K's proposition in mathematical terms we would find the most puzzling of equations that would look something like  $1 + 1 - 1 = 0$ .

Mr K's conclusion is that God is dead. This is indicated by the zero in the above equation. However, we must note carefully that the equation is badly flawed. His equation reads as follows: Catastrophes are reality (1) + Prayers are offered (1) - No evidence prayer works (1) = God is dead (0). Let us examine this more closely.

First, Mr K. makes two positive statements regarding the reality of catastrophes and prayer. However, using some magical formula, he is able to negate these two realities by the insertion of a query as to whether prayer is ever answered. The futility of this approach must be seen in the lack of further exploration done in regard to the first two statements made. Logic would tend to dictate that one should start at the beginning and work through to a conclusion. For example, in the present case we would expect something like: catastrophes happen; Man does not have control of these; Is

there a being or power that does? So, as far as the first proposition is concerned there is a likelihood that there is a power or being apart from man that exercises control over our world.

In regard to the second proposition, that of prayer, we would tend to proceed along the following lines: Catastrophes happen; They are out of our control; Something must control them; Could this be a power or a being?; Prayer is the response of millions; people would not pray to an impersonal power; This means there must be a being, apart from man, that has control over man.

Now, this of course does not answer any of the deeper questions about God, and is rather simplistic in its approach, but it would at least present us with a start in the right direction.<sup>10</sup> It is obvious at this point that Mr K. does not like where reason is taking him so he negates his first two propositions with a third, namely, that there is no evidence that prayer has had an impact upon this world. The real tragedy here is that Mr K. has deliberately ignored the obvious conclusion because his agenda does not allow for it. His starting point is 'God does not exist' and that is what he sets out to prove. Why is it that Mr K. is able to overturn so easily evidence that points to a personal God? Simply, because in his darkened estate he has no desire to express belief in a personal God, the natural consequence of which is to admit that we are accountable to such a being.

The real futility of this type of argument can be seen if we use the example of electricity. When a light switch is turned on a globe lights up (1) + I receive a power bill from the electricity company (1) - Electricity cannot be smelt (1) = Electricity does not exist (0). Now this is an absolutely brilliant theory, that is, until the first time you place your finger into a power socket and come away with a free perm and a somewhat black and crispy finger.

If Mr. K is to have any respectability he should at least try and present a case that is plausible and logical. Of course, this is a paradox for the humanist for he is forced to deny that which he sees around him every day. Psalm 19 and Romans 1 declare fully that this world is

full of the knowledge of the Lord and that it is only by wilful rebellion that men suppress this truth.

The humanist is, in this respect, much like the Jehovah's Witnesses who have translated a bible to suit their theology rather than taking their theology from the Bible.

We must, therefore, realise that the humanist has a false way of doing his sums. He begins with the answer, which is for him zero, and then tries to manufacture an equation to fit.

## 7. Autosalvation

**H**AVING, AT LEAST in his own mind, disproved God, Mr. K. is now in a position to proclaim his own doctrine of salvation. Man is it. Man can save himself. Man has science and science is his god. Together they are an unbeatable team. This boast sounds very much like the one the builders of the tower of Babel made just before the Lord came down and scattered them. The similarity does not stop there. Just as the boast of the builders of Babel was hollow, so is that made by Mr K.

Mr K., as you will remember, started by questioning D. Kirkland's statement that God's judgement is evident in "droughts, plagues, incurable diseases (and) earthquakes". To this list he himself adds, "tidal waves, horrible viruses, floods, famines, cyclones, volcanic eruptions and errant meteorites". Now, at the end of his article, Mr. K. claims that the "amelioration of the human condition over the past few hundred years is largely due to the dedicated research work of scientists and technologists".

Well, let us examine the facts. In the first instance note the time frame Mr K. uses. It is only over the "last few hundred years" that science has saved man. One is then forced to ask, what about the previous "eons"?

Secondly, we will do well to note the number of Christians whom God has blessed with answers to perplexing questions that have made many of the new discoveries possible<sup>11</sup>

Last, and by no means least, is the absolute falseness of the claims made.

10. No man can find God through reason alone. God must find man and quicken him with His Spirit. My point here is simply to point out the faulty logic that is used by many humanists in their efforts to disprove God.

11. For good information on the role of Christian scientists in history, contact the Creation Science Foundation P.O. Box 6302, Acacia Ridge DC, Qld. 4110.

Yes, science has made a few breakthroughs with the control and eradication of disease.<sup>12</sup> However, let us look at the real facts: Science has not cured the common cold; science still grapples with AIDS and science still struggles to develop anti-venom for some of the world's poisonous creatures.

As far as natural disasters go, science is not even in the hunt. As I sit at my computer and write this article, much of Queensland is in flood; 7 more people died and 6000 flights have been cancelled as the result of the snow storms that are lashing the East states of America; parts of France are 2 to 3 metres under water — and this is in the last few days. A couple of months ago various cyclones reaped untold damage; Bangladesh was devastated by flood; and twelve months ago, nearly to the day, Kobe was flattened by an earthquake — need I go on.<sup>13</sup>

What has science achieved with regard to natural disaster — Zero. Science can measure the size of an earthquake; science can measure the wind velocity in a cyclone; science can measure accurately the amount of rain that caused the flood; science can predict the time that a flood will peak; science can even get close in predicting the eruption of a volcano, but *science is absolutely, one hundred percent, powerless to do anything to stop any of the abovementioned disasters.*

## 8. The Human Condition

**W**ITHOUT BEING REPETITIVE there is not much to say at this point, except, Mr K. you have done it again.

As pointed out above, the "human condition" is sin caused by wilful rebel-

lion. Man suffers from a broken heart — literally. His affections and desires are completely askew because he has sinned against God.

Science cannot solve the human condition, it merely compounds the problem.

Jesus Christ is the God-given solution to the predicament into which man has placed himself, for there is no other name under heaven by which men must be saved.

## 9. Conclusion

**I**N CONCLUSION, it is necessary for us to pin point the real problem from which the humanist suffers. Much of what has been said so far addresses the symptoms, now we must strike at the heart of the disease.

Throughout his letter Mr K. made many claims and many boasts, not the least of which was the place of science in alleviating the human condition. In so doing he displayed an inordinate amount of faith. Yes, faith. He has placed his faith wholly in the abilities of man, and yet he dares to laugh at those who have faith in an infinite God. Why is this? It is because the humanist denies the possibility of *revelation.*

We are blessed in that we have a God who has revealed Himself in living flesh; a God who has revealed the answers to life's perplexing questions, yet the humanist will not accept this — to his detriment.

The denial of revelation sets the humanist on an exercise in futility as he clutches at straw after straw attempting to make sense of one thing or another. Because of this denial of revelation the humanist must try and work out his own

scheme or framework into which he can weave his ideas about life and the universe. However, this framework is faulty and it means that whatever is woven upon it will have gaps and mistakes. Allow me to illustrate. Many years ago, my late grandmother sent us a tapestry that she had completed. This work was framed and hung in a prominent place. It was a lovely piece of work, yet, it was flawed, for during the production my grandmother had missed a stitch. From a distance the tapestry looked fine and even a fairly close inspection did not reveal the mistake easily. Nonetheless, it is there and careful scrutiny will reveal it.

Mr K. has put forward his case. Like the tapestry it may look good at a distance, yet careful scrutiny will show up the flaws.

The humanist foundation is one that will not support the humanist edifice that has been built upon it.

Mr K. has gone out on the proverbial "limb" because he will not accept revelation as a legitimate form. If he had, then he would know, as D. Kirkland does, that God does exist, that He is personal, and that He will avenge Himself on His enemies.

God's revelation informs us that God is a jealous God, (Ex 20:3-5; 34:14; Deut. 4:24) and that He will in no way share His glory with another (Isaiah 42:8; 48:11).

God will not sit idly by and allow the humanist to rob Him of His glory and praise. No! He will open his store house and send forth His holy wrath. He will release storms, quakes and floods and He will let His creation know that He is displeased with their idolatry (See Job 37:9-13; Psalm 18:7-15; 107:25; 135:7; 147:16-18).

12. Although this is even questionable. An American study has shown that deaths from infectious diseases are up 58%. In the 80's infectious disease was the fifth highest killer in America. Today, it is third.

13. Stop press: Mt. Martha in Victoria was hit by an earth tremor registering 2.6 on the richter scale. It was four kilometres south of the township and at an approximate depth of ten kilometres. Now these are very impressive figures — Science has excelled itself! Well not really. Science did not see the earthquake coming and it certainly did nothing to stop it.