

# BASICS • Part 4 – God, The Creator

## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. *The Calculator*

1. Billions of years ago, there was an infinitely tiny and infinitely dense single point of energy – in fact, time itself was contained in this single incredibly miniscule particle
2. It was so dense and so packed with energy that it exploded and began to rush outward at a speed the likes of which are unimaginable!
3. Within just a short period of time, maybe a half of a second, the size of the explosion had reached the distance of several light years across – and the energy was condensing and cooling to allow the formation of tiny particles we call electrons and protons and neutrons.
4. These particles then united to form atoms –then the atoms united with other atoms to form molecules
5. As this huge ball of matter continued to fly apart, the density rapidly fell until space started to appear inside the explosion – and the force behind the explosion was so great the matter began to rip, shredding apart at an unbelievable rate.
6. The temperature dropped dramatically, and it actually began to *freeze* in certain areas.
7. Finally, the force of the explosion was spent and the matter just hung in space, floating around like scum on the top of a stagnant pond.
8. But this matter possessed a unique quality – it liked to pull on other matter, even over long distances.
  - a. so slowly but surely, matter began to gather in small clumps,
  - b. little clouds of gas and tighter balls of heavier elements began to form in various places throughout the massive explosion field
  - c. these grew and grew – condensing into solid bodies
    - 1) the gas clouds grew so hot under their own weight they ignited and became stars
    - 2) the solid spheres became planets and soon were caught in the pull of the larger stars
9. But the most amazing thing happened on *one* of those planets caught in the gravitational field of a medium sized yellow star in one of the millions of galaxies that had formed inside the explosion field called the universe
10. On this planet, the gravitational pull of it's tiny moon, in competition with the gravitational pull of it's Sun, competed with the internal forces of it's own furnace of molten rock to form mountains and valleys.
  - a. hydrogen united with oxygen at a ratio of two to one, and voila – liquid water was formed
  - b. now this substance was utterly unique – every other place in the universe was either too cold or too hot for liquid water

- c. but on this planet, it was to be found in abundance
- d. in fact, clouds formed and rains fell, washing over the face of the planet and eroding the rocks on the mountains and carrying them into the valleys
- e. with the passage of much more time, soil formed in the valleys, dirt
- 11. One day, a shudder shook this planet, it was an earthquake; the mountains split and rocks broke apart
  - a. some of them went tumbling in to the valley
  - b. and as they did, they banged against each other and the dirt
  - c. this accident caused a new substance to be formed – plastic
- 12. But the little piece of plastic just lay there – a result of chance, a fluke of the random forces of nature.
- 13. But no, wait, another earthquake shakes the mountains and more rocks fall, more plastic is made and joins the first little piece
- 14. A storm sweeps through the valley and the plastic is tumbled across the ground and is worn into a flat, rectangular shape
- 15. Then lightening strikes it and punches perfect square holes in it
- 16. A million years later, more earthquakes, wind and lightening had added a circuit board to it and buttons with numbers on them.
- 17. Then another millions years passes and a battery is produced somewhere nearby
- 18. And then, one day, another good earthquake causes the battery and plastic thing to meet.
- 19. Voila – a calculator!

### ***B. Ridiculous!***

- 1. Do you buy it? I hope not!
- 2. But the sad thing is, millions and millions of people who believe in evolution *do* buy it
- 3. You see – this calculator is NOTHING in complexity compared to the human body
- 4. The engineering and design of this [calculator] come no where close to the detail and information in this [human body].
- 5. We laugh at the story I've just told – yet millions buy the bigger farce called evolution – which really is not much different from the scenario I've just laid out.

### ***C. Basics – Today***

- 1. Today we're focusing on God as Creator, and specifically, we're looking at Creation versus Evolution
- 2. The reason we're doing that, in this Basics series we are doing on Sunday mornings, is because the whole Creation/Evolution debate has become a defining issues of our times.
- 3. One of the Reformers said that if we are right in every point of doctrine, but remain silent on that one point of truth the devil is currently attacking, we have denied the Faith
  - a. as salt and light – we must not shun to declare the truth

- b. and specially when it is under attack
- c. and no truth is as besieged today as the Truth of Creation
- 4. Also, we have to understand that our starting point determines where we end up.
  - a. if we begin with an evolutionary worldview,
  - b. our *thinking*, and so our *living* ends up in a much different place than if we begin with God
- 5. Now, I realize there may be some people here this morning who believe in both creation and evolution; this is known as *theistic evolution*.
  - a. this is the idea that God is the ultimate origin of all things,
  - b. but that He *used* evolution to populate the earth with all the life-forms we see today
  - c. theistic evolution is an attempt to have the best of both worlds and resolve the debate on tidy grounds
- 6. So let me say this to that – I once *was* a theistic evolutionist
  - a. in fact, in high school I argued effectively for it
  - b. but then I went to college and majored in geology – it was my intent to become a geologist
  - c. my studies in the earth sciences, combined with many hours in the field, conspired to strip me of any belief in evolution
- 7. Evolution makes for a nice theory when printed up in text books and drawn on chalkboards
- 8. But as thousands of researchers and scientists who've gone into the field to look for evidence of evolution have discovered – IT ISN'T THERE!

## II. BEGINNINGS • GENESIS 1:1

- 1. It's critical for us to understand that the Bible is quite clear on the subject of *Origins*
  - a. and it isn't being merely poetic
  - b. or trying to describe something highly complex to a pre-scientific age of superstition
  - c. no – the language of the opening verses of the Bible is *rich with language* that carefully describes God's creative act in calling the universe into existence
- 2. So let's begin with our starting point – our foundational verse for our study of God as Creator

### **In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.**

- 3. It's not our purpose today to do an elaborate word-study on this verse, but if we did there is enough here to occupy our studied attention for hours
  - a. let me just say this, because it will help us see just what the Lord is revealing in this verse-
  - b. the Hebrew words employed here carry a depth of meaning that amply correlates to our modern understanding of the physical universe
  - c. scientists refer to the universe as the space-matter-time continuum
  - d. it was Einstein who showed that *even time itself* is a *property* of the physical universe

4. What do we find in Genesis 1:1? – We find the origin of space, matter, and time
  - a. in the beginning = time
  - b. God created the heavens = the word here means *space*
  - c. and the earth = the word “earth” refers not to the physical planet so much as the *stuff* the planet is made of, in other words – matter.
5. In Gen. 1:1 we find the origin of space, matter, and time; the basic constituents of the physical universe
6. And from what did it all arise – God created it!
  - a. the Hebrew word used here for create means to bring into existence
  - b. to create out of nothing; or as the theologians say, *ex-nihilo*
  - c. when man creates, we take pre-existing materials and fashion or shape something new
  - d. when God creates – He brings a thing into existence.
7. And here is where we run in to the very first problem in the whole Creation/ Evolution debate
  - a. ultimately, evolution does not answer the question of *Origins*; it doesn’t go back far enough
  - b. evolutionists say life evolves into ever more complex forms
  - c. modern man was once a more ape-like creature, and before that, he was an ape, and before that four legged mammal,
  - d. farther back he was an amphibian, before that a fish, a single-celled bacteria, a loose collection of amino acids, inanimate chemicals, gaseous clouds, heat, energy, a singularity called the seed of the Big Bang
  - e. QUESTION: Even if evolution were true, it isn’t, but even if it were - Where did that singularity come from?
  - f. as we saw last week when we studied the Eternity of God, the existence of the physical universe *demand*s an eternal, and all powerful God, just as Romans 1:20 says!

---

8. I say it proud and confidently – and so should you! ==

**In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.**

### **III. THE PROBLEM OF ORIGINS**

#### **A. Defining Our Terms**

1. When we enter the Creation/Evolution debate, we must first *define our terms*.
2. This is where the discussion usually breaks down because people *mean* different things by the words they use
3. So, we need to back up and define our terms and use them consistently throughout the discussion

#### **B. Science**

1. In your notes there is a definition given out of Encarta; it’s pretty representative of the definition of science you will find anywhere

<p><b>Science</b> (Latin <i>scientia</i>, from <i>scire</i>, “to know”), term used in its</p>
---

broadest meaning to denote systematized knowledge in any field, but applied usually to the organization of objectively verifiable sense experience. The pursuit of knowledge in this context is known as pure science, to distinguish it from applied science, which is the search for practical uses of scientific knowledge<sup>[1]</sup>

2. Science, rightly defined, and you find this as a common thing in all the definitions, is that field of research that is limited to OBSERVATION and EXPERIMENTATION
3. In order for something to be classed as genuine scientific knowledge, it must be
  - a. observable (can measure it)
  - b. experimental (can repeat it)
4. Keep that in mind because it plays into the whole debate on whether or not creation ought to be taught side by side with evolution in science classes

### **C. An Issue of Faith**

1. Since science is limited to *observation* and *experimentation*, the **Issue of Origins** lies *outside* its scope
  - a. there were no white lab-coated scientists present at the “Big Bang”
  - b. no measurements were being gathered on clip-boards, no stop watches were ticking away
  - c. no one gathered samples of primordial ooze in beakers and boiled them atop Bunsen burners
2. No one was present at Creation but God!
3. Therefore, the **Issue of Origins** is a matter of *FAITH* not science!
  - a. when they say evolution is science and creationism is religion, they err
  - b. both are *philosophical* models for how life arose on earth
  - c. but to claim that evolution is *science* while Creationism is *religion* is nothing more than prejudice
  - d. and it does violence to the definition of science
4. An editorial was recently printed in the Star that loudly asserted evolution was science while Creation was religious faith and had no place in the science classroom
  - a. I wrote a really good letter in reply but the Star didn't print it
  - b. take up the challenge and use the classes they say Creation can be taught in and lay out the case for Creationism – let the students decide in light of the evidence instead of the prejudice

### **D. Evidence**

1. While the Issue of Origins is more a matter of *faith* than *science*, as Christians, we've *always* maintained that our faith is based on *solid evidence*!
2. When considered fairly, using the scientific method as an investigative tool, the evidence clearly supports the *Creation* rather than the *Evolutionary* Theory of Origins
3. And that's what we're going to concern ourselves with for the rest of our time

- this morning
4. But before we do, let me say this: It's important that as we engage supporters of evolution, we realize *they believe evolution with a kind of religious zeal*.
    - a. they think they have the weight of *science* on their side
    - b. but really, their belief in evolution is a *faith*-issue
  5. That is why the Chinese government recently issued a proclamation *banning* the teaching of evolution from their school system: The Communist regime realized that the *EVIDENCE* does **NOT** support evolution, therefore, it is a faith more on par with *religion* than *science*.

## IV. EVOLUTION

### A. Change – We Need To Define Some Terms

1. Evolution means *change*. As applied to **Origins**, it means the arising of living cells from inanimate matter, and their development over long periods of time in increasingly more complex life-forms. *Molecules to Man*
2. *Classic* evolution sees the emergence of whole new species through the process of *mutation*
3. *Microevolution* defines minor variations in the genetic code of a *single species* that may effect such things as size, color, hair length, etc. but which does not remove later generations from the species. Example: dogs, cats, horses, humans
4. *Macroevolution* defines trans-species change, in which one species gives rise to another.
5. Evolutionists use examples of *microevolution* as evidence of *macroevolution*
  - a. Example: The Peppered Moth
  - b. in the 1850's, there was a large population of peppered moths in the forests around industrial cities
    - 1) 98% of the moths were white
    - 2) 2% were black
  - c. the white ones were more numerous because they were *hidden* against the white birch bark of the trees they typically were found on, while the black ones stood out and so were eaten by birds
  - d. as the industrial revolution kicked in and pollution altered the environment, the white bark of the birch trees darkened.
  - e. this change causes the white moth population to decline as more birds began to eat them and the darker moths were allowed a respite from the fowl onslaught
  - f. evolutionists used this as an example of adaptation and natural selection and said that this proved evolution.
  - g. does this prove the evolution of one species into another? What kind of evolution is this? *Microevolution!*
  - h. the species itself never changed! Peppered moths are still peppered moths!
  - i. time also proved the evolutionists *wrong*: as pollution controls were introduced the birch trees returned to their original white color and once again the white moth population grew!

- j. problem is – you don't find this in the text books which use it as an example of evolution
- 6. Evolutionists point to examples of microevolution like this and say, "See, life changes! This proves that one species eventually evolves into a completely different species."
- 7. The problem is, there isn't one shred of evidence of this to be found!  
ANYWHERE!

### **B. The Problem With Mutations**

- 1. Evolutionists say that evolution occurs through changes to the genetic code called *mutations*
- 2. These mutations give the offspring some feature that is significantly different from the parent, and which it is able to pass on to *its* offspring
  - a. in order for *evolution* to occur, these mutations must be *beneficial* -
  - b. they must give the plant or animal some *advantage* that allows it to compete in its environment more effectively
  - c. Charles Darwin called this *Natural Selection* – those organisms best adapted to their environment will *survive*, while those less well adapted will die off because they can't compete
  - d. this idea is also known as "survival of the fittest"
- 3. The problem with mutations is that as an *observable* thing, what we actually see in nature and in the laboratory, a *beneficial* mutation has never been seen!
- 4. Researchers have worked with hundreds of thousands of generations of rapid-spawning organisms, (single-celled organisms, fruit-flies)
  - a. they've bombarded them with radiation and chemicals -
  - b. they have *yet* to observe a single *beneficial* mutation
- 5. On the contrary, mutations that do occur create changes that *debilitate* the creature and lead to it's death
- 6. As biologists perform research on DNA, they've discovered a marvelous "error-checking" and correcting feature that works AGAINST mutations
- 7. Contrary to mutations giving rise to *other* species, the genetic code of DNA works to *limit* change and fix the genetic material in its species-boundaries

### **C. Kinds**

- 1. Man has cataloged life according to the taxonomic labels he has given  
Kingdom – Phylum – Class – Order – Family – Genus – Species
- 2. This system is drawn from an evolutionary framework which believes most species today have risen from *common ancestors*, and tries to lump larger groups of plants and animals together
- 3. God's order of life is different – it has one category
- 4. In Genesis 1 we read . . .
- 11 **Then God said, "Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb *that yields seed*, and the fruit tree *that yields fruit according to its kind*, whose seed *is* in itself, on the earth"; and it was so.**
- 12 **And the earth brought forth grass, the herb *that yields seed according to its kind*, and the tree *that yields fruit, whose seed is in itself according to its kind*.**

Jump on down to v. 20

20 Then God said, "Let the waters abound with an abundance of living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth across the face of the firmament of the heavens."

21 So God created great sea creatures and every living thing that moves, with which the waters abounded, according to their kind, and every winged bird according to its kind.

Now v. 24

24 Then God said, "Let the earth bring forth the living creature according to its kind: cattle and creeping thing and beast of the earth, *each* according to its kind"; and it was so.

25 And God made the beast of the earth according to its kind, cattle according to its kind, and everything that creeps on the earth according to its kind.

5. God created life, both plant and animal, according to *kinds* and their reproduction is fixed and limited within this class
6. No where do we see that one *kind* gives rise to another *kind*
7. On the contrary, each *kind* is to stay fixed **ACCORDING** to its *kind*
8. So, what do we find when we go out into the field and take a look at the evidence of past life on earth we call the fossil record? Let's see . . .

### III. THE FOSSIL RECORD

#### A. Darwin's Hope

1. When Darwin proposed his theory of evolution, he said that over long periods of time, via small mutations, one species eventually gave rise to an entirely different species
2. This is known as *Classic Darwinism* – slow change over long times periods
3. Darwin knew that if his theory were true, the fossil record would contain an abundance of evidence for all the minor changes that had occurred in different plants and animals
4. These transitional forms would PROVE Darwin's theory of slow gradual change over long periods of time
5. Because paleontology (study of fossils) was an infant science in Darwin's day and the geologic column was not yet in place, Darwin said he fully expected the fossil record to one day have the *continuous record* of the evolution of life from single celled organisms all the way to modern species

#### B. Darwin Disappointed

1. Using the scientific method, the first tenet being OBJECTIVITY, what *test* could we devise, based on Darwin's hope about the fossil record that would prove him **WRONG**?
  - a. *gaps* in the fossil record between species –
  - b. an *absence* of fossil material showing the smooth ascent of one species from another.
2. Guess what! As paleontologists have pursued the task of discovering the transitional forms, the gaps have only gotten *wider*!

3. In fact, it is now the settled conclusion of most paleontologists that the transitional forms are not only undiscovered, *they never existed!*
  - a. one of the most identifiable transitions would be the emergence of marine life onto the land
  - b. this amphibian to reptile emergence ought to possess abundant fossil evidence
  - c. the following quote, taken from evolutionist Lewis Carroll is enlightening . . .

“Unfortunately not a single specimen of an appropriate reptilian ancestor is known prior to the appearance of true reptiles. The absence of such ancestral forms leaves many problems of the amphibian-reptilian transition unanswered.”<sup>[2]</sup>

4. “But what about those nifty diagrams you see in the textbooks and museums that show the lineal ascent of life from primitive forms to more complex ones - like the horse, or man?”
5. They’re totally fabricated – made up!
6. “What about the fossil evidence of animals and plants that are unlike anything found on earth today? Doesn’t this prove that life *used* to be different?”
7. Yes, but it doesn’t prove evolution.
8. It is far better accounted for by the Bible’s record of drastically different earth conditions before and after the Flood
  - a. Creation scientists have amply shown how conditions prior to the flood would support numerous plant and animal forms that presents conditions *cannot* sustain
  - b. indeed, the fossil record gives evidence of a “great dying,” exactly as the Creation/Flood model proposes
9. “Why don’t we find evidence of modern plants and animals mixed with these extinct forms?”
10. The answer to that is - We do!
  - a. there are fossil beds around the world that show a *mixing* of fossil material from widely diverse “ages”
  - b. Creationists expect this
  - c. but oh my, you should hear the wild theories by the evolutionists as they try to explain the mixing of fossils that are supposed to be separated by hundreds of millions of years.

### **C. Missing Links**

1. One need not look to Creationists to point out the gaps in the fossil record.
2. The literature is filled with evolutionists decrying the lack of transitional forms
3. Some interesting quotes are given in the notes for you to read later . . .

“... the Cambrian strata of rocks, vintage about 600 million years [evolutionists are now dating the beginning of the Cambrian at about 530 million years], are the oldest in which we find most of the major invertebrate groups. 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>[3]</sup>

“There is no need to apologize any longer for the poverty of the fossil record. In some ways it has become almost unmanageably rich, and discovery is out-pacing integration.” p. 1

“The fossil record nevertheless continues to be composed mainly of gaps.” p. 3

“Granted an evolutionary origin of the main groups of animals, and not an act of special creation, the absence of any record whatsoever of a single member of any of the phyla in the Pre-Cambrian rocks remains as inexplicable on orthodox grounds as it was to Darwin.” p. 5 <sup>[4]</sup>

“Instead of finding the gradual unfolding of life, what geologists of Darwin’s time, and geologists of the present day actually find is a highly uneven or jerky record; that is, species appear in the sequence very suddenly, show little or no change during their existence in the record, then abruptly go out of the record. And it is not always clear, in fact it’s rarely clear, that the descendants were actually better adapted than their predecessors. In other words, biological improvement is hard to find.” p. 23

“Thus, some pterosaurs were larger than all flying birds and even many small airplanes. They achieved this size and were still able to fly because their design was nearly optimal.” p. 24

“Thus, the trilobites 450 million years ago used an optimal design which would require a well trained and imaginative optical engineer to develop today.” p. 24

“The record of evolution is still surprisingly jerky and, ironically, we have even fewer examples of evolutionary transition than we had in Darwin’s time. By this I mean that some of the classic cases of darwinian change in the fossil record, such as the evolution of the horse in North America, have had to be discarded or modified as a result of more detailed information—what appeared to be a nice simple progression when relatively few data were available now appears to be much more complex and much less gradualistic.” p. 25 <sup>[5]</sup>

#### **D. Lunacy**

1. The fossil record is so absent of transitional forms that it has created a dramatic change in evolutionary theory
2. There are few scientists and evolutionary biologists who hold to *Classic Darwinism* anymore, though it continues to get play in the schools.
3. Evolutionary theory has moved to hold on to the basic tenet of Darwinism (the emergence of more complex forms of life from simpler forms) while seeking to incorporate the *evidence* of the fossil record
4. Since transitional forms are lacking, and since scientists now realize that many extinct forms of life were highly complex, superceding even many forms of life

today, they have proposed that life evolved in explosive periods of development over short periods of time.

5. This new theory is called “Punctuated Equilibrium”
  - a. equilibrium is the standard state – life goes on unchanged for millions of years
  - b. but then every so often, this equilibrium is “punctured” by dramatic changes that give rise to whole new species.
6. Evolutionists came up with this theory because it’s what the fossil record reveals
7. But if the mechanism for change is still blind but beneficial mutation –
8. Then instead of a small number of *minor* beneficial mutations over a *long period of time* (which mutations have never been observed in actual fact) then what Punctuated Equilibrium requires is a *whole lot of beneficial mutations to arise simultaneously*.
9. How reasonable is that?
10. Consider the eye!
  - a. in his book, *Origin of the Species*, Charles Darwin documents in a chapter titled, “Difficulties With The Theory” his concern with accounting for something as complex as the eye
  - b. he wrote, “When I consider the eye, I shudder.”
  - c. he realized that evolution, under any mechanism or model could never account for such a complex organ.

## V. CONCLUSION

### A. Yes – Consider The Eye

1. Yes, consider the eye – it is a complex organ that no amount of time and chance could ever produce {elaborate}
2. It was fashioned by God so we could see
3. So we could see all of this and then using that marvelous computer called the brain, reason to Him!
4. Do we see? Do we understand?

### B. Romans 1:18-22

- 18 For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who suppress the truth in unrighteousness,**
1. the word “suppress” means to try to hold something down that will not be held down
  2. Like a cat under a blanket – one way or another, it’s coming out of there, and heaven help the fool whose trying to tie it down!
- 19 because what may be known of God is manifest in them, for God has shown *it* to them.**
3. How?
- 20 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,**

4. The physical universe loudly declares the existence of God
  5. So what happens when rebel man shuts his eyes and closes off his mind to the obvious existence of God?
- 21 because, although they knew God, they did not glorify Him as God, nor were thankful, but became futile in their thoughts, and their foolish hearts were darkened.**
6. Rejecting God, rebel man comes up with his own ideas about the universe and about life
  7. But they are a fiction, and they prove his foolishness
- 22 Professing to be wise, they became fools,**
8. And friends, that is where we are at today.
  9. Today, because of genetic research and the advances in the information sciences, we have conclusive proof macroevolution is a fiction!

### **C. The Ending Point**

1. I said at the outset that our starting point determines where we end up
2. If evolution is true, then we are all just grown up germs
3. There is no overarching purpose or meaning in life
4. It's eat, drink, and be merry, because this is all there is and then you return to the dust
5. So really, there is no right and wrong, only what feels good and what works for me
6. If you're in my way, I can deal with you as I please – might makes right.
7. How is it that political officials and public school administrators can wring their hands over the violence and vandalism on campuses and tell kids they ought not do such things?
8. They are mandating that these same kids attend science classes where they are told they are nothing more than a mistake, a fluke of random chemicals & cosmic forces
9. What supreme hypocrisy!
10. Man is not a fluke, a mistake.
  - a. human beings are not merely the most highly evolved germs
  - b. they are unique creatures created in the image of God to enjoy an eternal love relationship with Him
11. Listen – God created the universe as a theater hall
  - a. then he created the earth as the stage
  - b. he brought forth the land and the seas, the plants and the animals, as scenery and props
  - c. and history is the great drama of His love for the principle actors – the human race
12. You know this! – You feel it in your very bones.
  - a. you sense the call of destiny – of something great
  - b. there is the awareness that there is a larger purpose to life, a meaning that beckons you

13. That my friend is the Call of God on you soul
14. Be done with the fiction of evolution – And go to The One who Created you.

---

[1] "Science," *Microsoft® Encarta® Encyclopedia 2000*. © 1993-1999 Microsoft Corporation. All rights reserved.

[2] Carroll, Lewis L., "Problems of the Origin of Reptiles," *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, vol. 44 (1969). p. 393

[3] Dawkins, Richard, *The Blind Watchmaker* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1987). p. 229

[4] George, T. Neville, "Fossils in Evolutionary Perspective," *Science Progress*, vol. 48 (January 1960). George was Professor of Geology at the University of Glasgow.

[5] Raup, David M., "Conflicts Between Darwin and Paleontology," *Bulletin, Field Museum of Natural History*, vol. 50 (January 1979), pp. 22-29. Raup is Curator of Geology at the Field Museum.