

# Macro and Micro Evolution and Biblical Creation

## (Or Evolution versus Creation)

**Pre-Amble: I do not believe in the term micro-evolution.** Although this has been forced down the throat of biologists, I intend to show later that the examples usually used to explain “micro-evolution” are best described as Variation. Involving only either horizontal changes or downward vertical changes, they are further confirmation of Creation. Evolution connotes the idea of progress or upward vertical (improved) changes. **A Dictionary definition: “the scientific idea of the development of the various types of plants, animals, etc., from fewer and simpler forms, 2. gradual change and development**

The most comprehensive statement on evolution as a process is the classic definition of Sir Julian Huxley, as follows:

**Evolution in the extended sense can be defined as a directional and essentially irreversible process occurring in time, which in its course gives rise to an increase of variety and an increasingly high level of organization in its products. Our present knowledge indeed forces us to the view that the whole of reality is evolution – a single process of self-transformation<sup>1</sup>**

I will address mainly the subject of evolution versus creation, paying attention to the issues highlighted in GF’s letter, trusting that all questions required of me will be answered by the end. The time limit of 45 minutes means economy and packaging of ideas is indispensable.

---

<sup>1</sup> Julian Huxley, “Evolution and Genetics,” in What is Man? ed. J.R. Newman (New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1955), p. 278

## 1. Introduction

- ❑ Evolution or Creation. The Only two alternatives to origin of Information, Order and Life in the Universe. The answer is of utmost importance. It's a Winner-takes-it-all situation.

Because both concepts deal with the unobservable and scientifically unrepeatable/unreproducible issue of Origins, we cannot PROVE which one is correct. But we can state the basic assumptions in both MODELS, and see which one best fit the realities of our world. Three lines of evidence can be generally used to evaluate both models:

(1) the factual data supplied by the observed facts of science and the observed and reliably recorded facts of human history. Most of my presentation will be from this perspective, and I hope to clearly demonstrate that the Creation Model is far superior and that there is absolute no substance to the theory of evolution.

(2) Looking at Society, which of the models generate good or evil results when conscientiously put into practice. In other words, which of them will best promote peace, harmony and continuity of present structure? Without any question, it is clear that the inhabitants of the earth seem designed to live and prosper under the guidelines spelled out in the creation model and seem to destroy both themselves and others when operating from an evolutionary basis. I might touch this line of evidence from time to time in this presentation.

(3) The existence of God can not be logically proved or disproved. However if He exists (as we do believe in this meeting), then He observed the origins. Furthermore, he has given the facts in the Holy Bible. The fact is do we believe the Scriptures as completely accurate and inerrant? I assume most if not all of us are familiar with what Scriptures say on the issue of Origins, and will not appeal to this line of evidence in this presentation. However, I will like to emphasize clearly that this is the heart of the matter – do we want to believe in a God Who designed all things (and consequently to Whom all stand accountable) or not? In the long run, it is a matter of religious conviction whether we choose to believe in Evolution or Creation. We can support this statement by numerous quotes from hard-core evolutionists themselves. We cite two quick examples. First Prof D.M.S. Watson wrote in an article to Nature:

“The theory of evolution itself [is] a theory universally accepted not because it can be proved by logically coherent evidence to be true but because the only alternative, special creation, is clearly incredible<sup>2</sup>

Also Harvard's Nobel Laureate in Biology, Dr George Wald declared:

“One has only to contemplate the magnitude of this task to concede that the spontaneous generation of a living organism is impossible. Yet here we are – as a result, I believe of spontaneous generation”<sup>3</sup>

He later explained why he has chosen to believe what he knew to be impossible:

“The only alternative to some form of spontaneous generation is a belief in supernatural creation”<sup>4</sup>

Dr Wald considered this a greater impossibility! Evolution or Creation? Whatever choice we make is invariably dependent on Faith. Is there God or not?

The Doctrine of Special Creation is foundational to other key doctrines in Christianity, such as:

- ❑ Doctrine of Original Sin
- ❑ Doctrine of Redemption through the death of Christ
- ❑ Final restoration of all things

**Ultimately, since all the rest of Scriptures keep referring to Genesis 1 and 2, if this portion of Scripture is unreliable, the whole of Scriptures will eventually have to go** – or at best relegated to some other status rather than the Word of God. Sadly, millions have gone through this route into apostasy. And perhaps billions others are right now on that path!

---

<sup>2</sup> D.M.S. Watson, “Adaptation,” Nature, vol 124 (1929), p. 233. Prof Watson was a prominent British zoologist.

<sup>3</sup> George Wald, in Scientific American, August, 1954

<sup>4</sup> and “Innovation in Biology,” Scientific American, vol 199 (September 1958), p. 100

## 2. The Models

Evolution Model	Creation Model
<i>Continuing</i> Naturalistic Origin of Basic Systems Net Present <i>Increase</i> in Organized Complexity of Basic Systems	<i>Completed</i> Supernatural Origin of Basic Systems Net Present <i>Decrease</i> in Organized Complexity of Basic Systems

The Evolution Model clearly stresses that natural processes can bring things into existence and organize them into more complex systems (innovation and integration. A progress – evolution – into something better) while the Creation Model stresses that complex systems came into existence in the past and are being maintained as such in the present (conservation ) except that if any “vertical” changes do take place, they necessarily must be in a “downward” rather than in an “upward” direction (disintegration).

### The Models are all-encompassing

The issues under discussion include everything in the universe. For example the predictions of both models include:

New, more complex elements should be evolving	No new elements.
New, more complex Stars	No new more complex stars
New kinds of life – plants and animals (+spirit guides?)	No new kinds
New more complex human languages	No new more complex languages
The “egg came before the chicken”	“The hen came before the egg”
(Implication of this last example in sustenance of evolutionary life, dating, geology, etc!)	
etc	

### The models are mutually exclusive

The idea that God used evolution is complete non-sense both in the evolutionist camp and the creationist camp. The key word in evolution is naturalistic and chance. No design, no designer. Creation is the exact opposite. {Sad to point out, many who confess creation by mouth have unconsciously embraced the idea that there is no purpose for their lives; and that their destinies are entirely in their own hands.}

A quote from Douglas Futuyma, a leading evolutionary biologist affirms this mutual exclusivity:

“Creation and evolution, between them, exhaust the possible explanations for the origin of living things. Organisms either appeared on the earth fully developed or they did not. If they did not, they must have developed from pre-existing species by some process of modification. If they did appear in a fully developed state, they must indeed have been created by some omnipotent intelligence<sup>5</sup>.

Various attempts to compromise on Creation such as Theistic Evolution, Progressive Creation, Day-Age Theory, Gap Theory etc can therefore not stand. The major character behind linking Creation and Evolution was **Teilhard de Chardin** linked with such falsified missing-links as the Piltdown Man, (debunked in 1951 after fooling experts for 40 years), Pekin Man (compressed 22 feet thick ash reported as ‘traces of ash’!), etc. This Jesuit priest is the ideological high priest of the United Nations. Previously declared a heretic by the Roman Catholic church, he was later re-instated and his ideas is the backbone of the Vatican upholding their own form of theistic evolution, claiming that God put the human soul in one of the apes in that had evolved down the line etc.

<sup>5</sup> Douglas J. Futuyma, Science on Trial (New York: Pantheon Books, 1983), p. 197

### 3. Evolution is anti-Science

#### □ No agreed Mechanism

Despite the attempt to make Evolution look 'scientific', science is the last thing that supports evolution. {In the special edition of the Skeptic Inquirer, devoted to Evolution and Religion, no single scientific support could be deduced for evolution. The summary of the evidences for evolution usually goes like this "If evolution has not been scientifically proved beyond every reasonable doubt, the Pope would never have supported it!"}

The original concept of evolution across species occurring in imperceptibly small changes over aeons is actually now largely derided among evolutionists and labeled Darwinism. After decades of search for intermediate forms had yielded zero find, Darwinism has been all but completely abandoned.

The latest idea is Stasis, i.e. stability, "standing still". Paleontologist Steven M. Stanley of Johns Hopkins University explains this concept:

"The [fossil] record now reveals that species typically survive for a hundred thousand generations, or even a million or more, without evolving much. We seem forced to conclude that most evolution takes place rapidly, when species come into being by the evolutionary divergence of small populations from parent species. After their origins, most species undergo little evolution before becoming extinct.<sup>6</sup>

Similarly, Harvard University paleontologist and one of the world's foremost evolutionists today, Stephen Gould has this to say:

Thus, our model of "punctuated equilibria" holds that evolution is concentrated in events of speciation and that successful speciation is an infrequent event punctuating the stasis of large populations that do not alter in fundamental ways during the millions of years that they endure<sup>7</sup>

In short, evolution which means 'change' is characterized mainly by stasis, which means "no change". The "punctuations" that produce new species occur so rapidly and so rarely that they can never be observed. Since we can never observe evolution in action, it is presumed to happen very rapidly when we are not looking. This explains why no mechanism could be even theoretically proposed to evolution, though of course, evolution has to be true.... else we are faced with God!

#### □ Evolution violates law of Cause and Effect

One of the very fundamental law of science is the principle of cause and effect: Every effect must have a cause. Also, no effect can be greater, in size or in kind, than its cause. No exceptions to the law of caus and effect have ever been observed. The existence of the universe (comprising basically of Space-Time and Energy-Mass) then most logically points to a First Cause, Which must be eternal to have caused Time, and Which must be infinite to have caused Space, and omnipotent to have caused Energy. Modern evolutionary cosmologists have however tried to develop a mathematical system that can do away with the idea of a cause for the universe. Causal reasoning, which is applicable everywhere in the real world of human experience is postulated as not working here:

"Thus we reach a general conclusion: there is no *philosophy of big bang cosmology* that makes it unreasonable to reject the fundamental thesis of *big bang cosmology*; that the universe began to exist without a cause.<sup>8</sup>

#### □ Evolution violates the Laws of Thermodynamics

The First Law of Thermodynamics is the important mass-energy conservation principle. It states that matter and energy cannot be created or destroyed. Energy can be converted from one kind to another, but the change does not result in any gain or loss of energy. Energy and mass have been recognized as different form of the same quantity and can be converted into one another according to the famous equation of Einstein,  $E = mc^2$

This clearly is in agreement with the Creation Model which asserts that all creation is completed. Evolution theory on the other hand with its assertion that creation is continuing has problems with this most tested law. In its assertion that all matter and energy was brought out of nothing, without any input from any other source outside the Universe, Evolution is on a direct collision with the First Law. However, what makes evolution theory completely unscientific is the Second Law of Thermodynamics.

The Second law: is recognized as the most important, most tested law in all of Science. It touches every aspect of Science.

---

<sup>6</sup> Steven M. Stanley, *The New Evolutionary Time-table: Fossils, Genes and the Origin of Species* (Basic Books, Inc., 1981), preface.

<sup>7</sup> Stephen Jay Gould, "Is a New and General Theory of Evolution Emerging?" *Paleobiology*, vol 6, no 1 (1980), p. 125

<sup>8</sup> Quentin Smith, "Did the Big Bang Have a Cause?" *British Journal of Philosophy of Science*, vol. 45 (1994), p. 666.

Italics are his.

In one form, (classical thermodynamics), the second law states that “for every naturally occurring transformation of energy is accompanied, somewhere, by a loss in the *availability* of energy for the future performance of work”. In short, though total energy is conserved according to the 1<sup>st</sup> law, the total available energy is always decreasing with time. Since everything in the physical universe is energy in some form, and since in every process some energy becomes unavailable, it is obvious that ultimately all energy in the universe will be unavailable energy, if present processes go on long enough. When that happens, presumably all the various forms of energy in the universe will have been gradually converted through a multiplicity of processes into uniformly dispersed heat energy. Everything will be at the same low temperature. there will be no “differential” of energy levels, and, therefore, no “gradient” of energy to induce its flow. No more work can then be done, and the universe will reach what classical physicists used to call its ultimate “heat death”.

The multitude of processes going on in the universe shows it is still very active. This shows that the universe had a beginning. It has not always existed.

A second form of stating the 2<sup>nd</sup> Law is via the concept of entropy (Statistical thermodynamics). It states that in all real processes there is an increase of entropy, the degree of disorderliness. Isaac Asimov, popular evolutionist explains it in this way:

“Another way of stating the Second Law then is: “the universe is constantly getting more disorderly,” Viewed that way, we can see the Second Law all about us. We have to work hard to straighten a room, but left to itself, it becomes a mess again very quickly and very easily. Even if we never enter it, it becomes dusty and musty. How difficult to maintain houses, and machinery, and our own bodies in perfect working order; how easy to let them deteriorate. In fact, all we have to do is nothing, and everything deteriorates, collapses, breaks down, wears out, all by itself – and that is what the Second Law is all about.<sup>9</sup>

The big question is, How does a real biological process, which goes from order to disorder, result in evolution, which goes from disorder to order? How can a house build itself from the scratch without a design and directed energy? How can a living cell build itself up? etc.

A third, and still more fascinating form of the Second Law comes from the field of information theory (Communicational Thermodynamics). In information theory, entropy is considered to be a measure of the degree to which information is lost or becomes garbled in the transmission process. It measures the “noise” or “static” that tends to inhibit the perfect transmission of a message. the process of communication is surprisingly analogous to a standard energy-conversion process. Just as some energy is lost in the conversion process, so always some information is lost in the communication process. No one appropriates the teacher’s complete lecture, and the recording never reproduces the orchestral rendition with perfect fidelity.

Hence, there are three basic vehicles of physical reality associated with the entropy concept. In the structure of all systems, **entropy is a measure of disorder. In the maintenance of all processes, entropy is a measure of wasted energy. In the transmission of all information, entropy is a measure of useless noise. Each of these three concepts is basically equivalent to the other two, even though it expresses a distinct concept. The Second Law states that always, entropy tends to increase. Everywhere in the physical universe there is an inexorable downhill trend toward ultimate complete randomness, utter meaningless, and absolute stillness. This is a direct frontal attack on the theory of evolution. The evolutionary delusion becomes absolute nonsense in the context of the all-comprehensive Second Law.**

---

<sup>9</sup> Asimov. “In the Game of Energy and Thermodynamics”, p. 6

### **{Criteria for a Growth Process}**

Block can grow to a building. Seed can grow into a tree and an embryo grows up into an adult animal. These all violate the entropy rule. The following are the requirements

1. An open system. This is a redundant condition, all systems in the real world are open. Can be influenced externally.
2. Available Energy. Not just brute energy though.
3. A Coded Plan. That is a design, (eg DNA, architect plan, etc)
4. An Energy-Conversion Mechanism. e.g not just shining extensive energy on the blocks, but getting workmen using pulleys etc, or existence of means of converting sunlight energy (e.g. chlorophyll for photosynthesis), etc.

Obviously all these can only fit in with the idea of a Creator working out His own plans.

#### 4. Micro and Macro Evolution revisited

“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. Gen 1:11

The very existence of a science of taxonomy is a *prediction* of creationism and a *problem* to evolutionism.

**The classification system which we still use today (variety, species, genus, family, order, class, phylum, kingdom) was long ago developed primarily by the great biologist Carolus**

**Linnaeus**. This system is found by modern biologists to apply effectively to all the extinct plants and animals in the fossil world (the categories did not evolve!) as well as those in the present world. It is very significant, therefore, that Linnaeus was a creationist, and was attempting to show that the Creator had organized all organisms into these distinct categories for His own purposes, with the very existence of the gaps—rather than being an evolutionary “continuum” of organisms—serving clearly as a testimony to His creative purpose for each type of creature.

This evidence, of course, is one of numerous reasons why many modern biologists are also returning to belief in creation.

One of these, in fact, was selected to write the foreword to the special Centennial Edition of Darwin’s *Origin of Species*. In this connection, he said:

Taking the taxonomic system as a whole, it appears as an orderly arrangement of clear-cut entities, which are clear-cut because they are separated by gaps. . . . The general tendency to eliminate, by means of unverifiable speculations, the limits of the categories nature presents to us, is the inheritance of biology from the *Origin of Species*. To establish the continuity required by theory, historical arguments are invoked, even though historical evidence is lacking. Thus are engendered those fragile towers of hypotheses based on hypotheses, where fact and fiction intermingle in an inextricable confusion.<sup>10</sup>

The author of this penetrating and perceptive analysis, Dr. W. R. Thompson, was for many years director of the Commonwealth Institute for Biological Control in Ottawa, Canada.

Different varieties of plants and animals, at the same level of complexity, can easily be developed, either naturally or artificially, but that’s all. **Sometimes, evolutionists call this phenomenon “micro-evolution,” giving the impression that with enough time, it could become “macro-evolution,” but this is either wishful thinking or intentional deception.** Not the slightest evidence exists that this has ever happened or ever could happen. Therefore, the process should be called, simply, “horizontal variation,” or “recombination,” at the same level of complexity (e.g., change in color), but should not be termed evolution.

It therefore seems clear that, contrary to Darwin’s conception, most of the genetic variation in populations arises not from new mutations at each generation but from the reshuffling of previously accumulated mutations by recombination. Although mutation is the ultimate source of all genetic variation, it is a relatively rare event, providing a mere trickle of new alleles into the much larger reservoir of stored genetic variation. Indeed recombination alone is sufficient to enable a population to expose its hidden variation for many generations without the need for new genetic input by mutation.<sup>11</sup>

Although the author of the above quotation is one of the world’s leading geneticists and a strong anti-creationist, his statement that the phenomenon of variation (or micro-evolution, as some would call it) is normally just recombination of existing genetic attributes is unintentionally confirming an implication of the creation model. A great deal of variation can take place in a species merely by reshuffling genes. *Mutations* are necessary for real evolution, but these are very rare. **Are seedless oranges an upward vertical change? Definitely not!**

The creation model stresses conservation of the completed creation, and this implies that the Creator would initially build into each created genome a wide range of variability, enabling the specific creature to adapt to a significantly large range of environments without becoming extinct. That is, the phenomenon of “adaptation,” often cited as evidence of evolution, is in reality evidence of conservation, rather than evolution.

“Darwin, it has now become commonplace to acknowledge, never really addressed the “origin of species” in his book of that title.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> W.R. Thompson, “Introduction” to *Origin of Species*, by Charles Darwin (New York: Everyman’s Library, Dutton, 1956).

<sup>11</sup> Francisco Ayala, “The mechanism of Evolution,” *Scientific American*, vol 239 (September 1978), p. 63. Ayala is a leading modern neo-Darwinian biologist.

<sup>12</sup> Niles Eldredge, “Progress in Evolution?” *New Scientist*, vol. 110 (June 5, 1986), p. 55

□ Examples of variation oft-cited as micro-evolution

Evolutionists are always careful to say that only the “vast majority” of mutations are harmful, leaving open the possibility that some just might be beneficial. The possibilities are exceedingly limited, however.

From the standpoint of population genetics, positive Darwinian selection represents a process whereby advantageous mutants spread through the species. Considering their great importance in evolution, it is perhaps surprising that well-established cases are so scarce; for example, industrial melanisms in moths and increases of DDT resistance in insects are constantly being cited.<sup>13</sup>

As a matter of fact, however, neither of the cases cited is a true mutation. Industrial melanism in moths is simply a recombination of genetic factors already present, and the same is true of the insects.

Insect resistance to a pesticide was first reported in 1947 for the housefly (*Musca domestica*) with respect to DDT. Since then the resistance to pesticides has been reported in at least 225 species of insects and other arthropods. The genetic variants required for resistance to the most diverse kinds of pesticides were apparently present in every one of the populations exposed to these man-made compounds.<sup>14</sup>

The mention of industrial melanism in moths refers to the famous peppered moth in England, often considered to be the classic example of “evolution in action” today. The story is found in practically every biology textbook, about how the light-colored moth evolved into a dark-colored moth with the advancing industrial revolution and the soot-darkening landscape. But most books do not give the updated version.

The peppered moth, *Biston betularia*, is a classic example of natural selection in action. As the dark satanic mills blackened the English landscape, the dominant form of the peppered moth changed from light to dark, a case of industrial melanism. Since the Clean Air Acts came into force, industrial pollution has declined. A new study by Sir Cyril Clarke and his associates shows that the light form of the peppered moth has become much more common.<sup>15</sup>

This change, just like that of the insects responding to the pesticide, was not evolution at all, but conservation! The species has an inbuilt genetic potential to vary in color, with both light and dark moths always present in the population, enabling the population as a whole to shift its dominant coloration in response to environmental changes.

No mutations were involved at all, but simply recombinations of genetic inheritances at most, as involved regularly in all species. Mutational changes would take far longer to become fixed in a population than this shifting back and forth of genes already present.

The first black specimen of *Biston betularia* was caught in Manchester in 1848. By 1895, 98 per cent of the moths in the area were dark, an extremely rapid change given that the peppered moth breeds just once a year<sup>16</sup>

Because of all these problems, more and more evolutionists are realizing that ordinary mutations, as actually observed in nature, are *not at all adequate* to provide the basis for evolution. Neither will it do to suppose that very small, non-observable mutations, gradually accumulating over long periods of time, could do the job.

Bacteria, the study of which has formed a great part of the foundation of genetics and molecular biology, are the organisms which, because of their huge numbers, produce the most mutants . . . bacteria, despite their great production of intra-specific varieties, exhibit a great fidelity to their species. The bacillus *Echerichia coli*, whose mutants have been studied very carefully, is the best example. The

---

<sup>13</sup> Motoo Kimura, “Population Genetics and Molecular Evolution,” Johns Hopkins Medical Journal, vol 138 (June 1976), p.260

<sup>14</sup> Ayala, “The Mechanisms of Evolution,” p. 63.

<sup>15</sup> Jeremy Cherfas, “Clean Air Revives the Pepered Moth,” New Scientist, vol. 109 (January 2, 1986), p.17., quoting Biological Journal of the Linnaean Society, Vol 26, p. 189.

<sup>16</sup> ibid

reader will agree that it is surprising, to say the least, to want to prove evolution and to discover its mechanisms and then to choose as a material for this study a being which practically stabilized a billion years ago.<sup>17</sup>

The same is true of the organism whose mutants have probably been studied more than any other.

The fruit-fly (*Drosophila melanogaster*), the favorite pet insect of the geneticists, whose geographical, biotopical, urban, and rural genotypes are now known inside out, seems not to have changed since the remotest times<sup>18</sup>

The author of the above evaluations, Pierre Grassé, is not a creationist and, in fact, as France's leading zoologist, held the Chair of Evolution at the Sorbonne (France's leading university) for over 20 years. His opinion of mutations as an explanatory cause of evolution is summarized below:

The opportune appearance of mutations permitting animals and plants to meet their needs seems hard to believe. Yet the Darwinian theory is even more demanding: a single plant, a single animal would require thousands and thousands of lucky, appropriate events. Thus, miracles would become the rule: events with an infinitesimal probability could not fail to occur. . . . There is no law against day-dreaming, but science must not indulge in it.<sup>19</sup>

This is surely an insightful evaluation, and Grassé's fellow-evolutionists would do well to pay attention to it.

#### □ How about Transitional forms?

Most of the ape-men have been proved to be either fakes or blunders

The Horse Family bush (no longer a tree!) and walking whales – all figments of imagination now thoroughly debunked.

Archaeopteryx (lizard evolving into bird?)– Fakes apart, when archaeopteryx existed, even before archaeopteryx, fossils of birds have been found, etc. Now recognized as a mosaic.

Coelacanth? Still exists today, same form. Obviously another mosaic. Designed by God. Same for lungfish. These are not fishes about to become amphibians!

Platypus (Reptile-mammal). Same story.

Polyploidy – sudden doubling or quadrupling of genes in the chromosomes. This is not speciation as no new basic type is generated. Also it applies almost exclusively to plants. No new genes. Horizontal changes.

## 5. What should be the Christian position on Evolution?

- Don't compromise with evolution. It is insulting on God's wisdom, character and omnipotence to assume that God works through evolution
- Expose the lies of evolution. ("And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather expose them" Eph 5:11). Let's do seminars, etc.
- Don't cop-out. ("I don't believe in evolution anyway, why should I promote creationism, etc are all mere ways of avoiding contending "earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints" Jude 3b). Don't be cowed.
- . Support organizations like Church Arise! LivingWater Ministries that are making their own little efforts to contend for the faith. Let's network with Christians of like-minds and do the job.

---

<sup>17</sup> Pierre P. Grasse, Evolution of Living Organisms (New York: Academic press, 1977) p.87

<sup>18</sup> ibid p. 130

<sup>19</sup> ibid, p.103

These materials have been drawn, extensively from Institute for Creation Research material, The Modern Creation Trilogy (vol 2). Also from Creation Science by David Rosevear. These materials are available at Church Arise! LivingWater Ministries library for free loan.