

I didn't make this world in order that its sin should conquer it and destroy it. I made it in order that it might be won back to the Lord and be a place where Christ will reign in righteousness and glory - and the earth will be inhabited. Not a place which will remain in the vain condition in which it is today when sin is ruling. I think it's looking forward to the future. I think it doesn't have anything in the world to do with the original creation but with the ultimate purpose in the future of that original creation.

My question is perhaps directed to the other side of the platform - either Dr. Speck or Dr. Willets. I'm thinking in terms of Dr. Speck's comments concerning the structural features of animals and plants, etc. Since we're told in Scripture that God created two atmospheres in which the plants and the animals were to live - that of the water and that of the air. And we're also aware of the fact that there are certain life processes which these all must exhibit in order to maintain their existence. Would it not be then that the evolutionists have perhaps thought of some kind of a play on words here to use this in proving their evolution? Secondly, going back to Genesis 1 where we read this "after his kind". Is it not impossible chemically or biologically for these various plants, species, etc., to give rise to future generations of other plants because of their chemical nature?

It is a pretty complicated question to answer. First let's deal with plants and animals as a different form of life. If I get off from answering your question, please remind me. First of all we should clarify a plant and an animal. Now the zoologist is in complete disagreement at certain times with the botanist over a single organism as to whether it is an animal or a plant - I'm thinking in terms of the organism *Utricularia* (?). When I took botany we didn't even consider it a plant. When I took zoology we considered it an animal. But you will find in many textbooks of botany that the organism *Utricularia* is considered a plant. My only answer to this disagreement is, so what! Well, what else need I say? Whether it be a plant or not we are recognizing an organism. We are studying its structure. If you would get down to the chemistry of it, which I don't know enough about, as to whether it resembles animal more than plant, of what significance is it in placing it in the proper group in the kingdom of life? I think your one question, if I recall, asking in one organism because of its chem-