

## Doctrine of Evolution

Prologue: This report was first written when my daughter was a student in West Lake High School, Austin Texas. She asked for another view since she was being taught evolution as fact rather than theory. I first undertook this self-imposed assignment in 1975 but over a period of several years, I have revised the document as new information became available.

### Introduction

Creation By Fiat Defined: God created out of absolutely nothing by fiat the earth and all living things. The source was the Trinity with the active agent being Jesus Christ.

Darwin's Theory of Evolution Defined: Living forms in the world have arisen from a single source which itself came from an inorganic form. The source of this definition is Dr. G.A. Kurkut, Southampton University.

Textbook writers sometimes get carried away by teaching evolution as fact and refuse to teach the ambiguities, mistakes, prejudices, and gross assumptions or even minor perturbations attendant with the theory, and even worse general science and biology teachers refuse the student alternative views.

Our study will set forth what the Bible says and provide insight into what some have called "evolution-the great intellectual fraud." It will be done in such a way as to antagonize and, therefore, stimulate your thinking. No one person or group of persons will ever prove God or what He purports to have done, after all, if we could prove His existence, He would not be much of a God.

### The Background of Evolution

Evolution's Foremost Assumption: That evolution is the only theory worthy of study and the only "scientific" approach. Since most evolutionists assume there is nothing better than Darwin's theory, it must be correct. Creation by Fiat is considered "mumbo jumbo" religion and thus unworthy of consideration. Several evolutionists have in fact gone on record as saying, "Even if evolution is "scientifically" disapproved there is no way a reasonable man could accept creation by fiat. Quotations supporting this prejudice are legend.

W. W. Wheeler in his book *Creation by Evolution* writes: "no plea for the supernatural origin of anything is valid so long as there is a possibility of a natural explanation of its origin."

George F. Hutchinson, 1957 *Encyclopedia Britannica* writes: "if there is no choice, instead of accepting the supernatural acts of God, the scientist may have to assume that there have been changes in the laws of nature ...

Arthur Thompson in *The Outline of Science* has written: "But frankly the only scientific way of looking at the present day fauna and flora is to regard them as the outcome of natural selection."

Ernest Hooten writes in *Up From The Ape*: "Just how fins developed into limbs is still a mystery but they did."

Calvin S. Hall writes in *The Inheritance of Emotionality*: "You may question, of course, whether rat intelligence is the same as human intelligence, but if you do put the question you are really not an evolutionist and, therefore your view deserves little consideration."

Horatio Newman in *Evolution, Genetics, and Eugenics* writes: "There is no rival hypothesis except that outworn and completely refuted idea of special creation now retained only by the ignorant, the dogmatic and the prejudiced."

Prehistoric Man

Assumptions

The Earth is some 6,000,000,000 years young.

Fossil remains have been found as old as 6,000,000 years.

Textbooks show an orderly progress of man from lower forms to higher forms. The picture is a smooth flow from ape to cave man to modern man.

The *World Book Encyclopedia* along with an orderly evolutionary progress chart also offered in 1973 the following as fact:

"...fossil man is said to have been 1,000,000 years in age. The Ape is said to be 1,500,000." The encyclopedia goes on to imply the 500,000 year period between man and ape was to be surely filled with an ancestry tree of ordered progression just as soon as evidence could be 'dug up.'"

And then in 1973 a giant fly fell into the ointment. Her name was "Thoroughly Modern Milly." She was discovered by young Dr. Leakey who dated her at 2,800,000 years thereby blowing the sanctity of evolutionary theory. The gap was now something which must be somehow explained away. Worse however the often published orderly charts showing man's evolution from ape to man must now be destroyed, lest the world find out the hoax was on us. Dr. Leakey with reference to his find said: "Either we toss out this skull or we toss out our theories of early man."

See *National Geographic*, June 1973 for an excellent article describing Dr. Leakey's find. Thoroughly Modern Milly was either misdated or she was to be a cause for great alarm to former postulations that the oldest ape preceded man by 500,000 years.

She was said to be as modern as any fossil man ever found and yet she preceded earliest fossil man by thousands of years and worse she was 1,800,000 years older than homo erectus - the ape who walked.

Evolutionists began to scramble for plausible theories. Maybe the genus represented by Milly had become extinct and she simply began a new evolutionary journey. This was basically Dr. Leakey's explanation and then a few cynics were so thoughtless as to state "maybe the ape evolved from man."

The August 17, 1995 issue of the *Wall Street Journal* reported "Scientist said they discovered a new species of human ancestor in Kenya. They said a shin bone indicates the creature walked upright, which means pre-humans were walking half a million years earlier than had been believed."

The Associated Press reported on the morning of 11 August 1995 that this shin bone provided further substantiation of the hypothesis that man evolved from an ape. The bone was said to be three and one-half million years old meaning the prior postulations were in error concerning progressions. At the time, I wondered how far off other postulations and assumptions might be. As you read this document try to fathom how this shin bone could possibly be "further substantiation to the theory of evolution." The shin bone is another in a series of discoveries which tends to indicate man may be even older than the ape.

I think it is safe to say that as of today we still have no fossil evidence of an orderly evolution of man; in fact what we do have indicates (at best) great gaps in the order of development from animal to man. Even some data supports an evolution from man, to primate, and then to a new genus of man.

Today, most agree fossil evidence seems to show that man began and then became extinct and then man's evolution began again because the oldest likeness to man ceases and a gap of animal fossils span long periods of time and then suddenly man "appears" to develop again thus making clear the adage "you can't keep a good man down" or perhaps better said "you can keep a very old man down but not for long."

Writing for the *New York Times* in 1999 John Noble Wilford spoke to the point that a new trunk on the genus of the human tree had been discovered or "what ever happened on the way to mankind's orderly but inexorable though inexplicable evolution."

The Times reported, "Paleontologists in Africa have found a 3.5 million year old skull from what they say is an entirely new branch of the early human family tree, a discovery that again threatens to overturn the prevailing undocumented supposition that a single orderly line of descent stretched through the early stages of human ancestry ... Humanity's family tree, once drawn with a trunk straight and true, is beginning to look more like a bush, with a tangle of branches leading off in many directions. The new skull was discovered ... by a research team led by Leakey [1999] ..."

After careful analysis, it was concluded that the nearly complete skull and partial jaw represented not only a different species but also a completely new genus - virtually a new trunk on the tree of human evolution." To say the least, the previously held position that the fossil record supported an orderly progression from primates to homo-sapiens had to be rethought. The former supposition that the fossil record supported an orderly progressive picture of early man proceeding from hominid to modern man was now under attack by many well respected Darwinians.

Many evolutionists, however, held resolutely to the sacrosanct supposition that "no other explanation of man's beginning would be accepted." Nothing slowed their deductive postulations that Darwin's theory was correct.

Adding insult to injury, on Saturday, April 20, 2002 an article appeared in the *Washington Post* under the headline: **New Study Primates Roamed With Dinosaurs**. In the article Guy Gugliotta threw a significant monkey-wrench (no pun intended) into formerly hard and fast evolutionary theory. We are told in this article:

"Primates, the mammals from which humans evolved, emerged on earth much earlier than had been thought, originating perhaps 85 million years ago during the age of the dinosaurs ... Paleontologists ... place the origin of primates at 55 million years ago ... the researchers developed a statistical model that builds an evolutionary tree based on the number of primate species alive today (235) and the number of recorded fossil species (396) and their ages. By assuming each primate species would live approximately 2.5 million years the team was able to estimate the length of time that elapsed between the oldest known fossil primate ... by this technique the lead researcher Robert Martin concluded former theories of dinosaurs predating primates by millions of years were in error ... Robert Martin was quoted in the article "I've been arguing for years that there's [sic] so many gaps in the fossil record that primates are probably much older than we thought ..."

As you can see scientists, in 2002, were finding need to make profound and wild assumptions and projections over millions of years. They were now faced with the revised supposition that "the mammals from which humans evolved emerged on earth much earlier than previously thought ..." Before continuing our study of Darwin and his theory I want to introduce a point or two about Creation by Fiat.

I personally am not sure which I prefer, an ape for an ancestor or an ape for a descendent but in either case I am glad that God said: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Let's see what the Bible has to say about Creation, Chaos and Restoration.

Let's begin by reading what the book of Genesis has to say about the original creation, the ensuing chaos and the six day restoration. I want to read from the New International Version of the Scripture Genesis 1:2 through Genesis 2:7.

NIV

Gen 1:1 In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.

Gen 1:2 Now the earth was formless and empty, darkness was over the surface of the deep, and the Spirit of God was hovering over the waters.

Gen 1:3 And God said, "Let there be light," and there was light.

Gen 1:4 God saw that the light was good, and he separated the light from the darkness.

Gen 1:5 God called the light "day," and the darkness he called "night." And there was evening, and there was morning--the first day.

Gen 1:6 And God said, "Let there be an expanse between the waters to separate water from water."

Gen 1:7 So God made the expanse and separated the water under the expanse from the water above it. And it was so.

Gen 1:8 God called the expanse "sky." And there was evening, and there was morning--the second day.

Gen 1:9 And God said, "Let the water under the sky be gathered to one place, and let dry ground appear." And it was so.

Gen 1:10 God called the dry ground "land," and the gathered waters he called "seas." And God saw that it was good.

Gen 1:11 Then God said, "Let the land produce vegetation: seed-bearing plants and trees on the land that bear fruit with seed in it, according to their various kinds." And it was so.

Gen 1:12 The land produced vegetation: plants bearing seed according to their kinds and trees bearing fruit with seed in it according to their kinds. And God saw that it was good.

Gen 1:13 And there was evening, and there was morning--the third day.

Gen 1:14 And God said, "Let there be lights in the expanse of the sky to separate the day from the night, and let them serve as signs to mark seasons and days and years,

Gen 1:15 and let them be lights in the expanse of the sky to give light on the earth." And it was so.

Gen 1:16 God made two great lights--the greater light to govern the day and the lesser light to govern the night. He also made the stars.

Gen 1:17 God set them in the expanse of the sky to give light on the earth,

Gen 1:18 to govern the day and the night, and to separate light from darkness. And God saw that it was good.

Gen 1:19 And there was evening, and there was morning--the fourth day.

Gen 1:20 And God said, "Let the water teem with living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth across the expanse of the sky."

Gen 1:21 So God created the great creatures of the sea and every living and moving thing with which the water teems, according to their kinds, and every winged bird according to its kind. And God saw that it was good.

Gen 1:22 God blessed them and said, "Be fruitful and increase in number and fill the water in the seas, and let the birds increase on the earth."

Gen 1:23 And there was evening, and there was morning--the fifth day.

Gen 1:24 And God said, "Let the land produce living creatures according to their kinds: livestock, creatures that move along the ground, and wild animals, each according to its kind." And it was so.

Gen 1:25 God made the wild animals according to their kinds, the livestock according to their kinds, and all the creatures that move along the ground according to their kinds. And God saw that it was good.

Gen 1:26 Then God said, "Let us make man in our image, in our likeness, and let them rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air, over the livestock, over all the earth, and over all the creatures that move along the ground."

Gen 1:27 So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them.

Gen 1:28 God blessed them and said to them, "Be fruitful and increase in number; fill the earth and subdue it. Rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air and over every living creature that moves on the ground."

Gen 1:29 Then God said, "I give you every seed-bearing plant on the face of the whole earth and every tree that has fruit with seed in it. They will be yours for food.

Gen 1:30 And to all the beasts of the earth and all the birds of the air and all the creatures that move on the ground--everything that has the breath of life in it--I give every green plant for food." And it was so.

Gen 1:31 God saw all that he had made, and it was very good. And there was evening, and there was morning--the sixth day.

Gen 2:1 Thus the heavens and the earth were completed in all their vast array.

Gen 2:2 By the seventh day God had finished the work he had been doing; so on the seventh day he rested from all his work.

Gen 2:3 And God blessed the seventh day and made it holy, because on it he rested from all the work of creating that he had done.

Gen 2:4 This is the account of the heavens and the earth when they were created. When the LORD God made the earth and the heavens--

Gen 2:5 and no shrub of the field had yet appeared on the earth and no plant of the field had yet sprung up, for the LORD God had not sent rain on the earth and there was no man to work the ground,

Gen 2:6 but streams came up from the earth and watered the whole surface of the ground--

Gen 2:7 the LORD God formed the man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives, and the man became a living being.

God is the creator of all things. From the outset in the book of Genesis, the focus of the creation revelation turns upon the Almighty. God is the beginning, the cause and the source of all that is. In the creation and later the restoration God brought into being all that fits into His plan for the ages.

God miraculously spoke into existence all physical matter necessary for His purposes of creation and restoration. With the phrase, "In the beginning (**BERESHITH**)," Moses, under the inspiration of God the Holy Spirit, takes the reader back before time, into the unfathomable reaches of eternity. He seeks to suggest the state of things before time was. Moses under the inspiration of God the Holy Spirit gives no hint of a tangible date for this beginning. The creation account reaches back into a "space" before there was a dating of events.

The sublime sovereignty of the revelation is based on this one mighty assertion. God did it. It is called "Creation by Fiat." Nothing more astounding could be declared: "In the beginning **ELOHIM** created out of absolutely nothing planet Earth and all surrounding celestials, both seen and unseen, known and unknown."

**EL** is the usual word for "God" in Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic. In all three languages it is actually plural in form, but it is used with verbs in the singular. In **ELOHIM** is united all the powers of eternity and infinity, the beginning and the end, the Alpha and the Omega.

Created (**BARA** in the Hebrew) is a verb used exclusively for an act of God. Man cannot reach up to the powers inherent in this word, for it describes a miracle whereby undefined perfection was created from absolutely nothing. By the sovereign, originative power of God something absolutely new was first brought into being, only to be scarred and then restored.

Gen 1:1 In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.

Gen 1:2 Now the earth was (**HAYAH**) formless (**TOHU**) and empty (**BOHU**), darkness was over the surface of the deep ...

Isa 45:18 For thus saith the LORD that created the heavens; God himself that formed the earth and made it; he hath established it, he created it not in vain (**TOHU**), he formed it to be inhabited: I am the LORD; and there is none else.

The Scriptures direct our attention toward a tiny little planet called Earth and the many created beings that would ultimately live upon it. In this phrase, "In the beginning God created" is included the completed universe as it was known or might come to be known. We believe our galaxy contains more than 100 billion stars, and that our sun is 150 trillion miles from the center of our galaxy. Our galaxy is one of a small cluster of 19 galaxies, the nearest of which is thirty million light years from us (150 million trillion miles).

Research scientists, by using powerful telescopes, have discovered more than a billion galaxies, and as better telescopes are constructed the number grows daily. It has been estimated that the number of stars in these galaxies number close to 100 quintillion. The candle power of one of the galaxies is equal to that of 400 million suns. As man looks on this vast creation and reads Moses' inspired account of its origin; he cannot help but be filled with awe, reverence, respect, wonder and perhaps dread.

Right now most, and that includes many avid agnostics, agree the Big Bang theory is the best guess as to how the universe began. Let's note how similar it is to Creation by Fiat. When a scientist writes about God his colleagues assume he is over the hill or going bonkers. Ben Stein in his movie (*Expelled*) provides details of how such scientists are ostracized in the scientific community and thus the title of his movie.

As I peruse the latest scientific literature describing the origin of the planet, I am fascinated by what seems to be a sea change. Rather than an evolving origin we find a sharply defined punctilious beginning, i.e., creation began at a certain moment in time. Was the creative agent one of the forces of physics or was it as the Old Testament says: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth?"

The essential elements of what is now called the Big Bang theory are similar to what we find in the book of Genesis. According to the Big Bang theory, everything began suddenly, with a great flash and a release of energy. Many scientists are unhappy that the world apparently began in this way. Until recently most were more comfortable with the steady state theory of development because it was consistent with evolution. The best science now concludes there was a sudden beginning to our grand universe.

The Big Bang theory was first postulated in 1912 at the Lowell Observatory in Flagstaff Arizona, where several galaxies were observed to be moving away from planet Earth at speeds of millions of miles an hour. The new findings were not reported until 1914 at a scientific meeting. From these empirical observations, Dr. Edwin Hubble developed a new scenario for all beginning; it is now called The Big Bang theory. Dr. Albert Einstein at first was appalled, because such theorizing did not agree with his mathematics; ergo he rejected the new empiricism. In fact he would write "this circumstance of an expanding universe irritates me." He later, however, was convinced of the correctness of the theory after meeting with Dr. Hubble.

The theory suffered from the age-old problem "from where came the original spark of energy which caused that first explosion?" Thus the natural question, "since we now have a beginning, what came before the beginning?" Some of the bolder have asked "who was the prime mover? And was there some intelligent design?" Theologians are generally happy with the new theory, but most astronomers are very upset.

Philip Morrison, a well-recognized astronomer said on BBC "I would like to reject the Big Bang theory, but I must accept the facts. As a scientist who has always lived his life by tracing cause and effect and who has lived his life in the power of reason, this story ends like a bad dream. At the end of the nightmare I see several of us scientist climbing the mountain of ignorance and as we reach the last pinnacle, even as we claw our way over the last barrier, there I find thousands of grinning theologians who have been sitting there waiting for us for 2000 years."

It is difficult not to recognize the hand of God in the beauty and order of the solar system. The word "beginning," appearing in Gen 1:1 and Joh 1:1 is used in a specialized, absolute sense. The beginning is thus separate from that which begins, both preceding and transcending time. The beginning refers to that which occurred before God invented time for mortal man. According to Scripture, when categorically studied in the original language, the creation account is the first in a series of acts. There was first a creation, which Isaiah in Isa 45:18 tells us was perfect.



Isa 45:18 For thus saith the LORD that created the heavens; God himself that formed the earth and made it; he hath established it, he created it not in vain, he formed it to be inhabited: I am the LORD; and there is none else.

The first two verses in the book of Genesis, in corrected translation, tells us this perfect creation "became without form and void."

Gen 1:1 In the beginning the Trinity created out of absolutely nothing the heavens and planet earth.

Gen 1:2 And the earth became formless and void, empty of any good; and darkness, totally devoid of any heat was upon the face of the raging waters surrounding planet earth. And the Spirit of God hovered over those raging waters and provided incubating heat.

What caused the perfect creation to become imperfect cries out for an explanation, and that we will develop later. That there was a perfect creation which became "without form and void" is clearly taught in Scripture.

Heb 1:10 And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning (**ARCHE**) hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands:

Psa 102:25 Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the work of thy hands.

The creation was an immediate act of God, prior to time as we know it. The restoration began our account of time. Time is an "invention" of God, and we both use and abuse it. Creation was an independent act by an independent God Who pre-existed all things and this included "time as we know it."

Joh 1:1 states that the **LOGOS**, "the Word" (Christ Jesus) by which the eternal and invisible God is revealed to man, was with God (the Father) "before time was." The Father, the Son and God the Holy Spirit are presented in Scripture as coequal, coinfinite and coeternal. Before anything was the Trinity was there. John, for our edification distinguishes Jesus--the Word with the other two members of the Trinity. For you see only Christ visited planet Earth as the Godman; He came into the world and lived among us.

Joh 1:1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and God was the Word.

Joh 1:2 The same was in the beginning with God ...

Joh 1:14 And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

The Lord Jesus Christ is called the Beginning (**ARCHE**) and is said to pre-exist all things by both Paul (Col 1:17-18) and John (Rev 21:5-6).

Col 1:17 And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.

Col 1:18 And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the Beginning (**ARCHE**), the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence.

Notice Who was the active agent of the creation; it is Jesus the Christ, "and by him all things consist."

Rev 21:5 He who was seated on the throne said, "I am making everything new!" Then he said, "Write this down, for these words are trustworthy and true."

Rev 21:6 He said to me: "It is done. I am the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning (**ARCHE**) and the end ..."

Now let's briefly explore this much maligned theory called Creation by Fiat. The work of God in bringing all things into existence is described in Genesis chapter one verse one. Upon this abbreviated description rests much of what we call creation theology.

Although basic, it is unknown and overlooked by most Christians. God the Creator is a personal Trinity, He is among other things, sovereign, righteous, just, love, eternal, omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient, immutable and true. God alone is eternal, and He is both imminent (existing and remaining within, and thus, an inherent being) and transcendent, (preeminent and supreme) with respect to all things.

God's act of creation occurred before anything was; this is what the verb **BARA** communicates. It is translated "created" in the KJV of Gen 1:1. The idea that the present universe has been developed out of prior materials, though commonly held by many religions and philosophies, begs the question.

Sadly enough there are many "Bible-believing Christians," who in their desire to accommodate other explanations have adopted the blasphemy that God used evolution to create and perpetuate the planet and its inhabitants. Such well-meaning heterodoxy has no basis in either Scripture or physical science. It is of paramount importance to recognize that Scripture teaches a finished creation, a fall, a failure and a restoration. A Scripture or two with comment will best illustrate. And yes I know, several of these Scriptures have already been mentioned. But a little repetition with comment is needed.

Gen 1:1 In the beginning God (**ELOHIM**) created (**BARA**) the heaven (**SHAMAYIM**) and the earth (**ARETZ**).

Gen 1:2 And the earth was (**HAYAH**) without form, and void (**TOHU VA BOHU**); and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

Isa 45:18 For thus saith the LORD that created (**BARA**) the heavens (**SHAMAYIM**); God himself that formed the earth and made it; he hath established it, he created (**BARA**) it not in vain (**TOHU**), he formed it to be inhabited: I am the LORD; and there is none else.

What we have just seen in Scripture is a description of a perfect creation becoming "formless and empty." What caused this change begs to be answered. Is there any event in Scripture which might help us unravel this conundrum? As we search the Scriptures for a possible answer, we soon arrive at one clear and compelling event; one of such size and importance as to set in motion that which would alter the history of planet Earth. That event was Satan's fall! Before time was, Satan chose in his arrogance to fall from heaven. He said in his heart, "I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; I will be like the most high."

He along with one-third of all the angels elected to leave the third heaven and take up residence on planet Earth, "in the sides of the north upon the mount of the congregation. "When Isa 14:12-15 is compared with Psa 48:2, we begin to see a picture of angelic revolution of no small proportion being played out on a tiny little planet called Earth.

Isa 14:12 How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations!

Isa 14:13 For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north:

Isa 14:14 I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High.

Isa 14:15 Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit.

Psa 48:2 Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth, is mount Zion, on the sides of the north, the city of the great King.

A once perfect creature, Lucifer, fell and chose planet Earth as the battlefield, and a perfect creature, Christ, entered that same battlefield where in perfection He went to the cross on behalf of mankind to resolve what we now call the Angelic Conflict.

Eze 28:12 "Son of man, take up a lament concerning the king of Tyre and say to him: 'This is what the Sovereign LORD says: "'You were the model of perfection, full of wisdom and perfect in beauty.

Eze 28:13 You were in Eden, the garden of God; every precious stone adorned you ... Your settings and mountings were made of gold; on the day you were created they were prepared.

Eze 28:14 You were anointed as a guardian cherub, for so I ordained you. You were on the holy mount of God; you walked among the fiery stones.

Eze 28:15 You were blameless in your ways from the day you were created till wickedness was found in you.

Eze 28:16 Through your widespread trade you were filled with violence, and you sinned. So I drove you in disgrace from the mount of God, and I expelled you, O guardian cherub, from among the fiery stones.

Eze 28:17 Your heart became proud on account of your beauty, and you corrupted your wisdom because of your splendor. So I threw you to the earth; I made a spectacle of you before kings.

Eze 28:18 By your many sins and dishonest trade you have desecrated your sanctuaries. So I made a fire come out from you, and it consumed you, and I reduced you to ashes on the ground in the sight of all who were watching.

Eze 28:19 All the nations who knew you are appalled at you; you have come to a horrible end and will be no more."

God created the heavens and the earth absolutely perfect, Satan rejected God's authority creating chaos on planet Earth and God in grace restored the planet in preparation for the ultimate victory of Christ over sin and evil. Now that we have a cause for the perfect creation becoming "without form and void," let's look further at the process. Scripture teaches that after the restoration, there was no creation process in the physical sense, especially as it relates to matter. Certainly there was change but not evolution in the strict sense of the word.

Scientific study of present processes can therefore lead to no understanding of creation. These events were brought about by divine fiat and thus beyond useful scientific investigation. This teaching of Scripture is supported scientifically by the law of conservation of mass and energy, the first law of thermodynamics, which is one of the most basic and best-proved laws of physics.

This first law of thermodynamics postulates that "neither energy nor mass is now being either created or destroyed." Things may change but nothing new is ever created. Science teaches "all has been created that was created." The universal reservoir of energy (which really includes everything in the physical universe) must therefore date from a punctilious point, just as the Bible and the Big Bang theory, in part declares. There is therefore no valid scientific reason to doubt the accuracy of the events recorded in the creation and restoration passages. The restoration events occupied a six-day period. Each act was complete and each was judged by God to be "good." The total restoration He called "very good" (Gen 1:31).

Gen 1:31 And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day.

It would certainly seem possible that the things restored in the six literal days might, at the instant of their creation, have had an "appearance of age." This is most obvious in the case of Adam and Eve, who were created as mature humans. Therefore, it would be logical to assume such might be for all other objects, both animate and inanimate. All flora and fauna may have likewise been so created. For example, trees could have been created with rings depicting years of growth.

## Restoration Summary

The restoration, according to Scripture, was accomplished as a series of divine acts. They were done in six literal days. These acts were highly organized and completely functioning from the beginning, and could very well have been formed with an appearance of age. The restoration was completed and finished during a special period in the past, following which God "rested" in the sense that he had done everything good for man. Thus, there remains no reason why we cannot or should not accept the creation and restoration recorded in Genesis as an historical, literal and factual account of the specific events which took place just as God declared. I would offer again, a caution to our brothers and sisters in Christ. In our study I hope you noticed there is no indication of how long the planet has been around. Given the fact we have no idea how long the Earth existed in perfection before the fall of Satan, and given the fact we have no idea how long it took Satan to destroy God's perfection, we must not assert an age for the planet nor should we attempt to describe what was occurring on earth during either the age of perfection or the age of chaos.

If you want to know more about creation, chaos and restoration I would urge you to get a copy of R. B. Thieme's book entitled *Creation, Chaos and Restoration* and Clarence Larkin's book entitled *The Greatest Book on Dispensational Truth in the World*.

Now that we know a little about Creation by Fiat, let's return to evolution the modern alternative.

### Other Evidence of Evolution

Under the heading of "other evidence of evolution" we will look at some assumptions designed to stimulate your thinking. The evolutionist would dearly love for you to be convinced that change within a genre is scientific proof of evolution. It is a theory with no proof even after hundreds of years of determined searching. The proponents of evolution like to assert that evolution means "change over time." Such an assertion begs the question and is without controversy and change over time is not what all the hoopla is about. After all, don't animals change over time? Of course they do. Evolution is not selective breeding, which produces thorough-bred race horses, pedigreed dogs, colored cotton, resistance to DDT or dark and light colored moths etc.

Darwin's theory of evolution declares "life on earth began with a single cell life form, which evolved into multicelled life forms, which as the result of the change process of random mutation, followed by natural selection, all without guidance or assistance from any intelligent entity like "God." In other words, very complicated developments like, the human eye, morality, thumbs and a consciousness of mortality just happened by accident. The Darwinians will quickly say "but that's why it took billions and billions of years."

## Darwin's Theory

What Darwin's theory stresses is an accretional process which gave us the very complicated world in which we live. The two tools the evolutionist uses to support his basic theory are natural selection and random mutation.

### Natural Selection

Natural selection was first credited to Charles Darwin a (preacher) it later became synonymous with the term "survival of the fittest." Darwin proposed that nature was constantly improving plants and animals in the sense that those best suited to the environment were surviving. Darwin went much beyond this by asking his readers to believe this process explains how all life, both plant and animal, came into existence. Even if nature followed this process, which it does not, it takes a leap of faith to imagine that natural selection is a mechanism for evolution given the following problems:

Many useful characteristics would be liabilities instead of assets while in an incomplete state of evolution. As a result the evolving species would probably not survive unless "nature" intervened with some type of protection or plan. Many species have characteristics which work against their best interest and some of these species are our oldest.

For example, the opossum feigns death and is often eaten rather than flight or fight. Professor Osmond Breland, a University of Texas Biology Professor says, "Whatever the reason for this performance it appears decidedly disadvantageous to future generations of opossums."

Many animals have developed deleterious effects which have resulted in the demise of the species. These evolving characteristics are supposed to get them into another species better fitted to the environment but since this has never been seen, we are left only to ponder what might we find in the future. Some scientists have therefore felt obligated to offer a reason for the lack of evidence. The explanation is the old stand-by "things just happen too slowly, it takes millions of years." Many have asked, "How long must we wait for a single example?"

Clearly, many species change as environments dictate, but such changes are always intra-species changes and not "new species." There have been cases where a reversal takes place, when environmental conditions change. A species may in fact change and then return to its original form because the environment changes.

Example: In England the number of dark colored moths of a certain genre disappeared. Taxonomist feared this disappearance was permanent—evidence of a lost species. Soon, however, the same genre of moths reappeared but as light colored moths. An English medical doctor named H.B.D. Kettlewell gave up his lucrative practice of 15 years to investigate this color change as evidence of evolution facilitated by natural selection.

He concluded in an article that appeared in *Scientific American Magazine* “this was the most striking change ever witnessed by man.” This event occurred just before the industrial revolution when the trees were light in color. It seems the birds found it easier to see the dark colored moths against the light colored tree bark and thus the dark moths soon disappeared. It was noted that the same genre of moths later appeared as light colored and thus declared to be evidence of a new species caused by natural selection. In some text books this case has been used to prove a change in species because of natural selection and yet it was stipulated by all concerned that the species was the same. Just the color of the moths changed.

Another widely reported change in a species because of natural selection was the observed ability of flies to develop resistance to DDT and this development was thought to be passed-on to their descendants. The next generation however did not cooperate fully because they were still just flies who resisted the poison.

In the May 24, 1995 addition of the *Wall Street Journal* there appeared a special front page report entitled *The Prehistoric Past Casts Ills In New Light*. The article written by Dr. S. Boyd Eaton contained many very interesting facts about prehistoric man, and how modern medicine had adopted practices which did not permit man to any longer evolve. The major problem seemed to be, at least in the mind of the author, that the practice of medicine did not let the weaker members die off, therefore, natural selection was not permitted to refine and evolve a “better” human specimen. One quote was particularly revealing, “Those who couldn't cope tended to be culled before they could mate and pass on their unfit gene variants. But somewhere around 100,000 years ago, our increasingly brainy forebears learned how to talk and use tools to block the cruel culling. Physically, we have changed little since.”

Interestingly the lack of evolution observed in man is now man's own fault. It would appear Dr. S Boyd Eaton is hard up for scientific data to support his lack of evolutionary sightings. So we just keep on being the same old “unevolved” people.

### Random Mutation

This is the Darwinian mechanism to carry out the natural selection. For example, the average textbook will say something like this:

“Charles Darwin by natural selection had the theory of evolution almost complete but not being a geneticist he lacked “the how to” of the theory.” One such work goes on to say “today we have through the advancement of genetics the answer for a complete explanation—the “how to” is called mutation.”

According to Webster a mutation is “a hypothetical change in heredity producing new individuals basically unlike their parents.” The text book writer will go on to give examples of how the color of an animal will change from that of its progenitors. This, remember, is the great scientific area where Darwin needed training.

This is what many textbook writers will glibly declare. The problem is our children and grandchildren will be taught by teachers who believe this stuff. The 1973 West Lake High School 10th grade biology textbook stated: "the following two examples are proof of evolution via natural selection, mutation and adaptation or ecological factors working together" and then we get the fly and DDT scenario already reviewed. When evolutionists are making so much about examples like this you know they are in a "world of hurt for proof."

Mutations are in most cases adverse or harmful to the species, even fatal or crippling. In 99 percent of the cases or as Huxley stated "more than 99 percent of all mutations are harmful." Evolutionists use this circuitous logic to support their theory. Even though by their own admission, more than 99 percent of mutations will harm the animal or insect by either killing or crippling it. You might ask, "How could that be?" Easy they just say, "See I told you it takes a long time because we have to wait on the less than one percent and that is why you never see any of this happening."

### Dating the Planet

Dating methods for geological time have nothing to do with the theory of evolution. The subject is often used in discussions among the evolutionists just to try to discredit the Bible. Repeatedly bringing up the subject is merely a diversionary tactic. The reason Darwinians continue to bring up the subject is because it is widely reported the Bible limits planet earth to about 8000 to 10,000 years. Nothing could be further from the truth. In our categorical study of creation, chaos and restoration we saw that there is no scriptural basis for questioning what science now believes is a very old earth. Recall our previous study: there is no one who knows how long the earth existed as a perfect creation, no one who knows how long it took Satan and his minions to "mess-up perfection," and there is no one who knows how long Adam and Eve lived in the garden. Clearly, therefore, the old earth theories may be true.

Dating methods may suffer from inherent problems but such should be of little concern to the Christian. Let's review these methods with the understanding the review is not designed to argue the age of the planet. The aim is simply to recognize the methods and a few of their weaknesses. Planet earth may indeed be millions of light years old given what we have just learned of the creation, the chaos and the restoration.

Fluoride-- as a body dies it begins to take-in fluoride and thus geologists have measured the amount of fluoride in a fossil as evidence of age. There is an obvious problem, however, the amount of fluoride is not distributed equally over the earth's surface. For this reason this method is now discredited.

Carbon 14-- is produced as cosmic rays bombard nitrogen atoms in the atmosphere and carbon 14 is absorbed into the body during a life span. At death a body begins giving off carbon 14, the less carbon 14 the younger the specimen.



Carbon 14 is a much publicized dating method and one with much purported accuracy. The truth of the matter, however, is not all that clear. There are some members of the scientific community who are somewhat skeptical. For example:

Professor William Lee Stokes in his book *Essentials of Earth History* writes, "The original enthusiasm over Carbon 14 dating was followed by a period of more cautious evaluation when many obviously incorrect dates came to light."

Ernest Antevy writing in the *Journal of Geology* said: "The apologist try a little too hard to make the geology fit the dates ... An informed geological estimate is better than a Carbon 14 date lacking geological support, even though the latter may appear attractive by giving an impression of definiteness ..."

Charles B. Hunt, President of The American Geological Institute said: "... radiocarbon dates are sufficiently scattered and erratic to provide some determinations that will support almost any proposed correlation." An example:

"An island in the near Pacific (this little island was Kilauea ) with a known short lived life was dated by Carbon 14 and said to be between 0 to 22 million years. Experts when queried about the "scientific slop" responded:

'Because the island was underwater so long before it rose cataclysmically from the ocean, there was a shielding by the water of cosmic radiation, therefore less Carbon 14 buildup due to very few cosmic rays bombarding nitrogen atoms.'

Little did these experts realize at the time that this very accurate statement explains the great disparities of Carbon 14 dating's when antediluvian versus postdiluvian dates are compared. In Gen 1: 7 God said He placed a canopy of water around the atmosphere or firmament covering planet earth. At the time of the great flood which is estimated to be about 4000 B.C. (based on a number of "good scientific "as well as biblical reasons) the canopy of water collapsed and we had our first rain—and boy was it a "doozy." The canopy made for a deluge and ended the great shielding which had kept Carbon 14 from building up at "normal" postdiluvian rates. As a practical matter the shielding would mean dates after the flood using Carbon 14, or any other radiogenic techniques, would be far more accurate than dates before the Flood.

There are other reasons why some scientists believe radiogenic methods such as Carbon 14 are inconsistent:

Dr. Bolton Davidheiser, a zoologist and geneticist, believes cosmic radiation has not been constant because of changes in the earth's magnetic field and radiation flux itself. Geologists agree that the effect of carbon dioxide released by volcanic action over the last 50,000 years alone would be very difficult to measure. They all agree that CO<sub>2</sub> affects radiogenic methods. In the future, care must be taken to evaluate the effect of neutrons released into the atmosphere by nuclear testing.

It is estimated that carbon 14 in the atmosphere is 3 to 4 times greater today than in 1962 as a result of such testing.

Isotopic ---The problems encountered with isotopic dating methods are vast and recently great doubt as to their validity has been cast in much of the scientific community. Decay rates of radioactive materials over geological time have changed. This is startling because the whole system of isotopic dating is based on the assumption that such decay rates are constant. For example, Robert V. Gentry in the October 1957 issue of *Medical Opinion and Review* has written, ..."my investigation of the Uranium and Thorium halos disclosed a startling circumstance: the radioactive decay rates have probably changed considerably during geological time."

Potassium-Argon is a dating method where rocks located near fossil remains are measured as to the content of potassium compared to the amount of argon. It is assumed that potassium decays at a fixed rate producing a gas known as argon. This method has certain inherent disadvantages. Like other methods, there is a great deal of authority indicating the rate of potassium decay has not always been constant. Results from potassium-argon dating have given some rather bazaar and discrepant results. For example, the "nutcracker man" found by L.S.B. Leakey was dated at 1,750,000 years. The stratum just below the skull tested 1,500,000 years which should be older rather than younger. Further, G.H. R. von Koenigswald, a noted anthropologist, tested a layer of basalt below the second stratum and found the "life" measured 1,000,000 years younger than the test shows.

Dr. Hunt previously quoted says of dating methods in general: "No one seriously proposes that all the determined dates are without error, and we do not know how many of them are in error. We do not know which dates are in error or by what amounts or why." Now compare these scientific opinions with a purported "fact" found in the October 1961 issue of *National Geographic*, "... no ordinary mechanical clock - not even the finest Swiss watch - can match our laboratory instruments for precision."

Dating methods in general do not conflict with the Bible, however, to the evolutionist time is very necessary because:

- a. to the evolutionists the mechanism of mutation is the only viable method for genetic progression caused by natural selection.
- b. 99 percent of all mutations result in either death or crippling and thus a 1 percent effective rate requires a great deal of time if evolutionary progress is to be "made."
- c. for the tools of evolution (natural selection and random mutation) to be viable billions of years are necessary .

## Interesting Facts-Mysteriously Hidden

### A. Teleology

Teleology is the study of evidence of design in “nature.” Textbook writers are cautioned to never provide students with an implication of intelligent design. The science editor of *Newsweek* in the December 23, 1963, issue reported that geologists at a meeting of The American Geological Society “were advising the rehabilitation of catastrophism without recourse to a supernatural agent.”

In other words intelligent designed must never be offered to students as a possibility. For example, many teachers are urged to say things like “Turtles come out of the water and happen to lay their eggs on the beach” as opposed to “turtles come out of the water to lay their eggs on the beach” and yet any biologist or good taxonomist will tell you there are certain species of turtle who never come on to the beach ever except to lay their eggs. Many proponents of evolution are deathly afraid intelligent design might be equated with God or a supernatural power rather than “happen chance.” As a good student this should make you fighting mad that someone is attempting to mold your “plastic mind” in a preset mold consistent with someone else's preset standards. Whatever happened to the age old axiom that “a scientist must think inductively and not deductively.”

### B. Taxonomy

Taxonomy is the study of classifying species. There is a prevailing argument on the part of evolutionist that the book of Genesis tells us that every species was created in its own kind and every creature was to reproduce after its kind. Interestingly this is exactly what we see happening today. No data has ever been presented to indicate such reproduction ever stopped. It is a wonder any evolutionist would ever bring up the subject, but they do. Because some animals resemble one another like a zebra looks like a horse and a coyote looks like a dog, the evolutionist with great pomposity makes much of what they call “theoretical progressions” based solely on similarity of looks. Let me explain:

There is a great reliance on taxonomy. It is assumed that any good taxonomist knows for sure what is a specie and can therefore tell if animals are moving from one to another. Let’s look at the history of classification or the wonderful world of taxonomy. Although there are numerous changes within most species; there has never been a change even alleged to have occurred between species, and this after hundreds of years of careful scrutiny by multitudes of biologists seeking desperately to find such a phenomena.

Evolutionists have duped students with clichés such as “the gap is all we have need to fill and then it will be all over.” The trite but powerful “gap” is that discovery of inter-specie movement. This gives the insouciant student the impression that all but minor proof has been found when in reality the only proof available is nothing; since no one even purports to find movement from one species to another.

Much has been left to the taxonomist to arrange hard and fast species definitions. Quite to the contrary, taxonomy has been unable to agree on definitions of species. They vary and change even as we speak.

Let me illustrate--first by a few diversionary insults:

Quoting from a Heuschel and Cook textbook, *Biology for Medical Students*, "To explain the presence of so many different kinds of plants and animals, two theories have been propounded. The traditional idea was that of special creation in which all organisms as we know them today were invented and made in the beginning of time with the same structure as we now find them. Such is the primitive human conception of the origin of the species as exemplified in the first chapter of Genesis and similar ideas also current in the cosmologies of most religions of the world. The "facts" of biology, however, do not allow us to accept this view."

Hegner and Stiles in their book, *College Zoology*, "The doctrine of special creation, that is that each species of animal was specially created, is sufficiently refuted to the satisfaction of most biologists by the "facts" of organic evolution."

Gairdner Moment in his textbook *General Biology*, "One of the oldest ideas and, until recently, the most widely accepted, is the theory of special creation. Certainly very few, perhaps no biologists now believe that each species was separately created and has existed since the beginning of the world."

Much is made of the use of the Hebrew word "**LAMINAH**" translated "kind" as meaning every species was created exactly as it was ordained and divinely prohibited from change. Nothing could be further from the truth. The word translated kind is very subjective and might better read "after the general likeness of one another." The kind described in Genesis is far from being restrictive as most Darwinians allege. It will surprise even Christians to learn that the KJV leaves a little to be desired. Let's take a look at a few Scriptures.

Gen 1:21 uses the word **TANIN** meaning land mammals after their kind, living creature or **NEPESH** meaning all animal life, cattle or **BEHEMAH** meaning tame or domesticated animals after their kind, creeping things or **RAMAS** meaning living things that glide on the earth.

Much then is made by the evolutionist that God said something He never said. God obviously left room for animals to operate sexually within their general kind (subject to certain chromosome limitations).

Please remember we find nothing offered by the evolutionist as evidence of inter movement of species but rather a diversionary tactic of an alleged prohibition by God that "species were separately created and must exist as originally created from the beginning of the world."

This is again done by the evolutionist to merely discredit the Bible because obvious intra-movement of species has always been a fact—not inter-species movement.

Please keep in mind the evolutionist is a master at scientific legerdemain. The evolutionist is devious because his arguments are most often made by men with knowledge of biological science and should know one cannot at any given time properly define the term species. Since the experts frequently disagree among themselves and change their minds as to what is a species, it is absurd as well as dishonest to imply that men who are not taxonomists can do this.

What they try to do is to portray creationists and people who believe the Bible as stupid. Textbook writers charge that special creationists believe every species was created separately and then they themselves admit the number of creations change over time. Let's look at a few examples:

a. Fresh water clams were formerly believed to exist in 251 species but these have now been reduced to one. See Ernst Mayer's, *Systematics and The Origin of the Species*.

b. In 1931 Swarth studied ground finches and classified them into 5 genre, 317 species and subspecies but confessed it would be logical to place them in one. See Julian Huxley's *The Living Thoughts of Darwin*.

c. In Ruggles Gates *Human Ancestry* the species of birds were said to be reduced by changes of opinions from 27,000 to 8,500.

d. Fishes of North America have moved from 670 to 795. See Michael Guyers' *Animal Biology*.

e. In 1955 the Rana Kandivehi frog formerly classified in 1922 was determined to be only a mutant form of the common leopard frog. It differed only with reference to a single mutant gene.

This list of quotes could go on *ad infinitum*. This is perhaps why Harvard Professor Hooten was quoted as saying, "I am convinced that a zoological classificationist may be as dissolute and irresponsible as a lightning rod salesman." See Ernest Hootens' *Apes, Men and Morons*.

Had Richard Nixon known how the taxonomist can adjust species to fit their needs or how strong the environmentalist lobby would become, I doubt the Endangered Species Act would ever have been signed into law. Today we find progress being stopped and property rights taken as genera are adjusted to fit the needs of "mother earth."

DNA and Evolution—Much found in this section will repeat what has earlier been discussed, however, there is a major difference. As you know I started my study of evolution in 1995 and much has changed since then.

Knowledge has evolved but it is still knowledge. My library has grown and I have been forced to read additional books, acquire a new vocabulary to include terms like biochemistry, micro-biology, crystallography, cilium and flagellum etc.

Let me just take a moment to list several books for the serious student's library: *Did God Use Evolution?* By Werner Gitt, *Darwin On Trial* by Philip E. Johnson, *Darwin's Black Box* by Michael J. Behe, *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Science* by Tom Bethel, *Godless* by Ann Coulter and *Evolution and Christian Faith* by Bolton Davidheiser.

Don't Believe All You Read In Your Newspaper

The purpose of this section is to record several comments about an article which appeared in the Austin American Statesman in October 2005. The article is a reprint from the WASHINGTON POST. The authors are Rich Weiss and David Brown. I want to review the article with comment. My comments will be high-lited after each paragraph.

The headline read **Evolution of Evidence, DNA Tests say Darwin Was Right.** The article begins with a definition of what is evolution? "Evolution is a genetic change in a species over time. Evolution also refers to common descent: Humans and chimps, for example, are thought to share a common ancestor. Evolution is driven by several processes, the best known of which is natural selection," a driver described by Charles Darwin in his 1859 book, *The Origin of Species*. The article then asks "What is natural selection?" The author then answers, "Species evolve from common ancestors as genetic mutations give rise to new physical traits."

**The author provides two definitions of evolution. The first "Evolution is a genetic change in a species over time." As we have seen, this is not a definition of evolution. We often see intra specie changes over time. The second definition is a good one and one accepted by most Darwinians. As earlier noted evolutionists believe there are two facilitators of evolutionary change. They are natural selection and mutation. The author stipulates natural selection and random mutations are necessary for evolution to occur. It has long been established that mutations are usually detrimental. Approximately 95% to 99% of all mutations result in something bad. We see it most often in deformed children although it is often seen in animals. When there is a mutation it generally will result in a physical problem or even death of an offspring. Let me again quote from Bolton Davidheiser's book *Evolution and Christian Faith*: "Mutations are the bane of evolutionary theory; mutations are said to be the method by which species have evolved. If however the vast majority of mutations result in deformities or death, it is difficult to see it as a mechanism for changes in species. Traits that improve a species' ability to survive and reproduce are passed to new generations, while traits that hinder reproduction and survival fade away.**

**“Natural selection can be ecological (driven by competition for food and habitat) or sexual (driven by competition for mates). Sexual selection can result in features that appear contrary to ecological survival; for example the tail feathers of a peacock. Another example is the possum playing dead. The possum is one of the oldest species and yet one of the characteristics of the possum which is said to be a result of natural selection is "playing dead." The possum that plays dead is often eaten. None the less the opossum as it is called in scientific terms continues to exist and prosper.”**  
**The article tries to answer the question is evolution just a theory?**

"Scientific theories are not mere hunches. A theory in science is a structure of related ideas that explains one or more natural phenomena and is supported by observations from the natural world. Evolution is a 'theory' in the same way that the idea that matter is made of atoms is a theory or that some bacteria cause disease is a theory."

**Keep in mind no advocate of evolution has ever purported to have seen evolution at work therefore it is somewhat dishonest to make a statement that the theory of evolution is like observing that bacteria causes disease. We know from observation that various bacteria can cause diseases. Evolution is certainly a theory since there is no proof natural selection and mutation cause inter specie movement and there is certainly no proof that humans and chimps share a common ancestor; ergo evolution is just a theory.**

The article continues:

"When scientists announced in August that they had determined the exact order of all three billion bits of genetic code that go into making a chimpanzee, it was no surprise that the sequence was more than 96 percent identical to the human genome."

**This statement is somewhat misleading. Though we have been able to identify the chimpanzee genome we have not been able to fully understand the workings of the human genome. Only about 10 % of the human genome is understood as it relates to biological history. In fact the article later makes the point and I quote:**

“More than 90% of human DNA still appears to be the flotsam of biological history.”

**Flotsam is "the wreckage or cargo that remains afloat after a ship has sunk. It is literally another term for refuse or debris; that which is to be discarded. About 90% of the human genome is not as yet understood therefore it is dismissed as "flotsam." It is difficult to imagine that 90% of our DNA is flotsam. Especially when so much is made of the chimpanzee's genetic code being 96% identical to 10% of the human genome.**

**Given the similarity of 96% of the monkey's genome to 10% of the human genome, Philip E. Johnson, author of the best-selling book *Darwin on Trial* has asked the question, "Why does the chimpanzee look like a chimpanzee and act like a chimpanzee and a human being looks and acts like a human?"**

Returning to our article:

"Decoding a chimpanzees' DNA allowed scientists to do more than just refine their estimates of how similar humans and chimps are. It let them put the very theory of evolution to some tough new tests. Using a mathematical formula that emerges from evolutionary theory, they should be able to predict the number of harmful mutations ... Sure enough, when ... tallied the harmful mutations in the chimp genome ... fit perfectly into the range that evolutionary theory had predicted."

Our writers go on to conclude:

"Their analysis was the latest of many in such disparate fields as genetics, biochemistry, geology and paleontology that in recent years have added new credence to the central tenet of evolutionary theory ... a smidgen of cells 3.5 billion years ago could -- through mechanisms no more extraordinary than random mutation and natural selection -- give rise to the astonishing tapestry of biological diversity that today thrives on Earth."

**How the evolutionists arrive at the "3.5 billion years ago" is again not provided. From the article it would seem this number was simply pulled from the air. There are numerous scientists from disparate fields who take exception to the many bizarre exceptions common to evolutionary theory. The most formidable are: Michael J. Behe, professor of Biochemistry at Lehigh University, Bolton Davidheiser a zoologist and geneticist and professor at Westmont College in Santa Barbara, California, Phillip E. Johnson professor of Law at The University of California at Berkeley, Werner Gitt a professor at the prestigious Technical University at Aachen. These men have written extensively about evolution and its theory. Our newspaper article makes a great deal of a stipulated fact, i.e., that mutations are generally harmful; we have always known such to be the case and in fact proponents of evolution have very defensively worked to explain the difficulty mutations present to their theory since as we have noted they are virtually always harmful.**

**In his book *Darwin's Black Box* Michael J. Behe, Professor of Biochemistry at Lehigh University, makes clear there is no way evolution could be a practical theory because of the complexity of the human body. Darwinians devote most of their time explaining how, a dog became a coyote, which turned into a wolf, etc., as opposed to the various mechanisms in the body which would also have to evolve. The blood clotting system and the human eye are extremely complex. Behe describes this complexity in great detail.**



**The time required for these systems to evolve says Behe is just not there. He estimates that a thousand billion years would be required just for the complex systems found inside the body which is roughly a hundred times the current estimate of the age of the universe. From reading Behe's book I would conjecture that the odds are better that a tornado could roar through a junk yard and create a super computer than for random mutation to evolve the human eye. Behe is only one of many scientists today who strongly reject evolution as a plausible theory.**

"What makes evolution a scientific explanation is that it makes testable predictions"

**As we know there are no testable predictions when it comes to evolution. The concept of an intelligent designer is not a scientifically testable assertion either. The complexity of the creation process makes testing either Creation by Fiat or Evolution impossible.**

By some accident of nature whose workings we cannot explain, an organism may exhibit a variation in shape, color or body function new to the species. Although most of these new traits are damaging -- probably lethal -- a small fraction actually help ... As to the reason these traits occur the article theorizes ... for example why did a bird develop a wing? It's because the bird without a wing fell out of a tree and he tried real hard not to fall and when he hit the ground he died, but the next time ... the bird kept trying and trying and there was a need for a wing and it came out a little bit and kept coming out and about a million years later after numerous off-springs a winged bird appeared.

**A major problem exists. Why have we not discovered any evidence of these interim processes? There are no intermediate fossils. A lack of fossil record is the worst problem that evolutionists have. All we find is a dog, a bird, a cat, a dinosaur, or whatever. A dinosaur with wings, a dinosaur without wings, a dinosaur that eats grass one that eats meat but they are complete in their characteristics. Where are the intermediaries?**

The article attempts to address this problem: "Supporters of intelligent design frequently say evolution can't explain the so-called Cambrian explosion, when new groups of animals suddenly appeared 500 million years ago. The fossil record lacks transitional stages connecting complex Cambrian creatures with older, simpler forms, they say. But new evidence shows that relatively complex animals existed as many as 125 million years before the Cambrian period. And recent studies of DNA sequences in well-dated fossils set divergence to a time before the Cambrian."

**This sweeping statement (that "recent studies of DNA sequences in well-dated fossils set divergence to a time before the Cambrian explosion") is supposed to allay all problems related the Cambrian phenomena of new groups of animals. Let me try to explain the terrible problem eating at most Darwinians without the usual evolutionary subterfuge.**

**The Cambrian period is a geological time period some 500 million years ago. It was characterized by the sudden appearance of fossils of virtually all known phyla. As America's leading Darwinian, Richard Dawkins said "It is as though all of these phyla were just planted there, without any evolutionary history." Think of the problem from a Darwinian's perspective. Some 125 million years before the Cambrian period there are numerous fossils indicating a slow but orderly evolution and then "suddenly there is a dearth of fossil evidence. It was as though evolution took a vacation and stopped. For 3 billion years, nothing but bacteria and worms and then suddenly the Cambrian explosion when new groups of animals appeared. Gould and Eldredge as devoted Darwinians were forced to address the embarrassment, "Perhaps evolution could happen really fast and then stop happening at all for 150 million years."**

**The Cambrian question: where are the intermediate fossils? They do not exist. Was there evolution between the 125 million years and the 500 million Cambrian period? There are none. The fossil record slaps the evolutionist in the face and when he arises he is stuttering, and in a dazed state but not crying "no mas." The books being used by the educators of our children do not ask the question "where is the fossil record? Thus the Cambrian explosion remains unexplained.**

A biologist at Michigan State University, Richard Lenski, has been following 12 cultures of the bacterium *Escherichia coli* since 1988, comprising more than 25,000 generations. All 12 cultures were genetically identical at the start. For years he gave each the same daily stress: six hours of food (glucose) and 18 hours of starvation. All 12 strains adapted to this by becoming faster consumers of glucose and developing bigger cell size than their 1988 "parents." When Lenski and his colleagues examined each strain's genes, they found that the strains had not acquired the same mutations. Instead, there was some variety in the happy accidents that had allowed each culture to survive. And when the 12 strains were then subjected to a different stress -- a new food source -- they did not fare equally well. In some, the changes from the first round of adaptation stood in the way of adaptation to the new conditions. The 12 strains had started to diverge, taking the first evolutionary steps that might eventually make them different species."

**Here we go. Wow, some of the coli died, some prospered and all in varying degrees. This is simply the same thing you see in human beings placed in a prison camp. Some are provided food at first then they are provided stress, some die, some prosper, some don't, but they don't prosper or survive at the same rate. So the DNA simply does what the human does in a given situation. There are some bodies that handle stress some that can't handle stress. Apparently, the same is true of *Escherichia coli*. To forecast the evolution of a different strain is a bit of a stretch.**

"One of the more exciting developments in biology in the past 25 years has been how much DNA alone can teach about the evolutionary history of life on Earth. For example, genome sequencing projects have shown that human beings, dogs, frogs and flies (and many, many other species) share a huge number of genes. These include not only genes for tissues such as muscle but also the genes that go into basic body-planning (specifying head and tail, front and back) and appendage-building (making things that stick out from the body, such as antennae, fins, legs and arms)."

**The sharing of a huge number of genes is declared to prove 'something,' it proves that any kind of animal be it fish, mammal or fowl retain basic similarities in their gene pools. As the article says, dogs, frogs and flies and many, many other species share a huge number of genes. As Philip E. Johnson asks in *Darwin on Trial*, "why, when I look in the mirror do I see a human instead a fly, a chimpanzee, dog or a frog, even though our DNA are very similar?"**

Further "Research on how and when tool-kit genes are turned on and off also has helped explain how evolutionary changes in DNA gave rise to earth's diversity of species. Studies show the determination of an organism's form during embryonic development is largely the result of a small number of genes that are turned on in varying combinations and order. Gene regulation is where the action is.

**The question is "who turns on the genes in varying combinations and who turns it off - could it be mother nature, random happen-chance or God?"**

Conclusion

I want to conclude this doctrine with several quotations.

**Michael Behe**, Professor of Biochemistry at Lehigh University in his book *Darwin's Black Box* has written, "Albert Lehninger, a fine teacher has written a very successful biochemistry text book ... the new addition ... contains two references to evolution ... We find that the new addition uses the word evolution as a wand to wave over mysteries ... For example, one citation is to "evolution, adaptation of sperm whale." When we flip to the indicated page, we learn that sperm whales have several tons of oil in their heads which becomes more dense at colder temperatures. This allows the whale to match the density of the water at the great depths where it often dives and so swim more easily. After describing the whale the textbook remarks, "Thus we see in the sperm whale a remarkable anatomical and biochemical adaptation, perfected by evolution." But that single line is all that's said! The whale is stamped "perfected by evolution" and everybody goes home. The authors make no attempt to explain how the sperm whale came to have the structure it has.

**David Bolton Davidheiser**, a biology professor with a Ph.D. from John Hopkins University has written in his book *Evolution and the Christian Faith*.” Opinions about some of the things *related to evolution* may still change, but the point is that when it comes to evolution, scientist are not all objective or even honest in their approach to problems ... It is the opinion of evolutionists, expressed over and over, that only the uninformed, the ignorant, and the bigoted do not accept evolution as a fact. This has been repeated so many times that people are afraid of being called ignorant if they express any doubts about the truth of evolution.

**Ann Coulter** in her New York Times best-selling book *Godless* has written, “Evolution is not selective breeding, which produces thoroughbred horses, pedigreed dogs ... and so on. Evolution is not the capacity of bacteria to develop antibiotic resistance, but which never evolves into anything but more bacteria. Evolution is not the phenomenon of an existing species changing over the course of many years ... In fact; evolution is not adaptive characteristic developing within a species at all. Darwin’s theory says we get a new species, not a taller version of the same species. Evolutionists call such adaptations “microevolution” only to confuse people.”

Dr. Hoyle and Dr. Wickramasinghe (winners of the Dag Hammarskjold 1986 God Medal for Science award) are both atheists. Consequently, they have some odd ideas about the origin of life—but they know enough about science to know Darwin’s theory does not provide a viable explanation for the creation of life. Hoyle ran some numbers to determine the mathematical probability of the basic enzymes of life arising by random processes. They concluded that the odds were 1 to 1 followed by 40,000 zeroes, or “so utterly minuscule” as to make Darwin’s theory of evolution absurd.

**Phillip E. Johnson** in his book *Darwin on Trial* has written, “For those who have chosen to devote their lives to exploring exactly how humans evolved from apes, persons who doubt the basic premise are by definition creationists, and hence are not to be taken seriously ...” *Recall we have no reliable fossil evidence of human evolution.* “For example Solly Zuckerman, one of Britain’s most influential scientists and a leading primate expert, is a good scientific materialist who regards the evolution of man from apes as self-evident, but who also regards much of the fossil evidence as poppycock. Zuckerman subjected the Australopithecines to years of intricate “biometric” testing, and concluded that “the anatomical basis for the claim [they] walked and ran upright like man is so much more flimsy than the evidence which points to the conclusion that their gait was some variant of what one sees in subhuman Primates, that it remains unacceptable.”

The above quotations and the lack of a fossil record make evolution difficult to accept, unless one looks at the facts with a jaundiced eye. Michael Behe in his book has perhaps done more for objective analysis of evolution given his expertise in microbiology and its application to evolution.

Coulter in her book makes the point, “Behe disproved evolution—unless evolution is simply a ... pseudoscience, like astrology. Behe produced various “irreducibly complex” mechanisms, of which there are thousands—complex cellular structures, blood-clotting mechanisms, and the eye, among others. A bacterial motor, called a flagellum, depends on the coordinated interaction of 30-40 complex protein parts. The absence of almost any one of the parts would render the flagellum useless. An animal cell’s whip like oar, called a cilium, is composed of about 200 protein parts. Behe compared these cell parts to a simple mousetrap, with far fewer necessary components than the cilium or flagellum ... all of the parts of a mousetrap ... have to be working together at one time for the contraption to serve any function whatsoever ... Behe then demonstrated that it is a mathematical impossibility for all 30 parts of the flagellum (or 200 parts of the cilium) to have been brought together by the numerous, successive, slight modifications” of natural selection. Life at the molecular level, he concluded, “is a loud, clear, piercing cry of design.” Although clearly annoyed with him, many evolutionists were forced to concede Behe’s point.”

Michael Behe, among many of his contemporaries, is *persona non grata*. I recall reading a rather terse response from one of Dr. Behe’s contemporaries. It went something like this, “If Michael Behe would spend more time trying to find out how evolution happened rather than criticizing the theory we would all be better off.”

Creation by Fiat provides an alternative to evolution. Perhaps the apostle John said it best.

Joh 1:1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

Joh 1:2 He was with God in the beginning.

Joh 1:3 Through him all things were made; without him nothing was made that has been made ...

Joh 1:10 He was in the world, and though the world was made through him, the world did not recognize him.

Joh 1:11 He came to that which was his own, but his own did not receive him.

Joh 1:12 Yet to all who received him, to those who believed in his name, he gave the right to become children of God --

Joh 1:13 children born not of natural descent, nor of human decision or a husband's will, but born of God.

Joh 1:14 The Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us. We have seen his glory, the glory of the One and Only, who came from the Father, full of grace and truth.

