

Which is true ...
Creation or Evolution?

by Jerry Ingerman
www.knowyourmessiah.com
kym4us@gmail.com

Introduction

Christians should and must believe in Creation, not because of any secular, scholarly scientific ‘evidence’ that they are presented with, but because of their faith in Jesus Christ and in His Word the Bible. Jesus Christ is revealed in the Bible to be the Creator of all things:

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

- a proof text for the Deity of Jesus Christ

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

John 1:3 All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.

‘made’ — brought into being

Also:

Hebrews 1:2 Hath in these last days spoken unto us by [his] Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds;

Since the beginning, everyone has been without excuse if they have not acknowledged God as Creator. For everyone to see and appreciate, the evidence is all around them in the Creation itself.

Romans 1:19 Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed [it] unto them.

Romans 1:20 For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, [even] his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse:

Jesus Christ is, for Christians, the Lord of all things, including Science.

Acts 10:36 The word which [God] sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ: (he is Lord of all:)

Ephesians 1:22 And hath put all [things] under his feet, and gave him [to be] the head over all [things] to the church,

One must approach the Bible as a child. Such a mindset is willing to hear and is often ready to obey the solemn messages of God’s Word. Men educated under the light of their own revelation will rarely accept God and His word. Until a man is saved he cannot even understand and appreciate the majority of what the Bible can teach.

1 Corinthians 2:14 But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know [them], because they are spiritually discerned.

The Bible was not written as a work of Science nor was its purpose to describe the workings of the physical world. It was written to explain spiritual principles - the nature of man, the nature of God, and how man can have a personal relationship with

God. However, when the Bible describes the physical world, it is always accurate. For example

<u>Scientific Principle</u>	<u>Biblical Reference</u>
Cosmology and Astronomy	
Time had a beginning	2 Timothy 1:9, Titus 1:2, 1 Corinthians 2:7
The Universe had a beginning	Genesis 1:1, 2:4, Isaiah 42:5, etc.
The Universe was created from the invisible	Hebrews 11:3
The dimensions of the Universe were created	Romans 8:38-39
The Universe is expanding	Job 9:8, Psalms 104:2, Isaiah 40:22, Isaiah 42:5, Isaiah 44:24, Isaiah 45:12, Isaiah 48:13, Isaiah 51:13, Jeremiah 10:12, Jeremiah 51:15
Creation of matter and energy has ended in the Universe (refutes the steady-state theory)	Genesis 2:3-4
The Universe is winding down and will "wear out"	Psalms 102:25-27
Describes the correct order of creation	Genesis 1
Number of stars exceeds a billion	Genesis 22:17, Jeremiah 33:22
Every star is different	1 Corinthians 15:41
Pleiades and Orion as gravitationally bound star groups	Job 38:31
Light is in motion	Job 38:19-20
The Earth is controlled by the heavens	Job 38:33
The Earth is a sphere	Isaiah 40:22, Job 26:10
At any time, there is day and night on the Earth	Luke 17:34-35
Earth is suspended in space	Job 26:7
Earth Sciences	
Formation of continents by tectonic activity	Psalms 104:6-9, Proverbs 3:19
Vents exist on the bottom of the sea	Job 38:16
Ocean currents in the sea	Psalms 8:8
Air has weight	Job 28:25
Winds blow in circular paths	Ecclesiastes 1:6
Biology	
The chemical nature of human life	Genesis 2:7, 3:19
The life of creatures is in the blood	Leviticus 17:11
The nature of infectious diseases	Leviticus 13:46
Importance of sanitation to health	Numbers 19, Deuteronomy 23:12-13, Leviticus 7-9
Physical and Emotional Health	
Typhoid, cholera and dysentery	Deuteronomy 23:12-13
High maternity mortality rate	Numbers 19:13-14
Proper day of circumcision	Genesis 17:12
Deadly results of alcohol use	Proverbs 23:29-35
Deadly results of tobacco use	Genesis 17:11-12
Effects of venereal disease	Mark 10:4-9, Proverbs 5:1-12
Marital infidelity	Hebrews 13:4, Mark 10:68
Overeating	Titus 1:12-13
Suffering	Romans 8:35-37

One doesn't have to seek the wisdom of science to find out that God framed the world and created it.

Genesis 1:2 And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness [was] upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

The most important thing in this verse that you can understand is that one understands through faith not education. Faith is the medium for understanding. Simply find out what God said and believe it and then you'll know what really happened. A Christian *knows* where he came from and where he is. An unsaved man *thinks* he came from evolution. The Bible is the body of revealed truth. Important knowledge comes from the Word of God.

It took scientists 2,000 years to discover that the things that are made are not made of visible things. The atomic theory is in this verse.

1 Corinthians 15:52 In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. 'moment' - the shortest measurable element of time: Greek - atomo -> atom

Thus, within the revelation of the Scriptures is the word 'atomo' representing the shortest or smallest measure of time -► transliterated as 'atom'. The theory that things are made of the smallest measurable thing, things are made up of sub-atomic particles that are invisible to the naked eye can be found in Hebrews 11:

Hebrews 11:3 Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.

Most all the scientific laws are given to you in the Bible.

Ecclesiastes 1:7 All the rivers run into the sea; yet the sea [is] not full; unto the place from whence the rivers come, thither they return again.

All the natural laws can be found in the Bible. Certain of these laws have been shown to be true scientifically. For example, man now knows that the Earth is indeed suspended in space, it is spherical - not flat and that light is in motion.

Job 26:7 He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, [and] hangeth the earth upon nothing.

Faith is no longer required to accept these truths. But when it comes to the creation of the Universe and of man himself, if man doesn't have the faith that it was God that accomplished these things he must speculate and theorize on how these things could have happened.

That is the situation scholarship finds itself in today. Society lacks the faith to accept the unseen things, in this case the things the Bible says about creation: of Man and of the Universe. Because they want to take the authority away from God and instead be the authorities themselves, a plethora of speculation and theory is being foisted upon us. Yet in spite of the endless research to prove it true, the 'Theory of Evolution' can only be called that – a theory. Evolution to this day is still classified as a theory because scientists themselves cannot make it stand up to any 'scientific process'.

In fact, regarding evolution, while the theory claims that life evolves from the simple to the complex, biologists now deny life gets more complex. They have even found that in certain cases life actually goes from a complex state to a simpler one. And although scientists can go back in time to the early milliseconds of the creation of the Universe, nobody can show what took place at millisecond number one. We will go more deeply into these issues in the main body of this document.

Evolutionists fight to keep their agenda in the schools despite the overwhelming evidence and odds against evolution. Because it is in conflict to man's teachings, the Bible has been removed from the schools of America. God's name has even been removed from the pledge of allegiance and by no less of an 'authority' than the U.S. Supreme Court.

Biblical Man was uniquely created by God and placed into the universe –all independently of the events of the Big Bang. We also propose that the days of creation are literal days from God's perspective and when God's clock became synchronized with Man's at the time of the creation of Adam (Genesis 2:7) Man's perspective of time then harmonizes with Bible time. Until that point the length of the creative days of Genesis are literal 24 days – from God's perspective.

It can only follow that if God created the Universe and He therefore created Man then Evolution is totally a non-existent factor. The goal of this paper is to dispute the theory of Evolution and expose it as impossible to be true.

Originally, nothing of our Universe existed, not even time or space. It truly was in the beginning when God caused the Universe to explode out of nothing. One of the laws of physics is the Law of Causality which when paraphrased says an effect cannot be part of its cause. In other words, nothing cannot produce something anyway you look at it unless acted on by an outside force - in this case God. Space, time, matter, and energy spread out like a curtain at God's command. Why didn't the universe collapse immediately back upon itself due to the immense effects of gravity as physics tells us it could have? The answer is the hand of God was involved to regulate events.

It is generally agreed that in the doctrine of creation - *ex nihilo* - God created all things out of nothing . This is taught implicitly in Scripture. Genesis 1:1 states that it was God who created the world in the beginning. The question of what the cosmos was made from is not one that this verse was intended to answer. However, at least one prominent modern Old Testament scholar, G. Vermes, has argued persuasively that the verse speaks of an absolute beginning and therefore creation *ex nihilo*.

The major problem with the Big Bang theory for the Bible Believer (the author of this document himself being such a person) is that God's creating man and the Big Bang theory appear to be mutually exclusive. In other words, the Big Bang theory states that the debris of an explosion created everything, including Man. However the Universe was created in six days and man was created in the image of God, independent of a Big Bang. Encompassed in this thought will be a disputing of the Theory of Evolution and its creator Charles Darwin.

Another concern was that in 1650 AD Archbishop James Ussher used the genealogies provided in Genesis to calculate the age of the earth. He arrived at a date of 4004 BC. In response to this if one considers that God's 'time clock' (His perspective of time) and man's time clock (his perspective on time) these 'clocks' did not synchronize until the Creation of man. With the synchronization of these two clocks Bible history and Man's history become synchronized.

The Law of Relativity makes it impossible for a common reference frame to have existed between God and each part of the mix of matter that eventually became Mankind and the planet Earth. The differences in motions and gravitational forces among the various galaxies, or even among the stars of a single galaxy, make the absolute passage of time a very local affair. Time differs from place to place. The curvature of space and time make the measurement of time a relative thing.

It was at the point that God breathed the breath of life into Adam that a common 'clock' was established between God and the Earth. Man started to operate in the same space-time reference frame as God did. At this point the chronology of the Bible and the flow of time on the Earth became one and at this point there is parity between the ages that the Bible ascribes to post-Adam events and corresponding archaeological estimates of dates for the same events. The Bronze Age of the Biblical calendar and the Bronze Age of archaeology do coincide. The post-Adamic part of the calendar makes sense to us and the discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls prove that the Bible predates by thousands of years any of the modern archaeological finds that confirm it.

Main

The Creation of the Universe

Whether or not God created the Universe is the all-encompassing issue in the Evolution-Creation debate. If one could be made to accept that God created the Universe and it wasn't merely a random explosion of chemicals, then it would only follow logically that this same God could and did create man. As shown in the chart below, there are some startling parallels between the Big Bang and the Genesis narrative of Scripture. A Bible believer must however enforce the restriction that Big Bang cosmology and Scripture are two different things: one is the result of human inquiry and understanding and the other is the divine revelation of God.

Now please consider the following table:

BIG BANG THEORY * * * *	BIBLICAL CREATION
Creation of time, space, energy and matter out of nothing.	Creation of time, space, energy and matter out of nothing. <i>Genesis 1:1 In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.</i>
For the first 10-43 second the universe existed with one super-law, one super-force, and one super-particle. All of the laws of physics, fundamental forces and particulate matter "froze" out of this oneness.	<i>Deuteronomy 6:4 Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God [is] one LORD: Ephesians 4:4 [There is] one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; Ephesians 4:5 One Lord, one faith, one baptism, Ephesians 4:6 One God and Father of all, who [is] above all, and through all, and in you all. 1Timothy 2:5 For [there is] one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;</i>
Universe expands uniformly for first 10-43 seconds and then goes through an unimaginable period of inflationary expansion until 10-35 seconds and then resumes normal expansion through today.	<i>Psalms 104:2 Who coverest [thyself] with light as [with] a garment: who stretchest out the heavens like a curtain: Isaiah 40:22 [It is] he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof [are] as grasshoppers; that stretcheth out the</i>

First 300,000 years - universe was dark, burning formless void. Photons interact with free electrons too quickly to escape.

After 300,000 years and below 3,000oK electrons bind into atoms and photons bathe the universe in a blinding yellow light.

After 500,000 - 1 million years atoms bind to form molecules and visible matter appears. Between 1 million and 2 billion years galaxies, stars and planets were formed. As these planets first rotated around their suns - day and night was born.

Our planet, it seems, developed as a ball of hot gases orbiting the sun. As these gases cooled the solid core appeared and was surrounded by a dense gas cloud of water vapor. As the earth cooled further the water vapor began to condense forming the oceans. To this day there remains a constant interchange between the water vapor in the sky and the waters of the ocean

As the earth's surface became uneven due to volcanic and plate disturbances dry ground appeared first in the form of a large single land mass and then into separate ones through

*heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in:
Zechariah 12:1 The burden of the word of the LORD for Israel, saith the LORD, which stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him.*

Genesis 1:2 And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness [was] upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

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

Genesis 1:4 And God saw the light, that [it was] good: and God divided the light from the darkness.

Genesis 1:5 And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning were the first day.

Genesis 1:6 And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters.

Genesis 1:7 And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which [were] under the firmament from the waters which [were] above the firmament: and it was so.

Genesis 1:8 And God called the firmament Heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day.

Genesis 1:9 And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry [land] appear: and it was so.

"continental drift".

Genesis 1:10 And God called the dry [land] Earth; and the gathering together of the waters called the Seas:and God saw that [it was] good.

Table by Grace Valley Christian Center

*** It should be pointed out here that the Big Bang theory contradicts the Bible, which states

Exodus 20:11 For [in] six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them [is], and rested the seventh day: wherefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.

It is very important to understand that the creation of Man was SEPARATE from the Big Bang. God considered the creation of Man to be above and unique from the rest of His Creation. This fact can be gleaned from Scripture -

The letter 'yod' symbolizes finite manifestation beginning from a finite zero-dimensional point, into a one-dimensional line and then a two dimensional surface. Ramban states the creation itself as being something from nothing. 'Yod', the smallest letter, being used in 'Israel' also reflects on God's choosing of the smallest nation to be His 'seat' on earth.

An example of God's use of the grammatically superfluous 'yod' can be found in a comparison of "formed" in Genesis 2:7 (Man created) and in Genesis 2:19 (all creatures created). In Genesis 2:7 the word 'formed' contains a grammatically superfluous (extra) 'yod' We are being told that there was a something 'special' about the creation of mankind by the inclusion of the extra 'yod'. Yod is the first letter in God's name (Jehovah), which is NOT His title of (Lord) and yod is also the first letter in 'Jesus' and in "Israel. Thus, God's use of the grammatically superfluous 'yod' in Genesis 2:7 (the Creation of Man is stated) indicates that God considered this Creation to be a unique event, separate and above His other creative works.

Thus, the Creation of Man is separate from anything created in a Big Bang scenario. It is important to understand this distinction when studying this document.

We can now further focus on the events of Genesis 1:1-3 -

Genesis 1:1 In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.

The scientific explanation of the above chart has a remarkable similarity to what was written in Genesis thousands of years ago. The Big Bang sent cosmic debris to every corner of the Universe. This debris slowly united into spherical masses and the beginning of stars, planets solar systems and galaxies. According to Big Bang science (in agreement with the Biblical Sages), all the matter in the Universe came into existence at the same time. There was nothing, then there was a cataclysmic explosion of time and of all the matter in the universe. So the stars and planets, at least the materials that form them, came into existence at the same time. Genesis 1:1 supports this finding.

Before the Big Bang nothing of our Universe existed, not even time or space. It truly was in the beginning when God caused the Universe to be created out of nothing. According to the laws of physics the early Universe should have collapsed immediately back upon itself due to the immense pull of gravity, as physics tells us. Only the 'hand of God' could have prevented this from happening.

Genesis 1:2 And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

Genesis 1:2 explains how the 'hand of God' allowed this infinitely dense particle to expand despite its infinite mass. It was because the Spirit of God was hovering over Creation and He chose to overcome His laws of physics to allow a perfectly balanced the Big Bang event to take place. In the language of Man's Science, the infant universe can be likened to a grain of mustard. It was initially the tiniest imaginable speck of space. All matter was concentrated in one miniscule particle. Scientists cannot backtrack their data to this exact point of Universe's creation.

From an initial state of extreme density came expansion and a lowering of the extreme temperatures and energy could now condense into protons and electrons in accord with Einstein's law, $E = mc^2$, which states that energy and mass are actually different states. As this expansion continued away from the core, temperature and pressure dropped and the material Universe as we know it began to take shape. This process is widely accepted by present day cosmologists and is referred to as the Standard Model of the formation of our Universe.

The parallel between the scientific accounts and the Bible is remarkable. Writers today declare that without much sophisticated equipment we would never be able to speculate that the Universe came from a primordial state of high density and thus develop a Big Bang theory. Furthermore, powerful telescopes and knowledge of the Doppler Effect were necessary or Science could not conclude that there was an expanding Universe. The early Biblical commentators had no such modern technology available to them when they were able to reach virtually the same conclusions.

Scientists speculate about the future of the Universe; whether it will expand forever or oscillate between states of expansion and collapse. The Law of Entropy states that there will be an increasing progression towards disorder in a given system. To

answer this issue one can simply consult the Bible, which states that universe can exist forever and thus does not ‘oscillate’. The ancient sages understood this.

Psalms 148:4 Praise him, ye heavens of heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens.

Psalms 148:5 Let them praise the name of the LORD: for he commanded, and they were created. Let them praise the name of the LORD: for he commanded, and they were created.

Psalms 148:6 He hath also stablished them for ever and ever: he hath made a decree which shall not pass.

Light is composed totally of photons. As the infant Universe cooled further this allowed electrons to bind in stable orbits around hydrogen and helium nuclei, not only did the photons break free from the matter of the Universe, but they became visible as well. Light was now light and darkness dark, both theologically and scientifically.

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

Light is not only a substance we can see, it is also synonymous with wisdom and knowledge.

Daniel 5:14 I have even heard of thee, that the spirit of the gods [is] in thee, and [that] light and understanding and excellent wisdom is found in thee.

Light is used of the righteousness of God.

Isaiah 2:5 O house of Jacob, come ye, and let us walk in the light of the LORD.

Light is also applied to the Word of God. His Word "is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path,"

Psalms 119:105 NUN. Thy word [is] a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.

According to this theory, God first designed the universe and "ran a model of the universe he wanted" in a thought-experiment that was totally complete and accurate, and then he created a universe with an apparent history that was complete, with accurate data (including nonessential apparent age) about "what would have happened since the beginning" even though it never happened. If the current theories accepted by almost all scientists are correct, God created a universe that looks exactly the same as if it had been created with a Big Bang billions of years ago.

Biblical man

The distinction must be made between the debris of the Big Bang coalescing to form the sum total of the Universe and Biblical man who, although he was formed from this debris, was formed in the express image of God:

Genesis 1:26 And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

The author of Genesis states explicitly that mankind was made and created in the “image”, as a “likeness” of God (Genesis 1:26). Does this mean that here exists a

corporal or physical similarity between man and God? It is a basic principle of Judeo-Christian tradition that the Creator is not corporal and that no bodily attributes apply to the Creator. This seeming contradiction between the incorporeality of God and making man in God's "image" is resolved by the root meaning of the Hebrew word for image, which modifies the word "likeness" in the biblical text (Genesis 1:26). That meaning is "shadow". Man is indeed intended to present a likeness of God. But the likeness is not physical. It is the projection of God's acts as they appear in this world. God's shadow as it were. We are obliged to emulate God as we perceive God's interactions projected within our world.

Based on the literal meaning of Genesis 2:7 and Genesis 2:19, man and land animals and birds were *formed*, and they were formed from the same substance, the ground or Earth. There is, in the two verses, an important difference in the spelling of the verb *formed*. Although in both verses the tense and person of the verb are identical and the structure of both verses is the same, when describing the formation of mankind an extra grammatically superfluous Hebrew letter, 'yod' is added to the word *formed*. Yod is the first letter of the Hebrew name of God and is also used as an abbreviation for God's name.

The Bible makes the claim that humans alone are "created in the image of God." The Bible says that both males and females are created in the image of God. Some have equated the image of God as being the *physical* characteristics of our bodies that make up the way we look. Not only scientists, but even religious sects such as the Mormons have taken this interpretation to extreme by saying that God is just an exalted man, who has "a body of flesh and bones." The official Scriptures of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints contain the following:

One who accurately understands Scripture knows that the Bible states that we are created in God's image in Genesis 1:26-27.

Genesis 1:26 And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

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

This event happened before the fall of Man, but we know that we are still in some sense created in the image of God because 1 Corinthians 11:7 reaffirms this fact.

1Corinthians 11:7 For a man indeed ought not to cover [his] head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man.

The words "image" and "likeness" used in Genesis 1:26-27 express the idea of the whole Man being created in this way. In some sense, both a man's material and

spiritual aspects are included in the assessment. Man's physical body is not patterned after the physical appearance of God. God is Spirit and does not reside in a physical body. However, this does not preclude the physical body being some part of the image of God. God has given man free will, which likewise reflects God's image. Every man has the ability to choose for himself his actions. Man understands that certain things are good and certain things are evil. Before the fall, Adam and Eve had no knowledge of good and evil, but they did understand that they should obey God's commands. In part of the "image of God" refers to the ability of humans to be creative.

In spite of the above Scripture and the above reasoning there is a general misunderstanding in Science regarding the differentiation of Biblical man from lower creatures that happen to *resemble* man. This misunderstanding/unawareness of Scripture itself leads, even today, to scientific attempts to establish an evolutionary path from these lower creatures that happen to resemble Biblical man to Biblical man himself.

This difficulty that researchers possess is fueled by the fact that there is a range of fossils that now exists showing that creatures almost identical in shape to humans have existed at least for the past million years and perhaps longer. There exist thousands of fossils from the past 15,000 years, which scientists can date by the carbon-14 concentration in the fossil itself, although the accuracy of this technique is questionable. Villages have been found in the Arctic that contain remains of entire villages of Eskimo-like dwellers. These existed 9,000 years ago. Among the finds, in addition to the skeletons are relics of clothing, housing and the utensils of a socially organized lifestyle. Equally well-documented pre-Adam settlements extend from France to the Ukraine. In these finds additional items, such as fine sculptures of a variety of animals and even more remarkably, drawings revealing hand and eye coordination and the perception necessary to draw three dimensional objects in two dimensions.

Visible results of this have been discovered. Cave paintings, such as those found in southern France and dated at 30,000 years old and are termed 'sophisticated art' by scientists. We have a similarity to ancestral hominoids as far as cranial capacity is concerned. This capacity has not increased since the appearance of the Neanderthals, some 100,000 years ago. In fact here are Neanderthals with cranial capacities reaching 1,400 cc. That is some 100 cc larger than today's humans and 300 cc larger than the brain of a recent Noble Prize winner. This intelligence gives these humanoid creatures abilities to do things like build simple tools and draw paintings on cave walls as well.

So, without a proper understanding of the Bible, as is the situation today, Science continually attempts to develop an evolutionary chain leading to man from these fossilized bones. However the Jewish Sage Maimonides noted:

"In the time of Adam there coexisted animals that appeared as humans in shape, but lacked the 'image' that makes man uniquely different from other animals, being as the 'image' of God."

- Maimonides, Guide for the Perplexed

This statement is the key to distinguishing between the Universe that was created in the Big Bang and created Man who was made in the express image of God.

Genesis 1:26 And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

Man's animal predecessors, although physically related to him, are not connected with him in any spiritual sense nor do they contain the express image of God as man does.

Genesis 2:7 And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.

To briefly reiterate, evidence has been presented arguing for an intelligently created Universe. The odds against the random formation of even the most basic building blocks of life have been shown to be astronomical. Biologist findings regarding evolution and complexity have shown that in certain instances the trend is towards simplicity. The ancient sages and the written Word both make a distinction between Man and the other human-like beings.

Charles Darwin and Man's attempt to establish his own authority

One man who tried to establish an evolutionary path from lower animals to man based on random fossil evidence was Charles Darwin. In 1827 Charles Darwin entered the University of Cambridge to become a clergyman for the Church of England. As a student, when he was traveling on the H.M.S. Beagle as naturalist, he became very interested with certain facts that dealt with the distribution of the organic beings inhabiting South America and in the geological relations of the present to the past inhabitants of that continent. Darwin spent most of this time exploring on land and about 1/3 of the time at sea. His work established his reputation as a geologist and collector of fossils and his detailed observations of plants and animals provided the basis for ideas which he later developed into his Theory of Evolution by natural selection.

During this expedition Darwin saw, first hand, things in the Earth he could not explain by the theories he had learned. Among these were fossils of believed extinct creatures that closely resembled living creatures. Also, the Galapagos Islands proved very puzzling to him, with each island having different but similar forms of the same species of animals. Darwin's natural selection theory was published in 1859. It claimed that species slowly change through time as favorable adaptations make the animal better able to survive in its environment. These creatures would then pass this favorable change on to their offspring.

The fossil record of the mid-1800s, at the time of the writing of Darwin's 'On the Origin of Species', contained organisms ranging from the primitive to the complex. But there was no continuity within this record. With its gaps in fossil evidence, it did not demonstrate an evolutionary flow from the primitive to the complex. Darwin

realized and acknowledged this deficiency. The fossil record of the 1900s contains a hundred times more information than the record that existed at the time when Darwin published 'On the Origin of Species'. Yet today's fossil record is as discontinuous as that of Darwin's time.

For the last 150 years, the most popular explanation for the diversity of living things in the universe (except for Biblical Creation) has been Darwin's theory of evolution, often explained as "survival of the fittest". Darwin's theory met with much criticism from both scientists and religious leaders although Darwin himself originally gave God the glory of being responsible for the gradual changes he perceived in the species of animal life on earth. As research increased on the newly discovered fossils of the huge extinct creatures termed 'dinosaurs', scientists began to embrace this 'Evolution' theory.

Evolutionists claim that animals, when continually exposed to negative situations or attacks, evolve defense mechanisms to overcome these assaults. A common example is parasitism. Darwinists argue that, over the eons, animals that habitually fall victim to parasites evolve into creatures with better defense mechanisms, while parasites evolve improved methods to parasitize their evolving hosts. This thinking can be found in *Natural History* magazine, which claimed that a host's immune system, an exquisitely precise system of defense brought about by the evolutionary pressure of parasites, will do its level best to stave off the invasion. But host organisms have evolved other kinds of warfare as well: they can enlist other species to help them. They can medicate themselves. They can even program their unborn offspring for life in a parasite-ridden world (Zimmer)...As effective as some of these counterattacks may seem, parasites - not surprisingly - can evolve counter-counterattacks.

Charles Darwin comments on his own work in his own writings

"Connecting links" (between man and the lower animals) "have not hitherto been discovered." - Descent of Man

"If it could be demonstrated that any complex organism existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous successive slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down." - Origin of Species

"Why, if species have descended from other species by fine gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms." - Origin of Species

"To suppose that the eye with all its inimitable contrivances for adjusting the focus to different distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I confess, absurd in the highest degree." - Origin of Species

“When we descend to details, we cannot prove that no one species has changed. That is, we cannot prove that a single species has changed.” - Origin of Species - The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin, Vol. 1. New York: D. Appleton & Co., p. 209-10

“Geology assuredly does not reveal any finely graded organic chain; and this is perhaps the most obvious and serious objection that can be urged against the theory of evolution.” - Origin of Species

“Not one change of species into another is on record. We cannot prove that a single species has been changed into another.” - My Life and Letters

Darwin, plants and evolution

Scientists are shedding light on what Charles Darwin called an “abominable mystery”: how and when flowers evolved. Researchers report that the two largest groups of flowering plants are more closely related to each other than any of the other major lineages are. These are the monocots, which include grasses and their relatives, and the eudicots, which include sunflowers and tomatoes.

Robert Jansen, a biologist the University of Texas at Austin and member of the second research group, said the stage is being set for all future comparative studies of flowering plants. This new work is to appear in the research journal Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. Botanists predating Darwin noticed that flowering plants, which comprise at least 60 percent of all green plant species, diversified abruptly shortly after they appeared. The details, and especially the cause, of this diversification, known as ‘Darwin’s “abominable mystery”, have been a strong topic in botany research ever since. The speed of the diversification is “one of the reasons why it’s been hard to understand evolutionary relationships among the major groups of flowering plants,” Jansen said.

Researchers with the two universities analyzed DNA from plant chloroplasts, the cellular compartments responsible for plants’ ability to convert sunlight into sugar. Jansen and colleagues at his university analyzed DNA sequences of 81 genes from chloroplasts of 64 plant species; University of Florida researchers analyzed 61 genes from 45 species. The two groups also performed a combined analysis. “If you are interested in understanding the evolution of flowering plants, you can’t do that unless you understand their relationships,” he said.

Darwin first studied medicine at the University of Edinburgh and subsequently he studied theology at the University of Cambridge, but his grandfather’s work “Zoonomia” or the laws of organic life containing some initial ideas about the evolution of organisms and together with the botanist J. S. Henslow from Cambridge influenced Darwin to pursue this line of research.

Darwin regarded the great variety of orchid flowers as being a result of the adaptation to their pollinators, i.e. insects. No other plant family developed and perfected as many impressive differences in flower structure, while keeping a large degree of uniformity of the plants' vegetative parts. The flowers are built to allow, favor or even demand cross-fertilization.

He also looked into the hermaphroditism of plants, i.e. the fact that plants have female and male reproductive organs in one flower. He explains hermaphroditism as a consequence of the danger of originally dioecious plants that had formerly the advantage to be always fertilized by other specimen, to remain not fertilized and thus to produce no progeny. With dioecious plants, female flowers (with carpels) and male flowers (with stamens) belong never to the same plant.

As a result of these studies, two botanical essays of Darwin presented a whole host of supplementing proofs for the theory of selection that were strongly connected to his theory of evolution. As is the case with higher organisms under the constant struggle to exist, he found that inferior organisms are more likely to die before they can reproduce. On average, superior living things with useful traits are more likely to survive and reproduce and thus to pass on their helpful features. As a result, the next generation changes slightly, the struggle for survival goes on among the descendants and the process is repeated. In other words, the struggle for existence selects organisms with helpful variations but makes others die out. Darwin outlined his theory in his book *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection* in 1859, which was met with ridicule, antagonism and skepticism before it was accepted.

Do Genetic Studies Demonstrate Evolution?

Undoubtedly, in an attempt to come up with theories that don't depend on the failed attempts at pursuing evolution through the study of fossil evidence, evolutionists now claim that genetic studies of animals and humans demonstrate that groups of related species stem from a common ancestor. This *appears* to provide solid evidence for evolution, far beyond a few fossil fragments and it can be interpreted in several ways. An example of the confidence some evolutionists have in genetics can be found in a statement by evolutionist Carl Zimmer in *National Geographic*:

"From generation to generation certain genes of a species mutate at relatively steady rates. If you compare the genes of two species, say humans and chimpanzees - and you know the rates at which their genes have been mutating - you can estimate how long it has been since their ancestors diverged from a common ancestor."

However, media claims that geneticists have 'seen' proof of evolutionary divergence in the distant past are biased and misleading. In truth, the allegedly visible evidence in the genetic record is not an incontrovertible fact, but rather is interference based on assumptions. For example, Jonathan Losos, professor of biology at Washington University and director of that school's Tyson Research Center, writes:

"By comparing DNA sequences for the same gene or genes in different species, biologists can draw inferences about how species are related evolutionarily. Although controversy exists about the best method of deducing phylogenetic relationships from DNA comparisons, researchers agree that species that have more similar DNA are, in most cases, more closely related to each other than to another species whose DNA is less similar."

Zimmer himself, despite his previous statement, has also shown that genetic mapping only provides inference for, not proof of, evolution. Instead of showing a clear map of how a given species evolved from a lower life form, the genetic record shows a tremendous amount of genetic mutations that neither harm nor improve the species. He reports:

"The irony [of this discovery] was inescapable: scientists finally had a chance to tune in to evolution on its most basic level, but the signal of natural selection seemed to be swamped by the static of neutral evolution."

Worse, the signs of evolution by natural selection, supposedly visible in the genetic record, are simply not there, so inferences have to be made, as Zimmer admits:

"Researchers can't go back millions of years to read a gene's ancestral sequence, nor can they know the precise history of mutations that led up to its current form. But biologists can make some inferences by comparing the genes of closely related animals....But the evidence from real genes is rarely so clean, and thus some uncertainty inevitably creeps in.

Attempts to establish a link between Hominoids and Man

A significant portion of modern society today believes that there were strange creatures in prehistoric times not quite men and not wholly animal. We are told, in the name of Science, that these ape-men really did exist and that we have evolved from them. However, over the years the fossil evidence has been so sparse and weak that many unscientific humanoids were hastily constructed just to further the theory of evolution. Evolutionist literature on the whole has been found to be filled with basic errors and often-downright falsehoods when discussing Creationism (usually as a result of incredibly sloppy research and relying almost totally on another evolutionist's lack of objectivity and poor investigative procedures). Not uncommonly, such literature also is biased in an unfavorable way and even blatantly libelous. Several famous examples of this are described below.

In contrast to this kind of effort, for the Christian, the origin of life is not a problem at all. As we have stated, the Bible says that God called all plants and animals into existence by his Word. God also made man separately in His image, after His likeness. Even though Adam was made from the dust of the ground, this is not life coming from non-life as Evolution suggests. God is the Living God, and He gave life to Adam. God is both our Creator and Redeemer through Jesus Christ.

Next, the following examples of scientific effort to produce a ‘missing link’ ancestor that would reside on an evolutionary chain leading to modern man are presented. The scientist, at times will resort to a hoax just to prove his theory. But even studies that are done in a moral, ethical way will inevitably contain some flaw in their methodologies as the Bible is always true.

Java Man

In 1891 Doctor Eugene Dubois went to Java to search for the missing link between man and ape. Later, Dubois presented his Pithecanthropus - better known as Java Man. He showed to an international congress of zoologists what he had found in a river-bed in Java. Dubois presented a skull-cap and a tooth, both appearing to belong to an ape. He also showed them a thigh-bone that he had found a year later about fifty feet distant. The thigh-bone appeared to be human. Dubois insisted that they belonged together. Thus, the ape skull-cap stood on the human thigh bone and he announced that the missing link was finally found.

Doctor Dubois had not been entirely honest in his findings, however. The most important part of the story was excluded. Dubois did not disclose that he had also found two human skulls in the exact same stratum as the skull-cap. If this important information had been disclosed it would have spoiled his successful case because these were human skulls, which showed that real humans did live in Java at the same time as the supposed ape-man. This would have meant that there was no need to link the thigh bone with the skull cap found fifty feet distant, and that would have meant that evidence for the alleged ape-man would have been non-existent. For more than thirty years, Dubois kept the human skull secret and hidden. This led the great biologist Thomson to later state "The success of Darwinism was accompanied by a decline in scientific integrity". In 1921 a repentant Dubois revealed the human skulls. By then it was too late and Java-Man was reported as being falsely established.

Nebraska Man

A notable case of scientists using poorly researched material to promote the theory of evolution was with a humanoid called ‘Nebraska man’. This discovery lasted for a total of five years, starting in 1927. Further research eventually proved that the unusual tooth on which Nebraska man was founded (there were less than a cupful of bone fragments used to construct the complete Nebraska Man) was not actually from an ape-man but from a peckery, a type of wild pig. This ape-man turned out to be constructed from the tooth of a pig. In 1927 other parts of the skeleton were also found. According to these newly discovered pieces, the tooth belonged neither to a man nor to an ape. It was concluded that it belonged to an extinct species of wild American pig called Prosthennops. In spite of this, Nebraska Man is still used in some modern text- books, despite the fact that Professor Osbourne (Nebraska man’s discoverer) himself admitted that his findings were really that of a pig.

Neanderthal Man

Neanderthals were often portrayed as very primitive and apish looking. They were pictured as brutish because Neanderthal man was thought to be further back on the evolutionary scale. Modern humans, according to evolution, were more refined. This was based on slanting the data to fit preconceived notions of how early man was supposed to look

Neanderthal man was supposed to be slightly more sophisticated than the chimpanzee, walking stooped forward, and walking with his knees bent in a hairy, animalistic fashion. Marcellin Boule proved that Neanderthal Man had a bigger brain than modern man. Evidence then emerged that Neanderthal Man believed in the supernatural and there was substantial evidence that Neanderthal man had intermarried with modern type man. In 1929 Professor Boule even proved that Neanderthal man walked upright. Neanderthal Man is now regarded by scientists as a close relative of modern man, just another group of homosapiens.

Piltdown Man

Piltdown man is one of the most famous frauds in the history of science. In 1912 Charles Dawson discovered the first of two skulls found in the Piltdown quarry in Sussex, England, skulls of an apparently primitive hominid, an ancestor of man. Piltdown man was the expected "missing link" a mixture of human and ape with the noble brow of Homosapiens and a primitive jaw. For forty years, Piltdown Man fooled the world. It's discoverers claimed that over a period of four years they had found strange fossils at Piltdown, namely the upper part of a skull which was human and nearby a broken lower jaw bone. In the period 1912 to 1915 the Piltdown quarries yielded two skulls, a canine tooth, and a mandible of Eoanthropus, a tool carved from an elephant tusk, and fossil teeth from a number of pleistocene animals.

It was determined that the teeth in the jawbone belonging to an orangutan, had been worn down artificially and that the "primitive" tools discovered with the fossils were simple imitations that had been sharpened with steel implements. Eventually it became obvious under meticulous examination that Piltdown's teeth had been filed to make them look human and the marks of the abrasive were visible. The jawbone and teeth had been stained by chemicals to make them look like ape specimens. The men who engineered this fraud were later connected with the Peking Man of China.

African ape-man

In 1993 the BBC announced that scientists had uncovered a complete hand and arm of the ape-man Australopithecus - the first discovery of its kind. Australopithecines was known as African ape-man. These are pictured as large-jawed, small brained and standing about four feet tall and walking in approximately human fashion; not quite human but scientists classified them as a pre human phase of hominid evolution. They

said the fossil bones that were discovered were likely to yield dramatic new details about the anatomy and behavior of this distant cousin to modern humans and that they should also tell something about how modern man's hands and arms evolved.

Later, this team reported the discovery of a complete ape-man (hominid) skull and associated remains at the same location. Analysis revealed that the creature must have died at least 3.3 million years ago. What has been learnt over the years about Australopithecus - of which there were several species - suggests that the creature walked upright and ate plant foods and small animals, when they could be caught. They concluded these remains showed a probable common ancestry with modern man.

However there was little fossil evidence and the geologists ended up contradicting one another, sometimes allocating bones the way they want them. Frustrated with a lack of sufficient evidence researcher Douglas Dewar later said "*The supposition that African man walked upright is based on the supposition that some isolated bone found among a heap of bones in a cave belonged to the same species*". After he had written this, further evidence from more complete bones indicates that African Man did not walk upright.

The research of Dr. Leakey

Doctor Louis Leakey was a famous paleontologist who worked in Africa for a number of years financed by the National Geographic Magazine. In 1950 Leakey's wife found 400 fragments of a skull, although possibly parts of two skulls were involved. In 1959 she found their first significant hominid fossil, a skull with huge teeth. It was found in deposits that also contained stone tools and Louis, typically, inflated its importance by claiming it was a human ancestor. To everyone else, it seemed markedly un-human, and similar to australopithecines. However, the four hundred pieces were put together into a skull, with the exclusion of the jaw- bone. A model jaw-bone based on a jaw bone that Doctor Leakey's son had found elsewhere was molded and the completed skull was called Zinjanthropus, or Zinj.

National Geographic featured the story and Zinj was declared as the oldest real human, aged one million seven hundred and fifty thousand years old. There was much excitement generated by this find until it was found to be a complete mistake. Everyone involved, including Leakey's son, agreed that Zinj was not human after all. Zinj was just another Australopithecus. The Leakey's' soon found another humanoid called homo-habilis to perpetuate this propaganda. Homo-habilis was a clever man who was able to use tools. Thus we are taught that Homo-habilis outlived his other ape cousins because the continuous use of tools allowed his brain capacity to increase, making him more and more intelligent... However, while muscles have been observed to increase through exercise brain cells have not.

Finds like these were thought to 'revolutionize' the way researchers viewed the descent of Mankind, showing the world that Humankind did evolve from and begin in Africa. Doctor Leakey's view was that habilis was a species of Man now extinct.

However, many other evolutionists say that Leakey was wrong and that habilis was just an Australopithecines - another brute.

These scandals demonstrate that evolutionist scientists do not hesitate to employ any kind of unscientific method to prove their theory. By keeping this point in mind, when considering the other so-called evidence of the "human evolution" myth, similar situations will be confronted. Here only some of the more notable examples of this type of 'scientific' fraud were covered. The goal is always the same – to give man the authority over his own existence and eliminate God from the picture. Some of these 'humanoids' are still taught as being part of an evolutionary chain to modern man in the schools today while God and the Bible have been systematically removed from the classroom.

Peking Man

Peking Man was a Chinese representation of an allegedly early species of human, found as fossils, 500,000–750,000 years old, in the cave of Choukoutien in 1927 near Beijing (Peking). Peking man used chipped stone tools, hunted game, and used fire. Similar varieties of early human have been found in Java and East Africa. A researcher named Dr. Black believed that man began life in China. Black took charge of the excavation work near the hill at Peking. In 1926, and on the evidence of one tooth, Black showed a great deal of confidence in finding an ape-man. There was also a Chinese scientist in on the fieldwork and the infamous Teilhard de Chardin, who acted as unofficial observer. Reporting to France in 1929, Dr. Black found something which made the first official Peking Man but was uncertain whether it a skull or just a skull-cap.

Teilhard de Chardin reported finding a skull, which closely resembled the great apes, while Dr Black however, announced a skull-cap. Whatever it was, Black constructed a model, not a cast but a model of the supposed skull. It took two years to make the model and according to a Father O'Connell, Malcolm Bowden and other observers, Dr Black did not comply with appropriate guidelines when constructing the skull. Black made the skull represent what he wanted it to represent. As excavations continued, two great heaps of ashes were uncovered, and in the ashes were the bones of numerous animals. Also mixed in the ashes were monkey-like skulls and Black claimed the monkey-like skulls were more of his Peking men. Their classification is disputed: some anthropologists classify them as *Homo erectus*, others as *Homo sapiens pithecanthropus*. Immediately the picture of Peking Man emerged as a transitional creature just across the dividing line - a man, but just an extremely primitive man using stone tools, walking upright, living in a cave and using a fire for cooking.

Teilhard de Chardin sent a report to France. He confirmed that human skulls and bones had indeed been found on the site despite the fact that three years later he then sent a second report, stating that no trace of real men had been found. (Teilhard de Chardin later abandoned his vocation as a Catholic Priest). Every fossil bone of Peking Man has since disappeared. Apparently, just after the war, the fossils were put on board an

American ship and then disappeared. Dr. Pei was said to have had very good reason to destroy the fossils.

The skulls were, destroyed before the Chinese government returned to Peking in order to remove the evidence of fraud on a large scale". The fossils are gone, and all that remain are the imaginative models of Peking Man. After the communists took over, Dr. Pei used the models to teach the Chinese people that they are born of monkeys.

Evolution's Dating System is fatally flawed

One of the foundations of the theory of evolution is the dating of the fossils. Animal remains found in geological layers of a certain age are deemed to be the evolutionary descendants of animals whose fossils are unearthed in layers considered even older. Evolutionists date geological layers by the fossils found in them. In other words, Fossil Y is considered an evolutionary descendant of Fossil X because Y is found in a geological layer deemed younger than the layer containing X, and this geological layer is deemed younger because it contains the evolutionary ancestor of Fossil Y.

Biblically based scientists have always leveled the charge against evolutionists that this method of dating is clearly self-serving and useless as it uses the fossils to date the rock layers, and the rock layers to date the fossils. Evolutionists have admitted that this is exactly what they themselves are guilty of. An example of this can be found in a statement by one of America's leading paleontologists, Dr. Edwin H. Colbert, the author of numerous books on evolution, dinosaurs, and other ancient life. He is also Curator of Vertebrate Paleontology at the Museum of Northern Arizona and Curator Emeritus of the prestigious American Museum of Natural History.

"...Consequently the interpretation of the sediments in which the fossils are contained is a complex and exacting discipline. But such interpretation is of importance if the sequence of the fossils and the consequent evolutionary conclusions as based on this sequence are to be correctly understood. ..."

Evolutionists do not seem to be bothered by this tremendous flaw in their own theory, even though they openly admit that the flaw exists. Evolutionism rests heavily on interpreting the fossil record as showing a chronological procession of primitive to more advanced life-forms, but this interpretation is not credible because it is based on circular reasoning designed to fit a pre-determined theory rather than the objective facts. The theory of evolution, thus, rests not on a foundation of stone but of shifting sand.

Evolution is not possible

All this is taking place in spite of the fact that evolution is not possible! For atoms and molecules to randomly form the simplest proteins (the building blocks of life) more time would be required than all the time contained in a 6,000 year OR a 15 billion year universe. On absolutely no evidence, and, indeed evidence to the contrary, Darwinian evolution is still proclaimed by many to be quite true. The natural laws of thermodynamics have been violated; the billions and billions of 'missing links' of plants and animals don't exist. Despite the fact that no beneficial mutations have ever been scientifically observed, assumptions become the rule although they often border on fantasy.

Neither Darwin nor his supporters have been able to find a fact in the universe to support their hypothesis. With millions of species and incomplete sets of fossils, investigators have not been able to find one single instance in which one species has evolved into another. With millions of examples, nothing in the process of change was found. Furthermore, no link between Neanderthal DNA (the humanoid thought to be closest to modern man) and the DNA of modern man has ever been found.

Darwinian evolution only focuses on the mechanism for modification over time between kinds of organisms. Evolutionary theory still doesn't deal with the first organism that 'arose' on the Earth. To deal with this evolutionary researchers have developed a theory called "spontaneous generation." The doctrine of Spontaneous Generation holds that organic life could and does arise from inorganic matter. Spontaneous Generation was thought to be the Origin of Life until the late 1850's. Pasteur disproved Spontaneous Generation. "Pasteur filled a long necked flask with meat broth. He then heated the glass neck and bent it into an "S" shape. Air could reach the broth, but gravity acted to trap airborne microorganisms in the curve of the neck. He then boiled the broth. After a time, no microorganisms had formed in the broth. When the flask was tipped so that the broth reached the microorganisms trapped in the neck, the broth quickly became cloudy with microscopic life." Spontaneous Generation was thus disproved as the Origin of Life in 1859. Ironically, it was this same year that Charles Darwin's Origin of Species was published. The famous Nobel Prize-winning biologist, Professor deDuve wrote in a book called Tour of a Living Cell in which he said "If you equate the probability of the birth of a bacteria cell to chance assembly of its atoms, eternity will not suffice to produce one."

In spite of this fact very soon after water appeared on the earth, tiny, one-celled creatures called bacteria and algae were formed in wisdom for a very special job. This sudden appearance of life, so soon after the earth formed surprised scientists and forced a radical change in the theories of how life originated. These microbes originally fed on pre-biotic slimes and chemicals. It is as if a Divine wisdom was at work preparing the atmosphere to become rich in oxygen, just right for the breathing by larger forms of life that were to come. But never think that because these first microbes were small that they were simple. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Each one is like a universe in

miniature. These tiny first forms of life did almost everything that we do, but of course on a micro-scale.

Like modern man they had to eat and to grow. The cells of our bodies divide to make new ones. So did the first form of life also know how to grow and divide, how to take in nutrients and to get rid of the waste products, how to make new parts for the workings of the cell as the old parts wore out. And all this wisdom some people think was built solely by random chance reactions from the rocks and water and a few simple chemicals that were on the surface of the newly formed earth. The implication of this research was that life does not create itself, it required God to create it originally.

Their results were so compelling that they remained unchallenged for about 50 years. Then, Alexander Oparin, a Russian chemist, proposed that organic molecules coalesced together to form the first living cell in the primordial soup. Such a cell would then go on to evolve into all of the different types of living things on earth today. This resurrection of spontaneous generation was developed in the early years of Soviet Russia which was strongly atheistic. Therefore, Oparin's theory was the product of an atheistic worldview that excluded God rather than one based on scientific evidence. The scientific evidence still confirms that life comes only from pre-existing life.

Scientists who promote a spontaneous origin of life without a Creator begin with the assumption that God does not exist. Then they devise an imaginative and improbable scenario in which molecules come together to form a living being. Since the evolutionists have an "explanation", they use it to insist that life can arise without God. However, this is simply a case of circular reasoning.

Similar reasoning is seen in the work of Stanley Miller. In the 1950's, Miller mixed several gases in an electrical chamber. In the reactions that ensued, amino acids, the building blocks of proteins were produced. While the mere formation of amino acids is hardly the creation of life, nonetheless, Miller's work was widely acclaimed. Many hailed this as a major breakthrough to show how life could arise spontaneously. However, Miller chose the composition of his starting material and designed the apparatus to make amino acids.

Additional research has shown that the composition of the earth's atmosphere was never similar to Miller's apparatus. This seriously calls into question whether the "building blocks of life" could ever be made spontaneously on earth. Increasingly, scientists are finding that *destruction* of building blocks would be favored over production further supporting the fact that life comes only from life.

In spite of the many theories no one in any laboratory has come even close to showing how this could have happened by random reactions. In fact the famous Nobel Prize-winning biologist, Professor deDuve wrote in a book called *Tour of a Living Cell*, "If you equate the probability of the birth of a bacteria cell to chance assembly of its atoms, eternity will not suffice to produce one." Yet, according to the fossil record, life started on the Earth very, very rapidly.

“Just as the theory of there having been a big bang creation of the universe from absolutely nothing exceeds the understanding of the human mind, so does the fact that lifeless matter, rocks and water, became alive, and knew how to stay alive from the very first. Never ever let yourself forget the wonder of our world. Never take our magnificent universe for granted. Every sight of a tree or a leaf or a tiny insect is a reminder of the marvel and the miracle of our existence.”

Only by the wisdom and ability of God, creation, from the rocks and water and a few simple chemicals that had formed naturally on the Earth’s surface, such as methane, ammonia, and amino acids, life was brought forth. Only an intelligent God could convert disorder and chaos to higher level of order. Part of the miracle of life from non-living matter is that it arose on earth almost immediately after the Earth had cooled.

In 1968 Professor Harold Morowitz of Yale University presented computations of the time required for random chemical reactions to form a bacterium – not an organism as complex as a human or even a flower. Just a simple single-celled bacterium. Based on his calculations on optimistically rapid rates of reactions, “the calculated time for bacterium to form exceeds not only the 4.5-billion-year age of the Earth, but also the entire 15 billion year age of the universe. The likelihood of random processes producing life from a primordial bath of chemicals is even less likely than that of your shaking an omelet and having the yolk and the white separate back into the original form of the egg!”

Even until the middle 1970’s the accepted scholarly wisdom of random evolution was that billions of years passed during which random chemical reactions in muddied puddles of water or on moist surfaces allowed for first form of life to appear. Then came the amazing discoveries of Harvard University Professor Elso Barghoorn that the first form of life, microbes, appeared not after billions of years but immediately after the earth cooled. Also Sterrenberg Barghoorn (1915-1984) was an American paleobotanist best known for his discoveries in South African rocks of fossils which pushed back the estimates of the origin of life to more than 3.4 billion years ago. This showed that life originated comparatively soon after a suitable environment appeared.

The old theory of the gradual evolution of life from non-living matter literally was now disproved. The goal of evolutionists is now the struggle to discover how life could have emerged from non-living matter so rapidly. However, because the Bible speaks in language people can understand, its text consistently deals with aspects of life as they are directly understandable to humans. At the time the Bible was written and for most of time afterward, people would not have understood the concept of living creatures that cannot be seen. However, ancient Bible commentators recognized there was literally more than meets the eye in these verses. The ancient commentator Nachmanides, commenting on the origins of plant life, stated over 700 years ago:

“God decreed that there be among the potentials of the earth a force which causes vegetative growth and bears seed.” The potential for the greening of the earth appears to

have already existed within the earth. All that was needed was God's suggestion, "And God said," to activate this potential, and the earth "brought forth" the first, simple photosynthetic cells, or what the Bible suggests were the precursors to plants, that would later become visible and more complex during the following days of the six days of creation in Genesis."

The conclusion of this discussion is that only an intelligent God could have produced the initial elementary forms of life on the Earth. Randomly, even if the development of even simple bacterium did occur, it would have required a longer period of time than the total age of the Universe itself. Therefore, a Big Bang could only have been started by the 'hand of God.' There is no other explainable or no sufficient amount of time for the early formation of even the most elemental forms of life to appear. So, the feeling in this document is that the Big Bang is another name for the process of creation, something created from nothing, by the hand of God Himself. And this does not preclude the creation and placement of Biblical Man into this created Universe at a later time in history.

During this time the battle to keep the Bible as a respected book among learned scholars was fought and lost in the nineteenth century. In this time frame the critic of Scripture had gained another advantage. Science was developing with an amazing speed, making enormous strides. It was the golden age of invention and theologians seemingly couldn't compete. A book was not competing with the 'practicality' of Science. Additionally, there were major denominational splits in the church, such as between Catholics and Protestants.

During this period there was a mushrooming of anti-Biblical, anti-Christian movements. There was the growth in radical Biblical criticism and the emergence of religious modernism. In philosophy positivism, naturalism, materialism, and agnosticism were being strongly advocated and defended. Orthodoxy was barraged from every side. Universities, many religious leaders and much of society in general yielded to the critical and scientific attacks on the Bible. This revolt began at first against Catholicism but it then became hostile to Protestant orthodoxy. This deep-moving secularism amounted to life without God, philosophy without the Bible, community without the Church. It was all against the Christian.

In the nineteenth century battleground of the Bible and Science, Science was developing with an amazing rapidity. All the practical and theoretical success of science added weight to the arguments of Christianity's critics. The rapid strides of science in the nineteenth century were enormous. Because the strides in science during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries have so shadowed those of our entire human history and man has become so accustomed to these scientific marvels, we have forgotten the days of the scientific giants of the nineteenth century altogether.

The Bible was losing its importance to the majority of scholarly thinkers. With a society having this mindset it becomes more difficult for the Bible to compete popularly

with the practicality of Science. The result is people in general become accustomed to the scientist's claims that are demonstrated very concretely and at times very dramatically. It then becomes a desire for people to rather believe what they CAN see over the faith to believe in things UNSEEN.

In hand with this, the God-fearing scientist became rare and the conservative or the orthodox scientist became an oddity. The prestige of Science went to the scientists and to their philosophical and religious views. The result of this was that Science was now being developed within non-Christian belief system. Theology is no longer taught at the major universities. It is therefore now not a part of the scientific community's curriculum. This is not to say that there are no Christian scientists, but the trend is clearly away from the incorporation of theological beliefs into scientific inquiry. Thus, Science is no longer a major concern on the part of the theological curriculum. On the surface science and theology appear to have little in common, although there are those in Christian circles who seek to know more about the Universe around them that God has created.

Conclusions

It has been claimed in this document that God created the Universe from nothing at His will. This was accomplished via a modified version of the Big Bang theory, the modification being that man was created in the image of God and not in the same way as all the other the products of the Big Bang. Furthermore, we proposed that God gave the Universe an apparent age and that until Adam was created God's time keeping was different than the way Man perceived the passage of time. By establishing that God created the universe we indirectly proved that He also created man.

Evolutionary methods were shown to be based on false assumptions and outright scientific impossibilities. These research efforts were often constructed with sparse, poor or altogether lacking data and at times deliberate hoaxes were even perpetrated just to further theories or even desires of researchers. Schisms in the Church were shown to have also led a segment of society to seek scientific answers. Modern discoveries were also a distraction and became a competing force with the Bible itself.

In conclusion, no evolutionary finding has ever proved the Bible wrong in any way. In actuality all the answers to how the Universe and Man were created can be find within the Scriptures. They contain everything we need to know about the planet we live on. In addition to matters of Science, the Bible also contains the answers to personal health and happiness, spiritual peace – and infinitely more. Most importantly, of all of the Bible contains the message of salvation and how an individual can achieve personal salvation.

Evolution vs. Creation Bibliography

Course #125

Jerry Ingerman

Charity Baptist Bible Institute

Sicker, Martin. The Biblical Creation Narrative. New England: Greenwood Pub Group. 2006

Darwin, Charles. The Origin Of Species. United States: Penguin, 2003.

Darwin Charles. The Descent of Man. United States: Penguin Classics, 2003.

Darwin, Charles. The Voyage of the Beagle: Charles Darwin's Journal of Researches. United States: Penguin Classics, 2006.

Darwin, Charles, Nora Barlow. The Autobiography of Charles Darwin 1809-1882. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1993

Darwin, Charles. The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals. South Carolina: BiblioBazaar, 2007.

Darwin, Charles. The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication. Boston: Adamant Media Corporation. 2001

Darwin, Charles, Darwin, Francis. The Structure and Distribution of Coral Reefs. United States: University Press of the Pacific, 2001

Darwin, Charles. The Differnet Forms of Flowers and Plants of the same Species. Whitefish, MT: Kessinger, 2006.

Darwin, Charles. Selected Works. Darwin Online <http://darwin-online.org.uk/>

Schroeder, Dr. Gerald. The Genesis Project. < <http://www.tothesource.org> > (2006)

Paine, Thomas. The philosophy of Creation. Boston: Bela Marsh 1860

Levin, Frank. Calibrating the Cosmos How Cosmology Explains Our Big Bang Universe. Rhode Island: Springer Science + Business, 2007.

Spontaneous Generation. 2002 - 2007 AllAboutTheJourney.org
<<http://www.allaboutthejourney.org/spontaneous-generation.htm>>

Sawan , Dr. Z. Richard, Evolution vs. Creation – The Final Word 2004 Authorhouse
<www.authorhouse.com>

Matthews, Jason. The Big Bang: Notes from Looking Within 2006 Authorhouse
<www.authorhouse.com>

Allday, Jonathan. Quarks, Leptons and the Big Bang - Second Edition. Bristol and Philadelphia: Institute of Physics Publishing Ltd. 2002.

Krauss, Lawrence M. Atom: A Single Oxygen Atom's Journey from the Big Bang to Life on Earth...and Beyond. Boston: Back Bay Press, 2002.

Bradshaw, Robert I. “*Creationism & the Early Church*” The Early Church's Doctrine of Creation (2007) <<http://EarlyChurch.org.uk>>
Gibson, Gary C. Creation and Cosmos; The Literal Values of Genesis. San Diego: Gibson Publishers, 2006.

Schroeder, Gerald Dr. Genesis and the Big Bang: The Discovery Of Harmony Between Modern Science And The Bible. New York: Bantam, 1991.

Dew, Diane. Creation vs. Evolution What Saith the Scriptures? 1991
<<http://www.dianedew.com/creation.htm>>

Ramm, Bernard. The Imperative Necessity of a Harmony of Christianity and Science. 2005 University of Wisconsin 2005
<<http://www.uwgb.edu/dutchs/PSEUDOSC/RammReconcile.HTM>>

Gitt, Werner. “Is the ‘big bang’ a good scientific theory?” *Creation* 20(3):42-44 1998

Ham, Ken Origins: Is the Big Bang good Scientific Theory? 2006
<<http://www.answersingenesis.org>>

Schroeder, Gerald Dr. The Hidden Face of God: Science reveals the ultimate truth. New York: Simon and Shuster 2001.

Becker, Carl J. A Modern Theory of Evolution. London, New York: University 2005.

Krafchow, Dovid. Time. <http://ezinearticles.com/?expert=Dovid_Krafchow 2007.>

Deem, Rich. Man, Created in the Image of God: How Mankind is Unique Among All Other Creatures on Earth. 2007

<<http://www.godandscience.org/evolution/imageofgod.html>>

Ferrel, Vance. Science vs. Evolution. 2006.

<http://www.pathlights.com/ce_encyclopedia/sciev/sci_vs_ev_TOC.htm>

Yaya, Harun. Evolution Deceit. United Kingdom: Ta-Ha Publishers Ltd. 1999.

Weiman, Ted. Louis Leakey Discovering the Secrets of Humankind's Past 1997.

<<http://www.utexas.edu/courses/wilson/ant304/biography/arybios97/weimanbio.html>>

Hoyle, Frederick. Genesis: Absolutely Reliable Scientifically.

<<http://www.layevangelism.com/advtxbk/sections/sect-10/sec10-1.htm>>

Ramm, Bernard. The Christian View of Science and Scripture. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing 1955.

Evolution vs. Creation Bibliography

Sicker, Martin. The Biblical Creation Narritive. New England: Greenwood Pub Group. 2006

Darwin, Charles. The Origin Of Species. United States: Penguin, 2003.

Darwin Charles. The Descent of Man. United States: Penguin Classics, 2003.

Darwin, Charles. The Voyage of the Beagle: Charles Darwin's Journal of Researches. United States: Penguin Classics, 2006.

Darwin, Charles, Nora Barlow. The Autobiography of Charles Darwin 1809-1882. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1993

Darwin, Charles. The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals. South Carolina: BiblioBazaar, 2007.

Darwin, Charles. The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication. Boston: Adamant Media Corporation. 2001

Darwin, Charles, Darwin, Francis. The Structure and Distribution of Coral Reefs. United States: University Press of the Pacific, 2001

Darwin, Charles. The Differnet Forms of Flowers and Plants of the same Species. Whitefish, MT: Kessinger, 2006.

Darwin, Charles. Selected Works. Darwin Online <http://darwin-online.org.uk/>

Schroeder, Dr. Gerald. The Genesis Project. < <http://www.tothesource.org>> (2006)

Paine, Thomas. The philosophy of Creation. Boston: Bela Marsh 1860

Levin, Frank. Calibrating the Cosmos How Cosmology Explains Our Big Bang Universe. Rhode Island: Springer Science + Business, 2007.

Spontaneous Generation. 2002 - 2007 AllAboutTheJourney.org
<<http://www.allaboutthejourney.org/spontaneous-generation.htm>>

Sawan , Dr. Z. Richard, Evolution vs. Creation – The Final Word 2004 Authorhouse
<www.authorhouse.com>

Matthews, Jason. The Big Bang: Notes from Looking Within 2006 Authorhouse
<www.authorhouse.com>

Allday, Jonathan. Quarks, Leptons and the Big Bang - Second Edition. Bristol and Philadelphia: Institute of Physics Publishing Ltd. 2002.

Krauss, Lawrence M. Atom: A Single Oxygen Atom's Journey from the Big Bang to Life on Earth...and Beyond. Boston: Back Bay Press, 2002.

Bradshaw, Robert I. “*Creationism & the Early Church*” The Early Church's Doctrine of Creation (2007) <<http://EarlyChurch.org.uk>>

Gibson, Gary C. Creation and Cosmos; The Literal Values of Genesis. San Diego: Gibson Publishers, 2006.

Schroeder, Gerald Dr. Genesis and the Big Bang: The Discovery Of Harmony Between Modern Science And The Bible. New York: Bantam, 1991.

Dew, Diane. Creation vs. Evolution What Saith the Scriptures? 1991
<<http://www.dianedew.com/creation.htm>>

Ramm, Bernard. The Imperative Necessity of a Harmony of Christianity and Science. 2005 University of Wisconsin 2005

<<http://www.uwgb.edu/dutchs/PSEUDOSC/RammReconcile.HTM>>

Gitt, Werner. "Is the 'big bang' a good scientific theory?" *Creation* 20(3):42-44 1998

Ham, Ken Origins: Is the Big Bang good Scientific Theory? 2006

<<http://www.answersingenesis.org>>

Schroeder, Gerald Dr. The Hidden Face of God: Science reveals the ultimate truth. New York: Simon and Shuster 2001.

Becker, Carl J. A Modern Theory of Evolution. London, New York: University 2005.

Krafchow, Dovid. Time. <http://ezinearticles.com/?expert=Dovid_Krafchow 2007.>

Deem, Rich. Man, Created in the Image of God: How Mankind is Unique Among All Other Creatures on Earth. 2007

<<http://www.godandscience.org/evolution/imageofgod.html>>

Ferrel, Vance. Science vs. Evolution. 2006.

<http://www.pathlights.com/ce_encyclopedia/sciev/sci_vs_ev_TOC.htm>

Yaya, Harun. Evolution Deceit. United Kingdom: Ta-Ha Publishers Ltd. 1999.

Weiman, Ted. Louis Leakey Discovering the Secrets of Humankind's Past 1997.

<<http://www.utexas.edu/courses/wilson/ant304/biography/arybios97/weimanbio.html>>

Hoyle, Frederick. Genesis: Absolutely Reliable Scientifically.

<<http://www.layevangelism.com/advtxbk/sections/sect-10/sec10-1.htm>>

Ramm, Bernard. The Christian View of Science and Scripture. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing 1955.