

So You Lost Your Faith in College or University Over the Study of Evolution

by Gary T. Panell

“A single fertilized egg (zygote), the size of a pinhead, contains chemical instructions that would fill more than five hundred thousand printed pages. (A. E. Wilder-Smith, *The Natural Sciences Know Nothing of Evolution* {Costa Mesa, Calif.: T.W.F.T. Publishers, 1981})

“The genetic information contained in this ‘encyclopedia’ determines the potential physical aspect of the developing human from height to hair color. In time, the fertilized egg divides into the 30 trillion cells that make up the human body, including 12 billion brain cells, which form more than 120 trillion connections. (A.E. Wilder-Smith, *The origin of life*, episode 3 videotape {Gilbert, Ariz.: Eden, 1983})” These quotes were taken from (*Fatal Flaws* by Hank Hanegraaff)

“The above statements lead us naturally into the *Discovery of DNA* (1953). The discovery of DNA was not made until long after Darwin had gone to his reward. Since the discovery of DNA we know it is impossible for life to come about by chance, or to change from one form of life to another!

“DNA has crushed the hopes of biological evolutionists, for it provides clear evidence that every species is locked into its own coding pattern. It would be impossible for one species to change into another, since the genes network together so closely. It is a combination lock, and it is shut tight. These quotes were taken from (*Fatal Flaws* by Hank Hanegraaff)

“Only sub-species variations can occur (varieties in plants, and breeds in animals). This is done through gene shuffling (*A.I. Oparin, *Life: Its Nature, Origin and Development*, 1961, p. 31; *Hubert P. Yockey, “A Calculation of Probability of Spontaneous Biogenesis by Information Theory,” *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, Vol. 67, 1977, p. 398)

The odds of accidentally producing the correct DNA code in a species or changing it into another viable species are mathematically impossible (*J. Con Leslie, “Cosmology, Probability, and the Need to Explain Life,” in *Scientific American and Understanding*. Pp. 53, 64-65; *E. Ambrose, *Nature and Origin of the Biological World*, 1982, p. 135).

“...Naturalists are always telling us that humans have been around for hundreds of thousands of years. If we did assume that humans have been around for 50,000 years and if we were to use [these] calculations..., there would have been 332 doublings, and the world's population would be a staggering figure—a one followed by 100 zeros; that is

10,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,
000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,
000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,
000,000,000.

"This figure is truly unimaginable, for it is billions of times greater than the number of atoms that are in the entire universe! Such a calculation makes nonsense of the claim that humans have been on earth for tens of thousands of years.

"Simple, conservative arithmetic reveals clear mathematical logic for a young age of the earth. From two people, created around 6,000 years ago, and then the eight people, preserved on the Ark about 4,500 years ago, the world's population could have grown to the extent we now see it—over 6.5 billion. [In the year 2009]

"With such a population clearly possible (and probable) in just a few thousand years, we could actually ask the question, 'If humans were around millions of years ago, why is the population so small?' This is a question that evolution supporters must answer."

Dr. Monty White is now a young-earth creationist; however, as a young Christian, he believed in theistic evolution. Since 2000, he has been the CEO of *Answers in Genesis* —UK.

You say, "How did you know that I lost my faith in college or university?" The reason I know this is because statistics show that of those who go off to college or university, about three-quarters of these lose their faith in God. This usually happens when students are confronted with naturalism or evolution.

The American Heritage Dictionary, Second Edition defines 'naturalism' as: "2. *Philos.* The system of thought holding that all phenomena can be explained in terms of natural causes and laws without attributing moral, spiritual, or supernatural significance to them. 3. *Theol.* The doctrine that all religious truths are derived from nature and natural causes and not from revelation."

I am addressing in this article, one, "former believers" in God. Second, I will also address believers who think we have to compromise creation with evolution. In other words they believe God used the process of evolution to bring everything into existence. The reason I want to address this group also, is because this type of thinking could also lead a person to a point of losing their faith in God.

First, we need to define the word 'evolution' here. The dictionary defines evolution as, "1. A gradual process in which something changes into a different, and usually, more complex or better form. 2. *Biol. a.* The theory that groups of organisms, as species, may change with passage of time so that descendants differ morphologically and physiologically from their ancestors. **b.** The historical development of a related group of organisms." (*The American Heritage Dictionary, Second Edition*)

Evolution, today, has come to mean, not only changes within species, but also a process where a primitive form changes to a more advanced form, even very different from the ancestors, such as a bird coming from a dinosaur egg in 'macro' evolution. This is also thought of happening without the assistance of God in the naturalist's view. These things are thought of as 'facts' and taught as such. In this article we will show that these things are not facts, but only imagination; the logical conclusion of thinking that matter can create itself is: There is no need to think God

created anything, if everything can create itself. However, the Bible says: "The fool has said in his heart, ' *There is no God.*'" (Psalm 14:1)

"ONE OF THE PRIMARY DILEMMAS of evolutionary theory is that it forces scientists to conclude that the cosmos in all of its complexity was created by chance. As biologist Jacques Monod, a winner of the prestigious Nobel prize, puts it, 'Chance *alone* is at the source of every innovation, of all creation in the biosphere. Pure chance, absolutely free but blind, [is] at the very root of the stupendous edifice of evolution.' (Jacques Monod, *Chance and Necessity: An Essay on the Natural Philosophy of Modern Biology*, translated by Austryn Wainhouse (New York: Alfred A. Knoph, 1971)

"As noted theologian R. C. Sproul explains, for the materialist, chance is the 'magic wand to make not only rabbits but entire universes appear out of nothing.' (R. C. Sproul, *Not a Chance: The Myth of Chance in Modern Science and Cosmology* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1994)...

"...Consider the absurdity of boldly asserting that an *eye*, an *egg*, or the *earth*, each in its vast complexity, is merely a function of random chance." (5) Ironically, Darwin himself found it hard to swallow the notion that the eye could be the product of blind evolutionary chance, conceding that the intricacies of the human eye gave him 'cold shudders.' (James F. Coppedge, *Evolution: Possible or Impossible?* Northridge, Calif.: Probability Research In Molecular Biology, 1993)

"In his landmark publication, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, Darwin avowed, '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 freely confess, absurd in the highest degree possible.' (*Charles Darwin, The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, in Robert Mynard Hutchins, ed., *Great Books of the Western World*, vol. 49, Darwin {Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1952})

The Bible says: "In the beginning God (Elohim) created (bara') the heavens and the earth." (Genesis 1:1) Many Christians think we can compromise with evolution by maintaining that the [Biblical account of creation](#) and evolution are compatible, but this is just not the case! One is true and the other false, but they both cannot be true, you will need to decide which you believe is right. To believe that God cannot create without using evolution says He is limited and thus is not God at all. Many people believe it is impossible for creation to be as simple as it is stated in Genesis chapter one.

This kind of thinking denies the simple truth of God's Word, and robs God of His "GLORY" in CREATION!

The Bible says, "For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse, because, although they knew God, they did not glorify Him as God, nor were thankful, but became futile in their thoughts, and their foolish hearts were darkened. Professing to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image

made like corruptible man-and birds and four-footed animals and creeping things." (Romans 1:20-23)

To many people, in their minds, "evolution," is very much a "fact." No doubt, the reason for this kind of thinking is because from the time we can remember magazines, books, newspapers, television, school textbooks, etc. have all been teaching us that evolution is a "fact." Is it then any wonder that nonbelievers, as well as believers, have become convinced that evolution is true? The icing on the cake, so to speak, comes when a person goes off to college and or university and is taught advanced courses that seem to confirm evolution is true.

Students see their professors advocating that a person is not intelligent unless they hold to naturalism. Some even go so far as to mock those who believe in a Creator. In a biology class that I attended it was obvious that Christians would not be called on when they raised their hand to speak in class. As a result of this kind of treatment, many students never hear the other side, or the reasons why millions of people still believe in a Creator.

Even before we started school we were shown on television, computer games, DVDs, etc. about how dinosaurs roamed the earth before man came on the scene. We were told in so many different ways that everything came about by chance, and that there is no rhyme or reason for anything that is going on in nature, so it is hard for us to think otherwise. (To see an article on [dinosaurs](#), click here.)

As we start school we are told that the earth is billions of years old. We are taught over and over again that dinosaurs existed long before man, and that they died off millions of years before man came on the scene. We are feed this diet of evolution from radio, T.V., magazines, newspapers, textbooks, teachers, internet, news and so on, to the point that it is surprising to me that many people don't lose their faith even before they get to college or university.

Then is it any wonder that by the time we get to college and university we are sold on everything they have to say? The only thing, though, is without even knowing it; we have been programmed to believe a lie. You were never given both sides of the arguments; you were only given one side so of course you believe what you hear from those you respect. I believe peer pressure has a lot to do with us holding to evolution as well.

Now would you be interested in hearing the other side? The side that has been kept from you for all these years? Would you like to know what really happened throughout history? After you have read this article, with an open mind, and feel you are still convinced evolution is true, that is your choice, but for the sake of debate why not listen, at least once, to the other side?

“YOUR BODY'S BLUEPRINT— Each of us starts off as a tiny sphere no larger than a dot on this page. Within that microscopic ball there is over six feet of DNA (*deoxyribonucleic acid*), all coiled up. Inside that DNA is the entire code for what you will become,—all your organs and all your features.

“The DNA itself is strung out within long coiling strips. DNA is the carrier of the inheritance code in living things. It is like a microscopic computer with a built-in memory.

DNA stores a fantastic number of 'blueprints,' and at the right time and place issues orders for distant parts of the body to build its cells and structures.

“You have heard of ‘genes’ and ‘chromosomes.’ Inside each *cell* in your body is a *nucleus*. Inside that nucleus are, among other complicated things, *chromosomes*. Inside the chromosomes are *genes*. The genes are attached to chromosomes like beads on a chain. Inside the genes is the complicated chemical structure we call *DNA*. Each gene has a thousand or more such DNA units within it. Inside each cell are tens of thousands of such genes, grouped into 23 pairs of chromosomes.

“Inside the DNA is the total of all the genetic possibilities for a given species. This is called the *gene pool* of genetic traits. It is also called the *genome*. That is all the traits your species can have; in contrast, the specific sub-code for YOU in the *genotype*, which is the code for all the possible inherited features you could have. The genotype is the individual's code; the genome applies to populations, the entire species.

“(For clarification, it should be mentioned here that the *genotype* includes all the features you could possibly have in your body, but what you will actually have is called the *phenotype*. This is because there are many unexpressed or recessive characters in the genotype that do not show up in the phenotype. For example, you may have had both blue and brown eye color in your genotype from your ancestors, but your irises will normally only show one color.)

“Your own DNA is scattered all through your body in about 100 thousand billion specks, which is the average number of living cells in a human adult. What does this DNA look like? It has the appearance of two intertwined strips of vertical tape that are loosely coiled about each other. From bottom to top, horizontal rungs or stairs reach across from one tape strip to the other. Altogether, each DNA molecule is something like a spiral staircase.

“The spiraling sides in the DNA ladder are made of complicated sugar and phosphate compounds, and the crosspieces are nitrogen compounds. It is the arrangement of the chemical sequence in the DNA that contains the needed information.

“The code within each DNA cell is complicated in the extreme! If you were to put all the coded DNA instructions from just ONE single human cell into English, it would fill many large volumes, each volume the size of an unabridged dictionary!

“DOUBLE-STRANDED HELIX—Deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) is a double-stranded helix found within the chromosomes, which are located inside the nuclei of every living cell. The molecule consists of just four nucleotide units, one containing adenine, one guanine, one cytosine, and one either thymine (in DNA) or uracil (in RNA). The sides of the helix consist of alternating deoxyribose sugars and phosphates.

“It has that shape because it must fit inside the chromosome. It does this by squashing an immense length into the tiny chromosome. It could not do this if it did not have a twisted shape...

“DIVIDING DNA—DNA has a very special way of dividing and combining. The ladder literally ‘unhooks’ and ‘rehooks.’ When cells divide, the DNA ladder splits down the middle. There are then two single vertical strands, each with half of the rungs. Both now duplicate themselves instantly—and there are now two complete ladders, where a moment before there was but one! Each new strip has exactly the same sequence that the original strip of DNA had.

“This process of division can occur at the amazing rate of 1000 base pairs per second! If DNA did not divide this quickly, it could take 10,000 years for you to grow from that first cell to a newborn infant.”

“Human cells can divide more than 50 times before dying. When they do die, they are immediately replaced. Every minute 3 billion cells die in your body and are immediately replaced.

“The human body has about 100 trillion cells. In the nucleus of each cell are 46 *chromosomes*. In the chromosomes of each cell are about 10 billion of those *DNA ladders*. Scientists call each *spiral ladder a DNA molecule*; they also call them *base pairs*.

It is the sequence of chemicals within these base pairs that provides the instructional code for your body. That instructional code oversees all your heredity and many of your metabolic processes.

“I will praise You, for I am fearfully *and* wonderfully made; marvelous are Your works, and *that* my soul knows very well. My frame was not hidden from You, when I was made in secret, *and* skillfully wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Your eyes saw my substance, being yet unformed.

“And in Your book they all were written, the days fashioned for me, when *as yet there were* none of them. How precious also are Your thoughts to me, O God! How great is the sum of them! *If* I should count them, they would be more in number than the sand; When I awake, I am still with You.” (Psalm 139:14-18)

“Without your DNA, you could not live. Without its own DNA, nothing else on earth could live. Within each DNA base pair is a most fantastic information file. *A-T-C-T-G-G-G-T-C-T-A-AT-A*, and on and on, is the code for one creature. *T-G-C-TC-A-A-G-A-G-T-G-C-C*, and on and on, will begin the code of another. Each code continues on for millions of “letter” units. Each unit is made of a special chemical...

“UTTER COMPLEXITY—IN order to form a protein, the DNA molecule has to direct the placement of amino acids in a certain specific order in a molecule made up of hundreds of thousands of units.

“For each position, it must choose the correct amino acid from some twenty different amino acids. DNA itself is made up of only four different building blocks (A, G, C, and T). These are arranged in basic code units of three factors per unit (A-C-C, G-T-A, etc.).

“This provides 64 basic code units. With them, millions of separate codes can be sequentially constructed. Each code determines one of the many millions of factors in your body, organs, brain, and all their functions. **IF JUST ONE CODE WERE OMITTED, YOU WOULD BE IN SERIOUS TROUBLE.**

‘**AN ASTOUNDING CLAIM**— The evolutionists applied their theory to the amazing discoveries about DNA—and came up with a totally astonishing claim:

“**All the complicated DNA in each life-form, and all the DNA in every other life-form—made itself out of dirty water back in the beginning!** There was some gravel around, along with some dirt. Nearby was some water, and overhead a lightning storm.

“**The lightning hit the dirty water and made living creatures complete with DNA. They not only had their complete genetic code, but they were also immediately able to eat, digest food, move about, perform enzymatic and glandular functions, and all the rest.**

“**Instantly, they automatically knew how to produce additional cells; their DNA began dividing (cells must continually replenish themselves or the creature quickly dies); their cells began making new ones; and every new cell could immediately do the myriad of functions that the first creature, and amoeba, can and must do.**

“**That same stroke of lightning made both a male and a female pair and their complete digestive, respiratory, and circulatory organs. It provided them with complete ability to produce offspring and they, in turn, more offspring. That same stroke of lightning also made their food, with all its own DNA, male and female pairs, etc., etc.**

“And that, according to this children's story, is where we all came from! But it is a story that only very little children would find believable. (*The Evolution Cruncher* by Vance Ferrell)

“Anyone with a basic education (or even access to television) knows that science is based on observation and experimentation. Scientists in every discipline follow the rules of the famous ‘scientific method’ when investigating phenomena and acquiring new knowledge.

“Simply put, a hypothesis (i.e., an educated guess) is formed, based on observation or a prediction, then it is tested and the results are analyzed. If the test results repeatedly verify what was anticipated by the hypothesis, then the ‘scientific method’ is said to have ‘proven’ the theory.

Experimental Science

“In the pure sciences (physics, chemistry, biology, etc.), the evidence must be observable and measurable, and the experiment itself must be repeatable. In the applied sciences (engineering, medicine, pharmacology, etc.), the testing is more rigorous, since unknown information may well result in the kind of failure that will do great damage.

“Many scientists would insist that to be satisfactorily proven, the hypothesis must be ‘falsifiable’ as well. That standard—which, by the way, is demanded in courts of law whenever scientific

evidence is used in a case—simply means that one must understand the processes and procedures used in the testing of the theory so well that the ‘wrong’ answer must be also known.

“The scientist must understand the information so thoroughly that he would know what would *disprove* his theory. This level of rigor is applied by most experimental scientist today.

Adaptive or Directed Change Is Not Evolution

“Although many experiments have attempted to duplicate some form of evolutionary change (e.g., from a lower form of life to a higher form, or from a mixture of chemicals to some kind of reproducing life form), no one has ever come close to ‘evolving’ anything in the laboratory.

“Certain kinds of ‘change’ can be replicated, such as mutations, which have often produced hideous results in various creatures. But the most brilliant scientists using the most expensive and advanced equipment cannot transform a ‘lower’ form of life into a ‘higher’ form.

“And yet, evolutionary scientists and philosophers strongly believe this to be possible. They insist that since we can see *adaptive* (horizontal) change among living things (such as big dogs and little dogs), there must be *evolutionary* (vertical) change among living things over long periods of time (such as some common ancestor developing into both dogs and cats).

“Nothing like that is observed in the present.

“Scientists have, through selective breeding, made some pretty severe changes to the shapes and sizes of animals. For instance, there are over 450 breeds of dogs—everything from a tiny Chihuahua to the enormous Great Dane and Afghan Wolfhound. But they are still dogs.

“Never once has one of these dogs ever changed into a horse or a pig. The same can be said for cats. Although the Cat Fanciers’ Association recognizes only 39 breeds of cats, all of the various sizes, shapes, and colors are still cats.

“Change among kinds of creatures can ‘happen’ or be made to happen, but those changes are always, *always* observed to remain within very specific and defined limits. Ever since humanity has been able to study these issues, there has never been a change from one kind of animal to another.

“Evolutionary theory insists that somewhere back in the unobserved past, a common ancestor to both dogs and cats (possibly a small, meat-eating animal called *creodont*) began to ‘evolve’ over time into the different kinds of animals that we now recognize as dogs and cats.

“However, there is no evidence for such changes—not in the present, certainly, and not in the fossil record. There are no ‘cogs’ or ‘dats’ anywhere!

“Finches, for example, may display variations in beak sizes in isolated population groups (as in Darwin’s Galapagos Islands). However, finches do not become woodpeckers. Nor do fish

become amphibians. There are no 'fincheckers' and there are no 'fishibians.' Modern science observes absolutely no upward evolution taking place today—anywhere.

Natural Selection Is a Conservative Process

“Natural selection is the process whereby natural environments tend to cull the least fit from some populations. Natural selection, as it has been observed, conserves. It preserves and protects a species; it does not innovate. Natural selection only 'selects' from among what already exists. By itself, it does not add genetic information. Natural selection does indeed 'weed out' the weaker and deformed creatures, but it has never been observed to 'create' a new kind. Never!

“Mutations to the DNA, on the other hand, do change the genetic information. Mutations disrupt the 'code' and cause changes to the life-building process. Most mutations are 'accidents' in the highly complex and vast information instructions of the genome. And most mutations are so small that their effect is virtually unremarkable.

“those mutations, however, that impact the genetic information to the point that they make an observable change, are overwhelmingly negative; they are not beneficial. The unusual creatures that do reach live birth with these observable mutations either die before maturity, or are ignored by the rest of the population and do not reproduce. Thus, natural selection preserves or conserves the generic characteristics of that kind, eliminating the 'mistakes' that happen.

“No one has observed the evolutionary process of upward change taking place today. It does not happen. The false reasoning used by evolutionists is that 'since there is evidence of small changes (horizontal), there must be big changes (vertical) over time.' This may be logical *supposition*, but it is not *observation* —and it is not fact.” (*5 Reasons to Believe in Recent Creation* by Henry M. Morris III)

Let's now shift gears for awhile and look at Geology: “*Consider these facts, which were uncovered by [Robert] Gentry's research: (1) The major basement rocks on our planet (granite) did not originate from the gradual cooling of molten lava, but came into being in their present solid form.* That fact completely disproves the Big Bang and every evolutionary theory of the origins of stars and our world.

“(2) **Those major rock formations came into existence within a space of less than three minutes time!** Incredible? Yes! But scientific evidence confirms it.

“You are about to learn about the trillions upon trillions upon trillions of radiohalos that are in all the granite rocks, boulders, mountains, and foundation strata of the world. Those little halos prove that those rocks came into existence in solid form within less than three minutes time...

“Po-218 HALOS – AND THE ORIGIN OF GRANITE

“In the late 1800s, scientists began studying rocks with microscopes in order to better understand their crystals and composition. Learning how to cut rocks into thin slices, they turned their

microscopes on certain rocks, especially granite,—and found small colored concentric circles inside them.

“It was eventually realized that these were actually spherical shells that went around a central grain in the center (something like slicing an onion through the middle, and finding circles, circles inside circles.) These circles (actually sliced sections of the spheres) were given the name, ‘halos.’

“We today call them ‘radiohalos.’ (The technical term is pleochroic halos.) A radiohalo is the mark left around a particle of a radioactive substance by the radiation coming from the particle. It can only form in a solid, such as rock; since, in a liquid or in molten rock, the mark would dissipate and could not be seen.

“1- There are many polonium 218, 214, and 210 halos in granite; in fact, careful specimen counts and extrapolations based on them reveal that **there are trillions upon trillions of them in granites all over the world.**

“2 – The vast majority of these polonium 218, 214, and 210 radiohalos have no uranium 238 halos with them. Therefore **they are primary polonium halos, and not daughter products of uranium 238.**

“3 – The primary polonium 218 (Po 218) halos are totally independent of radioactive parents. They are original in all rock in which they are found. **There is no evidence that they were caused by uranium in the central grain or by passing uranium streams.**

“4 – **These independent Po-218 halos develop their half-life halo in only three minutes** (in other words, they only emit radiation for only a few minutes), **so the radiohalos had to be in those rocks when the rocks were first brought into existence.**

“5 – **The rock in which they are found had to be solid at the time it was brought into existence, or those halos could not form inside it within that three minutes.** *However, all evolutionary theories say that the earth was molten for millions of years.*

“6 – **Since Po-218 halos are found by the trillions throughout all the granites of the world, all that granite had to originally become solid in far less than three minutes, when it was first created, in order for the Po-218 halos to form properly.**

“7 – Since this granite is the basement rock, forming a thick layer, with the continents of the world above it and the basalt and magma below it, **all this continental foundation apparently was created in solid form in less than three minutes time.** With this fact in mind, **there is little reason to expect the magma below and the continents above to have been formed in millions of years, if the granite between them was formed in less than three minutes.**

“*For example,* nearly everyone has dropped an Alkaseltzer tablet into a glass of water and watched it fizz away. If you found a glass of ice with half an Alkazeltzer tablet in the bottom, and bubbles going up in the ice, what would you know? You would know that the ice froze very

quickly, or the tablet and bubbles would have been gone. So we can know that the granites became solid in minutes, or the polonium radiohalos would not have formed.

“8 – *The alpha-recoil technique* has proven that these isolated, independent Po-218 halos were definitely not caused by ‘passing uranium or other radioactive solutions’ as theorized by critics of this discovery. Alpha-recoil research reveals that radioactive *damage trails* are always left by passing radioactive solutions.

“9- The granites should not be classified with the igneous rocks (all of which came from molten rock), but rather as primordial or Genesis rocks, ***Granite*** (generally almost white in color) **is original in its present solid form and is not secondary to a prior cooling from the black basalt beneath it or from anything else ...**” (Robert Gentry has written a 316-page book about his findings)”

EFFECTS OF THE FLOOD

“The oldest historical records of mankind in our possession were written by Moses. These are the books of the Genesis and Job. In the first of these is given the history of the world from about 4000 B.C. on down to about 1900B.C. In the first two chapters of Genesis we find an account of Creation Week, when our world and everything in it was made. In genesis 6 to 9 we are told about the [worldwide Flood](#) that occurred about 2348 B.C. (1656 A.M. [anno mundi], or about 1,656 years after Creation).

“The effects of that gigantic flood of waters were so dramatic that we find many evidences of it today. It is impossible to properly study origins and earth science without an understanding of the effects of the Flood...

“We will begin by considering rock strata and fossil remains as an effect and evidence of the Flood. Following this, we will view several non-strata and fossil effects of the time before the Flood, during the Flood, and a period of time immediately after the Flood ended...

“We will also see more clearly how those effects prove, not uniformitarianism, but catastrophism. There was a worldwide Flood! It alone can explain so many geographical features on our planet today.

“**UNIFORMITARIANISM**— A basic principle of evolution for over a century has been the theory of *uniformitarianism*, which teaches that “*all things continue as they were from the beginning*” (you will find 2 Peter 3:3-7 interesting reading).

“When evolutionists gaze upon the immense ocean, the millions of fossils and thick coal seams in the sedimentary rocks, the sea shells on top of the highest mountains, the deep canyons with small rivers, vast dried-up lake beds, and thrust-up mountain blocks,—they declare that it all came about by the same fairly gentle processes and natural forces that are operating today.

“This is the great underlying principle of modern geology and is known as the *principle of uniformitarianism*. Without the principle of uniformitarianism there could hardly be a science of

geology that was more than pure description.”— *W.D. Thornbury, Principles of Geomorphology (1957), pp. 16-17.*

Thoughtful scientists admit that **the uniformitarian theory explains nothing about the age of fossils, rock strata, the age of the earth, or anything else:**

“The idea that the rates or intensities of geological processes have been constant is so obviously contrary to the evidence that one can only wonder at its persistence. Modern uniformitarianism asserts nothing about the age of the Earth or about anything else..”—*James H. Shea, (*Twelve Fallacies of Uniformitarianism, in Geology, September 1982, p. 457.*)

“Uniformitarianists find it particularly difficult to apply their principle, namely: (1) the cause of mountain-building; (2) the origin of geosynclines; (3) the origin of petroleum; (4) the cause of continual glaciations; (5) the mechanics of overthrusting; (6) the cause of peneplains; (7) the cause of world-wide warm climates; (8) the nature of volcanism producing vast volcanic terrains; (9) of mineral deposits; (11) the nature of metamorphism; (12) the origin of saline deposits; (13) the nature of granitization; and (14) the origin of coal measures. Not one of the above phenomena has yet been adequately explained in terms of present processes.”— *H.R. Siegler, Evolution or degeneration—Which? (1972).*

“CATASTROPHISM— In contrast, the concept called **catastrophism teaches that a terrible crisis occurred at some earlier time.**

“Geologic evidence on all sides is clear that it was a catastrophe of such gigantic proportions that rocks were twisted, mountains were hurled upward, water was pulled out of the earth, and the very atmosphere was dramatically affected. As a consequence, thousands of volcanoes erupted and vast glaciers moved downward from poles which had earlier been warm.

“[*Bretz] has been unable to account for such a flood but maintained that field evidence indicated its reality. This theory represents a return to catastrophism which many geologists have been reluctant to accept.”—* *W.D. Thornbury, Principles of Geomorphology (1954), p. 401.*

“The evidence is so profound that many secular scientists are indeed turning away from uniformitarianism.

“In fact, the catastrophists were much more empirically minded than Lyell [who first widely championed uniformitarianism over a century ago]. The geologic record does seem to require catastrophism: rocks are fractured and contorted; whole faunas are wiped out. To circumvent this literal appearance, Lyell imposed his imagination upon the evidence. The geologic record, he argued, is extremely imperfect and we must interpolate into it what we can reasonably infer but cannot see.

“The catastrophists were [in contrast] the hard-nosed empiricists of their day.’—* *Stephan Jay Gould, ‘Catastrophes and Steady State earth,’ in Natural History, February 1975, p.17 [Gould is a professor at Harvard University, teaching geology, biology, and the history of science.]*

“Conventional uniformitarianism, or ‘gradualism,’ i.e., the doctrine of unchanging change, is verily contradicted by all post-Cambrian sedimentary data and the geotectonic [earth movement] histories of which these sediments are the record.”*(P.D. Krynine, ‘Uniformitarianism is a Dangerous Doctrine,’ in *Paleontology*, 1956. P. 1004)

“Often, I am afraid the subject [of geology] is taught superficially, with Geikie's maxim ‘the present is the key to the past’ used as a catechism and the imposing term uniformitarianism’ as a smokescreen to hide confusion both of student and teacher.’ (Stephen Jay Gould, “Is Uniformitarianism Useful?” in *Journal of Geological Education*, October 1957, p 150)

“We will now correlate the fossil and strata evidence with the worldwide Flood...

“FOSSILS AND ROCK STRATA— Above the molten rock at the center of our planet is a mantle of black basalt, from which flows the lava which issues forth out of volcanoes. Above that basalt is to be found the light-colored, coarse-grained crystals we call granite. This is the basement rock of the world and undergirds all of our continents. **At times this granite is close to the surface, but frequently a large quantity of sedimentary rock is above it.**

“The sedimentary rock that overlays the granite was obviously laid down by a gigantic flood of waters, and is characterized by strata or layers. The strata are composed of water-borne sediments, such as pebbles, gravel, sand, and clay.

“About three-fourths, perhaps more, of the land area of the earth, 55 million square miles, has sedimentary rock as the bedrock at the surface or directly under the cover of the mantle-rock. The thickness of the stratified rocks range from a few feet to 40,000feet [121,920dm] or more at any one place..The vast bulk of the stratified rocks is composed of shallow-water deposits.” (O.D. von Engel and K.E. Caster, *Geology*, 1952, p. 129)

“Within that strata is to be found billions upon billions of fossils. These are remains—or the casts—of plants and animals that suddenly died. Yet **fossilization does not normally occur today, for it requires sudden death, sudden burial, and great pressure.”** (*The Evolution Cruncher*)

“The Bible makes it clear that death, bloodshed, disease, thorns and suffering are a *consequence* of sin...Now if the Garden of Eden were sitting on a fossil record of dead things millions of years old, then there was the shedding of blood *before* sin. This would destroy the foundation of the atonement.

“The Bible is clear: the sin of Adam brought death and suffering into the world. As Romans 8:19-22 tells us, the whole of creation ‘groans’ because of the effects of the fall of Adam, and the creation will be liberated “from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God” (Rom. 8:21). Also, bear in mind that thorns came into existence after the Curse. Because there are thorns in the fossil record, it had to be formed after Adam and Eve sinned.”

“...Evolutionary scientists claim the fossil layers over the earth's surface date back hundreds of millions of years. As soon as one allows millions of years for the fossil layers, then one has

accepted death, bloodshed, disease, thorns and suffering before Adam's sin. (*Six days or Millions of Years* by Ken Ham)

No, the fossil layers do not speak of millions of years of death, but rather very clearly of the Worldwide Flood of Noah's Day. (For more on the Worldwide *Flood and Ice Age* see our article: [Noah and the Worldwide Flood and the Ice Age](#)) **“The sedimentary strata (also called fossil-bearing strata, or “the geologic column”) were laid down at the time of the Flood. There are no fossils in the granite, for that rock was formed prior to the Flood. There are no fossils in the granite, for that rock was formed prior to the Flood.**

“MILLIONS OF ANIMALS SUDDENLY DIED—The quantity of fossils in the sedimentary rocks is enormous. ‘At this spot [in Wyoming] the fossil hunters found a hillside literally covered with large fragments of dinosaur bones. In short, it was a veritable mine of dinosaur bones..The concentration of the fossils was remarkable; they were piled in like logs in a Jam.’” (*Edwin Colbert, Men and Dinosaurs*, 1968, p. 151)

“Scores of other instances of immense 'fossil graveyards' could be cited. Vast quantities of plants and animals were suddenly buried. So many fossils exist that one researcher made a *carbon inventory*, —and found that **at the present time—most of the carbon in our world is locked within the fossils in the sedimentary strata!**

“There must have been an immense quantity of living plants and animals before the worldwide Flood occurred. Evidence indicates that, back then, our world had no deserts, high mountains, few or no oceans, and plants and animals flourished even near the poles. So the world would have been filled with vegetation and animal life.

...**"WHY FOSSILS ARE SO IMPORTANT** —The term, ‘evolution,’ means that species change gradually into different species. **If such species changes are occurring today, the transitional forms should be seen. If it has occurred in the past the fossil record will show the transitional forms.**

“It is of interest that evolution bases its case on the fossils. This is because there is no evidence that evolutionary processes are occurring today. Therefore the Darwinists must consider the fossils to be their primary evidence that it has ever occurred at all...

“But just as there are no transitional forms today, there are none in the past either! At the present time, all we have are distinct plant and animal kinds. No transitional species are to be found. **(We will frequently refer to these basic types as ‘species,’ although man-made classification systems vary,** sometimes incorrectly classifying sub-species or genera as ‘species.’...)

“In that great window to the past—the fossil record— we also find only distinct plant and animal kinds, with no transitional forms. With the exception of creatures that have become extinct (plants and animals which are no longer alive today, such as the dinosaurs), **all fossils of plants and animals which did not become extinct are just like those living today (stasis).**

Only distinct species are to be found; there are no halfway, or transitional, species (*gaps*). Thus there is NO evidence of evolution in the fossils.

“All the Darwinists have to base their case on is *placement*, not *transitional forms*. But what caused that placement?

“FOSSIL PLACEMENT—The slowest-moving creatures were buried first; after that, the faster-moving ones. As the waters of the worldwide deluge rose higher and still higher, they first covered the slowest-moving water creatures and buried them under sediment.

“Then the **slower-moving land creatures** were covered and buried under sediment. Then the **more agile creatures (both water and land)** were covered. In the fossil-bearing sedimentary strata we frequently find this arrangement, with the smaller creatures in the lower strata and the larger ones higher up.

“Yet even the smallest creatures are complex. Just beneath the lowest stratum, the Cambrian, we find no fossils at all! This is both an astonishment and a terrible disappointment to the evolutionists. The lowest-level life-forms in the strata are complex multi-celled animals and plants.

“It has been argued that the series of paleontological [fossil] finds is too intermittent, too full of ‘missing links’ to serve as convincing proof. If a postulated ancestral type is not found, it is simply stated that it has not so far been found.

“Darwin himself often used this argument—and in his time it was perhaps justifiable. But it has lost its value through the immense advances of paleobiology [the study of animal fossils] in the twentieth century..The true situation is that those fossils have not been found which were expected. Just where new branches are supposed to fork off from the main stem it has been impossible to find the connecting types.” (*N. Heribert-Nilsson, Synthetische Artbildung, 1953, p. 1168 [Director of the Botanical institute at Lund, Sweden]*)

“Each twig on the imaginary plant and animal ‘family trees’ is a distinct plant or animal type, either extinct or like what we have today (although frequently larger). But there are no intermediate life-forms to connect the twigs! There are no branches and no trunk, only ‘twigs.’ The rest of the tree is imaginary.

“RAPID FORMATION OF IMMENSE DEPOSITS—Nowhere on earth today do we have fossils forming on the scale that we see in geologic deposits. The Karro Beds in Africa, for example, contain the remains of perhaps 800 billion vertebrates!! But **such fossils are not forming today.**

“A million fish can be killed in red tides in the Gulf of Mexico, but they simply decay away; they do not become fossils. Similarly, debris from vegetation does not today become coal. **In order for fossilization to occur, the vegetation would have to be rapidly buried under an extremely heavy load of sediment.**

“It required massive flood conditions to do all that burying. An immense worldwide catastrophe occurred in the past. It produced the Sicilian hippopotamus beds, the fossils of which are so extensive that they are mined as a source of charcoal; the great mammal beds of the Rockies; the dinosaur beds of the Black Hills and the Rockies, as well as in the Gobi Desert; the fish beds of the Scottish Devonian stratum, the Baltic amber beds, Agate Spring Quarry in Nebraska, and hundreds more.

“None of this fossil-making is being done today. It only happened one time in history—at the time of the Flood.

“Frequently the fossils in these beds come from widely separated and differing climatic zone, only to be thrown together in disorderly masses. Nothing but a worldwide Flood can explain this.” (*The Evolution Cruncher*)

Here are several evidences of a young earth:

Evidence 1 Fossils of sea creatures high above sea level due to the ocean waters having flooded over the continents

“We find fossils of sea creatures in rock layers that cover all the continents. For example, most of the rock layers in the walls of Grand Canyon (more than a mile above sea level) contain marine fossils. Fossilized shellfish are even found in the Himalayas.

Evidence 2 Rapid burial of plants and animals

“We find extensive fossil ‘graveyards’ and exquisitely preserved fossils. For example, billions of nautiloid fossils are found in a layer within the Redwall Limestone of Grand Canyon. This layer was deposited catastrophically by a massive flow of sediment (mostly lime sand). The chalk and coal beds of Europe and the United States, and the fish, ichthyosaurs, insects, and other fossils all around the world, testify of catastrophic destruction and burial.

Evidence 3 Rapidly deposited sediment layers spread across vast areas

“We find rock layers that can be traced all the way across continents — even between continents — and physical features in those strata indicate they were deposited rapidly. For example, the Tapeats Sandstone and Redwall Limestone of Grand Canyon can be traced across the entire United States, up into Canada, and even across the Atlantic Ocean to England. The chalk beds of England (the white cliffs of Dover) can be traced across Europe into the Middle East and are also found in the Midwest of the United States and in Western Australia. Inclined (sloping) layers within the Coconino Sandstone of Grand Canyon are testimony to 10,000 cubic miles of sand being deposited by huge water currents within days.

Evidence 4 Sediment transported long distances

“We find that the sediments in those widespread, rapidly deposited rock layers had to be eroded from distant sources and carried long distances by fast-moving water. For example, the sand for

the Coconino Sandstone of Grand Canyon (Arizona) had to be eroded and transported from the northern portion of what is now the United States and Canada. Furthermore, water current indicators (such as ripple marks) preserved in rock layers show that for '300 million years' water currents were consistently flowing from northeast to southwest across all of North and South America, which, of course, is only possible over weeks during a global Flood.

Evidence 5 Rapid or no erosion between strata

“We find evidence of rapid erosion, or even of no erosion, between rock layers. Flat, knife-edge boundaries between rock layers indicate continuous deposition of one layer after another, with no time for erosion. For example, there is no evidence of any ‘missing millions of years (of erosion) in the flat boundary between two well-known layers of Grand Canyon — the Coconino Sandstone and the hermit Formation. Another impressive example of flat boundaries at Grand Canyon is the Redwall Limestone and the strata beneath it.

Evidence 6 Many strata laid down in rapid succession

“Rocks do not normally bend; they break because they are hard and brittle. But in many places we find whole sequences of strata that were bent without fracturing, indicating that all the rock layers were rapidly deposited and folded while still wet and pliable before final hardening. For example, the Tapeats Sandstone in Grand Canyon is folded at a right angle 90 degrees without evidence of breaking. Yet this folding could only have occurred after the rest of the layers had been deposited, supposedly over ‘480 *million* years,’ while the Tapeats Sandstone remained wet and pliable.

What now?

“The Bible's history is reliable throughout — from the creation of man from the dust of the ground to the worldwide Flood to the coming of Jesus Christ. [Knowing this first: that scoffers will come in the last days, walking according to their own lusts, and saying, "Where is the promise of His coming?

“For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as *they were* from the beginning of creation." For this they willfully forget: that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of water and in the water, by which the world *that* then existed perished, being flooded with water. But the heavens and the earth *which* are now preserved by the same word, are reserved for fire until the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.

But, beloved, do not forget this one thing, that with the Lord one day *is* as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord is not slack concerning *His* promise, as some count slackness, but is longsuffering toward us, not willing that any should perish but that all should come to repentance. (2 Peter 3:3-9)]

But just reading the evidence isn't enough. The message of salvation founded in the Bible's history is also true, and, God wants us to accept the gift of salvation He freely offers us. ([What Does it Mean to Be Born Again](#))

“Today, literally thousands of scientists have abandoned the evolutionary model of origins, believing that true science supports the concept of primeval special creation.

“Furthermore, they are convinced that Creator is not some impersonal ‘force’ or ‘cosmic consciousness,’ as pantheists would allege, but rather an omnipotent, omniscient Person, capable of simply calling the majestic universe into being by His own power and wisdom. That being the reality — or, at least, the premise — it follows that the Creator would have a purpose in so doing, and would be capable of ordering and preserving the universe thus created, and that all creatures are under the ultimate authority of that Creator.

“Although there are many today who would insist that a scientist — by definition — cannot believe in special creation, the fact remains that there are indeed thousands of creationists today who would satisfy every definition of a scientist except *that* ! They may reject evolution, but they do have bona fide post-graduate degrees in some field of pure or applied science from accredited universities; they have published scientific research papers in their fields; and they make their living by practicing or teaching science.

“The Scientific Case for Creation: an Overview

“Before discussing the detailed scientific evidence relating to origins, it will be good to get a broad overview of the basic facts involved. It is not too much to say that there is literally no scientific evidence whatever — past, present... — for any real evolution. Belief in evolution is strictly a matter of faith.

“That is a bold statement, and readers will have to judge for themselves after they have seen the evidence. And that, of course, is exactly the point. If evolution is true, then we ought to be able to *see* the evidence. After all, *science* means ‘knowledge,’ something that is *known* (the word comes from the Latin *scientia*, meaning knowledge).

“But no one has ever *seen* evolution take place. The changes we do see in living species are either ‘horizontal’ changes, at the same level of organized complexity (e.g., different varieties of dogs, different tribes of people, different colors of roses), or ‘downward’ changes (e.g., mutations and extinctions).

“Evolutionists may react to this problem by noting that creation cannot be ‘seen’ either and they would be quite right. Real creation of some complex organism out of nothing, or even out of non-living matter, would indeed require a miracle.

“Therefore, evolution and creation are on the same ground. Both must be seen with the eye of faith, because neither can be seen taking place with our physical eyes. But this very fact is a strong argument *for* creation and *against* evolution. One could very legitimately *predict*, from the creation model, that we cannot now see creation take place, since it is postulated as a supernatural event completed in the past.

“The evolutionist, on the other hand, should expect actually to *see* evolution in action, since by definition it is an altogether natural process and, therefore, should be operating even now in

nature. If we really *could* see things evolving from, say, a given species into another species of greater organized complexity, we would all have to believe in evolution. We could verify it by observing it — *that* would be real science!

“But since we *cannot* see it functioning, it is not any more ‘scientific’ than creation. Neither evolution nor creation can be seen in operation. ...It is conceivable that either one — or both — may have occurred in the past but the past cannot be tested scientifically! A choice between the two can be made only by faith in one or the other...

“However, the [most] pre-eminent living evolutionist [at the time of writing] is probably Ernst Mayr, professor of biology at Harvard, a representative of the older generation of evolutionists, and a leader of the evolutionary school of thought known as neo-Darwinism. Mayr has said this:

“Since Darwin, every knowing person agrees that man is descended from the apes....Today, of course, there is no such thing as the theory of evolution; it is the fact of evolution... The only arguments now are over technical problems, but the basic fact of evolution is so clearly established that no scientist worries about it anymore. (Ernst Mayr, ‘Interview,’ *Omni* (March/April 1988), p. 46. It may be noted that Dr. Ken Cumming, Dean and Professor of Biology at the ICR Graduate School, studied biology at Harvard under Dr. Mayr. Nevertheless, Cumming is now a strong and firmly convinced creationist, even after receiving his doctorate in biology at Harvard.)

“With all due recognition of the brilliance and eminence of Professor Mayr, such a statement is pure propaganda. Surely he knows better!”

“Evolution is *not a proved fact* of science or history at all. It has never been observed, either scientifically in existing biological activity, or historically in the records of past biological phenomena, as we shall [continue to] abundantly document...

(This material was quoted from *The Modern Creation Trilogy* science & creation volume two by Henry M. Morris and John D. Morris.)

Let us just take this statement of Dr. Ernst Mayr, where he says, “Since Darwin, every knowing person agrees that man is descended from the apes...” If this is in fact true that we have descended from apes Dr. Mayr then why has every attempt failed to breed man with apes? Here is the known history of these experiments.

“Ilya Ivanon (1870-1932) was an eminent biologist who achieved considerable success in the field of artificial insemination of horses and other animals. Called ‘one of the greatest authorities on artificial fecundation,’ (1. Russian Admits Ape Experiments. *The New York Times*, June 19, 1926,2.) he graduated from Kharkov University in 1896 and became a professor of zoology in 1907. His artificial insemination techniques were so successful that he was able to fertilize as many as 500 mares with the semen of a single stallion.

“Ivanov also pioneered the use of artificial insemination to produce various hybrids, including that of a zebra and a donkey, a rat and a mouse, a mouse and a guinea pig, and an antelope and a

cow. His most radical experiment, though, was his attempt to produce a human-ape hybrid. (2. Pain, S. 2008. The Forgotten Scandal of the Soviet Ape-Man. *New Scientist*, 2670: 48-49.)

“He felt that this feat was clearly possible in view of how successful he had been in his animal experiments — and how close evolutionary biologists then regarded apes and humans. The experiments were supported by some of the most respected biologists of the day, including Professor Hermann Klaatsch (3. Klaatsch, H. 1923, *The Evolution and Progress of Mankind*. Ed. Adolf Heiborn, trans. Joseph McCabe. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company Publishers.)

“and Dr. F. G. Crookshank. (4. Crookshank, F.G. 1924. *The Mongol in Our Midst: A Study of Man and His Three Faces*. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co. Revised (3 rd) edition, 1931. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.) The main opposition was from ‘two or three religious publications.’ (5. Soviet Backs Plan to Test Evolution. *The New York Times*, June 17, 1926, 2.)

His Project Begins

“In the mid 1920s, Professor Ilya Ivanov began his project, funded by the Soviet government, to hybridize humans and apes by artificial insemination. (6. Etkind, A. 2008 Beyond Eugenics: The Forgotten Scandal of Hybridizing Humans and Apes. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences*. 39 (2): 205.)

“The funds for his project equaled over one million in today's dollars. Ivanov presented his human-ape hybrid experiment idea to the World Congress of Zoologists in Graz, and in 1924 he completed his first experiment in French Guinea. He first attempted to produce human male/chimpanzee female hybrids, and all three attempts failed. Ivanov also attempted to use ape males and human females to produce hybrids but was unable to complete the experiment because at least five of the women died.

“Because Ivanov was then an internationally respected scientist, he was able to obtain prominent sponsors for his project, including the polymath Otto Schmidt, editor of the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, and Nikolai Gorbunov, a chemical engineer and close friend of Lenin. (7. Ibid, 206)

“After Professor Ivanov detailed the rationale behind his idea, the British government, home of Darwin, promised to help raise money for the project. The Russian government contributed the first \$10,000, and a number of prominent American patrons of science were also very supportive of the project.

Efforts to support Evolution

“Charles Lee Smith wrote that the objective of Ivanov's experiments was to achieve ‘artificial insemination of the human and anthropoid species, to support the doctrine of evolution, by establishing close kinship between man and the higher apes.’ (5) The project was supported by The American Association for the Advancement of Atheism because it was seen as ‘proof of human evolution and therefore of atheism.’ (8) (Ibid, 209) When applying to the Soviet

government for fund, Ivanov emphasized the importance of his research for anti-religious propaganda. (7) (Ibid, 206)

“Attorney Howell S. England wrote that the scientists involved in advising the project ‘are confident that hybrids can be produced, and, in the event we are successful, the question of the evolution of man will be established to the satisfaction of the most dogmatic anti-evolutionists,’ concluding that the ‘original idea was that only hybrids from the gorilla would prove fertile.’ (5.)

“However, the scientist advisors wanted the field researchers to use orangutans, chimpanzees, gorillas, and possibly gibbons in the experiments. The researchers accepted the polygenetic theory of human evolution, concluding that orangutans should be crossed with humans of the ‘yellow race,’ gorillas with humans of the ‘black race,’ chimpanzees with the ‘white race,’ and gibbons with ‘the more rachycephalic peoples of Europe’ (he probably meant Jews). The purpose was ‘to try to demonstrate the close relationship of human and ape stocks.’ (9. Ape-Child? *Time* 8 (7), August 16, 1926)

“...In his opinion each species of anthropoid is more closely related to its corresponding human type than it is to either of the other anthropoids. In other words...the chimpanzee has a closer relationship to the white race than to the gorilla or the orang. The gibbon...has its corresponding human type in the more brachycephalic peoples of Europe. (10. Men Apes. *Time* 7 (26), June 28, 1926.)

“...*Time* magazine opined that if this experiment failed, evolution would still not be invalidated because this ‘test of evolution would be decisive only in the event that pregnancy, whether productive of healthy offspring or not, could be induced.’ Conversely, if the experiment succeeded, ‘fresh and final evidence would be established that humans and anthropoids belong to a common genus of animal life.’

“Furthermore, to more confidently establish human-from-ape evolution as fact, the ‘hybrid fertilization would have to be attempted upon females of both species, human and ape.’

“Fully formed, healthy offspring, if they resulted, would not be regarded as ‘missing links,’ but as living proof that apes and men are species as closely allied as horses and asses which can be hybridized to produce mules or hinnies. If an ape-man or man-ape hybrid should prove fecund, the relationship of the two parent species would be proved even closer than is now supposed.

“If no offspring resulted, evolution would by no means fail; the distance of apes and men from a parent stock would merely be demonstrated to be as great or greater than it is now estimated. (10.)

“In the end, the research failed and has not been attempted again, at least publicly. Today we know it will not be successful for many reasons, and Professor Ivanov's attempts are, for this reason, a major embarrassment to science.

“One problem is humans have 46 chromosomes — apes 48 — and for this reason the chromosomes will not pair up properly even if a zygote is formed. Another problem is a

conservatively estimated *40 million* base pair differences exist between humans and our putative [closest evolutionary relatives](#), the chimps. These experiments are the result of evolutionary thinking and they failed because their basic premise is false.” (11. Richards, M. 2008. Artificial Insemination and Eugenics: Celibate Motherhood, Euteleogenesis and Germinal Choice. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Science* 39 (2): 211-221.)

The above article was taken from *Acts & Facts* Institute for Creation Research, May 2009. Written by Dr. Bergman who is an Adjunct Associate Professor at the University of Toledo Medical School in Ohio.

Synthesized Protein

“The Miller experiment—In 1953, a graduate biochemistry student (*Stanley Miller) sparked a non-oxygen mixture of gases for a week and produced some microscopic traces of non-living amino acids. ...*The Primitive Environment*

“According to the evolutionary theory, life began in this way:

“(1) There was just the right atmosphere—and it was totally different than the one we now have.

“(2) The ground, water, or ocean where life began had just the right combination of chemicals in it—which it does not now have.

“(3) Using an unknown source of just the right amount of energy, amino acids then formed in sufficient quantities that—

“(4) They could combine into lots of proteins and nucleotides (complex chemical compounds)

“(5) They then reformed themselves into various organs inside a main organism.

“(6) They did some careful thinking (as with all the other points, beyond the mental abilities of even our best scientists today), and developed a genetic code to cover thousands of different factors.

“(7) At this point, they were ready to start reproducing young. —Of course, this last point reveals that all the previous six had to occur within the lifetime of just one bacterium. Since microbes and bacteria do not live very long, this first one had to think and act fast.

“Charles Darwin did a lot of daydreaming in his letters and in his book, *Origin of the Species*. Here was one of his hopeful wishes, as expressed in a letter to a close friend:

“But if (and oh! What a big if!) we could conceive in some warm little pond, with all sorts of ammonia and phosphoric salts, light, heat, electricity etc., present, that a protein compound was chemically formed ready to undergo still more complex changes.”—**Charles Darwin, in Francis Darwin (ed.), The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin (1887 ed.), p. 202 (the parenthetical comment is his also).*

“*Darwin was totally puzzled as to how even one of the plant or animal species could have originated, much less the millions we have today. Yet he wrote a book which according to the title, explained the problem. An ardent evolutionist refers to the difficulty:

“Since Darwin's seminal work was called *The Origin of Species* one might reasonably suppose that his theory had explained this central aspect of evolution or at least made a shot at it, even if it had not resolved the larger issues we have discussed up to now. Curiously enough, this is not the case.

“As Professor Ernst Mayr of Harvard, the doyen [senior member] of species studies, once remarked, the ‘book called *The Origin of Species* is not really on that subject,’ while his colleague Professor Simpson admits: ‘Darwin failed to solve the problem indicated by the title of his work.’

“You may be surprised to hear that the origin of species remains just as much a mystery today, despite the efforts of thousands of biologists. The topic has been the main focus of attention and is beset by endless controversies.”—* *Gordon R. Taylor, Great Evolution Mystery (1983), p. 140.*

“One of the greatest scientist of the last 200 years said this about the possibility of life making itself out of water and mud:

“Mathematics and dynamics fail us when we contemplate the earth, fitted for life but lifeless, and try to imagine the commencement of life upon it. This certainly did not take place by any action of chemistry, or electricity, or crystalline grouping of molecules under the influence of force, or by any possible kind of fortuitous concourse of atmosphere. We must pause, face to face with the mystery and miracle of creation of living things.” —Lord Kelvin, quoted in *Battle for Creation*, p. 232.

“OUR WORLD BEGINS— Evolutionary theorists tell us that long ago, our world spun off from a stellar condensation or collision of some kind. At first it was a molten mass of very hot rock. Gradually this is supposed to have cooled over a period of millions upon millions of years.

“THE PRIMITIVE ENVIRONMENT— Finally it was time for life to originate by spontaneous generation from (according to which theorist is speaking) warm wet dirt, seashore, hot and dry dirt, ocean water, desert sand, lake, poisonous chemicals or fumes, electrified mud puddle, a volcanic rim, or something else, An atmosphere of some type had formed, and occasionally lightning would strike the earth.

“Scientists have tried to analyze what conditions would have had to be like in order for spontaneous generation of life from non-life to occur. They call this the “primitive environment.”

“What were conditions like at that first moment when life is supposed to have created itself by random chance out of a mud hole or sloshing seawater? Evolutionists have figured this out. *Their conclusions are not only astonishing; but, ... we will learn—they further disprove evolution!* Here are their theories in their own words:

“We understand how the basic building blocks of life could have evolved on the early earth. In 1955 Harold Urey and Stanley Miller at the University of Chicago performed an experiment that showed how the first step in chemical evolution may have taken place. They put together methane, hydrogen, ammonia, and carbon dioxide—the materials we believe were the components of the earth's early atmosphere—and subjected the mixture to electrical sparks (thus simulating the effects of lightning).

“In a matter of hours they noticed that the constituents of early earth were forming molecules known as amino acids, which are the basic building blocks of proteins. Proteins, in turn, are the molecules that carry out most of the chemical work in living systems. What Miller and Urey had done, in other words, was to start with nonliving materials and produce the simplest materials that make up the living cell.

“Subsequent experiments have shown that not only lightning, but heat (for example, from volcanoes) and ultraviolet radiation (for example, from the sun) can produce amino acids from the same materials. In fact, modern researchers have found that Miller-Urey type reactions can be used to create not only amino acids, but a whole alphabet soup of biochemical molecules.

“Life might have started in the primeval soup. If the Miller-Urey reactions went on in the atmosphere of the early earth, there would have been a rain of amino acids on the ocean. In about one hundred thousand years (which is a short time, geologically speaking), the ocean would have had the same concentration of amino acids as it now has salt. Thus, the ocean would have been teeming with molecules which could be put together to make living systems.

“The ocean that resulted from this rain is often called the primordial soup. It had a concentration of amino acids of several percent—roughly the same as you'd get by putting a cube of bouillon into a gallon of water. It wouldn't have been a pleasant place to swim—a lot of the amino acids are pretty smelly—but it was a place that was extraordinarily rich in nutrients. It is in this soup that we believe the first living cell developed.

“Some amino acids may have been brought in by meteorites. One of the most surprising developments of the last few decades has been the discovery that amino acids are quite common in the universe. You can see them in giant clouds out in the Milky Way and on asteroids that fall to earth from space. This has led some people to suggest that some or all of the amino acids in the primeval soup came to earth with meteorites. Whether meteorites, the Miller-Urey process, or both contributed to the buildup, the result was that, shortly after the earth cooled, the oceans were rich in amino acids.

“We do not know how the first living cells formed from the complex molecules in the primordial soup. This is the greatest gap in our knowledge of the evolution of life.

“The problem with a cell developing in the primordial soup is a classic catch-22 situation. If amino acids come together to form proteins in the air or at the surface of the ocean, the ultraviolet radiation from the sun will break the proteins up. To escape this fate, the amino acids have to combine underwater. But if they do so, chemical reactions with the water will break them up.

“The only way that a soup of amino acids could develop into something more complex would be for the concentration of amino acids to be so high that there were regions where the water couldn't get in and break up the more complex molecules.

“Because of this, conventional thinking about the first cell focuses on ways that amino acids could have become concentrated. This concentration could take place in tidal pools, where water would slosh into the pool at high tide and then evaporate during low tide, leaving the amino acids behind. If the pool was as much as 30 feet deep, then the ultraviolet radiation at the bottom would be sufficiently screened so that combinations of amino acids could stay together at the bottom.

“Alternatively, heat from a volcano could evaporate water and allow the amino acids to concentrate. A third possibility is that the chemical combination of the amino acids can take place between the layers of some clay minerals at the ocean bottom.” (*Sharks Have No Bones, 1001 Things everyone should know about Science* by James Trefil) All I can say about this kind of reasoning is that it takes a bigger jump of faith to believe all this took place by chance than it does to believe God created life.

“The theorists tell us that the first life-form developed from nothing about 4.6 billion years ago. But *Steven Jay Gould of Harvard, one of the leading evolutionary thinkers of the latter part of the twentieth century, maintains that there would have been very little time for this highly improbable event to have occurred:

“We are left with very little time between the development of suitable conditions for life on the Earth's surface and the origin of life...Life apparently arose about as soon as the Earth became cool enough to support it.”—*S.J. Gould, “*An Early Start,*” in *Natural History*, February 1978.

“*Fred Hoyle wrote in the November 19, 1981 issue of *New Scientist* , that there are 2000 complex enzymes required for a living organism,—yet not a single one of these could have been formed on earth by shuffling processes in even 20 billion years!

“**SPONTANEOUS GENERATION—Life from non-living things is the Dark Ages error of 'spontaneous generation,'** an error which was not fully eliminated until more than a century ago. **Modern evolutionists believe in and teach spontaneous generation,** which they now call biopoiesis, so students will not recognize that they are still advocating spontaneous generation. (Earlier in the twentieth century, it was called abiogenesis.)

“In contrast, Biogenesis is a term in biology that is derived from two Greek words meaning *life* and *birth*. According to the theory of biogenesis, living things descend only from living things. They cannot develop spontaneously from nonliving materials. Until comparatively recent times, scientist believed that certain tiny forms of life, such as bacteria, arouse spontaneously form non-living substances” *Biogenesis, World Book Encyclopedia, p. B-242 (1972 edition)*.

“Spontaneous generation was believed by many scientist, prior to the careful experiments of Spallanzani (1780), and Pasteur (1860), which totally disproved that foolish idea. People thought that fruit flies spontaneously came forth from fruit, geese from barnacles, mice from dirty

clothes, and bees from dead calves. Even Copernicus, Galileo, Bacon, *Hegel, and *Shilling believed it, but that did not make it right, Great people believing an error does not make the error truth.

“Evolution teaches spontaneous generation. Think about that for a moment. We're returning to the Dark Ages!

“They [today's scientists] are back to spontaneous generation, but with a difference. The pre-Pasteur view of spontaneous generation was of something taking place now and quickly. The modern view is that it took place long ago and very slowly.”— *Isaac Asimov, Asimov's New Guide to Science (1984), pp. 638-639.*

Was life ever produced in the laboratory? Synthesized Protein

“The Miller experiment—In 1953, a graduate biochemistry student (*Stanley Miller) sparked a non-oxygen mixture of gases for a week and produced some microscopic traces of non-living amino acids. ...*The Primitive Environment* (which included a sketch of the complicated apparatus he used); this showed that *Stanley's experiment demonstrated that, if by any means amino acids could be produced, they would be a left-handed and right-handed mixture-and therefore unable to be used in living tissue.

“(1) There are 20 amino acids.

“(2) There are 300 amino acids in a specialized sequence in each medium protein.

“(3) There are billions upon billions of possible combinations!

“(4) The right combination from among the 20 amino acids would have to be brought together in the right sequence—in order to make one useable protein properly.

“(5) In addition to this, the ultra-complicated DNA strands would have to be formed, along with complex enzymes, and more and more, and still more.

“IMPOSSIBLE ODDS— What are the chances of accomplishing all the above—and thus making a living creature out of protein manufactured by chance from dust, water and sparks? Not one chance in billions. It cannot happen.

“Stanley Miller, who first synthesized amino acids in a laboratory later stated that his own experiment could not possibly have been done by chance outside of a modern laboratory. Other scientists have agreed.

“Evolutionists speak of ‘probabilities’ as though they were ‘possibilities,’ if given enough odds. But reality is different than their make-believe numbers.”

“A living organism is not just dried out ocean soup. It is highly integrated, complex, and purposive. —It has *life*, which no man can produce. And that living creature had to have

all its parts on Day One of its existence. And it had to have a mate and be able to reproduce offspring.” (*The Evolution Cruncher*)

“Many creationists are searching for a ‘magic bullet’ —a proof of creation so powerful that there can be no true rebuttal. But is there such a proof? ...When many people think of ‘proof,’ they often think of a particular piece of scientific evidence that they believe supports their position. They might be thinking of a particular fossil series or a specific rock or a DNA sequence. The problem with such evidences is that there is always another way to understand them.

“An evolutionist looking at a fossil series is thinking in terms of common decent, whereas a creationist is thinking in terms of variation within a kind. An evolutionist looks at the similarities in DNA and concludes that there is a common ancestor. But a creationist, looking at those same similarities, sees evidence that there is a common Creator.

“We all have access to the same physical evidence. But creationists and evolutionists interpret that evidence differently because we each have a different view of history. We have two distinctly different views of the world that constrain how we understand the evidence. So, there simply is no ‘magic bullet’ if we are thinking in terms of specific scientific evidences. Nevertheless, there is a proof of creation.

“...Many Christians are under the mistaken impression that critics of the Bible would believe if on they had more evidence of the biblical God. But this just isn't so. According to Romans 1:18-20 [as quoted at the beginning of this article], everyone has an innate knowledge of the God of creation.

“The problem is not that people lack evidence; the problem is that they ‘suppress the truth in unrighteousness.’ They deny what they know in their heart of hearts. The key to success in apologetics is not necessarily to give people more evidence, but to expose their suppressed knowledge of God. (Of course, evidence can be used as part of the means by which this is accomplished... “But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts, and always *be* ready to *give* a defense to everyone who asks you a reason for the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear ...” (1 Peter 3:15a)

However, salvation is a question of faith; one has to believe Christ died for their sins in order to be saved. But those who do not believe in Jesus as Savior will not be saved. The same is true when it comes to believing God created Hebrews 11: 3 says, By faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that the things which are seen were not made of things which are visible. But those who will not receive the truth of creation have God's wrath resting on them.

“For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who suppress the truth in unrighteousness, because what may be known of God is manifest in them, for God has shown *it* to them.

“For since the creation of the world His invisible *attributes* are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, *even* His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse,

because, although they knew God, they did not glorify *Him* as God, nor were thankful, but became futile in their thoughts, and their foolish hearts were darkened. Professing to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like corruptible man-and birds and four-footed animals and creeping things.” (Romans 1:18-23)

“The Bible is clear: the sin of Adam brought death and suffering into the world. As Romans 8:19-22 tells us, the whole of creation ‘groans’ because of the effects of the fall of Adam, and the creation will be liberated ‘from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God’ (Romans 8:21). Also, bear in mind that thorns came into existence after the Curse. Because there are thorns in the fossil record, it had to be formed after Adam and Eve sinned.’ (*Six Days or Millions of Years* by Ken Ham)

We need to face the fact that we were created in the image of God, as the Genesis account in the Bible tells us. Then we need to realize that the reason sin and death came into the world was as a result of man not trusting or believing God's Word. In order to get back into fellowship with God again, if you are one of those who have been doubting God's Word, you need to admit this to God.

You could pray a prayer like this: Dear God in heaven. I believe Jesus is your Son, creator of the universe, and that He came to earth to die for my sins. I believe that He came back to life the third day. Right now I repent of my sins (turn from them). I ask Jesus to forgive me for my sins and to come into my heart and life to save me. I want to be a child of God. In Jesus name I pray, amen.

For more information on this topic visit Answers in Genesis at www.answersingenesis.org or the Institute for Creation Research at: www.icr.org

For more information: bible-christian.org