

THE CHRISTIAN AND EVOLUTION

There are a great many divergent ideas about the position a Christian should occupy with respect to the theory of evolution. One reason is that there are over twenty various theories of evolution. Another reason is that though the Bible is an inspired revelation from God, any interpretation of it is not inspired. Thus good and honest people differ over just what God has said. Obviously, though the Bible gives some information about the creation of the universe and all therein, it is mainly given over to the story of redemption. The Bible text does not give any date for the creation of the world (the marginal notes and numbers are *not* a part of the text, and definitely not from God), so we are left without such information. We do not know for sure how much time elapsed from the creation in Genesis chapter 1 until the flood, or from the flood until Abraham. Abraham's time can be dated somewhat, but that is the best we can do. Hence, the Christian can hardly make the traditional date of 4004 B.C. an issue. The "how" of creation, the "why" and "who" might more reasonably be considered. We thus present the following article in this light. You will do well to remember that the case for or against evolution (herein presented as the alternative to creation by God, and as commonly taught in public school systems) rests on both 1) evidence and 2) interpretation of that evidence. The Bible is some of the evidence relating to "how," "why," and "who" of our universe. The evolutionary theory considered is variously known as organic or atheistic evolution. We recognize that the evolutionary positions held in the classrooms are often "ahead" of what is in the books advocating it, but the basic evidence and presuppositions are the same for the people who hold the theory of evolution to be true. Thus the following article is

intended to be generally useful, regardless of what particular theory of evolution is taught.

We have added a list of books which have either been quoted in the article, or are useful for those who want to read about the theory, or both.

THE MESSAGE OF THE BIBLE

1. *Genesis 1 speaks vividly of creation by God.*

Evolutionists say there need be no "god." Julian Huxley in *Evolution in Action*, (hereafter referred to as Huxley) says, "To postulate a divine interference . . . is both unnecessary and illogical" (page 20). Consider in this respect Psalms 33:6, "By the word of the Lord the heavens were made, and all their host by the breath of his mouth," and verse 9, "For he spoke, and it came to be; he commanded, and it stood forth."

The alternative to God is chance. However, science, as such, depends for its very existence upon this fact: we have enough of the universe to study that we may draw general conclusions. Our present conclusions are that every effect has some cause. We may be unable to ascertain the cause, but that it has one is as sure as our own experience tells us we exist. It has been an accepted fact for hundreds of years, at least in some areas of thought, *ex nihilo nihil fit*, "from nothing, nothing comes to be." As Crawford, (*Genesis, Vol. I*), well remarks, "If there had ever been a state in which there was nothing, then that state would have continued forever" (page 135). That the universe exists is undeniable if we assume the reality of our sense perceptions. Do we then have something beginning without an adequate cause? Do we postulate "no god" in spite of the effects we see about us? For instance, the universe has either existed always or it has not. No third view is possible. The consensus of

opinion is now and has generally been that it had a beginning. In fact, to say it is so many years old assumes a beginning. Nothing can be old without a beginning. We assume from experience that in every cause there is at least as much reality as we see in the effect, for if this were not so, we should have some of the effect coming from nothing. David Hume argued that people were stupid to assume causality. His problem was the confusion of two things: the difference between recognizing that every effect has a cause (even though we may not know it) and every effect has an immediate, observable cause.

The Bible asserts that God is an adequate cause for the effect we know as the earth, and the earth is not the result of chance. R. E. D. Clark, in *The Universe, Plan or Accident* (hereafter referred to as Clark), tells us that the noted evolutionist A. I. Oparin, argued that the chance argument as applied to the origin of life really undermines science (since science depends for its existence upon uniformity of the universe) so that it cannot be maintained, (page 34). Blum, in *Time's Arrow and Evolution*, (hereafter referred to as Blum), writes, "I do not see, for example, how proteins could have leapt suddenly into being. The riddle seems to be: how, when no life existed, did substance come into being which today are absolutely essential to living systems yet which can only be formed by these systems? It seems begging the question to suggest that the first protein molecules were formed by some more primitive 'non-living system', for it still remains to define and account for the origin of that system" (page 164). He has this problem: effect without adequate cause.

We will cite Bridgman for another reason why the universe did not create itself, but had to be created by God. Morris and Whitcomb, in *The Genesis Flood* (hereafter referred to as M/W), quote Bridgman as saying, "The two laws of thermodynamics are, I suppose, accepted

by physicists as perhaps the most secure generalizations from experience that we have. The physicist does not hesitate to apply the two laws to any concrete physical situation in the confidence that nature will not let him down" (page 222). The first law simply states that the total amount of energy in any system remains the same, regardless of how it is used, or into what form it is changed. Bridgman, as other scientists, knew no exception to this principle, which is applicable to our universe. The energy in our universe had to come from somewhere since it is not a cause adequate to create itself. Out of our own experience, we know that we did not create ourselves, nor were any of our ancestors capable of so doing. We also observe and know that any other matter in the universe is not able to do such. This leaves some needed source adequate to the effect. God surely qualifies.

The second law, also known as the law of entropy (for more explanation of these, read M/W, pages 222ff.; the *Creation Research Society*, hereafter abbreviated C.R.S., quarterly for March, 1969), simply states the corollary to this, that though the amount of energy remains the same, the amount available to be used steadily decreases. It states that any ordered system tends to disorder as time passes. Thorium disintegrates into radium, and finally becomes lead. Clothes wear out, and coal burns up, etc. Enoch, in *Evolution or Creation* (hereafter referred to as Enoch), quotes Sullivan, "We live in a wasting universe. One of the least disputable laws of physical science states that the universe is steadily running down" (pages 10-11). Huxley writes, ". . . the only over-all tendency we have so far been able to detect is that summarized in the Second Law of Thermodynamics—the tendency to run down" (pages 11-12). Blum: "In no case do we find controversion of the second law of Thermodynamics if we enlarge our view enough" (page 206).

William Overn, *Bible-Science* newsletter, December 1969, remarks, "Random processes produce random results," and "Every reaction is accompanied by a rise in entropy." The sun provides us with energy, but it burns up 250 million tons of matter each minute doing so. We ultimately use up that energy and turn it into such a state that it cannot be reused, at least by present known methods. Now, if we run this "burning up" back, we will soon arrive at a necessary starting point, when the sun had 100% energy available. How did that energy get there? Did God supply it?

2. *Genesis 2:1 speaks of a finished creation.*

The Hebrew word for finished means *finish, accomplish, destroy* (utterly), or *make clean riddance*, according to Strong. See Exodus 39:32; 40:33 and I Kings 6:38 for other uses of the word.

Hebrews 4:3 speaks of God's works as finished (having come into being) from the foundation of the world. God rested from all His works, verse 4, for the rest was real (an actuality). He did not need to continue creating but rather sustaining what he had created (John 5:17; Hebrews 1:3).

Evolutionists speak of a "continuing creation" (cf. Fred Hoyle, *Frontiers of Astronomy* 1955; *The Nature of the Universe* 1960) and the process of evolution going on to new and greater heights. So these men say things are happening which the Bible says are not! As R. E. D. Clark points out, "Continuous creation does not avoid creation; it merely spreads it liberally over the whole of space and time" (page 37). What he means is this: to postulate continuous creation simply sidesteps the problem of cause, and also contradicts the Bible. In contrast to the evolutionary theory, the Bible speaks of the earth

and heavens as growing "old like a garment" Hebrews 1:11. This means decay and disorder, not "new and greater heights."

3. *Genesis 1 speaks about each thing being created to reproduce "after its kind."*

This is the general statement by God concerning every area of life. We know of no exceptions to this rule. Hybrids such as the mule speak clearly that new species (in the sense of being able to reproduce themselves) are not possible (see Nelson, *After Its Kind*, pages 8-12). Every hybrid, if left to itself, dies out or reverts back to the original species. James Hutton (1726-1797) always pushed the principle that the "present is the key to the past." We will grant that and ask for any evidence that species naturally reproduce anything other than their own kind. (The problem of mutations, inherited characteristics and polyploidy will be dealt with under a later topic). If this were not the rule, any breeding or planting would be fraught with uncertainty. Even humans would be uncertain as to the product of a marriage. We assume and expect this rule to always be valid.

4. *Genesis 1 and 2 speak of plan and purpose in the action of God as he created.*

Revelation 4:11 says that by the will of God all things were created. This speaks of an expressed purpose in the mind of God. Consider that the universe about us gives evidence of design, of things working together as if planned that way. Huxley says, "At first sight the biological sector seems full of purpose. Organisms are built as if purposefully designed, and work as if in purposeful pursuit of a conscious aim" (page 13). Huxley will speak of apparent design and organized pattern (page 36). Though he disclaims that design is a reality, even he

recognizes that things work together. Blum says, "There seems to be an orderly relationship of things in the world we know, that may be spoken of as fitness." (Page 192)

The ability of species to adapt to a given environment could just as well indicate the fact that they were created this way as that they just happened. Our ability to make use of the environment around us simply says that we were created with this capacity. On page 12 Huxley says, "The proteins, the most essential chemical constituents of living substance, have molecules with tens or even hundreds of thousands of atoms, all arranged in patterns characteristic for each kind of protein. Each single tiny cell has a highly complex organization of its own, with a nucleus, chromosomes, and genes, and other cell organs, and is built out of a number of different kinds of proteins and other types of chemical units, mostly large and complex. But that is only the beginning, for large higher mammals such as men and whales may have in their bodies over a hundred million million cells of many different types, and organized in the most elaborate patterns." This sounds like purpose and plan, doesn't it? Hand in *Why I Believe the Genesis Record* (hereafter referred to as Hand), quotes Dr. George Washington Carver of Tuskegee Institute as saying, after analyzing a cabbage leaf, "There, gentlemen, is the limit of human wisdom. The chemist can separate a cabbage leaf into its component parts, but only God can take those parts and make a cabbage leaf" (page 25). (Consider the whole book called, *Wonders of Creation* by Harold W. Clark as he presents evidence for plan and purpose in the universe.)

5. *Genesis 1 and 2 speak of only six days involved in the creation of the world.*

Julian Huxley says that the universe is about 5 bil-

lion years old and that we have had life for about 2 billion years (page 21). He therefore considers that we have needed at least 2 billion years to produce life as we know it. Blum says, "The origin of life can be viewed properly only in the perspective of an almost inconceivable extent of time" (page 151). Again, he says on page 153, "No matter how the problem of the origin of life is approached, it seems necessary to admit that some events may have occurred which would appear highly improbable if viewed in our customary frame of experience."

We do not presume to say how old the earth is, but why must we take the picture for creation as painted by Genesis 1-2 to be longer than the six days stated? At first reading, the account simply says that six days were all that were needed. You may argue about the fact that the seventh day is not spoken of as being finished, but the six days were definitely finished.

If God is capable of creating the world out of nothing (Hebrews 11:3), then I assume that he could also create it instantaneously, and not even take six days to do it. How big is your God? Why do you think that the days in Genesis have to be more than 24-hour days? Is it because the sun does not appear until the fourth day? Who said we had to have a sun as we know it to have days? This was Thomas Paine's argument in his book, the *Age of Reason* and given as evidence that the Bible record was not believable. The Bible text does not say that the sun was not present until the fourth day, but rather that God placed it in the heavens that day. Besides, light and darkness had existed since the very first day. George Howe C.R.S. quarterly, September, 1969, says that study of day 3 of Genesis 1:11 shows that the vast geologic ages are impossible. If there were epochs of geological time and the purported geologic column is reasonably correct, there could be no one age of plant creation, for such reasons

as these: (1) Fossils of blue-green algae are known from Cambrian and Precambrian formations. (2) Then according to the uniformity assertion, land plants appeared later in the Silurian and Devonian times. (3) Seed plants arrived millions of years later in the Permian and Triassic ages. (4) Flowering plants came on the scene only during the Cretaceous, which is supposed to have come millions of years later than seed plants. So plant creation spans the whole of geologic time (page 92).

Morris, in *Studies in the Bible and Science*, points out that the Bible states that all plants and such as fruit trees were made on the 3rd day, while fish and other marine organisms were created on the 5th day, but geology reverses this order. He says that the Bible states that birds were created on the same day as fishes, but paleontology teaches that birds were evolved from fishes, and that insects were supposed to have appeared very early and reached their greatest development during the Carboniferous period, which preceded the appearance of the reptiles, birds, and mammals. How could the present ecological niches be filled with such an arrangement? He also states that according to the Bible, woman was made out of man, but paleontology must insist that male and female of all sexual species must have existed simultaneously (pages 33-34).

Again, assuming the present is our key to the past, the world as we know it now could not have existed for millions of years without the sun, nor could much plant life have existed without animal life. The reasons are these: plants convert the sun's energy (in the process called photosynthesis) into usable material for animals. But the corresponding process of respiration by animals is needed to convert what the plants need to function adequately. It seems to me that days must have been literal from the very necessity of the case.

Consider that in Exodus 20:11, the Bible states that "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth . . . and rested the seventh day." Do you think that the word "day" has two meanings here? A good hermeneutical principle is that the word used to mean one thing in a given context, if used again in that context, should mean the same thing, unless it is used as a pun, etc. Actually, the whole context of Exodus 20:8-11 is talking about literal 24 hour days. The word "day" appears approximately 396 times in the 5 books of Moses. Except Genesis 32:24, it is the translation of the Hebrew word "yom." How did Moses mean for us to understand it? Does Genesis 2:4, and 2:17 demand we understand the word as something other than 24 hour days? And if so, that we must do so any other place? If you say that the 7th day is not stated to have ended, that is simply an argument from silence, and not very strong as such. Besides, the first 6 days are definitely stated to have ended. That settles the matter for them.

6. *Genesis 1 speaks of God as the source of life.*

There are many other references in the Bible to this fact, as John 5:21, 26; Exodus 12:7. It is a well accepted scientific fact that spontaneous generation is not true, and the law of life from life (biogenesis) is true. Huxley says, "The work of Pasteur and his successors has made it clear that life is not now being spontaneously generated" (page 19). Lorande Woodruff writes, "We thus reach the general conclusion that, so far as observation and experience are concerned, no form of life exists today except from pre-existing life."

J. D. Thomas, in *Facts and Faith* (hereafter referred to as Thomas), quotes Harlow Shapley, Harvard physicist, as saying that we can not use "principles unknown or

unknowable to science" to solve the principle of origins (page 127). But such they do, for Shapley himself speaks on page 9 of *Science Ponders Religion*, about the "apparently automatic way life emerges when conditions are right". The ones who reject God as the source of life must take spontaneous generation as the only logical alternative, and organic evolution as the only logical theory. To state it the opposite way, M/W quote George Wald, "The only alternative to some form of spontaneous generation is the belief in supernatural creation" (page 235). Nelson quotes Ernst Haeckel, "The origin of the first monera (cell) by spontaneous generation appears to us as a necessary event in the process of the development of the earth. We admit that this process, as long as it is not directly observed or repeated by experiment, remains pure hypothesis. But I must say again that this hypothesis is indispensable for the consistent, non-miraculous history of creation" (page 14). Hans Gaffon writes, "A natural scientist who wants to study this evolutionary process has no choice but to start and proceed on the assumption that the living come from the non-living. This in spite of the fact that what stares him in the eye—all life about him—is so fantastically complex that it is hard for him to believe that it truly happened" (Thomas, page 127). J. H. Rush writes, "The scientist does not expect something to come from nothing. He has a dogged conviction that, if an explosion occurred, something must have been there to explode" (Rita Thodes Ward, *In the Beginning*, page 17). Sir Arthur Keith said, "Evolution is unproved and unprovable. We believe it because the only alternative is special creation, which is unthinkable" (Enoch, page 105). Yet Lord Kelvin thought that "Science positively demands creation" (Enoch, page 94). M/W again quote Wald, in a discussion of the great complexity of even the simplest organism, and the great odds against such even happening

or arising from non-living systems, "One has only to contemplate the magnitude of this task to concede that the spontaneous generation of a living organism is impossible. Yet here we are—as a result, I believe, of spontaneous generation" (page 234).

The origin of living matter is yet a mystery. Scientists now think that DNA is the secret of life, but the opposite is true, for life is the secret of DNA. Besides, DNA is the servant of the cell, not vice versa. We can put the ingredients of a kernel of wheat together, but there is no life there. A. D. Wilder Smith, in *Man's Origin, Man's Destiny*, (hereafter referred to as Wilder-Smith), quotes Dixon and Webb, "To say airily, as some do, that whenever conditions are suitable for life to exist life will inevitably emerge, is to betray a complete ignorance of the problems involved" (page 13). To say that conditions will be right for life to appear is to ask for exceedingly complex conditions. Only planned experiments in highly sophisticated laboratories will even allow the production of an amino acid, which is a long ways from a living cell, or anything like it.

Some would say (as mentioned before) that given enough time and the right combination of matter, life will arise. Perhaps, but some are not as credulous as others. Clark, in *Darwin, Before and After*, mentions that the eleven brothers of Joseph had not heard of the "laws of probability, of entropy, or of the second Law of Thermodynamics," but when they were seated in proper order, they all marveled (Gen. 43:33) and rightly guessed that the "long arm of coincidence would hardly have arranged them that way" (page 149).

We rule out chance! Even the word "chance" does not mean what it seems. Darwin postulated natural selection and survival of the fittest to circumvent chance. Huxley says, "Natural selection converts randomness into

direction, and blind chance into apparent purpose" (page 47). But Clark quotes Darwin as saying that "I should infer from analogy that probably all the organic beings which have ever lived upon this earth have descended from one primordial form into which life was first breathed by the Creator" (page 61). Even Darwin couldn't get away from the realization that things do not happen. They are caused! It is quite naive to assume with Pierre Teilhard de Chardin that "our earth is an unbelievable accident" (Wilder-Smith, page 89). What does "unbelievable" imply?

THE MESSAGE OF THE EARTH

7. *The earth says: Do fossils prove anything necessarily?*

Some evolutionists say that the earth simply happened through the avenue of chance. That life simply occurred when conditions were right. Assuming this premise for the sake of argument, we could assert the same thing about fossils could we not? That they are simply fortuitous concourses of atoms? Thus, simply proving that fossils prove nothing about past life.

We do not assume the premise of evolution, however, but we do assert fossils give evidence that 1) life is subject to the II Law of Thermodynamics, 2) some life has not always existed as it does now, and 3) the missing links are still missing.

Before we discuss any further, we would point out that the extant fossil remains of mammals are almost all confined to the Cenozoic era. William Gregory is quoted by Klotz as saying that all the fossils we have from the Mesozoic era could be put in a small box, since they consist almost entirely of tooth and jaw fossils. (*Genes*,

Genesis, and Evolution, hereafter referred to as Klotz, page 212).

The second law says decay is the rule. We tend to disorder. Death is the inevitable result of decay and disorder. This is as God ordained it. Often evolutionists say that the II Law of Thermodynamics applies to all systems except the specialized one of evolution since evolution supposedly tends to more order. Blum says, "There is no reason to think that evolution controverts the II Law of Thermodynamics, even though it (evolution) may appear to do so if viewed as a thing apart" (pages 200-201). His conclusion about evolution not being subject to the facts of the II Law: it just seems to be that way. The end of life just simply says that we have decayed, and the system no longer works as it once did.

We stated that some of life is different now than it used to be. It is also true to say that fossils show that some life is identically the same as it used to be. (We refer you to chapter 16 of *Geology Made Simple*, Wm. Matthews III, Doubleday & Co., for examples of life in the past ages.) For instance, we have leaves from the Ginko (or Gingko) that come from the Jurassic Epoch, several varieties of starfish from the Ordovician Epoch, a grape leaf and a walnut leaf of the Cretaceous Epoch, a hickory leaf from the Pliocene Epoch, a Japanese Oak leaf from the Eocene Epoch, and all of these are identical with their descendents of today (see Nelson). We have an ant preserved in amber that is the same as ants of 50 million years ago in the Eocene Epoch, Australian lungfish over a 150 million years old from the Jurassic Epoch, a seashell called *Lingula* from at least the Ordovician Epoch, an oyster from at least the Permian Epoch, a common opossum from the Mesozoic Era, all of which are the same as their descendants of this day (see Huxley pages 111-112). M/W have a picture of a Tuatara, a reptilian order of

beakheads, that is identical to fossils of 135 million years ago. They also mention a recent discovery of a deep-sea mollusk very much like the long-extinct Trilobites of the Cambrian Epoch, and each of these gives evidence that some things are the same today, according to the fossil record, as they were ages ago. Cook is quoted, "Sponges, echinoderms, mollusks, and worms formed already in these immeasurable remote ages, are groups as generally distinct from one another as they are at the present time. The fact is, there is no fossil evidence for evolution of invertebrates; they all appear suddenly, and fully specialized" (Enoch, page 47).

Blum states, "Fossil representatives of most of the major groups of existing forms of life were present, although the Chordates (the phylum including the vertebrates and man) and all the higher plants were conspicuously absent. Even in the earliest of the Cambrian rocks, a majority of the existing phyla are represented by forms which may be readily grouped alongside modern ones" (page 151).

Rimmer, in *The Theory of Evolution and the Facts of Science* (hereafter referred to as Rimmer), lists Silurian coral and algae, carboniferous crayfish, ferns, and palms and grasshoppers like their present day descendants; moss agates (a variegated chalcedony) whose age is unknown (one of which he knew to contain a mosquito); ancient conifers, and other things like present species known to us. (He mentions fossil dragon flies with a wingspread of 18 inches!—pages 80-95).

From these quotes we conclude that some life, according to the fossil record, (even assuming the geologic column normally presented as factual) has not changed at all. Tinkle, in *Heredity, A Study in Science and the Bible* (hereafter referred to as Tinkle) writes, "The general course of development is claimed to proceed from

THE CHRISTIAN AND EVOLUTION

simple to complex, as all biologists know, an optimism which is quite at variance with genetics, with physics, and with the Word of God" (page 163). (See also, in this aspect of simple to complex, Clark's chapter entitled, "One Way Traffic in Physics.")

With respect to homo sapiens, and the fossil record, we find such statements as this one by Mr. Short. He says, "The most unexpected part of the paleontological evidence, however, remains to be mentioned; the further back we look for early man, the more like ourselves he appears to be" (Hand, page 67). Hand points out (see also, Klotz, pages 198-199) that a wrestler of our own generation named "The Angel" had a skull like the Neanderthal Man. The shape of his skull was caused by a rare childhood disease called acromegaly. Is this skull and the cause of it any evidence for the few skulls of the Neanderthal man we have?

Reader's Digest of April, 1960 contains an article by Ivan T. Sanderson entitled "The Riddle of the Quick-Frozen Mammoths." In it, Sanderson graphically describes real mammoths quick-frozen in regions of Siberia and Alaska. These mammoths are as large or larger than any of the present day elephants. Besides, a great variety of other animals are also buried there, such as giant bison, wolves, beaver, woolly rhinoceroses, giant oxen and huge tigers. Not only do these point out vividly that life has not always been like it now is on earth (thus, making the uniformitarian assumption glaringly untrue) but that much of it was bigger. We have yet to mention the dinosaur family, and other varieties of such life as those creatures.

Reader's Digest of January, 1964, had the article about the Leakey's finds in the Olduvai gorge in east Africa. They describe the life that was contemporaneous with their celebrated Zinj, and write, "The evidence uncovered

at Olduvai also gives us a bemusing picture of the huge beasts that everlastingly surrounded Zinj., extraordinary creatures long vanished from the earth. The fossil harvest has yielded the remains of more than 100 prehistoric Titans. The remains of a pig as huge as a hippopotamus, with tusks so long that one scientist mistook them for an elephant's, were found there." They mention a "giant sheep which measured six feet at the shoulder with horns 15 feet across and as strong as a steel beam. Towering over the bird family was a tremendous ostrich, almost two stories high, which must have laid eggs as big as bowling balls".

We know that the Cro-magnon man was as large or larger than present day humans, with a cranial capacity as large or larger than ours (Wilder-Smith, page 134). These early humans existed at the same time as the Neanderthal men for their skeletons have been found together in caves on Mt. Carmel (Tinkle, page 105).

From these quotes we conclude that some of the life we see around us today is quite unchanged from any found in the fossil record. We also note that there were definitely animals that existed then much larger and in varieties not even now known. What about these facts? Do they tell a story about the validity of the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics? Not only that death occurs, but that life goes downhill—rather than uphill which evolution claims. We simply do not find in the fossil record any evidence of species transmutation either. Hand quotes Charles Darwin, "As by this theory innumerable transitional forms must have existed, why do we not find them embedded in countless numbers in the crust of the earth? Why is not all nature in confusion, instead of being, as we have them, well-defined species?" Why, indeed? He again quotes T. H. Morgan, "Within the period of human history we do not find a single instance of the transforma-

tion of one species into another one. It may be claimed then that the theory of descent is lacking in the most essential feature that it takes to place it on a scientific basis" (page 27).

Do we have any particular reason to think there are links between the species if organic evolution is not true? We should find all the species clearly defined, and such is the case. Frank Marsh, *C.R.S.* annual, June 1969, quotes G. G. Simpson as saying, "In spite of these examples, it remains true, as every paleontologist knows, that most new species, genera, and families appear in the record suddenly and are not led up to by known, gradual, completely continuous transitional sequences." And Alfred Romer, "'Links' are missing just where we most fervently desire them, and it is all too probable that many 'links' will continue to be missing". And Norman Newell, "Experience shows that the gaps which separate the highest categories may never be bridged in the fossil record. Many of the discontinuities tend to be more and more emphasized with increased collection" (page 17). He also tells us Theodosius Dobzhansky, well known zoologist at Columbia University, told him that we could not expect to prove from present plants and animals that mega-evolution (transmutation) had occurred, and that for such evidence, the fossil record was the only answer. We already see that there is no answer for their hopes there. Silence shouts loudly that the missing links are conspicuous by their absence.

The horse family should now make its appearance, since they are the real proof that evolution has occurred, at least according to evolutionists. (We highly recommend the article in the November issue of *The Plain Truth* entitled, "Evolution gets the Horse Laugh," by Paul Kroll, for plenty of evidence that horses prove no such thing.) The book, *Zoology, An Introduction to the Animal King-*

dom, published by Golden Press, states, "The fact of evolution is incontrovertible" (page 143). They then state that the horse family fossils prove this to be so. But the story is not yet all told. G. A. Kerkut, in *Implications of Evolution*, (hereafter referred to as Kerkut) writes, "The evolution of the horse provides one of the keystones in the teaching of the evolutionary doctrine, though the actual story depends to a large extent upon who is telling it and when the story is being told. In fact, one could easily discuss the evolution of the story of the evolution of the horse" (page 145). He states that in 1874 the number of genera of horses was known to be 3, by 1917 it was 15, but by 1945, G. G. Simpson listed 45 in his book, *Horses* (page 148). We would wonder why the 5 fossils (eohippus, mesohippus, merychippus, pliohippus, equus, W. W.) are then presented as if these were the only ones? He goes ahead then to point out what is not taught in textbooks, that "At present, however, it is a matter of faith that the textbook pictures are true, or even that they are the best representations of the truth available to us at the present time. One thing concerning the evolution of the horse has become clear. The story of the evolution of the horse has become more and more complex as further material is collected, and instead of a simple family tree the branches of the tree have increased in size and complexity till the shape is now more like a bush than a tree. In some ways it looks as if the pattern of horse evolution might be even as chaotic as that proposed by Osborn (1937, 1943) for the evolution of the Proboscidea, where 'in almost no instance is any known form considered to be a descendent from any other known form; every subordinate grouping is assumed to have sprung, quite separately and usually without any known intermediate state, from hypothetical common ancestors in the Early Eocene or Late Cretaceous.' (Romer, 1949). In the

THE CHRISTIAN AND EVOLUTION

first place it is not clear that Hyracotherium was the ancestral horse. Thus Simpson (1945) states, 'Matthew has shown and insisted that Hyracotherium (including Eohippus) is so primitive that it is not much more definitely equid than tapirid, rhinocerotid, etc., but it is customary to place it at the root of the equid group . . .' It is quite likely that further studies will show that the complexity of horse evolution will prove to be as great as that found in the Proboscidea, Rhinocerotidea, or Camelidea" (Pages 148-149).

Rimmer emphasizes that the 5 fossils of eohippus, mesohippus, merychippus, pliohippus, and equus are not all found on even the same continent, let alone in the same consecutive pile of rocks somewhere. He says that one fossil ancestor with 4 and 3 toes had been found, but it weighed something like 3 tons, and so was accordingly left out. In describing eohippus, he quotes a bulletin from the American Museum of Natural History, "The proportions of the skull, the short neck, and arched back, and the limbs of moderate length, were very little horse-like, recalling on the contrary, some modern carnivorous animals, especially the Civets (Viveridea). The teeth were short-crowned and covered with low rounded knobs of enamel, suggesting those of monkeys and of pigs or of other omnivorous animals, but not at all like the long crowned complicated grinders of the horse" (pages 110-111). He also mentions two fossil horses that lived at the same time as their so-called ancestry, eohippus, and known to science today. The names are *Equus nevadensis* and *Equus occidentalis*, both of which were contemporaries. The last horse was a native of the western United States, whose fossils are found in profusion (page 112). The reason these are never mentioned is that they complicate the picture considerably, as Kerkut pointed out. In the article from *The Plain Truth*, mentioned before, Kroll

writes, (quoting Simpson), "No one even suspected at that time (of the discovery of what is called eohippus, W. W.) these were ancestral horses. How could they? The specimens found by Colchester and Richardson had almost no special resemblance to the living horse. The teeth, instead of the great, ridged, grinding prisms of our present horses, were small, low, and cusped, really more like monkey teeth than horse teeth. The little skull . . . looked (as its first describer, Richard Owen, remarked) rather like 'that of the Hare or other timid Rodentia'. From the evidence then available, it would have been most unscientific to jump to the conclusion that this queer little beast was a sort of a horse. Owen named it Hyracotherium" (page 26). Then if such were so, why now call it a horse? Kroll tells us, however, why it is now called a horse. Simpson is quoted from pages 147-149 of his book thusly, "Owen compared the small Eocene mammal with the Hyraxes . . . which, indeed, it resembles more than it does the recent horses. When much later, similar fossils were found in the Eocene of North America, the principle of evolution had been well established. Professor Marsh was therefore able to recognize that these fossils were horse ancestors, and he coined for them the apt and euphonious name Eohippus, 'dawn horse,' referring to the fact that they occur in the Eocene . . . epoch." So it took a theory to set the horse straight! Yet this horse has no teeth, head, body, or feet like a horse, and rather looks like a kind of cat. In fact, Time Life's book, *Evolution*, says on page 112 that eohippus was a small animal about the size of a domestic cat. We think Kroll's article is well entitled, don't you?

The fossil record is just not convincing, and it is supposed to be. Enoch quotes T. H. Huxley, "If evolution has taken place, there (on the rocks, W. W.) will its mark be left; if it has not taken place, there will be its

refutation" (page 51). Besides the quotes in the earlier part of this point, consider that "The geological facts flatly oppose it (evolution). For all the great groups of creatures, all the most highly specialized types, appear suddenly and in full efficiency from the first, there being no links between the phyla, classes, or even orders. In other words, links are entirely missing just where, on the Darwinian theory, they should be most numerous" (Davis, quoted by Enoch, page 45). M/W quote Heribert-Nilsson, "It has been argued that the series of paleontological finds is too intermittent, too full of missing links to serve as a 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 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" (page 129).

Wilbert Rusch in the C.R.S. annual, May, 1969, says that the fossils of man such as Australopithecus, Java man, Neanderthal, Cro-magnon, and other supposed ancestors of man can no longer be considered as the oldest known relative of homo sapiens. The reason is that older remains have been found, and yet they are like modern man (as previously pointed out). Dr. Leakey, after finding Zinjanthropus, and calling him a missing link, later found another fossil over 300 feet down, and called him Homo Habilis. But this find caused him to say that this fossil would cause all the books on Anthropology to be written over, even his, since this fossil was so much like man (page 14).

The supposed link between birds and reptiles, Archaeopteryx, is claimed to be such though we have only 3 fossils found, and no one knows whether it could really fly or not, even though it has feathers like a bird. The little booklet, *Evolution, Science Falsely So-called*, points out that the many large feathers show that it was a warm-blooded creature, and fully capable of flight, with a typical bird-like skull and the feet of a perching bird. The feathers were definitely not frayed-out scales. This is what evolutionists claim to have happened of course, that scales became feathers. But scales are from a different layer of skin than feathers, and are basically different. Feathers go with birds as hair does with animals. Turner states, "The single supposedly prehistoric flying lizard Archaeopteryx is no more a link between cold-blooded reptiles and warm-blooded birds, than bats are links between birds and mammals" (page 30; see also Enoch, page 51).

The only thing we have not discussed is the geologic column. It is the purported series of rocks which have been claimed to contain the fossils of the life on the earth since its beginning. The earliest rocks said to contain the simplest life are the Cambrian, and so on up the column. The student can find the names and years each era, epoch, etc. represents in most any geology book, or other places of like nature. Suffice it to say that the rocks are not found in any clear order anywhere, without the same type rocks being found out of order other places. Nelson lists on pages 66-67 of his book a great number of places where the rocks are definitely out of order, if the evolutionists' column be factual. M/W list and show pictures on pages 180-211 of tremendous areas of rock and earth that are "out of order." The student ought to recognize that the rocks in point are sedimentary rocks, laid down by water processes. If this is so, how do we know that

the rocks were laid down as the column says they were, by processes over millions of years, and not rather in a flood as the Bible describes? Considering the vast areas of land that are not in order, and which are said to have gotten that way by some great upheaval of the earth, (the words "fault, thrust, folding," etc. are used to describe these events) the Bible catastrophe is not out of the ordinary at all, for magnitude. The previously mentioned article by Sanderson postulated catastrophic conditions on a scale equal to that of the Genesis flood, to say the least. The Bible flood could answer a lot of questions about great fossil beds the world over, and marine life found in tops of mountain ranges, etc. The student should read the section in M/W about the way fossils are formed, pages 154-169.

The next important thing to note about this theoretical pile of rocks is that such a stack is not to be had anywhere. Von Engel and Caster state that "If a pile were to be made by using the greatest thickness of sedimentary beds of each geologic age, it would be at least 100 miles high . . ." (M/W, page 106). It is almost needless to say that no such pile is around. The Grand Canyon is approximately 1 mile deep, and that is a long ways from 100 miles. So that is a theory of thin air, wouldn't you say?

The final note here is that the way the column is made is to assume the theory of evolution and then build the column from that. Schindewolf writes that "The only chrometric scale applicable in geologic history for the stratigraphic classification of rocks and for dating geological events exactly is furnished by the fossils . . . they offer an unambiguous time scale for relative age determinations and for world-wide correlation of rocks" (M/W, page 132). Many other quotes could be given which say the same thing. The point to be made is this: If evolution

is not true, then who is to say that any rocks are out of order, or what the order should be, if there is any order?

We think the fossil record tells us clearly that the II Law of Thermodynamics is and has been true for all of matter, that the present is not the key to the past, and that the missing links will always be "A.W.O.L." from the evolutionist's point of view, for the simple reason that organic evolution is a monstrous fraud. We do not argue with the fossils that have been found, only with the interpretation of them. The fossils cannot tell us about any relationships, since they are dead. We can just conjecture. Clark quotes D'Arcy Thompson as concluding that the great organizational gaps in evolution are today unabridged and likely to remain so forever (page 157).

8. *The earth says: I may not be as old as I appear.*

Appearances may be deceiving sometimes. The statement by Julian Huxley (page 11) that the earth is 5 billion years old is simply an opinion required by the evolutionary theory. Blum says, "The origin of life can be viewed properly only in the perspective of an almost inconceivable extent of time" (page 151). Yet Sir Isaac Newton, sometimes considered the greatest scientist the world has ever known, thought that Ussher's date of 4004 B.C. for creation did not conflict with what he knew of astronomy (Enoch, page 43). One may reply that we know so much more now that our knowledge puts Mr. Newton to shame. "We are the NOW generation. Knowledge of all past generations is superceded by ours!" It might be well to ask, (since some almost worship scientists and their statements), does this generation of people represent the epitome of knowledge, and if whatever is known which can be known is known by us? You would do well, sometime, just to sit down and write out the number of

THE CHRISTIAN AND EVOLUTION

"assured results" of past generations, and see how many are considered invalid today. It was once thought that earth, air, fire and water composed the sum total of elements! But it was not so.

What we are trying to say is this: We do not have to agree with some of the interpretations of scientists in the fields of biology and geology, inexact sciences, and especially so, since they generally assume evolution is a reality before they begin any research or extrapolate from the facts found.

The foundation of the theory of organic evolution is really based on the paleontological finds and facts. But listen to Mr. Kerkut: "The most important evidence for the theory of Evolution is that obtained from the study of Paleontology. Though the study of other branches of zoology such as Comparative Anatomy of Embryology might lead one to suspect that animals are all interrelated; it was the discovery of various fossils and their correct placing in relative strata and age that provided the main factual basis for the modern view of Evolution. It is unfortunate that the earliest rocks to contain fossils, the Precambrian and Cambrian, already show representatives of all the major invertebrate phyla. The earliest rocks are mainly igneous and it is possible that the fossils that they once contained have since boiled away, but there is an alternative view that the invertebrates suddenly and explosively evolved and had little or no Precambrian history" (page 134). We wonder why one would only suspect relationships from any other field except paleontology, and secondly, why the plant world could or would have suddenly exploded? We also wonder why we must place the various fossils in the relative strata. Why are they not already there, without any problems, such as we mentioned in point 7?

The last point considered some of the fossils and their story. One point to be mentioned here is this: the fossils do not necessarily show the earth to be old. The only reason time is postulated by evolutionists, and substituted for energy, is that the evolution of the world demands time. But the fossils show that man could be considered as old as any other of the supposed ancestors of man. The testimony of men who have seen with their own eyes the footprints of a man and a dinosaur in the Pulaxy river bed at Glen Rose, Texas, tells us that man may be considerably older than the 60 odd million years given him, and lived during times he was not supposed to be living. George Howe in the C.R.S. quarterly of December, 1968, reports the find of William Meister in Utah of a sandal footprint with crushed trilobites in it! These are testimonies that are factual! The presence of "living fossils" may say that things either have not changed or the earth is not as old as it is said to be.

In that same issue, Howe writes, "Uniformitarians teach that woody stems are supposed to have appeared no earlier than the Devonian strata, and the origin of wood is believed—in the context of evolution—to be hundreds of millions of years old. It comes as a shock then that Melvin Cook found valid wood specimens in the Pre-cambrian strata in Canada!" Cook reports that Dorf and Blais found fossil wood that gave a radio-carbon dating of only 4,000 years but was obtained in "Late Cretaceous rubble". (Cretaceous rocks are supposedly 100 million years old.) Howe reports that conifer seed plants (like pine and spruce) are not supposed to have appeared until the Permian period, but Clifford Burdick found such in the Pre-cambrian and Cambrian series in the Grand Canyon. No land plants of any type are to have existed before the Silurian period, yet Wilbert Rusch, Sr. knows about vascular plant spores in Cambrian rocks" (page 90).

THE CHRISTIAN AND EVOLUTION

The foregoing is for one purpose: to show that there is other evidence (facts) than what we are commonly told in the textbooks, which is commonly presented with a geological column to show in what era such life arose, beginning with the simplest life in the oldest (deepest rocks) and so on. The meaning is this: unless the organic evolutionary theory be assumed as true, the rocks simply do not show what the theory assumes, as already stated in point 8. The paleontological record is also very incomplete. Klotz has a quote in the *Bible-Science* newsletter, January 1969, as follows: "Actually studying paleontology is like trying to read a 400 page novel in which most of the pages are missing. It could be likened to reading only pages 13, 38, 170, 173, 300, and 400 which are intact in the book, but the rest are missing or severely damaged. Such is the problem."

The current rage for radiocarbon dating should make an appearance here. We recommend the C.R.S. quarterly for September, 1968, which is almost exclusively given to this subject, and the excellent article in the C.R.S. annual of 1969 by Robert Whitelaw on radio carbon and potassium-argon dating. The problem for each of these methods is the assumptions with which they begin (and assumed as true by evolutionists). D. O. Acrey in the C.R.S. quarterly, January, 1965, says that "The use of radioactive decay as a basis for absolute age determination involves the premise that a parent element decays at a known rate, which remains constant, into a daughter element. The decaying mechanism is assumed in all cases to occur directly or in a radioactive chain with nothing added or removed during the process of decay. The original rock or mineral must either be free of the ultimate daughter isotope or contain this isotope in a known proportion to other isotopes so that the original content of the decay material can be ascertained." Kerkut writes, "There are

two main ways of dating rocks: an objective method of using radioactive data and a subjective method by which one analyses the relative position of the rocks and their included fossils and then comes to conclusions concerning the contemporaneity and the priority of the different strata. Neither of these methods is completely free from objection . . ." (page 137).

M/W list the following assumptions for the C-14 method. (1) The carbon 14 concentrate in the carbon dioxide cycle is constant, (2) The cosmic ray flux has been essentially constant, (3) The decay rate has been constant, (4) The dead organic matter has not been altered by something, (5) The carbon dioxide content of the ocean and atmosphere has been constant, (6) and that the rate of formation and rate of decay of radio-carbon atoms has been the same. They go on to show that even the founder of the method, W. F. Libby, discovered problems with the method. Their chapter, pages 330-453, and the articles mentioned above, will show the reader that the dating methods are indeed questionable, and quite unreliable for many reasons.

You are able to see clearly from M/W what is assumed: uniformity throughout the past ages. As James Hutton said, "The present is the key to the past." But the findings around the arctic circle as previously mentioned in point 8, just to mention one thing, point out clearly the fact that the earth has not always been as it now is (The Bible also asserts this fact.) Mr. Kerkut will write on page 137 that paleontological evidence will indicate that "bone is more primitive than cartilage and in this respect conflicts with ideas that are derived from embryological studies."

Robert Whitelaw says, "All . . . time clocks fall into two classes, the quantitative and the qualitative. Of the quantitative clocks, only two remain in scientific favor

today: the Radiocarbon method, and the Potassium-Argon method. All others involve shaky assumptions, each assumption often contingent on the previous" (page 78, *C.R.S.* quarterly, September, 1968). Whitelaw points out that the C-14 method, as worked out by Libby, gives either a date for creation of 15,000 years or 7,000 years depending on which specific production rate of carbon is used. This is a far cry from the billions of years from Huxley. The year 1850 was chosen as the normal year for use in determining the amount of carbon that should be found in any rock, etc., since it was before the Industrial Revolution, which added to the carbon dioxide and neutrons in the atmosphere. But it is a known fact that the amount of radiocarbon in the air was unstable even before this time. Therefore, this year is surely no representative of all the time elapsed until then, or now. The theory itself has proved inconclusive since the production of radiocarbon differs almost 20% from that of the present disintegration rate (which makes the initial assumptions invalid since Libby and his associates assumed they were equal for testing). The production of radiocarbon is 18.8 atoms/gram-minute, while the decay rate is between 14.5 and 16.3. This means that there is more being produced than is observed disintegrating. With this actual ratio used, the earth shows a creation date of 15,000 years. But cosmic radiation today is reproducing neutrons (and consequently C-14 atoms) at the rate of 27 atoms/gram-minute. If this is the average to be used, then creation is only 7,000 years away.

The Potassium-Argon method is essentially this: natural potassium is radioactive and its beta activity is because of the K-40 which decays, with 92% being by gamma emission, and 8% being by beta emission. This last emission has a $\frac{1}{2}$ life of 1.31 million years. Half of the K-40 would appear as Argon-40. As Whitelaw points

out, there are only two major problems. One is that a way is needed to measure the very small amount of argon trapped in the rock specimen (since potassium only has K-40 in the ratio of 12 parts to 100,000 which would leave only 6 parts in 100,000 to be Argon-40), and how to determine what part of this argon is from the potassium decay, and what part has been picked up from the earth's atmosphere (in which Argon is very plentiful, about 1% by volume, and 99.6% of that is Argon-40). Whitelaw well says that the assumption that the ratio of the K-40 of the K-36 in the air as being uniform in all ages past is a "glaring example of the blinding power of the uniformitarian faith" (page 72). One must assume that the rate of buildup from a given creation point, and that the ratio of Argon-36 to Argon-40 has always been the same. But who knows that? He says, "This then is a timeclock without hands—without even a face—upon which evolutionary faith now depends to prop up its desperate belief in a world that never began, a creation that never occurred, and a Creator who never created and no longer exists!" (page 83).

If these are the two most dependable, then we have little to consider as to their accuracy. The qualitative clocks can only indicate a greater or lesser age and cannot determine actual years. The quantitative clocks are sorely lacking, and as Kerkut says, "We have, then, as yet, no accurate objective clock that will allow us to determine the absolute age of the majority of the rocks of the world" (page 140). Douglas Dean in an article in the *C.R.S.* January quarterly of 1966, says that the Petroleum Institute of New Zealand has reported that radiocarbon dating shows that our petroleum deposits were formed from 6,000 to 7,000 years ago! He also notes that the supposed age of Dr. Leakey's "Zinj" was obtained by dating some soil samples of the rocks in which it was found,

which means nothing about the age of "Zinj" and little more about the soil, if the information about C-14 is true which Whitelaw and others present. In the same quarterly, page 31, Mr. Wiant cites a study of some wood of living trees near an airport by the radiocarbon method shows them to be more than 10,000 years old, because the wood contained so much inactive "fossil carbon" from the exhaust of airplanes.

The fossils, as before pointed out, do not give any more hope. Who can say how the fossil got where it was found? Who is to know if the tests are accurate? (Besides, as Kerkut says, fossils are the subjective method!) Enoch tells that Dr. H. C. Morton relates how some American scientists had to reduce the age of a skeleton found in the Mississippi from 50,000 years to 5,000 because they found a modern flat-bottomed boat below it (page 36-37).

We will close with this information from Morris and Whitecomb, pages 132-134. They note that geologic dating and correlation are based on two assumptions: uniformity and evolution. They illustrate it with these quotes: Schuchert and Dunbar say, "A trained paleontologist can identify the relative geologic age of any fossiliferous rock formation by a study of its fossils almost as easily and certainly as he can determine the relative place of a sheet of manuscript by looking at its pagination. Fossils thus make it possible to correlate events in different parts of the world and so to work out the history of the earth as a whole." Dunbar is then quoted as saying, "Although the comparative study of living animals and plants may give very convincing circumstantial evidence, fossils provide the only historical documentary evidence that life has evolved from simpler to more complex forms."

We simply ask: if we cannot date the rocks except by the fossils, and the fossil record has no objective evidence to offer, how do we know how old the earth really is?

THE MESSAGE OF BIOLOGY AND ZOOLOGY

9. *The Plant and Animal Kingdoms show design and purpose, not chance.*

The plant and animal kingdoms from the perspective of design and purpose show many things that should convince the non-prejudiced person that they are not the result of chance combinations. We have no real evidence that forces us to the conclusion that it just happened. If all we now know came from nothing, then how did the two kingdoms ever separate? How closely are we related to the trees, for instance? to weeds? to worms? to sheep? Consider the evidence of these two areas for creation and against evolution.

That there is a clear-cut distinction between the two is readily apparent. The general conclusion that like produces like is also true. Many different varieties of certain things (like wheat, corn, flowers) exist, but all produce "after its kind," as the Genesis record reads. From a farm background, I never knew anything else to be true, in either kingdom. Assuming James Hutton's premise, I deny evolution has even occurred, since by his premise, my present is the key to the past. The observed principle (called a law) of biogenesis is incontrovertible. I have no record of any exceptions. Yet evolutionists say that sometime in the past, life came from non-life. All you have to do is read a little book like the one from Golden Press, entitled *Zoology, An Introduction to the Animal Kingdom* to see that such is true! The book comments that "all (animals) are descendants of some primal

life which began in some oriental sea over a billion years ago" (page 4). Yet, in the very next sentence we are told, "How life began is still unknown."

Which of the two assertions shall we consider as fact? The book says that "The ancient ancestor of modern plants and animals must have been extremely simple" (page 5). We ask why? It is only so because change cannot produce anything complicated? So they assert on page 11: "The dawn of life doubtless occurred over a billion years ago in an ancient sea by some chance combination of simple materials." Now from page 22, "Protoplasm is of some of the same chemical elements found in non-living things; yet it is endowed with the unique qualities of life. It is an exceedingly complex combination of chemicals." (Consistency is a jewel, eh)? Huxley remarks, about life's beginning, "It must be confessed, however, that the actual process is still conjectural; all we know is that living substance must have developed . . ." (page 21). But is this not just stating what is obvious: life is present? That has the same force as Darwin's postulate that the fittest will survive. That is simply saying that the living are the fittest, and accordingly survived. The arrival of the fittest is the thing in question, not the fact that something is alive.

Protoplasm is made mainly of proteins, carbohydrates, fats, salts and water. Its average chemical composition is as follows: oxygen 76.0%, carbon 10.5%, hydrogen 10.0%, nitrogen 2.5%, sulfur 0.2%, phosphorus 0.3%, potassium 3%, chlorine 0.1%, and less than 1% of sodium, calcium, magnesium, iron, and several other elements. With at least 12 different elements in this list, how do we know that all were even present at the same time and place at the dawn of the world? Even if they were so, how did they get in that exact ratio to each other? John Cothran in his chapter, "The Inescapable Conclu-

sion," writes, "Consider the 102 known chemical elements and their amazing diversities and similarities. Some are colored, others are colorless; some are gases extremely difficult to liquify and to solidify; . . . Yet, with all this seeming complexity, all conform with the . . . Periodic Law. The material universe is unquestionably one of system and order, not chaos, of laws, not chance and hazards" (pages 40-41). In the same book, (*Evidence of God in an Expanding Universe*), Frank Allen writes, "Proteins are the essential constituents of all living cells, and they consist of the five elements, carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen, oxygen, and sulphur, with possible 40,000 atoms in the ponderous molecule. As there are 92 chemical elements (considered stable, W. W.) in Nature, all distributed at random, the chance that these five elements may come together to form the molecule, the quantity of matter that must be continually shaken up, and the length of time necessary to finish the task, can all be calculated" (page 23). The number is 10^{160} to 1, or 10 multiplied by itself 160 times. The length of time needed would be 10^{243} power. He then remarks that it is impossible for all these chances to have built one molecule, and then says (even if such really happened) ". . . proteins as chemicals are without life." So how did it really come to be: life, that is? The evolutionists say they don't know. The odds are nil that conditions are even possible from the make-up of the simplest of matter for life to happen. The only experience we have is life from life. What do you accept by faith: God or evolution? And against what odds?

10. *The supposed evidences are not good evidence!*

The evidence for evolution in this field is based on (1) classification, (2) comparative anatomy, (3) em-

THE CHRISTIAN AND EVOLUTION

bryology, (4) biochemistry, (5) physiology, (6) geographical distribution, (7) vestigial organs, (8) breeding experiments, and (9) mutations.

The first five of these are simply arguments from *similarity*. But whose idea of similarity? How similar or dissimilar are various plants? various animals? Kerkut has said (see point 8) that such arguments only suggest the theory of evolution. So the sum total is still zero $\times 5 = \text{zero}$. It is well known (but little practiced) that arguments from analogy only illustrate, but establish nothing. Such arguments prove nothing in this area. Likenesses may give evidence of a common creator, rather than chance!

Suppose design and purpose, so very evident, are the effects of an all-knowing God. We could see evidence of such in these similarities, could we not?

The idea of classification, as presented in the common "tree of life" assumes the thing to be proved, which is organic evolution. So does the idea of comparative anatomy. The oft presented horse family (and *Life Magazine's* recent chart of man's ancestry) simply but blatantly assumes what it is supposed to prove.

Embryology deals with the likenesses of embryos of different animals (since plants have nothing along this line to offer). But the deductions therefrom are based on the foundation of the first two. Julian Huxley says that an embryo $2/3$ of an inch long possesses different things from his ancestors, such as a tail, and gill clefts. But, the supposed tail happens to be part of the intestine which at this stage (up to about 5th week) extends beyond the legs, and the anal opening is at the end. The 5th to 8th weeks this part begins to form the os coccyx. It then recedes to form the os coccyx. The vertebrae always number 33, and never more, which would be the case if a tail were present. I might add, I don't know

personally of anyone being born with such, do you? If so, were they considered normal?

The argument about *gill clefts* is only to mislead laymen who do not know any better. These embryonic folds never open, and are only there early because they are precursors in mammals of the incus, bones in the ear (stapes) and Meckel's cartilage, the external ear cartilage, hyoid apparatus, a part of the thyroid cartilage, and epiglottis. They also aid the heart in its supplying of blood to the developing brain.

Ernest Haeckel was the first to really promote this lie of embryonic gill clefts, because he was attempting to establish Darwin's theory on the European continent. In his books, *Natürliche Schöpfungs-geschichte* (*Natural History of Creation*) and *Anthropogenie* (The first of these two was published in 1868) he printed a series of woodcuts attempting to show this fact: at certain points in embryonic development, different vertebrate animals and man are alike. So he took the same woodcut and reproduced it three times side by side, and labeled one dog, one monkey, one man. He did the same thing again, changing the woodcut, and labeled one dog, one chicken, and one tortoise. Needless to say, they looked alike! (The interested reader can see these and others reprinted in the C.R.S. annual, 1969). The intent to deceive is obvious. Not only so, but when accused of falsifying some diagrams of other scientists for the same purpose, Haeckel said, "To put an end to the unsavoury dispute I begin at once with the contrite confession that a small number (3-6%) of embryo diagrams are really forgeries in Dr. Brass's sense; these, namely, for which the observed material is so incomplete or insufficient as to compel us to fill in and reconstruct the missing links by hypothesis and comparative synthesis . . . I should feel utterly condemned and annihilated by the admission, were it not that hundreds

of the best observers and most reputed biologists lie under the same charge. The great majority of all morphological, anatomical, histological and embryological diagrams are not true to nature, but are more or less doctored, schematized, and reconstructed" (page 63, Enoch).

We also would note here a quote from Hand, page 38, about such reconstructions, from Dr. E. A. Hooten, "The various reconstructions of the Piltdown man by Smith-Woodward, Keith and other experts differ widely from one another. To attempt to restore the soft parts is even a more hazardous undertaking. The lips, the eyes, the ears and the nasal tip leave no clues on the underlying bony parts. You can with equal facility model on a Neanderthal skull the features of a chimpanzee or the lineaments of a philosopher. The alleged restorations of ancient types of men have little if any scientific value and are apt to mislead the public."

We would note that since his remark, the Piltdown man has been exposed as a clever hoax, and is not fact at all though the scientific world in general was misled by him for 40 years. In 1969, the *Argosy* magazine published a big write-up about a newly found missing link, with the article so-titled, and we were off and running again, until some men in California called the Smithsonian Institute and informed them that he was a fabrication of rubber and hair. (The reader should consult the publication called *Doorway Papers* by Arthur Custance for three greatly different reconstructions of Dr. Leakey's "Zinj.")

No embryo helps evolution since it is quite obvious that in many respects the embryos are vastly different, and each of these *always* comes out what it is supposed to be: a dog, cat, etc. At 45 days, there are obvious differences in a dog and human embryo. Nelson, pages 33-36, cites the fact that the house-fly, the human, the fish, the Milkweed butterfly, and others, all have stages

that their ancestry could not possibly have been. The evolutionists call these a "falsification of the ancestral record." He quotes this from Lacy, "Many stages have dropped out, others are unduly prolonged or abbreviated, or appear out of their chronological order. And, besides, some of the structures have arisen from adaptation and are not, therefore, ancestral at all, but are, as it were, recent additions to the text. The interpretation becomes a difficult task, and requires much balance of judgment and profound analysis" (page 34). Nelson adds, "None but an evolutionist, we suppose, is privileged to have the necessary 'balance of judgment.'"

* We will only mention that if such as these were really true, then the attempts to explain the "convergence" of all of these is surely thwarted by a number of animals that have too many ancestors. Blood tests of various mammals show that some humans are more closely related to apes than to fellow humans. We are identical to sheep and other animals in the chemical substance called thyroïdin (from thyroid gland). (What does identity argue?) The milk of asses and humans is more nearly alike than any other. The nervous system of pigs is similar to ours. The plague affects only man and rats. The Australian platypus has a duck-bill covered with fur, has webbed feet, lays eggs, makes a grass-filled nest in a tunnel under water, has four legs and fur, a tail and claws. Which family for this "living fossil?" The Tasmanian animal, known as the "Tasmanian wolf" and called a thylacine, is outwardly like a dog, as also the skeleton. Yet is like the opossums (Marsupial family) and kangaroo in that it bears its young very small and lets them develop in its pouch. Which family is it? Similarity proves nothing except that we can see where the differences leave off and the similarity begins.

THE CHRISTIAN AND EVOLUTION

Vestigial organs is another argument. The set of encyclopedias I have say that man has some 90 of these. We ought to mark these down as items to keep us humble because they betray our ignorance. These things called vestigial organs are organs for which we do not know any use. The glands such as the thyroid gland, the pituitary gland, the thymus, the tonsils: all were once thought to have no use. All are now known to have important functions. Even the appendix is useful as it has to do with blood supply. Some argue that we can remove the appendix and live without it. We could have a lung cut out, or a hand cut off, and get along without them, but that doesn't prove they are not useful. We would readily grant that this is argument by analogy and proves nothing. We don't know that other things are like these. So it is also with the "vestigial" organs: we don't know about the use of some. As time goes on, however, we are finding uses of the once-thought vestigial organs. God may have just planned each of these for a use!

The argument from geographical distribution is an argument from silence generally. You can "prove" all sorts of things by this. Darwin first thought of it when he saw all the life on the Galapagos Islands. The evolutionist has to believe that everything is derived from a common ancestor or else we have had several beginnings. With the numerous stable species, this presents a real problem, since these preclude a change from any preceding species. Too, many species, though widely separated, can interbreed if placed together, which shows that they do not become "new" species by land separation. All in all, this supposed proof has too many gaps for any argument. The interested reader may peruse pages 157-163 of Dewar's book for more information. We would remark that though many languages the world over have been studied, no evidence for evolution has been found. There

are language families, but these do not indicate one common source at all.

We have left only the area of *mutations*. There is much material on this, which will be listed at the end of this paper. We would especially recommend the books by Klotz and Tinkle. The subject is really the issue to be studied, since evolutionists make so much of it, and with the new information on DNA, have generated great interest in this area. For after all, evolution is really a genetic problem. Do things produce after "their kind" or not?

Huxley says: "Mutation . . . is an imperfection in the basic property of living substance, of reproducing itself unaltered; but without it, there could have been no change, and so no improvement of any sort" (page 47). "Mutation . . . provides the raw material of evolution; it is a random affair, and takes place in all directions" (page 36).

So mutations are the key to any change according to Huxley. But it is well to ask: The key to what change? Richard Goldschmidt says, "It is true that nobody thus far has produced a new species or genus, etc., by macromutation. It is equally true that nobody has produced even a species by the selection of micromutations. In the best-known organisms, like *Drosophila*, innumerable mutants are known. If we were able to combine a thousand or more of such mutants in a single individual, this still would have no resemblance whatsoever to any type known as a species in nature" (pages 134, M/W). Enoch writes, "Though 26 generations of *Drosophila* can be observed (and even this rate of mutation can be speeded up by X-ray), so far no accumulation of mutations has been observed" (page 76).

Yet, it seems to me, that if evolution is so scientific, it ought to be demonstratable in the laboratory. We

THE CHRISTIAN AND EVOLUTION

ought to be able to mutate anything to something else, if mutations are the key to change. If we can not do so, then it is unprovable and simply guesswork on the part of those who so claim. This, by the way, is one of the problems and weaknesses on the inexact sciences like Biology and Geology. There is no way to check such guesses as these guesses in the laboratory, (as one can with Physics, for instance).

But we are told that we should not expect such. Dobzhansky says, "These evolutionary happenings are unique, unrepeatable, and irreversible. It is as impossible to turn a land vertebrate into a fish as it is to effect the reverse transformation. The applicability of the experimental method to the study of such unique historical processes is severely restricted before all else by the time intervals involved, which far exceed the lifetime of any experimenter" (page 226, M/W). It sounds to me like these people are saying "We can not prove it or show it, or anything close to it. You are to believe it because we say it."

Mutation is the name for any new variation whose means of production is unknown, or is known by means of an induced change of gene make-up on the chromosomes. That the differing numbers of chromosomes for various species show no evidence of evolution is a remarkable fact. It seems to me that if evolution were true, we should be able to see it in chromosome relationships, since these are the basics of all life. Yet it is not so (see Klotz, 272-274). The simple use of mutations, however, as the sole basis of evolution is highly questionable. They are over 99% lethal, and the remaining 1% is doubtful as to its helpfulness. The reason is that mutations are a change in an orderly process, and they almost invariably cause the thing in which it occurs to be less viable (able to live) than the ones without a mutation.

If such happened outside of the controlled experiment, they would render the things in question less able to survive, and it would likely not survive. Walter Lammerts, C.R.S. annual, 1969, states that in no case do mutations or crossovers provide the recipient with more ability to survive. He also shows, that according to studies, even if 1% of mutations were beneficial, it would take over 900,000 generations to establish a beneficial mutation in a species. You need to consider such things as: what good is an eye or ear if such is not in working order? (It has been estimated that it would take 200 mutations to produce an eye.) How long could fish exist without the ability to breathe under water? Or how long out of water with only gills? The few fossils, supposedly the intermediate links, may have become fossils because they were not the fittest!

Though mutations can be caused in the laboratory, it is not known what causes them outside the laboratory. If a given trait needed at least four factors to produce it (and some take 15), and one of these was recessive, the recessive (as Mendel's law shows) would only appear every 256 times. If there were 10 dominant factors to one recessive, the recessive would only appear once in 16,777,216 times. Would that sudden appearance be considered a mutation? The present breed of cattle being produced without any horns is nothing new. They were known in ancient Egyptian times. Nelson suggests that linkage (crossover) is a possible explanation of the appearance of new traits (pages 187-195). Yet we may be unable to assert that any new trait is not a simple recessive, unless we know absolutely that such a gene was not present in the parents. Humans have varying numbers of genes, according to different calculations, running all the way from 20-120 thousand. With even 20,000, we have a tremendous potential for some trait to be recessive, and

only appear at intervals. Mendel's law would show that with two members mating, with only three genes to consider, if one set of genes were all dominant and the other set recessive, none of the recessives would appear in that cross. Any mating of the resultant offspring would allow the recessive to appear only once out of every 64 offspring. Now, consider the possibilities in 20,000 genes of which we know little. Who can say that, if left unmolested, any new thing would appear? Even in the commonly known fruit fly, the mutation rate for a given gene is only once in 40,000 years. Supposing this to be true, what if the first 999 mutations were harmful? How long would it take to get a new species through mutations? Actually, Julian Huxley shows that even with favorable mutations, the odds against a horse happening are 1 with 5 million zeros behind it. What are the odds against the whole plant and animal world happening? Huxley himself says it is unbelievable. I accept his statement at face value.

Mutations are both harmful and recessive normally. If they become a part of the regular chromosome, they behave as any other gene does. In fact, one reason why mutations are suspect (as able to reproduce new species) is that they reappear. This has been observed in the fruit fly, and the Ancon sheep (a short-legged variety) just to mention two species. Tinkle cites Lammerts as saying that roses mutated might produce a more desirable rose for market purposes, yet every rose thus produced was weaker and less viable than the original Queen Elizabeth variety (page 69).

Remember this also: mutations may change a gene, but a changed gene does not make a new species at all. If one gene is changed in 20,000, what visible effect would it have? The fruit fly, *Drosophila*, has been observed since 1910. More than 1,000 generations have

been observed, innumerable experiments performed, but no accumulation of mutations has been seen. Huxley had to admit that "the direct and complete proof of the utilizations of mutations in evolution under natural conditions has not yet been given" (Enoch, page 78). Ployploidy does not help, since no genes are changed. Ployploidy is a condition which means the chromosome number (diploid number) is more than normal. The number might be triploid, or tetraploid, etc. This condition is probably caused by abnormal cell division of some sort. What causes it though, is as much a mystery as what causes mutations. Polyploidy generally results in larger sizes, but it does not create new species, since the gene make-up remains the same, even though there are more of them. Klotz will note that the fertility rate of polyploids generally is lower, as well as the viability. He quotes H. J. Muller to the effect that *animal* polyploidy is almost impossible, since the chromosome number is upset and sexual mating is thus impossible. This process certainly does not produce new kinds, but just variations, since nothing new is really added. Levan states that each species has an optimum chromosome number, and any increase beyond this number is lethal (Klotz, page 323). Having no proofs, then why must we be told it happens? T. H. Morgan admits that "within the period of human history we do not know of a single instance of the transformation of one species into another . . . It may be claimed that the theory of descent is lacking, therefore, is the most essential feature that it needs to place the theory on a scientific basis. This must be admitted" (Enoch, page 84).

(This is one major problem with the fossils, you see. They prove nothing. Breeding tests can't be applied to them, and this is necessary to determine the relationship of any new form, to another form.)

THE CHRISTIAN AND EVOLUTION

Klotz says that given a population of 100,000,000 organisms with the average generation one day, to expect five simultaneous mutations to happen would require about 270,000,000 years. (To get an eye, you need about 200 simultaneous mutations!)

The stability of the known world is a must to any type of science. Suppose things were not stable. As Dr. Dawson points out, a typhoid germ might turn into a malaria germ from one year to another, if the species, etc., were not constant (Hand, page 43). In other areas of genetics, crossbreeding is a means of producing different types of things, but hybrids are not as stable as needed, in order to keep a new species, and revert back to the original. The thoroughbred is just that: a product of specialized breeding. This does not occur naturally. Many hybrids are sterile and cannot reproduce, such as the male mule. Individual species do not cross naturally, anyway, as any farm boy knows. We will repeat: if the present is the key to the past, organic evolution has not occurred!

There are several areas we did not discuss, or just briefly mentioned. The list of books at the end, or the articles mentioned can give you more information about these areas, such as in genetics about DNA, the Urey-Miller experiment, and polyploidy; in physics, closed and open systems with respect to the Second Law of Thermodynamics; in the area of fossils about the consideration of the different fossil men that are found and the vast fossil beds known, the ice age(s); about the flood and the Bible's claim for God as Creator (over 70 times), and the major differences between man and ape (which are at least over 50 in number), or the arguments against evolution from epistemology such as cause and effect, design, purpose, etc.

We will, however, tell you why Morris makes the statement that "It is not too much to say that the evolu-

tionary philosophy, consistently accepted and applied, squarely contradicts Biblical Christianity in every essential feature" (page 15, *Evolution and the Modern Christian*). It is because, as we have noted before, it does away with all we hold as true and right. Listen to these quotes from Wilder-Smith on page 161: "George Gaylord Simpson is reported as saying that the modern advances in biological sciences had made the religious superstitions, so rampant in North America, untenable, intellectually speaking," and that "it was high time for Americans to throw overboard their naive theism and divine services. The fact that so many still partake in these exercises is, according to Simpson, proof of the sad lack of scientific education and the rampant nature of superstition among Americans." Enoch quotes Huxley as saying that "The doctrine of evolution, if consistently accepted, makes it impossible to believe the Bible" (page 148-149, see also M/W, page 446).

You see, organic evolution accepts a non-miraculous origin of the universe, and its god is chance, its mechanism is natural selection, and its code is survival of the fittest. Frederick Nietzsche's philosophy was the "right of might" and he got it from Darwin. Adolph Hitler applied it, as the Russian Communists do today. The Time-Life book, *Evolution*, states on page 10, ". . . when he (Darwin) started his career, the doctrine of special creation could be doubted only by heretics. When he finished, the fact of evolution could be denied only by an abandonment of reason. He demolished the old theory . . . For it is one thing for man to be told (and want to believe) that he was created in the literal image of God. It is quite another thing for him to be told (and have to accept) that he is, while unique, merely the culmination of a billion years of ever-evolving life, and that he must trace his godhood down a gnarled and twisted family tree through

mammals and amphibians to the lowly fish and thence to some anonymous, if miraculous Adam molecule."

Harlow Shapley in *Science Ponders Religion* writes on page 7, "I point out that modern science has removed the need for appeal to miracles or the supernatural for the origin of molecules, or the origin of life, or the origin of trees, or the origin of man and his curiosity. All these evolve naturally." So he writes, "In the beginning was the Word, it has been piously recorded, and I might venture that the word was hydrogen gas" (page 3).

We would add that, if all scientists were honest, and some had not tried to foist off false evidence on an unsuspecting public to prove the theory, we wouldn't be inclined to scoff at some of their claims. In addition to the now defunct Piltdown man, and Pithecanthropus Erectus (Java), and other hoaxes known to us, Henry Morris mentions in his book, *The Bible and Modern Science*, about (1) the Nebraska Man, whose tooth was found in 1922. This tooth was claimed to be one million years old, and introduced as evidence in the Bryan-Scopes trial in 1925 as such. Mr. Bryan denied that any ancestor lived 1 million years ago, but he was just laughed at. Two years later, the complete skeleton was found and discovered to be an extinct peccary pig. Or, (2) the Colorado Man (also from one tooth) was widely publicised, but the tooth was discovered to be a horse's tooth. Or, (3) a skull of an ape man, exhibited as such, but was later identified as the skull of a pet monkey that had been recently buried. Or, (4) the bone of a bear's hind leg exhibited for a while as an ancient human fibula (page 49ff.). The aforementioned Pithecanthropus Erectus was found in Java in 1891 by Dr. Eugene Debois, and proclaimed as a pre-human relative of man. But, alas, in 1923, the bones of dear old P.E. were identified as genuine bones of humans by Dr. Hrdlicka. So that one is also a hoax, (Rommer,

page 131). Mr. Rimmer also notes that another complete skull was found by Mr. Heberlein, and said to be a companion of the first Pithecanthropus Erectus. However, in that same year of 1926, Dr. Hrdlicka did an investigation of this find, and discovered said skull was actually the knee bone of an extinct elephant! (page 140-141).

We think it will be worth the space to add the following material from G. A. Kerkut's book, *Implications of Evolution*, published in England by Pergamon Press, 1960.

He says in chapter 2:

"Before one can decide that the theory of Evolution is the best explanation of the present-day range of forms of living material one should examine all the implications that such a theory may hold. Too often the theory is applied to, say, the development of the horse and then because it is held to be applicable there it is extended to the rest of the animal kingdom with little or no further evidence.

There are, however, seven basic assumptions that are often not mentioned during discussions of Evolution. Many evolutionists ignore the first six assumptions and only consider the seventh. These are as follows:

(1) The first assumption is that non-living things gave rise to living material i.e., spontaneous generation occurred.

(2) The second assumption is that spontaneous generation occurred only once. The other assumptions all follow from the second one.

(3) The third assumption is that viruses, bacteria, plants and animals are all interrelated.

(4) The fourth assumption is that the Protozoa gave rise to the Metazoa.

(5) The fifth assumption is that the various invertebrate phyla are interrelated.

THE CHRISTIAN AND EVOLUTION

(6) The sixth assumption is that the invertebrates gave rise to the vertebrates.

(7) The seventh assumption is that within the vertebrates the fish gave rise to the amphibia, the amphibia to the reptiles, and the reptiles to the birds and mammals. Sometimes this is expressed in other words, i.e. that the modern amphibia and reptiles had a common ancestral stock, and so on.

The first point that I should like to make is that these seven assumptions by nature are not capable of experimental verification. They assume that a certain series of events has occurred in the past. Thus though it may be possible to mimic some of these events under present-day conditions, this does not mean that these events must therefore have taken place in the past. All that it shows is that it is possible for such a change to take place. Thus to change a present-day reptile into a mammal, though of great interest, would not show the way in which the mammals did arise. Unfortunately we cannot bring about this change; instead we have to depend upon limited circumstantial evidence for our assumptions."

In Kerkut's concluding chapter (10), he writes:

"If we go back to our initial assumptions it will be seen that the evidence is still lacking for the most of them.

(1) The first assumption was that non-living things gave rise to living material. This is still just an assumption.

(2) The second assumption was that biogenesis occurred only once. This again is a matter for belief rather than proof. It is a convenient assumption that life arose only once and that all present-day living things are derived from this unique experience, but because a theory is convenient or simple it does not mean that it is necessarily correct. If the simplest theory was always correct we should still be with the four basic elements—earth, air,

fire, and water! The simplest explanation is not always the right one even in biology.

(3) The third assumption was that Viruses, Bacteria, Protozoa and the higher animals were all interrelated. We have as yet no definite evidence about the way in which the Viruses, Bacteria or Protozoa are interrelated.

(4) The fourth assumption was that the Protozoa gave rise to the Metazoa. Here again nothing definite is known. We can believe that any one of these views is better than any other according to the relative importance that we accord to the various pieces of evidence.

(5) The fifth assumption was that the various invertebrate phyla are interrelated. As has already been described, it is difficult to tell which are the most primitive from amongst the Porifera, Mesozoa, Coelenterate, Ctenophora or Platyhelminthia and it is not possible to decide the precise interrelationship of these groups. The higher invertebrates are equally difficult to relate. The evidence, then, for the affinities of the majority of the invertebrates is tenuous and circumstantial; not the type of evidence that would allow one to form a verdict of definite relationships.

(6) The sixth assumption, that the invertebrates gave rise to the vertebrates has not been discussed in this book. Here again it is a matter of belief which way the evidence happens to point. As Berrill states, 'in a sense this account (of how they arose) is science fiction.'

(7) We are on somewhat stronger ground with the seventh assumption that the fish, amphibia, reptiles, birds and mammals are interrelated. There is the fossil evidence to help us here, though many of the key transitions are not well documented and we have as yet to obtain a satisfactory objective method of dating the fossils.

In effect, much of the evolution of the major groups of animals has to be taken on trust. There is a certain

amount of circumstantial evidence but much of it can be argued either way. Of course one can say that the small observable changes in modern species may be the sort of thing that lead to all the major changes, but what right have we to make such an extrapolation? We may feel that this is the answer to the problem, but is it a satisfactory answer? A blind acceptance of such a view may in fact be the closing of our eyes to as yet undiscovered factors which may remain undiscovered for many years if we believe that the answer has already been found.

What alternative system can we use if we are not to assume that all animals can be arranged in a genealogical manner? The alternative is to indicate that there are many gaps and failures in our present system and that we must realize their existence.

It is in the interpretation and understanding of the factual information and not the factual information itself that the true interest lies.

There is a theory which states that many living animals can be observed over the course of time to undergo changes so that new species are formed. This can be called the 'Special Theory of Evolution' and can be demonstrated in certain cases by experiments. On the other hand there is the theory that all the living forms in the world have arisen from a single source which itself came from an inorganic form. This theory can be called the 'General Theory of Evolution' and the evidence that supports it is not sufficiently strong to allow us to consider it as anything more than a working hypothesis. It is not clear whether the changes that bring about speciation are of the same nature as those that brought about the development of new phyla. The answer will be found by future experimental work and not by dogmatic assertions that the General Theory of Evolution must be cor-

rect because there is nothing else that will satisfactorily take its place."

What do you wish to believe? The evidence for organic evolution is hypothetical. It is really an alternative solution to the problem of origins and a substitute for special creation. Evolution makes man a chance product of time, and effectively eliminates any reason for man to feel obligated to anyone. Might does make right. With God out of the picture, there are no absolutes of any sort. Man is the measure of all things. Everything is relative. Morals mean nothing. Life means nothing. There is no hope, for there is no answer. Life is meaningless. Evil and cruelty have no solution, as Francis Schaeffer points out in *The God Who is There*, "if man has been kicked up out of that which is only impersonal by chance, then those things that make him man—hope of purpose and significance, love, motions of morality and rationality, beauty and verbal communication—are ultimately unfulfillable and are thus meaningless . . . if all of life is meaningless, and ultimately absurd, why bother . . ." (page 89).

So we have a choice. The Bible and special creation give us answers to what we are, from whence we came, and why we are here. We have absolutes and a point of reference. We can hope in a rational understanding of all of life, the universe about us, and ourselves. So it is God or chance. As Schaeffer remarks, "Either there is a personal beginning to everything or one has what the impersonal throws up by chance out of the time sequence" (pages 88).

"As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord!"