





Faith and Science in Harmony .....	05
Advanced Scientific Knowledge Throughout Scripture .....	24
Many Scientists Reject the Theory of Evolution .....	46
Frauds in the History of Evolution .....	69
The Anthropic Principle: The Universe Was Made for Life to Exist .....	85
In the Beginning: Origins Reconsidered .....	109
The Age of Planet Earth .....	134



# 01

## *FAITH AND SCIENCE IN HARMONY*

For most of the last century many people wrongly assumed that science had somehow disproved the Scriptures, and that anyone who disagreed with this was in the same sorry state as those who believed the Earth was flat.

The sad irony of all this is that for much of history Christianity and scientific study have been allies, not opponents. Contrary to popular belief, it was the Christian worldview that provided the right environment for modern science to emerge. This is because the Christian faith is monotheistic.

It was actual belief in the One true God, who created everything through and by Himself, that led many scientists to expect an orderly, intelligible, rational and uniform world, with the underlying laws of nature remaining the same in time and space. A Universe that was irregular and wayward would not be capable of systematic study.

In addition, the Christian belief in an immanent transcendent God, outside of time and space, and completely distinct from the Universe and nature, made experimentation justified. This would not have been the case under other religious belief systems, that regarded forms of matter as gods, or under those that considered matter as something evil.

The Christian belief is that matter is good, but it is not God. As one commentator pointed out: “The Christian doctrine of Creation provided an essential matrix for the coming into being of the scientific enterprise.”

This fact is recognized by many of the greatest scientists, historians and philosophers in history. The historian Herbert Butterfield described science as, “a child of Christian thought.”

Dr Peter Hodgson said that, “Christianity provided just those beliefs that are essential for science, and the whole moral climate that encouraged its growth.”

This argument can be furthered by considering the views of some of the most prominent scientists the world has ever seen. These leading scientists found no contradiction between their discoveries in science and their acceptance of the authority of Scripture regarding God’s creation of the Universe out of nothing. Below are just a few examples.

*Isaac Newton* (1642-1723) was probably the greatest scientist ever. At the young age of twenty-two he invented calculus, which made him one of the greatest mathematicians of all time. Using the mathematics he had invented, he derived the law of gravity and the mathematical motions of the planets, the Moon, the comets and all moving terrestrial objects. In the conclusion of his scientific book *Principia* he wrote:

This most beautiful system of the Sun, planets and comets, could only proceed from the council and dominion of an intelligent and powerful being...This being governs all things, not as the soul of the world, but as Lord over all.

*Nicolaus Copernicus* (1473-1543) laid the foundations for modern astronomy and the scientific revolution by suggesting on mathematical grounds that the Earth travelled around the Sun. At first many resisted his discovery because they feared it was a contradiction to the Holy Scriptures. However, the Bible never makes any such claim that the Sun revolves around the Earth. Copernicus described God as the best and most orderly Workman of all.

**Galileo Galilei** (1564-1642) was a mathematician, physicist and astronomer, and founder of modern mechanics and experimental physics. Through his studies, he became convinced of the truth of the theory of Copernicus, that the Earth and the planets revolved around the Sun. The Pope condemned his theory on the grounds that the Bible said it was the Sun which ran about in the heavens, not the Earth.

In his defence, Galileo invited one of his opponents, a professor of philosophy at Padua University, to look through the telescope at the evidence on which his theory was based. The professor refused and Galileo was condemned by the Inquisition.

Despite persecutions from the Catholic Church, Galileo was a devout believer and said: “There are two big books, the book of nature and the book of super nature, the Bible.”

**Johannes Kepler** (1571-1630) was a brilliant astronomer and mathematician. He developed physical astronomy and the laws of planetary motion and believed strongly in God’s Creation. When Kepler was asked his purpose in pursuing science, he said that he wanted to complete scientific research to obtain a sample test of the delight of the Divine Creator in His work and to partake of His joy. Elsewhere Kepler said that he was thinking God’s thoughts after him.

**Robert Boyle** (1627-1691) was a devout Christian. He is renowned as one of the forerunners of modern chemistry and gas dynamics and gave his name to *Boyle’s Law*. In his book entitled *The Wisdom of God Manifested in the Works of Creation*, Boyle declared his firm belief in the Bible.

**James Simpson** (1811-1870) was the Scottish obstetrician who discovered chloroform which led to the modern anaesthetic. He

said that the most important discovery he ever made was the day he discovered Jesus Christ.

*James Clerk Maxwell* (1831-1879) discovered the four fundamental equations that light and all forms of electromagnetic radiation obey. These equations are what make radio transmissions possible. Maxwell was a firm believer of Scripture and was deeply opposed to the Theory of Evolution.

*Louis Pasteur* (1822-1895), who discovered the process of pasteurisation and revolutionized microbiology, said: “Science brings us nearer to God.”

*Gregor Mendel* (1822-1884), an Austrian botanist and plant experimenter, whose research into the laws of heredity formed the basis of the modern science of genetics, did much of his research in a monastery where he faithfully served as a priest and monk.

All of these and many other great scientists believed the Bible as the infallible Word of God. They admitted their Christian faith was the driving force and intellectual foundation of their excellent scientific work and discoveries.

If it were true that science and religion contradict each other, we would not expect to find believing scientists at all. But, as we shall demonstrate below, even today there are many leading scientists who have the wisdom to study the heavens and believe that God created them.

## **Complementing Each Other**

By investigating Creation in a scientific way, we understand more about God’s character, wisdom and power through the things He has created. Science is simply the process of discovering the



mechanisms of nature which God put in place to make our Universe work in the perfect harmony that it does. It is the interest of science to gather all the facts about our Universe in all its facets, but the function of the Bible to give these data their purpose and meaning. Through the Scriptures we discover the origin, purpose, and ultimate end of the created Universe.

The most brilliant scientist of this generation, the late Dr Stephen Hawking, unwittingly pointed this out when he said science may solve the problem of how the Universe began, but it cannot answer the question of why it bothers to exist.

## **What Modern Scientists Believe**

Today, the impression given to the general public is that all real scientists think alike and believe in the Big Bang Theory and the Theory of Evolution. Nothing could be further from the truth. Over the last few decades there has been an extraordinary revolution in the thinking of many scientists from diverse fields whose research and discoveries in astronomy, the genetic code of life, the complexity of biological systems and the nature of the atom, have made the idea of an accidental Universe unthinkable, even ridiculous.

Dr Malcom Dixon, head of the Enzyme Biology Department of Cambridge, worked out according to statistics that there were as many believers among scientists today as there were among non-scientists. Dr Dixon went on to show how a major proportion of the scientific progress of the last two centuries was made by Christian scientists.

Henry Margenau, Professor of Physics and Natural Philosophy at Yale University, and former president of the American Association for the Philosophy of Science, acknowledged the fantastic new scientific evidence that points towards the creation

of the Universe out of nothing; as the Scriptures declared thousands of years ago. He wrote:

It is absolutely unreasonable to reject the notion of a Creator by appealing to science. Science has definitely shown the non-contradiction of creation out of nothing.

Writer John Ashton edited a book entitled *In Six Days*, which is a series of short essays by fifty scientists who fully believe in the biblical story of Creation, and who find nothing in their research that cannot be reconciled with their faith.

These scientists are drawn from all over the world and work in different backgrounds, biology, chemistry, physics, geology, zoology and astronomy. Aston pointed out how some of them started out as believers while others were converted through their study of science.

The publication of an interesting book, entitled *The Intellectuals Speak out about God*, surprised its readers with the recent scientific discoveries that totally disprove the Theory of Evolution, but support both the existence and special creation of the Universe by a personal God. Below is a small extract:

Until quite recently it was thought by many people that the leading scientists universally support atheism, that science is the rational alternative to theism. However, it is now clear that science not only does not support atheism, but that it now lends rational support for theism.

There is now strong scientific evidence for the existence of God. Scientists, without presupposing God or creation, without trying to prove them, have come up with findings that strongly support the

existence of God, His creation of the Universe and man, and supports a supernatural purpose for the world we live in.

As early as the 1980s *TIME* magazine acknowledged that a very profound intellectual revolution was occurring in the scientific community, after almost a century and a half of rejection of the concept of an intelligent Designer of the Universe, due to the compelling evidence that these atheistic scientists were finding in their own research. The writer of the article declared:

In a quiet revolution in thought and argument that hardly anyone would have foreseen only two decades ago, God is making a comeback. Most intriguingly, this is happening... in the crisp intellectual circles of academic philosophers.

A physicist from Princeton University, Professor Freeman Dyson, also acknowledged a revolution in the thinking of many scientists after discoveries in their own field which point to an intelligent Designer. He wrote:

The more I examine the Universe and the details of its architecture, the more evidence I find that the Universe in some sense must have known we were coming.

Leading scientist Dr Francis Collins is just another of the thousands of believing scientists in the world today. He led a team of more than 2,000 scientists, who collaborated to determine the three-billion letters of the human genome – our own DNA instruction book. It would take thirty-one years to read those letters out loud.

In *The Language of God* Dr Collins says there is, “a richly satisfying harmony between the scientific and the spiritual worldviews.” Below are the words of his personal testimony given in a speech at the National Prayer Breakfast in the United States:

As I explored the evidence more deeply, all around me I began to see signposts to something outside of nature that could only be called God. I realized that the scientific methods can only really answer questions about HOW things work. It can't answer questions about WHY – and those are in fact the most important ones.

Why is there something instead of nothing? Why does mathematics work so beautifully to describe nature? Why is the Universe so precisely tuned to make life possible? Why do we humans have a universal sense of right and wrong and an urge to do right? Confronted with these revelations, I realized that my own assumption – that faith was the opposite of reason – was incorrect.

In Great Britain eight-hundred scientists made the following statement concerning their regret for the doubts that some others in their own field cast upon the authenticity of the Bible:

We the undersigned, students of the Natural Sciences, desire to express our sincere regret that researchers into scientific truth are perverted by some in our own times into occasion for casting doubt upon the truth and authenticity of the Holy Scriptures. We conceive that it is impossible for the Word of God written in the book of nature, and

God's Word written in the Holy Scriptures to contradict one another.

## **The *Order* of Creation: No Contradictions**

One of the areas of alleged conflicts between the Bible and the discoveries of modern science is the Creation account given in chapter one of the Book of Genesis; of how God created the Universe and all the living matter which supports mankind on planet Earth.

Dear reader, you will be surprised to learn that the order of Creation events proposed by many science books has a similar order to the order of Creation described in the Bible. For example, the formation of the Earth proposed by noted astronomer Hugh Ross has the exact same order as the Creation account given to Moses in the opening pages of the Old Testament.

As a side note, it is an interesting fact that the next ten chapters of Genesis, which follow the Creation account, show the exact same succession of cultures and civilisations that has only recently been discovered by anthropologists.

In his book, *Modern Discovery and the Bible*, the renowned and respected scientist Dr Rendle Short showed that by comparing the first chapter of Genesis, which was written long before any scientific knowledge came into existence, with secular scientific books, correlating them page by page, we discover the order of events are remarkably similar. He concluded:

These considerations bring to light a perfectly amazing accordance between the Creation narrative and the discoveries of modern science. When we remember the wild guesses as to the ultimate nature and origin of the Earth that were current amongst

other ancient people, the accuracy of Genesis stands out in solitary grandeur.

Geology is a young science: the classification of strata is not much older than a hundred years; we may be sure the author of the Creation narrative derived none of his information from fossil hunting. Neither guesswork nor intuition taught the writer to arrange events in the correct order. This narrative bears marks of a divine inspiration.

The late Professor James D. Dana of Yale University was pronounced by competent authority to be one of the greatest scientific thinkers of the nineteenth century. He admitted that one of the reasons he believed the Bible to be the very Word of God was because of the marvellous accord of the order of Creation given in the Book of Genesis with that worked out by the best scientific investigation.

Finally, “Physical science has nothing to say against the order of creation as given in Genesis,” wrote the famous mathematical physicist and engineer, Lord Kelvin.

Although the Creation narrative in the Bible correlates remarkably with science, this is not its objective, so its details are set out much more clearly and selectively. The first physical event in Genesis is God’s Command, “*Let there be light.*” Such a concept was contrary to primitive views, and even today some comment that the sequence of events seems unlikely.

However, science agrees that the intense visible radiation present at the beginning of the Universe is in accord with the Divine Command. Leading physicist Professor George Gamow said that the Divine Command was completely scientific. He continued:

All the chemical elements which we deal with today must have been formed within the first 30 minutes of

the life of this Universe, and it accords with the Divine Command, “*Let there be light.*” There certainly was light through this intense radiation.

The following list of scientific events concerning the formation of planet Earth assumes that the Universe was the result of a *natural* big bang event *only*. This, however, is not in agreement with the biblical account, which claims that in the beginning God created the entire Universe and everything in it by His Word.

I have included the list only to illustrate that science appears to agree with the *order* of Creation events and not their *cause*. Obviously, this should not lead us to believe that we should consider the Bible only because we find scientific proposals that agree with its contents. On the contrary, it means that science continues to uphold knowledge recorded in the Bible more than three-thousand years ago.

As we might expect, the Bible is much more concerned with meaning rather than mechanisms. Therefore, it does not give us a detailed explanation of *how* Creation took place, but simply says, “*He commanded and they were created*” (*Psalms 148:5*).

Some theists claim this is in contradiction to the Big Bang Theory as presently understood, but others see no conflict here between science and Scripture. We will discuss this issue in another chapter.

## PLANET EARTH’S BEGINNING

### Science book:

The Earth started... possibly as a whirling globe of hot gases. It passed through a liquid stage...

## **The Bible:**

*Now the earth was formless and empty, darkness was over the surface of the deep.*

*(Genesis 1:2a)*

Most cosmologists agree that the Genesis account of Creation, when it describes an initial void, “May be uncannily close to the truth.”

## **Science book then says:**

The Earth for long ages, was surrounded by a thick, steamy atmosphere...

## **The Bible likewise says:**

*And darkness was upon the face of the deep.*

*(Genesis 1:2a)*

## **Science book says next:**

As soon as the surface became cool enough, the water vapour condensed as rain, producing rivers and seas...

## **The Bible agrees:**

*God said “Let there be an expanse in the middle of the waters, and let it separate the waters from the waters.”*

*(Genesis 1:6)*

So God made the atmosphere separate, by evaporation, the water clouds from the sea water.



## **The Bible then says:**

*Let the waters be gathered into one place and let dry land appear.*

*(Genesis 1:9)*

## **Science book agrees:**

The original single continent is called *Pangaea*, which later broke up into individual continents, as we see today...

## **The Bible continues:**

*Then God said, "Let the land produce vegetation."*

*(Genesis 1:11a)*

Note that the Hebrew word *deshe* should not be translated *grass*. The word actually describes something green.

## **Science book is similar:**

The atmosphere lacked oxygen... most of the free oxygen present in the air has been produced by the activities of green plant life...

## **Science book continues:**

After the condensation of the thick steamy atmosphere, the sky could be seen, and the sun moon and stars...

## **The Bible places this event on the fourth day:**

*And God said: "Let there be lights in the expanse of the sky to separate the day from the night, and let them serve as signs to mark seasons and days and years, and let them be lights in the expanse of the sky to give light on the earth." And it was so. God made two great lights-the greater light to govern the day and the lesser light to govern the night. He also made the stars.*

*(Genesis 1:14-17)*

Some biblical scholars believe that the Hebrew historic tense used here means that the Sun, Moon and stars were already created and could not be seen until the atmosphere cleared in the fourth day. However, other theologians disagree with this conclusion.

## **Next the science book says:**

By the beginning of Cambrian times a considerable variety of non-backboned creatures came into the seas... All the main divisions existed in the seas.

Geologists who have discovered the fossils of this period verify how suddenly swarms of marine creatures of every kind appear in the strata without any trace of life in the layers of rock before them. This made even Charles Darwin admit that the record looked more like sudden creation than slow evolutionary changes. This scientific account is in complete harmony with the Bible. Moses recorded God's command:

*Let the waters teem with living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth across the expanse of the sky. So God created the great creatures of the sea and every living and*

*moving thing with which the water teems, according to their kinds, and every winged bird according to its kind.*

*(Genesis 1:20-22)*

## **Science book continues:**

The land animals appeared...

Geologists call this *The New Life Period* because a large number of new kinds of creatures start together. Long before these discoveries Moses wrote:

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

*(Genesis 1:24-25)*

When Genesis speaks of cattle and beasts, it is speaking in general terms to a non-scientific age. It would be referring to all mammals in general. So we have seen that science supports the order in which life appears in the Creation narrative of the Holy Scriptures. Both the Bible and science distinguish several main orders of life which appear in the same sequence.

The difference, then, between the Bible and evolution, is that the Scriptures say God created each order separately, while evolutionists say that each species evolved one from another. Therefore, the main difference lies in the interpretation of the facts that we have at hand.

## **Theories Based on Atheistic Assumptions**

The main difference between scientists who are *creationists* and those who are *evolutionists* is their starting assumptions. Both have a different view of history, but the way they do science is the same. Both use observation and experimentation to draw conclusions about nature.

The scientific facts that evolutionists claim as proof of millions of years for Earth history are really interpretations of selected observations based on their atheistic views and philosophical assumptions. The facts are the same for every scientist who studies them.

They all have the same living creatures, the same DNA molecules, the same fossils and rock layers, the same Sun, Moon stars and so on. How they were formed and how old they are, are simply interpretations. Biblical creationists accept the recorded history of the Bible while evolutionists reject this truth.

What one believes about history will obviously affect how he interprets the facts he observes. In order to draw conclusions about what the evidence means, we use our most basic beliefs about the nature of reality.

Since creationists and evolutionists have different starting assumptions, they both interpret the evidence to mean very different things.

## **Language of God Governing all Life**

*By the word of the Lord the heavens were made, and all their host by the breath of his mouth.*

*(Psalm 33:6-7)*

When we see the remarkable harmony demonstrated between the order of Creation in the Bible and that which science has

discovered, we naturally turn to the origin of that order. The account in Genesis reveals that everything came into existence as a result of God's speech. The science of information theory powerfully confirms this statement.

DNA is the molecule heredity and part of a staggeringly complex system more information dense than the most efficient super computer. To paraphrase the co-discoverer of the structure of DNA, Dr Francis Crick, there is almost no possibility whatsoever that the very first life could have spontaneously generated from the inorganic chemicals that were supposed to have existed in the Earth's atmosphere and surface water.

Since the information in our DNA can only come from a source of greater information and intelligence, there must have been something other than matter in the beginning. The New Testament makes it clear. It was the pre-existing Son of God who was the creating Word in Creation:

*In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was with God in the beginning. Through him all things were made; without him nothing was made that has been made.*

*(John 1:1-4)*

*He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation. For by him all things were created: things in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or powers or rulers or authorities; all things were created by him and for him. He is before all things, and in him all things hold together.*

*(Colossians 1:15-18)*

*Long ago God spoke to our ancestors in many and various ways by the prophets, but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, through*

*whom he also created the worlds. He is the reflection of God's glory and the exact imprint of God's very being, and he sustains all things by his powerful word.*

*(Hebrews 1:1-3b)*

The DNA code is contained in the middle of every cell of the human body and in the cells of each animal and plant. The discovery of the structure and function of DNA genetic code by Watson and Crick is the most spectacular scientific discovery of the last century, and one of the most compelling proofs for the existence of God and His language governing the creation and existence of all life forms. Molecular biologists are now able to read the message of the genes and are printing out the message page by page.

The message of the genes are the instructions in your body's cells on how to manufacture and reproduce the parts of your body. These instructions are set out in sentences, paragraphs and chapters. Several genes together make up a paragraph, and many paragraphs of gene clusters make up a chapter. These chapters together make a book called a *chromosome*. There are twenty-three chromosome books to make a whole encyclopaedia of instructions.

Each encyclopaedia is duplicated to produce an identical copy so that your body has two. These instructions instruct complicated machines called *ribosomes* to make the proteins which construct the shape of your heart, liver and stomach etc., and to put all these body parts in the right place. The psalmist was not exaggerating when he said, "*We are fearfully and wonderfully made.*"

This code is declared by scientists to be the *Language of Life*. Nobel Prize winner Dr Geo Beadle declared: "This language is as old as life itself. Its words are buried deep in the cells of our bodies."

The Words which God spoke at the beginning of Creation created all life and are contained in the cells, in the DNA books and chapters. The words which Dr Beadle describes were recorded by Moses more than three-thousand years ago. When God said, “*Let the earth bring forth vegetation,*” He put His instructions in the form of DNA codes into all plant cells.

From a biblical perspective, we know that all God’s Creation had perfect DNA. Adam and Eve, including the original animal and plant kinds, had perfect DNA strands with no mistakes or mutations. However, after the Fall, flaws and mutations began to occur and accumulate. The incredible amount of information that was originally in the DNA has been lost due to mutations and natural selection.

This would explain why God, with the passing of time, strictly forbid marriage with close relatives. Such a union would result in the possibility of similar genetic mutations appearing in the offspring, due to inheriting a common mutation from the father and mother. Marrying someone who is not a close relative reduces the chance of both parents carrying the same mutated gene.

### **Standing in Awe of Him**

With the discovery of the DNA genetic code we are now in possession of a very clear information filled message, so amazing in its complexity that it could not possibly have been produced without a supernatural intelligence.

When Dr Crick and Dr Watson made this discovery, the famous artist Salvador Dali exclaimed: “The announcement of Watson and Crick on the DNA code is for me the real proof of the existence of God.” “*I Am the Alpha and Omega*” – the alphabet of life – declared Jesus in the Book of Revelation.

# 02

## ***ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE THROUGHOUT SCRIPTURE***

The Bible is by no means a scientific Book, but as we have seen, and will see in the following chapters, it does reveal an astonishing amount of scientific knowledge that can only be explained if we accept that God inspired its authors. Many of the scientific statements found therein were thousands of years in advance of the scientific knowledge accepted in the period when the Scriptures were written.

These amazingly accurate scientific provisions found in almost every Book of the Bible is something very unique in the history of religious literature.

In his book, *The Creator Beyond Time and Space*, Mark Eastman, M.D, and Chuck Missler, a computer specialist, provide many examples which show how the Bible, scientifically speaking, was thousands of years ahead of its time:

There are dozens of passages in the Bible which demonstrate tremendous scientific foreknowledge. When the biblical text is carefully examined, the reader will quickly discover an uncanny scientific accuracy unparalleled by any document of antiquity... In virtually all ancient religious documents it is common to find scientifically inaccurate myths about the nature of the Universe and the life forms on planet Earth. However, throughout the Bible we find scientifically accurate concepts about the physical Universe that were not discovered by modern scientists until recent times.



In *the Biblical Basis for Modern Science*, scientist Dr Henry Morris offers a text supplying a large number of examples of scientific foreknowledge, or allusions, in the Bible. They are provided from the area of physics, astronomy, oceanography, the Earth's hydrologic cycle, meteorology, medicine, geology and biology.

Fortunately, due to the incredible advances in scientific knowledge during the last few decades the accurate scientific statements found in Scripture can now be tested.

The late A.E Wilder Smith, who held three earned doctorates in science and wrote numerous popular and technical books and scientific papers, was another of the many leading scientists who was greatly impressed by the historic, prophetic and scientific accuracy of the Word of God. Below are some of their discoveries.

## ***STATEMENTS CONSISTENT WITH GEOLOGY***

*It is he who sits above the circle of the earth, and its inhabitants are like grasshoppers, Who stretches out the heavens like a curtain, and spreads them out like a tent to dwell in.*

*(Isaiah 40:22)*

God inspired the prophet Isaiah to write that our planet was a globe hundreds of years before Aristotle suggested that the Earth might be a sphere. Critics have falsely suggested that the Bible states the Earth is flat because of the biblical expression, *the four corners of the earth*. But this statement is simply a colloquial expression, also in use today to indicate the whole Earth, or the four extremities of our globe from a central point.

The expression *circle of the earth* used by the prophet Isaiah clearly describes the Earth as a sphere or globe. This scientific

fact was also revealed to the Gospel writer Luke more than two thousand years ago:

*It will be just like this on the day the Son of Man is revealed. On that day no one who is on the roof of his house, with his goods inside, should go down to get them. Likewise, no one in the field should go back for anything. Remember Lot's wife!*

*Whoever tries to keep his life will lose it, and whoever loses his life will preserve it. I tell you, on that night two people will be in one bed; one will be taken and the other left. Two women will be grinding grain together one will be taken and the other left.*

*(Luke 17:30-37)*

These statements by Luke may have appeared quite contradictory until recently. But today we know that at whatever time Christ returns it will be day on one side of the globe and night on the other. These passages clearly indicate a revolving Earth with day and night at the same time.

## **The Earth's Crust:**

*Thus says the Lord: "If the heavens above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth below can be explored, then I will reject the offspring of Israel because of all they have done, says the Lord."*

*(Jeremiah 31:37)*

Although some scientists claim that they have measured the size of the Universe, it is interesting to note that every human attempt to drill through the Earth's crust to the plastic mantle beneath has so far ended in failure.

## ***STATEMENTS CONSISTENT WITH ASTRONOMY***

### **The Earth Hangs on Nothing:**

*He stretches out the north over empty space: He hangs the earth on nothing.*

*(Job 26:7)*

The Bible's description of the suspension of the Earth in space is an astonishingly advanced and accurate scientific statement, especially when you consider the pagan beliefs of Job's day. Many believed that the mythological hero *Atlas* carried the Earth on his shoulders, while others believed that the Earth was suspended on the backs of four elephants standing on the back of a giant turtle.

Only a century ago scientists believed that our planet Earth and the stars were supported by some sort of ether. But more than four-thousand years ago Job accurately stated that our planet moves in its orbit through outer space. In addition, an astonishing discovery by astronomers recently revealed that the area to the north of the Earth's axis is almost empty of stars, in contrast to the other directions.

### **The Sun Moving through Space:**

*In the heavens he has set a tent for the sun, which comes out like a bridegroom from his wedding canopy, and like a strong man runs its course with joy. Its rising is from the ends of the heavens, and its circuit to the end of them; and nothing is hid from its heat.*

*(Psalm 19:4c-7)*

For many years Bible critics stated that these verses in Psalm nineteen teach the old false doctrine that the Sun revolves around the Earth. This all changed, no doubt, when it was discovered that the biblical statement was correct and the Sun is in fact moving through space, and is not stationary as was once thought. I quote:

The Sun is estimated to be moving through space at about 600,000 miles per hour, and in an orbit so large that it would take an average 200,000,000 years to complete just one orbit.”

God also inspired David to write that the Sun is the source of the Earth’s energy, an amazing statement considering when the Psalm was penned.

### **More Galaxies than Previously Estimated:**

*As the host of heaven cannot be numbered, nor the sand of the sea measured, so I will multiply the descendants of David My servant.*

*(Jeremiah 33:22)*

Today, with an ordinary cheap telescope or a pair of binoculars you can see over 3,300 stars. In the Milky Way, our own galaxy, more modern telescopes allow us to view more than two hundred million stars. In 1925 the great astronomer Edwin Hubble used his new one-hundred-inch mirror telescope on Mount Wilson to view whole new galaxies of stars that were more than six million trillion miles away from planet Earth.

It is an interesting fact that until as late as 1915 astronomers believed that our galaxy made up the whole Universe, but Professor Hubble proved that the Universe contained as many galaxies outside our home galaxy as there were stars inside our

home galaxy. Further discoveries in the following years revealed that the Universe is actually much larger than previously estimated and contains more than fifty billion galaxies, each containing millions of stars.

## **Uniqueness of Each Star:**

*There is one glory of the sun, another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differs from another star in glory.*

*(1 Corinthians 15:41)*

All stars look alike to the naked eye, even when viewed through a telescope. However, analysis of their light spectra reveals that each star is unique and different from all others. Some can obviously perceive slight differences in colour and apparent brightness when looking at stars with the naked eye, but we would not expect a first century preacher to claim they differ one from the other.

## ***STATEMENTS CONSISTENT WITH METEOROLOGY***

### **Circular Wind Patterns:**

*The wind goes toward the south, and turns around to the north; the wind whirls about continually, and comes again on its circuit.*

*(Ecclesiastes 1:6)*

More than three thousand years ago King Solomon described the complex climatic circular wind patterns that determine the weather around the globe. He accurately described how the

planetary winds follow a circular pattern from south to north and south again.

## **Principles of Fluid Dynamics:**

*For he looks to the ends of the earth, and sees everything under the heavens. When he gave to the wind its weight, and apportioned out the waters by measure. When he made a decree for the rain, and a way for the thunderbolt.*

*(Job 28:24-27)*

The fact that air has weight was scientifically proven only about three-hundred years ago. The relative weights of air and water are needed for the efficient functioning of the world's hydrologic cycle. How could Job have known that the air and wind patterns are governed by their actual weight?

## **Statements on Hydrology:**

*All the rivers run into the sea, yet the sea is not full; to the place from which the rivers come, there they return.*

*(Ecclesiastes 1:7)*

*If the clouds be full of rain, they empty themselves upon the earth.*

*(Ecclesiastes 11:3a)*

To paraphrase another observation: When running at an average rate of flow, the Mississippi River deposits almost 6,052,500 gallons of water into the Gulf of Mexico per second. The answer to where that large quantity of water goes, bearing in mind that

this is just the water from one river, lies in the hydrologic cycle of which the Bible accurately speaks.

The Book of Ecclesiastes confirms that most clouds are formed by evaporation from the oceans. Studies in the area of agriculture prove that most of the waters that form into the clouds worldwide comes from the evaporation of the waters found in the oceans that cover a great part of the Earth's surface.

## **The Complete Hydrological Cycle:**

*For he draws up drops of water, which distil as rain from the mist, which the clouds drop down and pour abundantly on man. Indeed can anyone understand the spreading of clouds, the thunders from his canopy?*

*(Job 36:27-30)*

The complete hydrological cycle governing evaporation, cloud formation, thunder, lightning and rain is explained in detail in the Old Testament. The idea of a complete water cycle was not fully understood, or even accepted, until the sixteenth century.

The first evidence came from the experiments of Pierre Perrault and Edme Mariotte. Astronomer Edmund Halley also contributed valuable data to the concept of a complete water cycle. However, many centuries before their discoveries, Job revealed the complete hydrological cycle of evaporation, cloud formation and precipitation.

When you consider the weight of water compared to air, it is astonishing that large quantities are raised from the oceans and lakes every hour by evaporation and lifted thousands of feet into the air where it remains suspended for long periods. This also is described by Job:

*He binds up the waters in his thick clouds, and the cloud is not torn open by them.*

*(Job 26:8)*

## ***STATEMENTS CONSISTENT WITH OCEANOGRAPHY***

### **Hydrothermal Vents:**

*Have you entered into the springs of the sea? or walked in the recesses of the deep?*

*(Job 38:16)*

It is only in the last thirty years that underwater exploration of the ocean depths has revealed many huge springs of fresh water flowing through the ocean bed. Yet God asked Job if he had entered into the *springs of the sea*, or if he had *walked in the recesses of the deep*, long before their discoveries by science.

The Hebrew word for *recesses* refers to that which is hidden and known only through investigation, while the Hebrew for *deep* is the word for seas or oceans.

In previous centuries, the seashore was considered as nothing more than a shallow sandy extension from one continent to another. This changed in 1873 when a team of British scientists searching in the Pacific Ocean found a recess five and a half miles deep. Moreover, as one source tells us:

Huge currents such as the Gulf Stream run like deep rivers way beneath the surface of the Atlantic Ocean. This large stream carries more than five thousand times as much water as the great Mississippi River, and carries more than twenty-five times as much water as all the rivers on our planet.



It was not until recently that scientists discovered that “the Gulf Stream is only part of a huge thirteen-thousand-mile current of water that circles the Atlantic Ocean.” Yet centuries before, King David wrote of these huge currents that existed in the ocean deeps:

*All flocks and herds and the beasts of the field, the birds of the air, and the fish of the sea, all that swim in the paths of the seas.*

*(Psalm 8:8)*

It was this biblical passage that inspired Matthew Fontaine Maury to recognize that the *seas* were circulating systems with interaction between wind and water. His book on physical oceanography is still considered a basic text for studies of that class.

## **Water in Outer Space:**

*Has the rain a father, or who has begotten the drops of dew? From whose womb did the ice come forth, and who has given birth to the hoarfrost of heaven? The waters become hard like stone, and the face of the deep is frozen. Can you bind the chains of Pleiades or loose the cords of Orion?*

*(Job 38:28-32)*

*And God said “Let there be a dome in the midst of the waters, and let it separate the waters from the waters.” So God made the dome and separated the waters that were under the dome from the waters that were above the dome. And it was so. God called the dome sky.*

*(Genesis 1:6-8)*

The existence of water in the heavens or outer space seemed quite improbable to scientists until recent progress in astronomical discoveries proved that large amounts of water do, in fact, exist in space. Satellites located vast quantities of ice in the ice caps of Mars, as well as in the rings of Saturn. Because of extreme temperatures these waters are obviously frozen. In 1998 NASA announced that the *Lunar Prospector Spacecraft* had discovered evidence of massive quantities of ice beneath the surface of the Moon.

We also know that huge comets composed of great quantities of ice travel through our Solar System. In 1908 a small piece of the comet *Encke* broke away during its passage and collided with planet Earth in central Siberia.

Witnesses from a distance of thirty-six miles away from the point of impact were knocked over due to the weight of the massive block of ice weighing more than thirty-thousand tons. The large quantities of water in our oceans is small in comparison to the quantities of water that exist in the dome above.

## ***STATEMENTS CONSISTENT WITH BIOLOGY***

### **Development of Living Organisms from other Living Organisms:**

*So God created the great creatures of the sea and every living and moving thing with which the waters teem, according to their kinds, and every winged bird according to its kind. And God saw that it was good. God blessed them and said, "Be fruitful and increase in number and fill the waters in the seas, and let the birds increase on the earth."*

*(Genesis 1:21-23)*

*And God said, "Let the land produce living creatures according to their kinds; livestock, creatures that move along the ground, and wild animals, each according to its kind."*

*(Genesis 1:24-25)*

The opening pages of the Word of God describes the development of all living organisms from other living organisms, and the stability of each kind. The Bible uses the phrase *according to its kind* repeatedly to stress the reproductive integrity of each kind of animal and plant. Today we know this occurs because these reproductive systems are wonderfully programmed by their genetic codes.

*The Law of Biogenesis* is one of the most commonly accepted and widely used laws of science in the field of biology. This law has proven through experimental evidence that life comes only from preceding life and perpetuates itself by producing only its own kind or type. Men like Francesco Redi, Lazzaro Spallanzani and Rudolf Virchow were among the first to carry out experiments which formed the ultimate basis of the Law of Biogenesis.

Virchow documented what Moses had written thousands of years before, namely that cells do not arise from formless matter, but come only from pre-existing cells. This law has no exceptions and is a topic that creates many problems to the Theory of Evolution.

*The God who made the world and everything in it, he who is Lord of heaven and earth, does not live in shrines made by human hands, nor is he served by human hands, as though he needed anything, since he himself gives to all mortals life and breath and all things.*

*(Acts 17:24-26)*

## **The Function of Blood:**

*For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; For it is the blood that makes atonement for the soul.*

*(Leviticus 17:11-12)*

This scientific statement made by Moses was exceptionally astute because doctors have only recently discovered that our blood is essential to all of our body's life processes. In 1616 William Harvey discovered that blood circulation is the key factor in physical life, confirming the accuracy of what Moses wrote more than three-and a-half thousand years earlier.

The blood carries water and nourishment to every cell in our body, maintains our body's temperature, and removes the waste material of the body's cells. It also carries oxygen from the lungs throughout the body. When the blood supply is restricted to any part of the body, that part begins to die immediately. Up until a hundred and twenty years ago sick people were ignorantly bled to death through the blood-letting process and many died from this practice.

## **Remedy for Sound Mental Health:**

*A merry heart does good, like medicine, but a broken spirit dries up the bones.*

*(Proverbs 17:22)*

*Pleasant words are like a honeycomb, sweetness to the soul and health to the bones.*

*(Proverbs 16:24)*

It is a well proven fact that a person's mental and spiritual health is strongly correlated with physical health. Many Bible readers would be surprised to learn that modern psychiatry has discovered that good humour and laughter does indeed improve our health and well-being. Scientists discovered that the emotion of humour triggers off the release of certain hormones and endorphins that greatly improve our sense of well-being.

## **Man Created from Dust:**

*The Lord God formed the man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living being.*

*(Genesis 2:7-8)*

For many years scientists laughed at the apparent simple account of how God, using the dust of the ground, constructed the complex elements and molecules to create a human being. Interestingly, scientists are now saying:

Every atom in the human body was fashioned in stars that formed, grew old and exploded most violently before the Sun and the Earth came into being, and scattered their fine dust to form planet Earth. And from earth's rocks, atoms were incorporated into living things; carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, phosphorus, sulphur, calcium for bones and teeth, sodium and potassium for nerves and brains.

In addition to this, a *Reader's Digest* article in 1982 described a fascinating discovery made by the researchers at NASA's *Ames Research Center* which strongly supports the biblical account that every single element found in the body of human beings exists within soil and earth.

This incredible discovery caused the scientists there to make the following statement: “We are just beginning to learn the biblical scenario for the creation of life turns out to be not far off the mark.”

## ***STATEMENTS CONSISTENT WITH PHYSICS***

*But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in which the heavens will pass away with a great noise, and the elements will melt with fervent heat; both the earth and the works that are in it will be burned.*

*(2 Peter 3:10)*

The Bible suggests the presence of nuclear processes like those we associate with nuclear weaponry. This is certainly not something that we would expect a first century writer to explain, especially using scientific principles. Again, in Revelation we read:

*Then those from the peoples, tribes, tongues and nations will see their dead bodies three and a half days, and not allow their dead bodies to be put into graves. And those who dwell on the earth will rejoice over them, make merry, and send gifts to one another, because these two prophets torment those who dwell on the earth. Now after the three and a half days the breath of life from God entered them, and they stood on their feet, and a great fear fell on those who saw them.*

*(Revelation 11:9-12)*

This biblical passage describes a device that uses electromagnetic waves which would permit everyone on Earth to see a single event at the other end of the globe.

## **First Law of Thermodynamics:**

*Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all their multitude.*

*(Genesis 2:1-2)*

On the first day of Creation God made matter and energy that had not existed before, and on the seventh day He ended His creative work. Moses chose the Hebrew past definite tense for the verb *finished*, indicating an action completed in the past and never to occur again.

This is exactly what the First Law of Thermodynamics says. This law, often referred to as the *Law of the Conservation of Energy*, states that neither matter or energy can be destroyed or created.

The First Law of Thermodynamics states that the total energy of a system cannot change. Energy cannot come from nowhere, and it cannot disappear into nowhere. And when energy is transferred from one place to another, or from one form to another, this must be done according to definite rules which state that energy is not lost or gained in the end.

Beginning with the seventh day there was no more energy put into the Universe, except for special miracles which God can perform when He chooses. On the seventh day the Law of the Conservation of Energy began its normal workings in our Universe.

## **Second Law of Thermodynamics:**

*In the beginning you laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of your hands. They will perish, but you remain; they will all wear out like a garment. Like clothing you will change them and they will be discarded.*

*(Psalm 102:25-27)*

*Lift up your eyes to the heavens, look at the earth beneath;  
the heavens will vanish like smoke, the earth will wear out  
like a garment and its inhabitants die like flies.*

*(Isaiah 51:6)*

The Second Law of Thermodynamics, also known as the *Law of Entropy*, states that everything in the Universe is running down and wearing out, and that usable energy is becoming less and less available for use. Entropy, which is a measure of randomness, disorderliness and lack of structure, is increasing. This law means that the Universe will eventually wear out, exactly what the biblical writers stated clearly thousands of years ago.

## **Five Fundamentals of Science:**

*In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.*

*(Genesis 1:1)*

The famous British philosopher Herbert Spencer discovered after a lifetime of study that there are five fundamentals of science: Time, Force, Action, Space, and Matter. Spencer concluded what Moses had written long before in the very first verse of the Bible:

In the beginning - (*Time*)

God – (*Force*)

Created – (*Action*)

The heavens – (*Space*)

And the Earth – (*Matter*)



## ***STATEMENTS CONSISTENT WITH MEDICINE***

### **Circumcision:**

*Throughout your generations every male among you shall be circumcised when he is eight days old.*

*(Genesis 17:12a)*

For centuries, the Jewish people have kept the command given them by God to circumcise their male children on the eighth day of their life. This was to be for them a sign of their obedience to the Covenant of God. However, this command is also one of the most interesting of the medical details found in the Bible.

In 1935 Professor H. Dam proposed the name *Vitamin K* for the factor in foods that helped prevent haemorrhaging in babies. Research has proved that Vitamin K is responsible for the production of *prothrombin* by the liver. If there is a deficiency of the K vitamin, this will cause a prothrombin deficiency which would likely result in haemorrhaging, since both of these are necessary for proper blood-clotting.

When a baby is born, he has no bacteria in their intestines for the first few days, but by day seven the bacteria multiply and produce Vitamin K that is absorbed by the liver. The liver then uses this vitamin to produce prothrombin, which is essential to allow blood to clot properly.

It is only on the fifth through to the seventh day of the new-born male's life that Vitamin K begins to be produced, and only in the eighth day of the infant's life that the blood-clotting element *prothrombin* is above one hundred per-cent! How could Moses have known that the eighth day was the ideal day for an operation on a male baby unless God inspired him?

## **Advanced Sanitation Laws:**

*The person who has the leprous disease shall wear torn clothes and let the hair of his head be dishevelled; and he shall cover his upper lip and cry out, "Unclean, unclean." He shall remain unclean as long as he has the disease; he is unclean. He shall live alone; his dwelling shall be outside the camp.*

*(Leviticus 13:45-47)*

*This is the law when someone dies in a tent; everyone who comes into the tent, and everyone who is in the tent, shall be unclean seven days. And every open vessel with no cover fastened on it is unclean. Whoever in the open field touches one who has been killed by a sword, or who has died naturally, or a human bone, or a grave, shall be unclean seven days.*

*(Numbers 19:14-17)*

*And when he that hath an issue is cleansed of his issue; then he shall number to himself seven days for his cleansing, and wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in running water, and shall be clean.*

*(Leviticus 15:13)*

A close examination of the above detailed instructions displayed in the Book of Numbers and Leviticus reveal a very advanced quarantine system for the prevention of disease at a time when most people were not even aware that such infectious diseases existed. We need only examine the medical remedies of the ancient Egyptians and other pagan cultures of the Middle East to understand their ignorance of the most rudimentary medical knowledge.

Germ from a dead human body are extremely dangerous to other humans because of the high risk of transmission. But Moses

ordered the Israelites to wash their bodies in fresh *running water*, and similar instructions were given to those who had dealings with any afflicted with an infectious disease.

## **Horrible Death Rates in Vienna**

*The Encyclopaedia Britannica* documents that in the year 1845 Ignaz Semmelweis, a young doctor in Vienna, was surprised at the terrible death rate of women who were giving birth to their children in hospitals; almost thirty per-cent died after the delivery. Doctor Semmelweis noted that doctors would examine the bodies of dead patients and then go directly to the next ward and examine pregnant women without washing their hands.

It was only when Semmelweis had insisted that doctors wash their hands before examination that the death rate dropped to two per-cent. This was the normal practice of most doctors because the presence of microscopic germs was unknown. Even when doctors *did* wash their hands, they did so in a bowl of water which obviously would allow the germs to remain. But God commanded the Israelites to wash under “*running water*.”

## **Moses' Law Saves Europe from Black Death**

In the fourteenth century almost a third of Europe's population is said to have died by the *Black Death*, an epidemic of plague which started in Asia in 1347 and spread across Europe in 1348. It was the greatest disaster Europe had ever suffered. Entire countries and cities were wiped out without known survivors. Many believed that it was a punishment from God, or governed by chance or bad luck.

If only the doctors and the ordinary people themselves had followed the ancient biblical laws of sanitation and disease control, thousands of lives would have been spared. Instead,

patients with the deadly diseases were cared for in their home without any awareness of the high risk of transmission of their disease to the other people around them.

This dreaded plague was finally stopped when the Church Fathers wisely looked to the Holy Scriptures to see if God had given a solution to such a devastating situation. Indeed, history reveals that it was only after people began to follow the biblical laws of sanitation and disease control that the epidemic was stopped.

People were obviously unaware of the fact that invisible microscopic germs could remain on cooking and eating utensils also. This is why God commanded the Israelites to throw out broken pottery, as any cracks would contain harmful germs, and to scour bronze pots, an indication that this utensil should be disinfected by scouring and rinsing in water:

*The clay pot the meat is cooked in must be broken; but if it is cooked in a bronze pot, the pot is to be scoured and rinsed with water.*

*(Leviticus 6:28-29)*

The Old Testament reveal an accurate and advanced knowledge of germs, infectious diseases and their transmission, sanitation needs and many more medical advances which can only be explained if we accept that God inspired His prophet Moses to record them.

The famous medical historian Arturo Castiglione wrote in his book, *A History of Medicine*, the profound importance of the medical laws in the Bible. He said: “The law against leprosy in Leviticus 13 may be regarded as the first model of sanitary legislation.”

There is no other book in any of the world’s religions that contains such scientific truth as that of the Bible. On the contrary, they contain statements that are clearly unscientific and dangerous to human life.

A close examination of the Scriptures, however, reveals many startling scientific facts which were placed there hundreds, or even thousands, of years before they became known to modern scientific minds. As Eastman and Missler concluded:

In the twentieth century, more than any time in history, it can be demonstrated that the Bible is a skilfully designed, integrated message system that evidences supernatural engineering in every detail.

# 03

## ***MANY SCIENTISTS REJECT THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION***

Almost all university and secondary school students around the world have long been taught that the *Theory* of Evolution, as popularised by Charles Darwin in his famous book *Origin of Species*.

No other hypothesis, about the origin of human and other life forms on planet Earth, has done more to influence the way in which people view themselves and each other in the world in which we live.

While initially the theory was just limited to the study of biological life, these false ideas have become a total philosophy, and almost all secular books on biology and other sciences in recent generations have been written from evolutionary presuppositions, even though the scientific evidence to prove it has never been found; as the famous writer and molecular biologist Michael Denton also pointed out:

Despite the weakness of the evidence, Darwin's theory was elevated from what was in reality a highly speculative hypothesis into an unchallenged dogma in a space of little more than twenty years after the publication of *Origin*.

The overall subject of the Theory of Evolution is extremely vast and complex. Some years after the publication of *Origin of Species*, Tomas Huxley complained that the work was one of the most difficult books to exhaust that had ever been written.

And even today, and in light of the incredible scientific advances since Darwin's day, numerous books have been written on the subject with even greater complexity, confusion and controversy. Considering these facts, it would be extremely difficult to include an overview on the subject in just a few chapters, and especially to fully explore the gross errors of the theory in general. This would require volumes in itself and many more excellent and qualified scientists, writers and scholars have ventured to do just that.

However, here and in the following chapters I will outline just a small part of the compelling evidence that some of these eminent scientists and scholars have produced over the last few decades. Evidence which powerfully demonstrates that the scientific problems and inconsistencies of the Theory of Evolution are so blatantly obvious and vast that it now faces collapse on all fronts; and explains why many of the world's best scientists no longer hold to this view.

## **What Made Them Change Their Minds**

As I mentioned above, for almost one hundred and fifty years the world has seen a universal support for the materialistic Theory of Evolution by scientists, educators and philosophers from all academic fields.

But this all changed quite recently through the explosive scientific discoveries of the incredible complexity of the DNA genetic code, the nature of the atom, the total lack of fossil evidence for missing links, and many other interesting facts that have motivated many scientists – even evolutionists themselves – to totally abandon the theory.

Many scientists and academics now accept that the mathematical odds against life forming by random chance alone is quite impossible. A Nobel Prize winner for his research in chemistry, Harold Urey, described the impossibility of life forming by chance alone, but admitted that he still believed in the Theory of Evolution despite the total lack of scientific evidence in its favour. He wrote:

All of us who study the origin of life find that the more we look into it, the more we feel that it is too complex to have evolved anywhere. We believe as an article of faith that life evolved from dead matter on this planet. It is just that its complexity is so great, it is hard for us to imagine that it did.

Although Urey does not speak in favour of intelligent design, his sincere declaration proves that his acceptance of evolution is not based on evidence or logic, but on blind faith. In *Teilhardism and the New Religion*, the American mathematician and physicist Wolfgang Smith writes:

We are told dogmatically that evolution is an established fact; but we are never told who established it and by what means. We are told, often enough, that the doctrine is founded upon evidence... but we are left entirely in the dark on the crucial question wherein, precisely, this evidence consists.

Later Professor Wolfgang adds this interesting comment:

If by evolution we mean macro-evolution... it can be said with the utmost rigour that the doctrine is totally bereft of scientific sanction... there exists today not a



shred of bona fide scientific evidence in support of the thesis that macro-evolution transformations have ever occurred.

Not so long ago an interesting article in *Science Digest Special* announced that an increasing number of scientists are publicly rejecting the evolutionary theory that was previously the fundamental belief of Western society. It said:

Scientists who utterly reject evolution may be one of our fastest growing controversial minorities... Many of the scientists supporting this position hold impressive credentials in science.

Writing after many years of experience as senior palaeontologist at the British Museum of Natural History, Dr Colin Patterson had this to say:

Nine-tenths of the talk of the evolutionists is sheer nonsense, not founded on observation and wholly unsupported by facts. This museum is full of proofs of the utter falsity of their views. In all this great museum there is not a particle of evidence of the transition of species.

Today, with the tremendous advances in the study of molecular biology and knowledge of the living cell and all its mechanisms, more and more books by scientists are questioning Darwin's Theory of Evolution and what others deduced from it.

One scientist calls molecular biology *Darwin's black box*, because it reveals why his theory has crashed like an aeroplane to the ground. The black box, in this case, is the cell's intricate mechanism – more intricate than any computer factory.

## Processes of Change Observed by Darwin

Charles Darwin studied wildlife while on a voyage in South America where he noticed the variation in the appearance of individual animals. He supposed that natural selection working on these chance variations had led to the evolution of all living things.

This process of changing an organism's appearance through a series of small changes is called *micro-evolution*. In order to understand the truth about the Theory of Evolution we must clearly define and distinguish between *micro-evolution* and *macro-evolution*.

Micro-evolution describes the very small mutations and variations that scientists find occurring within species over periods of time. These small genetic changes may lead to a variation of a species. For example, after a series of evolutionary change, a frog may be larger or changed in colour, but it remains a frog; it does not become a lizard or a fish.

Microevolution also holds that in organisms of the same species different characteristics emerge as the result of adaptation to different natural environments. Such changes in species are in no way contradictory to the Word of God.

Macro-evolution, on the other hand, is the term scientists use to describe the process of developing new life forms. It goes much further than variations in species and claims that as a result of natural selection, life forms have evolved from a common ancestor in a continuity that goes back to a single primal origin.

It also claims that unlimited random mutations provide survival advantages within species over very long periods. Such changes are then reproduced from one generation to the next until the major changes actually produce an entirely new and different species that never existed before.

While it has been proven that micro-evolution occurs, there is absolutely no empirical (reproducible and testable) proof that macro-evolution occurs or has ever occurred in the past. As one expert in the field pointed out:

In 1859 Charles Darwin had no idea of the biochemical structures that underlie inheritance, or how it was that chance produced the variations that he observed. Today, with the invention of the electron microscope and the discovery of DNA code, we have a much greater understanding than he did.

### **Natural Selection at Work**

Charles Darwin proposed that evolution happens by a process which he called *natural selection*. According to this theory organisms prey on each other in order to survive and at the same time develop new characteristics in order to cope with the environment in which they live.

When these characteristics (passed on to the next generation) become permanent, a new species emerges in what Darwin called the *progress toward perfection*, whereas those life-forms which adapt less die out and become extinct.

As we said above, there is no argument against the theory that variations occur in nature, or that in some cases natural selection causes one variant to become more dominant. However, the Theory of Evolution demands that such changes be without limits, but there are very strong arguments that this is not the case.

As stated previously, major changes have never been observed in nature or in selective breeding by humans. Rabbits have never been bred from dogs, or dogs from cats. Humans have bred dogs for various purposes, but they remain dogs and can still interbreed

with one another. Darwin's error was to mistake variation within a very narrow range of organisms for the evolution of all forms of life. He mistook micro-evolution for macro-evolution.

## **Natural Selection Requires Loss of Genetic Information**

Selection, whether it is natural selection due to environmental factors or human inbreeding, involves the preferential selection of some genes and the elimination of others. This explains why the Galapagos Islands of South America are so famous for producing the most extreme variations.

Experts say the individuals on the islands were cut off from the larger gene pool of the species and so produced a subspecies which is distinct from the mainland's population. But this process involves the *loss* of genetic information in the gene pool of the subspecies, and not the acquisition of new information as the Theory of Evolution demands.

If it is true that fish evolved into amphibians, the amphibians into reptiles, and the reptiles into birds and mammals, then vast quantities of new genetic information would have had to be added at every stage.

Yet natural selection does not contain any mechanism for such a process, but only for losing it; and everything observed in nature seems to point us in the same direction. Scientific observations have proven that all systems and elements on Earth tend to disintegrate and fall to a lower order of organization over time and not the opposite.

## Evidence from the Second Law of Thermodynamics

The Second Law of Thermodynamics, the **Law of Entropy**, is universally accepted and observed to be true without exception. It states that in a closed system the amount of available, useful energy always decreases. Energy still exists but it degrades into useless forms. The entropy principle says that things move from order to disorder, and left to themselves things cool and run down.

In theoretical physics this means that given enough time the Universe itself will run down until everything becomes cold and dead. Scientists refer to it as the *heat death* of the Universe because all temperatures will reach a very cold equilibrium.

The physicist Ludwig Boltzmann spent decades studying the mechanics of thermodynamics and came to the conclusion that the Universe was doomed to the faith of heat death. In his research he saw no way to deal with the entropy principle, which says that the Universe is running down and there is no way to reverse this tendency.

Boltzmann reached the conclusion that someday there will be no available energy left in the cosmos, all the stars will be burned to nuclear ashes, and life will cease to exist.

Entropy, through the Second Law of Thermodynamics, is one of the greatest arguments against the Theory of Evolution. It teaches that species became more complex with the passage of time, that new genetic information was added and new species evolved, that entropy decreased, and that the chemical elements on Earth became more ordered.

The Law of Entropy proves that this is absolutely impossible. In biology, the general tendency that we observe is for species to become extinct, for genetic information to be lost, and for things to fall apart, wear out and disintegrate. The Theory of Evolution is an absolute denial of the Second Law of Thermodynamics.

## Changes Occurring Through Mutations

There is another mechanism on which the Theory of Evolution depends by which changes can occur in a species of living organisms. We have looked at the natural variations in the gene pool and seen how selection involves the loss of genetic information.

But change can also occur through mutation – the random alteration of letters in the genetic code. One expert says this may happen through errors being made in the process of copying DNA from one generation to the next. Though there are proof reading devices built into the system, errors can and seldom occur. Changes may also occur through DNA being exposed to radiation, and so on.

By the 1930s classical Darwinism was well on the way to being superseded by neo-Darwinism, which put forward the so-called *synthetic theory*. This theory holds that organic evolution could not be brought about by natural selection alone, but depends also on mutations (inherited genetic changes taking place over a considerable period of time). Yet with all the passion and glamorous advertising with which it is promoted, this theory has run into some massive difficulties.

First, natural mutations, as opposed to those carried out in a laboratory, are extremely rare. One expert suggested that they occur once in approximately every ten million duplications of the DNA molecule. Second, scientists have never observed mutations in nature or in the laboratory that adds information to an organism to generate positive changes.

With the exception of some very rare cases, most experiments have proven that genetic mutations can only produce freaks of nature that are less able to survive and reproduce than the standard version. I quote, “Even if the freak does survive and thrives, its faulty genetic make-up is not likely to be passed down

to another generation. If the mutant interbreeds with normal members of the species, there is an in-built tendency for the line to regress to the standard type.”

The Theory of Evolution depends entirely on the unproven assumption that random mutations, over extremely long periods of time, will result in beneficial improvements in a species through added information that will be carried to the next generation, resulting eventually in the evolution of entirely new kinds.

The essence of evolution is that such change must take place through a series of small steps where one beneficial mutation is added to another. But as we have just pointed out, copying errors through mutation cannot possibly add new information to any organism. They are nothing more than faulty copying of God’s original instructions in the hereditary code.

Nobel Prize winner Ernest Chain wrote about the impossibility of life evolving through chance mutations as proposed by the Theory of Evolution:

To postulate that the development and survival of the fittest is entirely a consequence of chance mutations seems to me a hypothesis based on no evidence and irreconcilable with the facts.

These classical evolutionary theories are a gross over-simplification of an immensely complex and intricate mass of facts, and it amazes me that they are swallowed so uncritically and readily, and for such a long time by so many scientists without a murmur of protest.

In *Mathematical Challenges to the Neo-Darwinian Interpretation of Evolution*, Marcel Schutzenberger of the University of Paris, along with other scientists, calculated the probability of evolution

based on mutation and natural selection and came to the following conclusion:

There is no chance to see this mechanism appear spontaneously...We believe there is a considerable gap in the neo-Darwinian theory of evolution, and we believe this gap to be of such a nature that it cannot be bridged with the current conception of biology.

Michael Denton is scientist and lives in Australia where he does research in molecular biology. Though writing from a secular viewpoint, he powerfully demonstrates the total lack of evidence behind Darwin's theory in his popular book, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, He stated:

The overriding supremacy of the myth has created a widespread illusion that the theory of evolution was all but proved one hundred years ago and that all subsequent biological research – paleontological, zoological and in the newer branches of genetics and molecular biology – has provided ever-increasing evidence of Darwin's ideas. Nothing could be further from the truth...

His general theory, that all life on Earth had originated and evolved by a gradual successive accumulation of fortuitous mutations, is still, as it was in Darwin's time, a highly speculative hypothesis entirely without direct factual support and very far from that self-evident axiom some of its more aggressive advocates would have us believe.



## Complexity of the Living Cell Requires a Designer

Darwin himself admitted that if it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, his theory would absolutely “breakdown.” Biologists have discovered that a simple cell is an extremely complex structure.

A small body cell is composed of billions of atoms arranged in almost a hundred proteins, together with a large amount of genetic information encoded in the DNA and RNA that controls the cell’s activities, repair and replication. The problem facing evolution is that every part of this complex structure needs to be present simultaneously for the cell to function properly.

In his book, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, Denton goes on to explain how a single cell is an extremely complicated construction which could not possibly have risen from random interactions of atoms and molecules. He compares the cell to a huge automated factory, larger than a city and carrying out almost as many unique functions as all the manufacturing activities of man on Earth! He wrote:

Magnify a cell a thousand million times until it is twenty kilometres in diameter and resembles a giant airship. On the surface of the cell we would see millions of openings, like the port-holes of a vast spaceship, opening and closing to allow a continual stream of materials to flow in and out.

If we were to enter one of these openings we would find ourselves in a world of supreme technology and bewildering complexity. We would see endless highly organised corridors and conduits branching in every direction away from the perimeter of the cell, some leading to the central memory banks in the

nucleus and others to assembly plants and processing units.

We would see that nearly every feature of our own advanced machines had its analogue in the cell: artificial languages and their decoding systems, memory banks for information storage and retrieval, elegant control systems regulating the automated assembly of parts and components, error fail-safe and proof reading devices utilised for quality control, assembly processes involving the principle of prefabrication and modular construction.

We would be witnessing an object resembling an immense automated factory... However, it would be a factory which would have one capacity not equalled in any of our own most advanced machines, for it would be capable of replicating its entire structure within a matter of hours.

Here Dr Denton is describing just one simple cell! The human body itself consists of billions of cells of different types organized in incredibly complicated arrangements, “Which are impossible to understand in terms of simple molecular motion and random combinations as the theory of evolution demands.”

In *Darwin's Black Box* Michael Behe, Professor of biochemistry at Lehigh University Pennsylvania, demonstrates how evolution could never account for the irreducibly complex biological systems we find around us today.

As stated, *Irreducible Complexity* describes a biological system that could never have developed gradually because it cannot function unless every part of the complex system is present. The electron microscope and molecular interactions within living organisms have demonstrated that numerous, successive, slight modifications *do* take place, but for complex organs such as the

eye to have evolved, too many successive, slight modifications would have had to take place simultaneously. Therefore, on the principle of irreducible complexity the theory of evolution does not have a leg to stand on.”

Professor Behe powerfully demonstrates this fact, and the dilemma most scientists face today in the face of the compelling evidence in favour of intelligent design. He wrote:

Over the past four decades modern biochemistry has uncovered the secrets of the cell. The progress has been hard won. It has required tens of thousands of people to dedicate the better parts of their lives to the tedious work of the laboratory...

The knowledge we now have of life at the molecular level has been stitched together from innumerable experiments in which proteins were purified, genes cloned, electron micrographs taken, cells cultured, structures determined, sequences compared, parameters varied, and controls done. Papers were published, results checked, reviews written, blind alleys searched and new leads fleshed out.

The result of these cumulative efforts to investigate the cell – to investigate life at the molecular level – is a loud, clear, piercing cry of ‘design.’ The result is so unambiguous and so significant that it must be ranked as one of the greatest achievements in the history of science...

The observation of the intelligent design of life is as momentous as the observation that the Earth goes round the sun or that disease is caused by bacteria or that radiation is emitted in quanta.

The magnitude of the victory, gained at such great cost, through sustained effort over the course of

decades, would be expected to send champagne corks flying in labs around the world. This triumph of science should evoke cries of ‘Eureka’ from ten thousand throats, should occasion much hand-slapping and high-fiving, and perhaps even be an excuse to take a day off.

But no bottles have been uncorked, no hands slapped. Instead a curious, embarrassed silence surrounds the stark complexity of the cell. When the subject comes up in public, feet start to shuffle, and breathing gets a bit laboured. In private people are more relaxed; many explicitly admit the obvious but then stare at the ground, shake their heads, and let it go at that.

## **The Central Idea of Intelligent Design**

The central idea of intelligent design is that the complexity of nature demands that a thinking intelligent Being planned and devised it. The famous British philosopher William Paley explained *complexity* as evidence of intelligent design.

He reasoned that if one walked across a field and found a watch, he would naturally assume that a watchmaker had designed it. The complexity and purpose of the watch points to the fact that it is not the result of undirected, unintelligent causes, but the product of a very intelligent designer.

With the explosion of knowledge over the last century concerning the complexity of the cell, the DNA code, microorganisms, and the complex design of the Universe, which contains many principles and laws that point us to the reality of God, the need for an intelligent designer has become much greater.

The current *Intelligent Design Movement* has much more than just theories and philosophical arguments for a designer in nature, it uses scientific evidence drawn from biology, chemistry and

physics. This view has received a great deal of publicity in the last few years and is known in some educational fields as an alternative to Darwinism (I will pick up on this again in another chapter).

A professor of Oxford University, Dr Anthony Flew, was a figurehead of the atheist movement for many years and one of the most influential rationalist philosophers of his time. But in 2004 he had a complete change of mind.

Flew did not come to a belief in the God of Scripture, but the compelling evidence that the Universe had an initial beginning and was perfectly fine-tuned to sustain life convinced him that there was a Creator and he abandoned his life-long commitment to atheism. A news article entitled, *Leading Atheist Says Science Has Changed His Mind*, recorded the story:

A British philosophy professor who has been a leading champion of atheism for more than fifty years has changed his mind. Anthony Flew 81, said scientific evidence has now convinced him that a super intelligence is the only explanation for the origin of life and the complexity of nature... If his new-found belief upsets people, Flew said that is too bad... he is always being determined to follow the evidence where ever it leads.

In 2005 another article on the intelligent design argument appeared in the *Los Angeles Times*. It said:

Intelligent Design, which started to gain notice about ten years ago, holds that evolution alone does not adequately explain some complex biological mechanisms, suggesting that a plan by an intelligent force is behind changes in species.

The noted astronomer Allan Sandage also expressed his belief in an intelligent designer behind nature:

I find it quite improbable that such order came out of chaos. There has to be some organizing principle. God to me is a mystery but is the explanation for the miracle of existence.

Professor Verner Von Braun, the leading post World War 2 rocket scientist, wrote:

I find it difficult to understand a scientist who does not acknowledge the presence of a superior rationality behind the existence of the Universe as it is to comprehend a theologian who would deny the advances of science.

After considering how completely unlikely it was that certain elements like carbon could have been formed by accident, the famous astrophysicist Sir Fred Hoyle was forced to admit the obvious:

A common-sense interpretation of the facts suggests that a super intellect has monkeyed with physics, as well as with chemistry and biology, and that there are no blind forces worth speaking about in nature.

The well-known British journalist and philosopher Malchom Muggeridge totally rejects the Theory of Evolution as a great scientific fraud and criticizes those who so readily accept it. He said:

I myself am convinced that the theory of evolution, especially the extent to which it has been applied, will be one of the great jokes in the history books of the future. Posterity will marvel that so many flimsy and dubious a hypothesis could be accepted with the incredible credulity that it has.

## **The Only Credible Alternative**

In light of statements such as these and the overwhelming scientific evidence which reveals the incredible number of flaws in the Theory of Evolution seen so far, you immediately wonder why it is still universally accepted by so many scientists and intellectuals today. Evolutionary scientist Arthur Keith openly admitted why:

Evolution is unproved and un-provable. We believe it only because the only alternative is special creation which is unthinkable.

Writing in *Nature* as far back as 1929, biologist and evolutionist D.M.S. Watson said much the same thing:

The theory of evolution itself is a theory universally accepted, not because it can be proved by logically coherent evidence to be true, but because the only alternative is special creation which is clearly incredible.

The palaeontologist L.T. More of the University of Chicago admitted:

Our faith in the idea of evolution depends upon our reluctance to accept the antagonistic doctrine of special creation.

In other words, if the Theory of Evolution is rejected, then evolutionists and atheists would have no other alternative other than the biblical account of Creation by a personal God.

Dr Richard Lewontin, an evolutionist from Harvard University, admitted that it is unyielding prejudice and bias against the supernatural that is the true motive that causes many scientists to reject intelligent design and not the evidence at hand.

Whether we choose to accept it or not, our finely tuned Universe demands a Creator. Such a magnificent design presupposes an intelligent mind and will, unimaginably great in wisdom and power.

The exact precision of the physical forces in our Universe, the coincidence of so many factors on planet Earth which make life possible, the language of DNA, and the ingenuity of the complex molecular machines on which life depends all demand an intelligent Designer and Creator.

*You are worthy, our Lord and God, to receive glory and honour and power, for you created all things, and by your will they existed and were created.*

*(Revelation 4:11)*



## Still Perplexed by Fossil Record

Charles Darwin admitted that millions of “*missing links*,” transitional life forms, would have to be found in the fossil record to prove the accuracy of his theory that all species had gradually evolved by chance mutation into new species.

Unfortunately for his theory, and despite hundreds of millions spent on searching for fossils worldwide for almost a century and a half, scientists have failed to locate a single missing link out of the millions that should exist if the Theory of Evolution is to be scientifically proven.

Fossils are the remains of plants or animals buried in such a way that much or all of their structure when alive has been preserved. They are found in the *sedimentary rocks*; rocks formed through the deposition of sediment in water. Fossils are found in the sedimentary rocks all over the Earth and under the seas.

It is generally found that the fossils contained in the lowest strata of the rocks are of simpler organisms, and as we work upwards we find more complex and developed ones, such as fish, amphibians, reptiles, mammals, birds, and Homo sapiens (please see chapter seven for more on this subject).

These fossilized remains found in the geologic column are said to provide compelling proof for evolution. This is because all the other evidence offered in favour of the theory is circumstantial, whereas the evidence from palaeontology (the study of life-forms based on fossils found in the rocks) claims to present proof of the history of evolution as opposed to its results and mechanisms. But as we shall see, the fossil record proves the exact opposite.

As we mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, the Theory of Evolution requires that one form of life evolved into another by a series of small gradual changes without any sudden jumps. This means that the fossil record should contain millions of animals with partially developed limbs or organs such as partial legs,

brains or eyes. But no such fossils have ever been found, as a firm supporter of evolution, Dr Niles Eldredge, was forced to admit:

We palaeontologists have said that the history of life supports the story of gradual adaptive change, all the while really knowing that it does not.

Supporters of evolution hoped at the beginning that they would find the continuous gradation of organisms showing all the intermediate stages through which the various species have passed in the course of time in the fossil record.

However, after one hundred and fifty years of claims made that just a little more time would produce such a progression, we find there is only an embarrassing and total lack of fossil evidence to produce what evolutionists so desperately seek to prove their theory – the smooth transition from one species to another with a string of intermediate organisms to *glue* the species together. Instead, as the late Dr Henry Morris, engineer and founder of the Creation Research Center, pointed out:

All the present orders, classes and phyla appear quite suddenly in the fossil record without indications of the evolving lines from which they presumably developed.

There are numerous examples in the fossil record of deterioration and extinction, but a complete absence of any fossils showing transitional structures leading to the evolution of more complex species. In his book, *Macroevolution: Pattern and Process*, palaeontologist Stephen M. Stanley wrote:

The known fossil record fails to document a single example of phyletic evolution accomplishing a major

morphologic transition and hence offers no evidence that the gradualist model can be valid.

Charles Darwin was very perplexed that the fossil evidence did not bear out his theory. In his *Origin of Species* he wrote:

Why if species have descended from other species by fine gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms? Why is not all nature in confusion, instead of the species being, as we see them, well defined? But, 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?

According to David Raup, the Curator of Geology at Chicago's Field Museum of Natural History, the situation has not changed much since Darwin's day. He claimed:

The record of evolution is still surprisingly jerky and, ironically, we now have even fewer examples of evolutionary transition than we had in Darwin's time... Darwin's problem has not been alleviated.

Unfortunately, this is not the message the average person has been taught at school or university. We were exposed to textbooks littered with trees, graphs, charts, columns and models with many polysyllabic names claiming to prove evolution, which gave us the impression that we were to take the whole thing for granted as something that has long been proven by science.

The truth is that after decades of millions being spent on massive global searches by scientists, who have catalogued hundreds of thousands of fossil specimens in museums and laboratories

around the world, the long sought after *missing links* are still missing!

The picture that the fossil record shows is a series of acts of Creation at various stages as new types of fully formed animals appear. This correlates exactly with the statements found in the Book of Genesis which states that God created each creature after its own kind:

*And God said, "Let the waters teem with living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth across the expanse of the sky." So God created the great creatures of the sea and every living and moving thing with which the waters teem, according to their kinds and every winged bird according to its kind. And God saw that it was good.*

*(Genesis 1:20-22)*

*And God said, "Let the land produce living creatures according to their kinds; livestock, creatures that move along the ground, and wild animals, each according to its kind.." And it was so. God made the wild animals according to their kinds, the livestock according to their kinds, and all the creatures that move along the ground according to their kinds. And God saw that it was good.*

*(Genesis 1:24-26)*

*Then God said, "Let us make humankind in our image, according to our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the wild animals of the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth." So God created humankind in his image, in the image of God he created them; male and female he created them.*

*(Genesis 1:26-28)*

# 04

## ***FRAUDS IN THE HISTORY OF EVOLUTION***

*Then God said, "Let us make human kind in our image, according to our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the wild animals of the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth." So God created human kind in his image, in the image of God he created them; male and female he created them.*

*(Genesis 1:26-28)*

Dear reader, there have been many frauds in the history of evolution. Under the heading *Embryonic Fraud Lives on*, the *New Scientist* of 6 September 1997 reported that Ernst Haeckel's fraudulent drawings of alleged embryonic evolutionary parallels are displayed in museums today even though he was convicted of fraud by Jena University over a hundred and twenty years ago.

Haeckel believed with Darwin that all life had evolved by chance from a common source. But he also proposed that in every individual the story of evolution is recapitulated in the womb. Haeckel claimed that as the human embryo developed, it passed through the different stages of evolution, resembling at one stage a fish, then a chicken, then a pig, and in the latest stage, a human being.

Haeckel produced drawings of the embryos of all these creatures to demonstrate their similarities. These drawings were fakes, a real and deliberate fraud. Even though they were exposed as early as the 1860s, they continued to be included in biological

textbooks, and worse than that, the idea of recapitulation is still repeated in television nature programmes today.

## **The Archaeopteryx Fossil**

Extinctions of many wonderful and weird creatures buried in the rock layers caused very much excitement when they were first discovered. Evolutionists made much of a fossil discovered in Austria known as *Archaeopteryx* (from the Greek word *archaios* meaning ancient, and *pteurux* meaning wing) which they boldly claimed to be a missing link, or a transitional form, between a reptile and a bird.

*Archaeopteryx* is a small creature close to the size of a crow and was declared to have lived around a hundred and fifty million years ago. Although this creature had certain unusual features such as teeth, a long tail and claws on its wings, everything else about the fossil revealed it was a true bird and taxonomists today have no hesitation in assigning it to that class for the following reasons.

First, fossil birds younger than *Archaeopteryx*, and not included in the supposed “reptile-to-bird” evolution scenario, have been found, some with teeth and others with a similar hook on their wings. A good example of this type is the modern hoatzin, officially placed in a family of its own, but with some of the features of *Archaeopteryx*.

Second, no creature that is fossilized or living has scales that are halfway to developing into feathers, and there is absolutely no evidence that this has ever occurred in the past. On the contrary, the fossilized remains of at least two undisputed birds have been found in rock strata said to be seventy-five million years *earlier* than the date which evolutionists give for *Archaeopteryx*.

After studying the evidence evolutionist Francis Hitching concluded: “Every one of its supposed reptilian features can be found in various species of undoubted birds.”

## **The Tale of Dinosaur to Bird Continues**

In November 1999 *National Geographic* announced that a fossil had been discovered which appeared to be a missing link between the dinosaurs and birds. The fossil had the tail of a dinosaur and the forelimbs of a bird. The article written by its senior assistant editor stated that: “We can now say that birds are theropods just as confidently as we say that humans are mammals.”

This of course created a storm of interest until it was revealed to be another deception and fraud. Palaeontologists proved that the back end of a dinosaur had been glued to the front end of a bird, a combination of two distinct and totally unrelated fossils! Professor Storrs Olson, curator of birds at the National Museum of Natural History in Washington D.C, condemned this bold claim made by National Geographic when he stated:

National Geographic has reached an all-time low for engaging in sensationalistic unsubstantiated tabloid journalism... It eventually became clear to me that National Geographic was not interested in anything other than the prevailing dogma that birds evolved from dinosaurs.

This type of scientific fraud is a lesson that we should take any media announcements regarding evolution with great caution. The newspapers, television and various magazines, and even some who should know better, are easily deceived and predisposed to publicize any new breakthroughs that support the

Theory of Evolution that will sell in the bookshops or newsagents.

The pattern so often is for a headline to blow the trumpet about another evolutionary discovery, but when that same discovery turns out to be a hoax, there is not one media squeak. As a result, the general public is left with the impression of *proof* when in reality we have nothing more than a false alarm.

## **Making Men out of Apes**

By far the most interesting gap in the macro-evolutionary theory is the gap between human beings and our supposed ape-like ancestors. The widely-accepted theory is that apes and humans evolved from a common and unknown ancestor between thirty and seventy-million years ago.

Most of us have listened to university professors, read textbooks, watched very impressive nature programmes, or visited museums around the world with fantastic exhibitions, which all give the impression that this evolutionary transition is to be taken for granted.

As we pointed out in the previous chapter, the scientific evidence at hand is absolutely in full support of the conclusion that the entire evolutionary process of apes to man is one of the greatest scientific frauds in history! Darwin's book, *The Descent of Man*, gave much to the hasty search for evidence in support of the idea, but almost a hundred and fifty years later palaeontologist Niles Eldredge of the American Natural History Museum has this to say:

The smooth transition from one form of life to another which is implied in the theory... is not borne out by the facts. The search for missing links between various living creatures, like humans and



apes, is probably fruitless, because they never existed as distinct transitional forms... no one has yet found any evidence of such transitional creatures.

Millions of people around the world have been taught an incredible lie to convince them that science has absolutely proven that evolution is true. One of the most effective techniques that evolutionists use to do this is their continual referral to the discovery of a number of “ape-men” fossils that have been found around the world since the search began more than a hundred and fifty years ago.

These “missing link” ape-men creatures are supposed to demonstrate the very slow and gradual evolution of modern humans from primitive ape-like creatures over millions of years. However, a detailed analysis of these fossils show an incredible account of mistaken identification, misrepresentation and outright blatant fraud!

What the general public is unaware of is that these so-called hominid fossil skeletons, popularized and reconstructed by evolutionary textbooks and museum curators, often consist of little more than a single tooth, a small piece of a skull, a single jaw fragment, or a portion of an elbow or knee-joint, out of which an illustration of a complete ape-man is created! Such meagre evidence is then used to convince the masses that modern man developed over millions of years from ancestors that resembled apes.

Worse than that, a number of the alleged hominid ape-men fossils presented by palaeontologists as evidence of the gradual transition from primitive ape-like ancestors to modern man have been shown to be nothing more than extinct forms of pigs, horses, monkeys and apes that have no relationship whatsoever to ancient or modern humans. Below are a few of the strongest cases to have

hit the media headlines since the time of Charles Darwin to modern times.

## **The Fossil Lucy:**

The host of extinct apes evolutionists continually use and upscale in their desperate attempt to fill the large gap in the fossil record include almost all the australopithecines, as well as a variety of other extinct apes such as *Ardipithecus*, *Orrorin*, *Sahelanthropus*, and *Kenyanthropus*.

Despite the fact that all of these have obviously ape skulls, ape pelvises and ape hands and feet, australopithecines, especially *Australopithecus afarensis*, are very often portrayed as having hands and feet very similar to those of modern man, including a straight, upright posture.

The fossil known as *Lucy* is probably the best-known specimen of *Australopithecus afarensis*. This little lady, with no hands or feet, was discovered in Ethiopia in the early 1980s by the American anthropologist Donald Johanson, and is said to be one of the most important discoveries for the evolution of man.

Only parts of her skull were found, so the size of her brain was not mentioned. Lucy was given the great age of three and a half billion years and was described as an early human because the knee-joint proved that this individual walked upright, while the skeleton showed evidence of small skull capacity akin to that of apes.

In spite of Johanson's enthusiastic announcement that he had "discovered" the first ape to walk upright, and therefore a link between primitive apes and humans, not all experts in the field were impressed with his statements. In answer to a question following a lecture at the University of Missouri in 1996, Johanson admitted that the knee-joint given as "proof" that Lucy

walked upright was found over two miles away and two-hundred feet lower in the rock strata!

A complete life-like mannequin of Lucy in the *Living World Exhibit* at the St Louis Zoo shows a hairy, human-like female body standing in an upright position with human hands and feet, but with an ape-like head; which many scientists say is a gross misrepresentation of what is known about the fossil ape *Australopithecus afarensis*.

As we mentioned above, these creatures are known to have ape skulls, ape pelvises and ape hands and feet. But despite evidence to the contrary, evolutionists and museums continue to portray these creatures with human-like features.

A fuller description of the Lucy discovery is given by Johanson and Edey in their book entitled *Lucy*. Here the authors aggressively state that the fossil record is true and human beings were indeed descended from apes. Nevertheless, they admit that the so-called fossils that link apes to humans have not been found:

There was no abrupt crossover from ape to man, but probably a rather fuzzy time of in-between types. We have no fossils yet that tell us what went on during that in-between time.

Author Richard Leakey goes further in his popular book, *Origins Reconsidered*, and not only pictures the progress of the in-between time, but actually draws pictures of a line of ape-men gradually walking more and more upright even though no such skeletons have ever been found.

Anthropologists now have a great number of human-like and ape-like fossils, but between them there is not one ape-man fossil. Reader, it needs repeating, most of the alleged hominid ape-men presented by palaeontologists as evidence for evolution are

nothing more than the remains of extinct forms of pigs, monkeys and horses.

## Combining Men and Apes

### **Piltdown Man:**

The most famous of a so-called ape–man find, which proved to be nothing more than a combination of ape and human bones mixed together, is the fossil known as *Piltdown Man*. This fossil was discovered in 1912 at the Piltdown quarry in England by a medical doctor and amateur palaeontologist named Charles Dawson. The cranium of the skull of Piltdown man appeared to be remarkably human, while the jaw was ape-like.

Shortly after the discovery, Dawson took the collection of bones to a friend of his at the British Museum for analysis, saying that he had found them in a gravel pit near Piltdown Sussex. Experts said the remains were about 500,000 years old and for the next forty years the fossil Piltdown Man, officially classified as *Eoanthropus dawsoni* (Dawson’s Dawn Man), was hailed as, “The sensational missing link,” and an early hominid between apes and modern man. It was forty years before this fraud became public.

Despite the fact that Piltdown Man was a giant hoax, the damage had already been done. From its initial discovery in 1912, to its final determination as a fraud in 1950, hundreds of scientists and university researchers had written numerous doctoral dissertations about the fossil Piltdown Man as the direct ancestor of modern man. In addition, hundreds of plaster casts of the find had been sent to museums around the world, and some years after Dawson’s death in 1916, the three scientists responsible for

establishing Piltdown Man's status in the ape-to-man sequence had received knighthoods.

Fortunately, the whole story took a turn in 1953 when it was exposed as a gigantic fraud. Piltdown Man was scientifically shown to be made up of a human skull and the jawbone of a female orang-utan, who had died about fifty years earlier, and whose teeth had been filed to give them a more human appearance.

Moreover, other fossils including fragments of rhinoceros, elephant, red-deer and a horse's tooth were found at the same site as Piltdown Man, but were all doctored to conceal their age and origin. It was also shown that some of these finds were discovered elsewhere, but brought to the Piltdown site to make the find more impressive.

An article in October 1956 in the *Reader's Digest* magazine recounted the new evidence from a scientific article entitled, *The Great Piltdown Hoax*, that had appeared earlier in the *Popular Science Monthly*. The instigator of this fraud had dyed the teeth and skull fragments to convince other scientists that the skull was extremely old.

As all the people associated with the Piltdown plot are now dead, we shall never know for sure who perpetrated it. Malcolm Bowden wrote in his book, *Ape-Men: Fact or Fallacy*, that the evidence points towards the famous philosopher and evolutionist Pierre Teilhard de Cardin.

Others have suggested it may have been a local resident, Arthur Conan Doyle, and certain members of the British Museum. But all that we can say with certainty today is that Piltdown Man, once hailed as proof of modern man's evolutionary ancestry was unquestionably one of the greatest scientific frauds in history.

## **Java Man:**

Another famous so-called ape-man was *Java Man*, discovered in 1892 by a Dutch palaeontologist, Eugene Dubois, in Java, Indonesia. The only evidence for this ape-man fossil was a skull cap, three teeth and a thigh-bone. Although these fossils were lying at least fifty feet from each other, and unearthed over a one-year time span, Dubois boldly announced that he had found *Anthropopithecus erectus* (upright, man-like ape).

Yet what scientists failed to tell the general public was that later in the 1920s in the same area where Java Man was found, the full skeletal remains of modern humans were also found.

These human bones, that provided concrete evidence that Java Man was not the transitional form that evolutionists hoped he would be, remained hidden under the floorboards of Dubois' house for many decades. So Java Man turned out to be another constructed missing link put together by the creative imagination of someone trying to fill the gap.

## **The Ramapithecus Fossil:**

Ramapithecus is another alleged hominid fossil that was discovered in 1932. This fossil was presented by evolutionists as the missing link between apes and humans for almost fifty years. But what we were not told is that the whole illusive skeleton of Ramapithecus was based solely on a few fossilized teeth. When they were later examined more closely it was discovered that these teeth belonged to a modern orang-utan and not the teeth of an ape-man at all. So Ramapithecus was eventually rejected by scientists.

## Nebraska Man:

More artistic imagination was used to construct a complete ape–man from nothing more than a single tooth! This fossil known as *Nebraska Man* was discovered in 1922 by the amateur geologist Harold Cook in the western side of Nebraska. Dr Henry Osborn of the American Museum of History, along with many other experts in the field, announced that this ape–man was the long sought after evidence of the missing link.

Despite the poor evidence scientists had to support Nebraska Man, detail drawings of this ape–man ancestor were printed in many publications, complete with the tooth’s wife, children, domestic animals and cave! Experts used this *tooth* known as *Nebraska Man* as proof for human evolution during the famous Scopes Trial in 1925.

Obviously, anyone observing these drawings would naturally believe that there existed many fossilized remains to support the reconstructions, but this was not the case. In addition to the poor evidence for Nebraska Man, it was discovered years later that the tooth unearthed by Cook belonged to a wild pig which is believed to have become extinct about ten-thousand years ago. The *Southeast Colorado Man* was another invention of such creative imagination.

## Making Apes out of Men

In another desperate attempt to fill the gap between apes and modern man, certain fossil men were considered to be extremely ape-like and so were declared to be ancestors of modern man. These human fossils that are claimed to be ape–men are often classified under the genus *Homo*, which means *self*, and include *Homo erectus*, *Homo heidelbergensis*, and *Homo neanderthalensis*.

The best known human fossils are of *Cro-Magnon Man*, whose paintings are found on the walls of caves in France, and *Neanderthal Man*. Both of these fossils are clearly human and have longed been classified as *Homo Sapiens*. But much attention was given to these finds when Charles Darwin published his *Origin of Species* in 1859 and the search began for the imagined ape-like ancestors of man.

### **Neanderthal Man:**

Neanderthal Man was first discovered in 1856 by workmen digging in a limestone cave in the Neander Valley in Germany. The bones of this fossil (a partial skeleton) appeared human, but had unusual features such as a prominent eyebrow ridge (like Australian Aborigines) and curvature of the thigh-bone. The fossil bones were examined by anatomist Professor Schaaffhausen, who concluded that they were fully human.

Also the eminent scientist Rudolf Virchow, who laid the foundation for modern pathology, argued that the Neanderthals were human in every respect and that the unusual features in the skull and elsewhere may have resulted from pathological changes caused by disease such as rickets and arthritis.

Nearly a century later another medical specialist reported that many of the remains of the Neanderthal specimens found in Europe showed that the individuals concerned had suffered from a Vitamin D deficiency, which is known to cause osteomalacia and rickets that would also produce a subtle change in the face. However, over the next few decades of the original discovery similar Neanderthal specimens were found throughout Europe, Africa and Asia and evolutionists eventually downgraded Neanderthal Man to a different species – *Homo Neanderthal*.



In the following years models were sculptured, designed and painted revealing semi-erect, barrel-chested creatures with short legs, prominent eyebrow ridges, long narrow skulls and a protruding upper jaw, and were said to have lived between 35,000 and 70,000 years ago.

These constructions certainly gave the impression of being apemen, but as one expert pointed out: “Only bones were found, all the rest of the reconstruction was speculation based on preconception.” In spite of this, most people who were taught evolution in school and elsewhere still believe that modern humans are descended from cave-men ancestors with these types of characteristics.

It should also be emphasized here that none of these so-called primitive features of Neanderthal people fall outside the range of normal human anatomy. In addition, the brain size (based on cranial capacity) of the Neanderthals was actually much larger than that of modern humans, even though the evolutionary dogma teaches that the reverse should be the case. Again, this fact is rarely emphasized.

Marcelin Boule, who studied two Neanderthal skeletons in the early nineteenth century, did much to provoke many misconceptions about the Neanderthals. He concluded that Neanderthal men were anatomically and intellectually inferior brutes, more related to apes than humans. These inaccurate views of Boule were expanded upon by many other evolutionists right up until the 1950s.

Later, anatomists William Straus and A.J Cave totally disproved the claims made by Boule after they had examined one of the French Neanderthals and concluded that the individual actually suffered from severe arthritis which had affected the vertebrae and caused the posture to bend.

One of the world's foremost authorities on Neanderthal Man, Dr Erik Trinkaus, concluded that there is nothing about Neanderthals that is in any way inferior to modern man. He said:

Detailed comparisons of Neanderthal skeletal remains with those of modern humans have shown that there is nothing in Neanderthal anatomy that conclusively indicates loco-motor, manipulative, intellectual or linguistic abilities inferior to those of modern humans.

In addition to anatomical evidence, there is also a growing body of cultural evidence for the fully human status of the Neanderthals. For example, they conducted religious rituals in burying their dead, made a variety of stone tools and worked elaborately with skins and leather.

Moreover, the dating sequence by the *missing link* idea was shattered when a typical Neanderthal skeleton was found buried in a coat of armour in a tomb in Poland in 1908, another interesting fact not emphasized and not included in modern textbooks.

In 1998 a report by American anthropologists further added to the weight of evidence pointing to the fact that the Neanderthals were fully human by their conclusion that in Neanderthal people, "The pencil-sized hypoglossal canal, which carries the motor nerve controlling the tongue, closely matched that of modern humans." In a 1998 editorial on the same subject the *Daily Telegraph* came to the same conclusion:

Far from being grunting oafs, the Neanderthals were accomplished conversationalists, with tongues quite as dextrous as our own. We have been wrong all along to use their name as a by-word for numb-

skulled immobilism. On the contrary, they were the chattering classes of Upper Pleistocene Europe.

## **Cro-Magnon Man:**

The fossil identified as *Cro-Magnon Man* is absolutely indistinguishable from modern humans. The sole reason the fossil was considered a primitive ape-man was because it was found near a collection of cave drawings that were considered primitive. Scientists no longer support this identification of the Cro-Magnon fossil.

## **The Conclusion of Ape-Men Finds**

The cases and illustrations mentioned above, and there are many more, have for a long time been accepted as convincing scientific proof that human beings developed over millions of years by gradual transitions. The late Dr Stephen Jay Gould was Professor of geology and palaeontology at Harvard University and a strong supporter of evolution.

However, he had the honesty to admit that the illustrations of evolutionary development found in science books and television nature programmes are actually fictitious inventions that by no means represent the facts.

It is very clear from the fossil record that there is absolutely no evidence to support human evolution. Today universities and museums have hundreds of thousands of fossils, but not one that bridges the gap between apes and man. Even the fossils found today only testify to separate creation acts.

Therefore, we should take the announcements of any new breakthroughs in the area of evolution with a good dose of scepticism; as scientists working in these fields are no more

immune to temptations than others, and are more than willing to get carried away with a fragment of a skull and a few teeth!

# 05

## ***THE ANTHROPIC PRINCIPLE*** ***The Universe Was Made*** ***for Life to Exist***

*For this is what the Lord says – he who created the heavens, he is God; he who fashioned and made the earth, he founded it; he did not create it to be empty, but formed it to be inhabited.*

*(Isaiah 45:18-19)*

*The highest heavens belong to the Lord, but the earth he has given to man.*

*(Psalm 115:16)*

After examining the complexity of the variables that govern the Solar System and planet Earth, many scientists have declared that our Universe is *anthropic*. This means that the Earth bears evidence that it was designed by a superior intelligence to allow human life to exist.

The Anthropic Principle strongly suggests that a supernatural intelligent Being must have created our Universe to produce humanity; because the conditions that make our Universe and human life possible are the result of spectacular “*fine-tuning*” of more than a hundred scientifically vital values.

For example, the strength of gravity, the Earth’s distance from the Sun, the chemical composition of the atmosphere, magnetism, and many more scientific constants. Changing one or two of the basic numbers that define the Universe by even a small amount would mean there were no stars, atoms, or life as we know it.

This principle is discussed in technical details by John D. Barrow and Frank J. Tipler in *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle*. They show with many equations and references that the scientific organization of the Universe is not coincidental, but appears to have been chosen in order to make human life possible.

## **Origins of the Design Argument**

Questions to the nature of our Universe and our planet Earth have existed – in their broadest sense – since the Middle Ages, but elements of them can be traced back to the ancient Greeks. In 45 B.C. the Roman lawyer and statesman Cicero pointed to the beauty and harmony of the heavenly bodies and put forward an argument for an intelligent designer in nature. In *The Nature of the Gods* he asked the following question:

When we see a mechanism such as a planetary model or clock, do we doubt that it is the creation of the conscious intelligence? So how can we doubt that the world is the work of divine intelligence?

Also, the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and the scientific revolution of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, produced many thesis for the design argument. Eminent scientists such as John Ray and Robert Boyle used it to demonstrate God's creative power, wisdom and intelligence, and Isaac Newton's quantitative scientific account of celestial motions allowed the design concept to be used in the realm of astronomy.

But the most famous and popular argument put forward for intelligent design was by the English scholar and theologian William Paley, whose works have had a long and lasting influence on many scientific textbooks.

In his work *Natural Theology* Dr Paley presented a massive accumulation of evidence for an intelligent Designer behind nature to back up his famous watchmaker argument, which supports the Bible's claim that God purposely designed the Universe for it to be inhabited by humanity. A key part of his argument is as follows:

In crossing a heath, suppose I pitched my foot against a stone, and were asked how it came to be there. I might possibly answer that, for anything I knew to the contrary, it had lain there for ever; nor would it, perhaps, be very easy to show the absurdity of this answer.

But suppose I found a watch upon the ground, and it should be enquired how the watch happened to be in that place, I should hardly think of the answer that I had before given – that, for anything I knew, the watch might have always been there. Yet why should not this answer serve for the watch as well as for the stone? Why is it not as admissible in the second case as in the first?

For this reason, and for no other, viz., that, when we come to inspect the watch, we perceive (what we could not discover in the stone) that its several parts are framed and put together for a purpose, e.g. that they are so formed and adjusted as to produce motion so regulated as to point out the hour of the day; that, if the different parts had been differently shaped from what they are, if a different size from what they are, or placed after any other manner, or in any other order than that in which they are placed, either no motion at all would have been carried on in the

machine, or none which would have answered to the use that is now served by it.

Dr Paley's argument here is that a man who discovered a watch on the ground would be forced by sheer logic and common sense to acknowledge that the complexity and intricate design of the watch, capable of measuring the exact passage of time, leads to the logical conclusion that there must be an intelligent purposeful watchmaker who originally designed and carefully manufactured such a complicated device.

Paley also stated that if the different parts of the watch had been differently shaped from what they are, it obviously could never have functioned at any level of effectiveness. Later, he pointed out that the argument for design becomes even more powerful when we consider the complexity of biological life in comparison to a device such as a watch.

Just as it is logical to assume a watchmaker from the perfect design and function of the watch, so we should assume an intelligent Designer when we see the perfect complexity and harmony in nature. He wrote:

For every indication of contrivance, every manifestation of design, which existed in the watch, exists in the works of nature, of being greater and more, and that in a degree which exceeds all computation. I mean that the contrivances of nature surpass the contrivances of art, in the complexity, subtlety and curiosity of the mechanism; and still more, if possible, do they go beyond them in number and variety.



## Death Blow to a Personal Creator

The Scriptures continually assert that God purposely created the heavens and the Earth, and especially so that it could be inhabited by humanity. However, a great majority of scientists of the last century rejected the concept of a Designer in nature due to their belief that the Theory of Evolution could account for the existence of all the complex biological lifeforms that we observe in the natural world today.

They also rejected the biblical claim that everything in the Universe was created by God for mankind due to the popular theory that the Universe had always existed in a stable static condition, and because the man-centred claim made in Scripture seemed to contradict the existing scientific evidence, which demonstrated that the Sun was the centre of the Solar System, and not the Earth as was previously assumed.

In the Middle Ages the standard textbooks on astronomy were still the ancient work of the second century Egyptian astronomer Claudius Ptolemy, whose major thesis was that all heavenly bodies in the Universe revolved around the Earth.

This view was challenged first in the sixteenth century by the Polish astronomer Nicolaus Copernicus, who created a philosophical revolution in the scientific world, because his research provided compelling evidence that the Earth rotated around the Sun, and therefore the Sun was the centre of our Solar System.

As stated earlier, at first Copernicus' discovery was rejected because many feared that it was a contradiction to the Bible – even though the Bible nowhere claims that the Sun revolves around the Earth.

Later on, the Italian astronomer and physicist, Galileo Galilei, came to the conclusion that Copernicus' discovery was correct, and in his work, *Dialogue of the Two Great Systems of the*

*Universe*, he confirmed that the Earth rotates on its own axis and revolves around the Sun. Because of this discovery, Galileo was immediately in trouble with the ecclesiastical authorities of his day and was placed under house arrest for the rest of his life.

This incident is worth repeating here because it has been used by atheists to argue that science has proved the Bible to be in error and done away with the need for a Creator; but such an argument can easily be disproved.

First, Galileo's disagreement was not only with the Roman Catholic Church, but with the orthodox seventeenth century science as a whole – between astronomers who supported Ptolemy and those who supported Copernicus.

Second, to say that corrupt seventeenth century theologians and clergy members giving their consent to a false unbiblical model from ancient Egypt discredits the Bible and destroys the whole idea of God is illogical and nonsense.

## **Returning to Original Ideas**

As we have pointed out in previous chapters, and as this chapter will further demonstrate, the last few decades have seen an extraordinary revolution in the thinking of many leading scientists worldwide, whose discoveries in their own fields have made the idea of a purposeless, accidental Universe impossible.

In fact, the scientific discoveries made over the last five decades are in favour of the ancient view, that both the Earth and the Universe were purposely created for humanity by a supernatural transcendent Being who is outside of time and space and completely distinct from the Universe itself.

This claim can be verified by an interesting article in a 1997 edition of the science journal *Nature*. The article reported on a survey carried out regarding the beliefs of leading American scientists in a personal God. Interestingly, the survey revealed

that more than forty per-cent of the physicists, mathematicians and biologists confessed their belief in a personal God as supreme Being who answers prayers and is involved in earthly affairs.

This fact suggests that a large number of top scientists have encountered such compelling evidence in their research as to convince them that the only logical conclusion to account for the incredible harmony in nature and the Universe itself is that there is an intelligent Designer who made it that way.

NASA astronomer and scientist Professor John O’Keefe acknowledged the impossibility of life existing on Earth through random chance. He declared:

We are by astronomical standards, a pampered, cosseted, cherished group of creatures... If the Universe had not been made with the most exacting precision, we could never have come into existence. It is my view that these circumstances indicate the Universe was created for man to live in.

Dr Paul Davies is a physicist, writer and broadcaster, and currently a professor at Arizona State University, as well as the director of *Beyond: Centre for Fundamental Concepts in Science*. Although Davies is not attached to any religious tradition, he acknowledges that the perfect fine-tuning of the Universe can only be accounted for if we accept that an intelligent Designer created it. In his popular book, *The Mind of God*, he stated:

I have come to believe more and more strongly that the physical Universe is put together with an ingenuity so astonishing that I cannot accept it merely as brute fact. For those with eyes to see, everything about Earth has got intelligent design written all over it.

Nobel Prize winner for physics, Professor Arno Penzias, admitted that astronomy reveals our Universe was created out of nothing, and obviously must have been designed by a super intelligent Being to allow life to exist and prosper. He wrote:

Astronomy leads us to a unique event, a Universe which was created out of nothing, one with the very delicate balance needed to provide exactly the conditions required to permit life and one which has an underlying, (one might say, supernatural) plan.

The astronomer and Director of *NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies*, Dr Robert Jastrow, reluctantly acknowledged that the new scientific evidence provides compelling proof that our Universe had a beginning and was purposely created by a super intelligent Designer to allow humans to exist.

Writing in the *New York Times* in 1978, Jastrow asked the question: "Have astronomers found God?" He came to the conclusion that they had, or had at least come close to doing so. The closing words in his article are incredible, especially since they are written by an agnostic:

This is an exceedingly strange development, unexpected by all but the theologians... We scientists did not expect to find evidence for an abrupt beginning because we have had until recently such extraordinary success in tracing the chain of cause and effect backward in time... At this moment it seems as though science will never be able to raise the curtain on the mystery of creation.

For the scientist who has lived by his faith in the power of reason, the story ends like a bad dream. He has scaled the mountains of ignorance; he is about to

conquer the highest peak; as he pulls himself over the final rock, he is greeted by a band of theologians who have been sitting there for centuries.

Writing along the same lines the cosmologist Professor Ed Harrison wrote in his book, *Masks of The Universe*, that the incredible new scientific discoveries point to the existence of God. He wrote:

Here is the cosmological proof of the existence of God – the design argument of Paley – updated and refurbished. The fine tuning of the Universe provides prima facie evidence of deistic design. Take your choice: blind chance that requires multitudes of Universes or design that requires only one... Many scientists, when they admit their views, incline toward the theological or design argument.

The late astrophysicist Dr Stephen Hawking, and author of the best-selling book, *A Brief History of Time*, was without considered the most famous scientist of this generation. Even though Hawking rejected the existence of God, he did acknowledge that there is remarkable evidence of the fine-tuning of the key constants controlling the nature of the Universe. He said:

In fact, if one considers the possible constants and laws that could have emerged, the odds against a Universe that produced life like ours are immense.

Dr Hawking also summarized the implications of his discoveries about the first moment of the Universe in this way:

The odds against a Universe like ours emerging out of something like the big bang are enormous. I think clearly there are religious implications whenever you start to discuss the origins of the Universe. There must be religious overtones. But I think most scientists prefer to shy away from the religious side of it.

## **Evidence Demanding a Verdict**

Scientists use the word *anthropic*, derived from the Greek word *anthropos*, which means *man*, to indicate that science has uncovered a growing mass of evidence, including an astonishing number of variables that fit within a very narrow range that allows life to exist on planet Earth. This evidence supports the view that our Universe was in some way perfectly created and shaped to produce the exact conditions that promote life and especially mankind.

Below we will examine a small portion of these discoveries, beginning with the relative strengths of the four fundamental forces which glue our Universe together. They are called the gravitational force, the electromagnetic force, the strong nuclear force, and the weak nuclear force.

All of these fundamental forces have a specific and precise numerical value which is constant throughout the Universe. If any one of these four forces were not precisely what it is, our Universe would not exist at all.

### **The Gravitational and Electromagnetic Force:**

The relationship between the relative strengths of the gravitational and electromagnetic forces is nothing short of remarkable. The precise balance between these two fundamental

forces allows stars like the Sun to exist and radiate energy. The gravitational force holds the star together, while the electromagnetic force energizes the star to radiate its energy. In his book, *God and New Physics*, Paul Davies states:

Both forces play an essential role in shaping the structure of the stars. Stars are held together by gravity, and the strength of the gravitational force helps determine such things as the pressure inside the star. On the other hand, energy flows out of the star by electromagnetic radiation.

For these two forces to balance out in such a way as to produce stars like our Sun, the range of the relative strengths of these two forces must be very narrow. The noted physicist Brandon Carter pointed out that even a tiny minute adjustment in the gravitation force, stars like the Sun would not exist, neither would any form of life that depends on solar-type stars to sustain it.

If the force of gravity were slightly stronger than it is, the Universe would not have even got off the ground in the first place, or if it had, it would have collapsed again as quickly as it had started. On the other hand, if the force of gravity were slightly weaker than it is, everything in the Universe would fly apart; nothing would hold together.

But as it is, the forces of gravity and electromagnetism are perfectly balanced and fine-tuned to allow life and consciousness to flower in our Universe.

## **The Strong and Weak Nuclear Force:**

These two forces together determine how protons, neutrons and electrons interact in order to form atoms, the fundamental building blocks of matter, and again their precise relationship is truly incredible.

Physicists have shown that if the strong nuclear force had been even slightly weaker than it is, then the Universe would be all hydrogen and we would have none of the diversity that we see around us today. Instead, if the strong nuclear force had been slightly stronger, all the hydrogen in the early Universe would have converted to helium and therefore the stars would not have formed.

In his popular book, *Just Six Numbers: The Deep Forces that Shape the Universe*, the noted astronomer Sir Martin Rees said that the strength of the fundamental strong nuclear force, which expresses the strength of the electrical force that holds atoms together, was precisely balanced and calibrated to the force of gravity to allow the Universe to exist. Dr Rees wrote:

The cosmos is so vast because there is one crucially important huge number  $N$  in nature, equal to 1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000. This number measures the strength of the electrical forces that hold atoms together, divided by the force of gravity between them. If  $N$  had a few less zeros, only a short-lived miniature Universe could exist. No creatures could grow larger than insects, and there would be no time for biological evolution.

Also the weak nuclear force, the other fundamental force in the Universe, is precisely calibrated to allow our Universe to exist and humanity to prosper. Even a minute variation in this force would have devastating effects on life, but it is at just the right level to allow hydrogen to burn at a slow and steady rate in the hot interior of the stars. If this was not the case, the rate at which stars burn hydrogen would not be conducive to life which depends on their energy.



## Nothing Comes from Nothing

It is an astounding fact that all the fundamental forces mentioned above have a specific and precise numerical value which is constant throughout the Universe. An astounding fact that demands an explanation. Why is it that the Universe in which we live is governed by such universal laws which themselves make the practice of science possible?

The physicist Tony Rothman wrote an article in *Discovery* concerning the need for scientists to seriously consider the implications of the astonishing fine-tuning of the most fundamental forces that define the nature and existence of our Universe:

When confronted with the order and beauty of the Universe and the strange coincidences of nature, it is very tempting to take the leap of faith from science into religion. I am sure many physicists want to. I only wish they would admit it.

In his book, *The Blind Watchmaker*, the famous scientist and agnostic Richard Dawkins claims that we do not need to postulate a designer in order to understand life or anything else in the Universe. Such a statement hardly qualifies as an explanation for the incredible harmony we see all around us in the nature of the Universe.

The very laws of logic demand that every known effect must be the result of a previous cause. The Romans created a maxim that included the natural and logical conclusion of logic, *Ex nihilo, nihil fit* – nothing comes from nothing. Universal laws suggest a law-giver and the observance of laws a law-enforcer.

This means the created Universe must have had a first cause – an eternal Being existing outside of time and space and the Universe

itself. It is obvious to any intelligent person that there cannot be an infinite series of causes.

Logic demands that there must have been a first cause, that was obviously not created by anything else. The Bible tells us that the first cause is God – a unique, personal, self-existent, eternal, transcendent, independent, perfect, holy, loving, omnipotent spiritual Being, who inhabits eternity and has the freedom and power to bring about anything that He wishes, including matter, time and space, and who sustains the whole of His Creation by laws of nature that He alone ordained and whose limits He alone determined long ago!

The famous Irish writer Jonathan Swift coined the frequently quoted illustration which says:

That the Universe was formed by a fortuitous concourse of atoms, I will no more believe than the accidental jumbling of the alphabet would fall into a most ingenious treatise of philosophy.

Portraying the same idea, the modern British author Rod Garner says:

We could suppose that the plays of Shakespeare came into being as a result of random typing by monkeys. But it is not a proposition that any reflective person would rush to defend. A more cogent explanation – and one we should note that is deeply embedded in human consciousness – is that the existence of a complex yet structured world leads us to the notion of a supreme cause or Being. Creation supposes a Creator.

In a book called *The Emperor's New Mind*, the British mathematician and physicist Roger Penrose, who worked with Stephen Hawking to develop our current knowledge of black holes, calculated the incredible degree of precision with which the Universe was created.

Dr Penrose computed the odds of a *natural* big bang producing by accident our incredibly ordered Universe, as opposed to a chaotic, disorderly one, and devised a number so large that it is said to have more zeros than the total number of particles in the entire Universe.

Above we have examined only a few of the indications which prove that life on Earth needs an extremely complex and precise arrangement of terrestrial and extra-terrestrial elements and laws in order to exist and function, but there are many more. Below I have listed some of the most obvious examples.

## **The Earth's Distance from the Sun:**

If our Earth was located much further away from our Sun, we would freeze like the planet Mars. If it was much closer, we would be burned up like the hot surface of Mercury. The Earth happens to be in the right place in relation to the Sun, and its temperature has to stay in a narrow band in order to sustain life. Moreover, our Sun is a very special type of star in relation to the others.

Most of the other stars in our galaxy are smaller than the Sun, and are called red dwarves. These give off red light and infrared radiation, but not enough blue light and ultraviolet radiation to support life. However, the large stars like F dwarves give off too much ultraviolet and blue light, whereas our Sun is just right.

The Sun also burns very steadily, so steadily that its heat output is practically constant. In contrast, red dwarves are inclined to flare

much more violently than the Sun, so that their output of light and heat varies a lot from time to time.

## **The Earth's Orbit around the Sun:**

Our planet Earth has an almost perfectly circular orbit round the Sun. If it did not revolve every twenty–four hours, the one half of our planet would be in permanent darkness without vegetation, while the other side of the planet would be an uninhabitable desert, as it suffered from permanent exposure to the Sun's heat. Orbits are not necessarily circular: elliptical orbits are just as possible.

But an elliptical orbit would mean that the Earth would be much further from the Sun at the end of its orbit and therefore much colder, and much nearer to the Sun in the middle of its orbit and so much hotter. This would make Earth's temperature very variable.

Again, our Earth has to rotate on its axis at the right speed. If the rotation were too slow, there would be too great a temperature difference between the night when it cools down, and the day when it heats up. All these facts demand an explanation. Why is it that our Universe is governed by such universal laws which make the practice of life possible?

In his book, *The Early Earth*, Dr John C. Whitcomb examines the compelling scientific evidence in favour of intelligent design and reaches the obvious conclusion that our Universe, Solar System and planet Earth were purposely constructed by a powerful intelligence within very narrow parameters to allow human life to exist. He wrote:

The overwhelming evidence of design throughout the entire Universe as well as the solar system and our own planet has never been more obvious than now.

The perfect mass of the proton, and the exact factor of 2 in gravitational and electrical force equations demand a supreme Designer.

So remarkable are these universal mathematical proportions that the term Anthropic Principle is being widely used among astronomers to describe the ‘neat and tidy’ cosmic mathematical formulas which are independent of the human mind and yet seem to be in beautiful harmony with the way we think.

The more we learn of the astronomic Universe, the more we realize that evolution, even theistic evolution offers no rational answers.

### **The Precise Size of Earth’s Moon:**

Another important sign of very fine-tuning is the precise size of our Moon in proportion to the Earth and its precise distance from our planet. If the Moon were any bigger or nearer our planet, it would provoke huge tidal waves and destabilize the Earth’s motion. If it were any smaller or more distant, it would have no significant effect on the Earth at all.

But the Moon is very important to life, as it helps to keep our planet stable on its axis and it creates the tides, which are important in flushing out nutrients from the rivers and increasing the ocean currents. These are an important factor in stabilizing the temperature of the Earth because they carry heat from the warmer equatorial regions to the colder arctic ones.

### **The Earth’s Perfect Atmosphere and Size:**

There are many factors which determine a planet’s atmosphere. The atmosphere of Earth is composed of precisely the right gases necessary to sustain life. In addition, these gases exist in the exact

ratio to facilitate the complex biological processes that are essential for the requirements of plant and animal life as well as human beings.

Our atmosphere is composed of 78% nitrogen and 21% oxygen (both of which gases are fundamental to the life cycles of plants and animals), a small quantity of other gases and an abundance of water.

But the composition and density of the Earth's atmosphere are by no means self-explanatory. The planet Venus is much the same size as the Earth, but it has a completely different atmosphere altogether. It is composed of 96% carbon dioxide and around 3% nitrogen, and the atmospheric pressure at the surface of the planet is ninety-six times greater than atmospheric pressure on Earth. Also the planet Mars – our nearest neighbour in the Planetary System – has literally no atmosphere at all and what there is, is 95% carbon dioxide.

The size of our planet Earth is also vital for life to exist and flourish. If it were any smaller, it would not have the right gravitational pull to retain the water and atmosphere essential to life. A smaller Earth would also produce a much thinner atmosphere that would diminish our protection from the many harmful cosmic rays and the hundreds of meteors that assault our planet very frequently.

On the other hand, a much larger planet would have a greater gravitational field that would greatly increase the weight of every living thing and make life impossible.

## **The Existence of Carbon and the Strange Nature of Water:**

Two other basic necessities for life on Earth are carbon and water, which need to be present in abundance because carbon atoms are

the essential building blocks of the molecules of life, while water is the medium of transport.

All life systems on Earth are based on the existence of the element known as carbon. Interestingly, scientists have discovered that it is extremely unlikely that the element carbon could have come into existence by random chance at the beginning of the Universe.

Science tells us that at the very fraction of a second following Creation, our Universe consisted of only helium and hydrogen. But the collision of a helium nucleus with another helium nucleus produced an unstable new element called beryllium. Then another helium nucleus collided with a beryllium nucleus and produced a new element – carbon.

The famous astrophysicist Sir Fred Hoyle had the honesty to admit that when he considered how totally unlikely it was that carbon could have been formed by accident, his atheism was shaken to the core. *In the Universe: Past and Present Reflections* he wrote:

A common-sense interpretation of the facts (concerning the energy levels in <sup>12</sup>Carbon and <sup>16</sup>Oxygen) suggests that a super intellect has monkeyed with physics, as well as with chemistry and biology, and that there are no blind forces worth speaking about in nature. The numbers one calculates from the facts seem to me so overwhelming as to put this conclusion almost beyond question.

Although they reject the idea of a personal Creator, Astronomer Royal, Sir Martin Rees, and science writer John Gribbin stated in *Cosmic Coincidences*:

This combination of coincidences just right for resonance in carbon-12, just wrong in oxygen-16, is indeed remarkable. There is no better evidence to support the argument that the Universe has been designed for our benefit – tailor made for man.

The other vital element for the existence of all life – water – has a whole range of physical and chemical properties; many of which are unique and uniquely adapted to sustain life. Water plays an important part in maintaining temperature stability in the bodies of living creatures and in the Earth as a whole. In fact, our bodies are made up of 62% water and its weight, in relation to the weight of other elements, is another crucial property.

If water were even slightly heavier than it is, we would not be able to stand up. In addition, water is thin, so it can easily flow, an important fact for the body's circulatory system which is based on water. If water were thicker, the heart would have to work incredibly hard to pump it through the veins in our body.

In his book, *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle*, astronomer John D. Barrow noted that the vital element water is an unusual and unlikely element to have formed in our Universe unless purposely designed. He said:

Water is actually one of the strangest substances known to science. This may seem a rather odd thing to say about a substance as familiar but it is surely true. Its specific heat, its surface tension, and most of its other physical properties have values anomalously higher or lower than those of any other known material.

The fact that its solid phase is less dense than its liquid phase (ice floats) is virtually a unique property.



The fact that ice floats allows aquatic life to exist in cold temperature zones.

Experts tell us without the unique qualities mentioned above all marine life would die because water would freeze from the bottom and kill all aquatic life in cold climates. Moreover, the proteins and nucleic acids in DNA could not exist without the unique qualities of water. Yet this essential substance for all life existence is found in abundance on the Earth's surface!

For life to exist on our planet we also need a quantity of many other elements such as oxygen, nitrogen, iron, calcium and so on. No other planet in our Solar System has anything like the right chemical composition to support life as planet Earth has. Biologist Dr Lawrence J. Henderson wrote about the appearance of the absolute essential elements in our Universe, hydrogen and oxygen, necessary for human life to exist and the odds against these elements being formed by chance. He declared:

There is in truth not one chance in countless millions of millions... These are no mere accidents; an explanation is to seek. It must be admitted however, that no explanation is at hand.

But to anyone who seriously considers the evidence there is one logical explanation: "*In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.*"

In his book, *The Unrandom Universe*, Sigmund Brouwer showed that the odds against the essential atmosphere, together with the water cycle, forming on Earth by chance are one in a hundred trillion-trillion.

The physical properties of our planet are by no means self-explanatory, as are the properties of the vital forces of the

Universe itself. Their combination cannot be accounted for by a matter of chance.

And the same can be said when we consider the extraordinary balance between the Universe's rate of expansion and collapse, the slight excess of matter over antimatter, and the rate of the proton and the electron – two of the three subatomic particles which form the atom – that is precisely that which enables life to subsist.

The precise ratio between the proton and the electron is a fundamental number governing our Universe and without it there would be no life, no chemistry and no physicists to figure it out! In *A Brief History of Time* Dr Hawking stated:

The remarkable fact is that the values of these numbers seem to have been finely adjusted to make possible the development of life.

The Anthropic Principle is supported by many leading scientists around the world today. These scientists are seeing that the early formation of the Universe was all the while leading up to man, exactly as the prophet Isaiah announced almost three thousand years before these modern discoveries by man.

## **Denying God's Existence Requires Faith**

There are those who accept the overwhelming evidence of the Anthropic Principle, but still deny the existence of a Creator. They conclude that the special numbers in our Universe which make life possible on planet Earth will all be worked out some day. They believe that scientists will come up with new theories that will explain all of these wonderful minute coincidences.

To deny God in this way, and to say that the Universe with all of its mathematical completion and perfection came into existence

by itself with no cause or meaning or reason, requires a lot more faith than a person who believes the Universe exists as it is because of a powerful intelligent God who designed and created it that way.

The physical laws of our Universe are not random. The Anthropic Cosmological Principle strongly suggests the ancient biblical view that they were purposely designed by God for the support of human life. Therefore, God had man in mind right from the beginning! Dear reader, the Bible goes even further and says that He had *you* in mind too. You were created and chosen to be His child and to share in His glory! Paul says:

*Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has blessed us in Christ with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places, just as he chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world to be holy and blameless before him in love. He destined us for adoption as his children through Jesus Christ, according to the good pleasure of his will.*

*(Ephesians 1:3-6)*

The Bible also says that you were created in God's image; something not said of anything else in the entire created order:

*Then God said, "Let us make humankind in our image, according to our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the wild animals of the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth." So God created humankind in his image, in the image of God he created them; male and female he created them.*

*(Genesis 1:26-28)*

Since God is Spirit and has no physical size, weight shape or any other kind of concrete dimension, to be made in His image means to be like Him in other respects. First, to be made in the image or likeness of God means to have a unique personality, feelings, and powers of thought, which far exceed the brute instincts of animal life. It means to have a unique level of intelligence, an ability to reason, and a will and conscience to choose and distinguish between right and wrong, and to make moral choices, rather than act by irrational instinct.

Finally, and above all, man is a unity of spirit, soul and body. This means that he has a spiritual dimension, a unique capacity to relate to God, to worship Him and to have fellowship with Him. Let us therefore take courage in the words of the distinguished modern thinker Francis Schaeffer, where he wrote:

The Bible tells me who I am. It tells me how I am differentiated from all other things. I do not need to be confused, therefore, between myself and animal life and between myself and the complicated machines of the second half of the twentieth century. Suddenly I have value, and I understand how it is that I am different.

I understand how it is that God can have fellowship with me and give me revelation of a propositional nature... Any man, no matter who he is... is made after the likeness of God. A man is of great value not for some less basic reason but because of his origin.

# 06

## ***IN THE BEGINNING: ORIGINS RECONSIDERED***

*In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. Now the earth was formless and empty, darkness was over the surface of the deep, and the Spirit of God was hovering over the waters.*

*(Genesis 1:1-3)*

*You alone are the LORD. You made the heavens, even the highest heavens, and all their starry host, the earth and all that is on it, the seas and all that is in them. You give life to everything, and the multitudes of heaven worship you.*

*(Nehemiah 9:6-7)*

It is difficult to imagine how anyone can avoid experiencing an incredible sense of awe and wonder when we contemplate the immensity and complexity of the Universe. “Space is big. Really big. You just won’t believe how vastly mind-bogglingly big it is.” With these words began the classic of modern astronomy – *The Hitchhiker’s Guide to the Galaxy*.

In the previous chapter we spoke of the size, complexity, richness and energy of our earthly home, which allows it to sustain thousands of varieties of animal and vegetable life as well as human beings. And we said that as far as we know there is no place like it in the entire Universe.

Yet for all its worth and glorious endowment, planet Earth is – as Stephen Hawking described – no more than, “A medium-sized planet orbiting around an average star in the outer suburbs of an ordinary spiral galaxy, which is itself only one of about a million million galaxies in the observable Universe.”

The Sun is orbited by nine planets with over sixty moons and a great number of asteroids and comets. To paraphrase one commentator, planet Earth is the fifth largest of these planets and once every twenty-four hours it spins on its north-south axis, which is tilted at an angle of  $23.45^\circ$ , and once every year, travelling at about 66,500 miles an hour, it orbits the Sun, ninety-three million miles away.

The other planets which orbit the Sun are Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Neptune, and Pluto. All these except Mercury and Venus have other bodies, known as moons, which orbit around them. Mars has got two, Jupiter sixteen, Saturn twenty-three, Neptune eight and Pluto one.

There are also large numbers of asteroids moving around within the Planetary System. These are small planets revolving around the Sun, mainly between the orbit of Mars and Jupiter.

Other natural objects include thousands of comets, which are often described as dirty snowballs, and millions of loose pieces of matter which burst into flames when they enter the Earth's atmosphere. These are often referred to as meteors or shooting stars.

As noted, all these bodies are dominated by the Sun, whose visible surface has a temperature of 6,000 degrees Celsius, rising to at least fourteen million degrees Celsius at the core. I quote:

The Sun loses four million tons of its mass every second, yet it is so incredibly big that it still has enough fuel to last another 5,000 million years! These figures are really unbelievable, yet the Sun is no more than an average-sized star in the *suburbs* of the Milky Way, which itself is a gigantic galaxy that contains about 100,000 million stars, the nearest of which is about twenty-three million-million miles away.

And that is just one single galaxy! During the last century, very powerful telescopes of astronomers revealed that the known Universe contains more than fifty billion galaxies with each galaxy containing more than two hundred million stars.

In order to write of what lies beyond the Solar System without having pages full of zeros after each number, astronomers speak of distances in terms of *light years*. To quote another expert:

This is the distance travelled by light, at its constant speed of approximately 300,000,000 metres per second, over the time of one year. Using these units, the distance to the nearest star, *proxima centauri* is about four light years.

## **The Most Important Questions of all**

It is very difficult for the mind to conceive of such a vast Universe in which stars extend from our Solar System for millions of trillions of miles in all directions. Yet it is even more difficult to avoid some of the most fundamental questions that the existence of this immense and magnificent Universe raises: What is it that we are seeing? How does it work? When will it end? Why are we here? What is our significance? When and how did it all begin?

If the elements that are in my body came from supernova explosions, and supernova explosions came from stars, and these from clouds of hydrogen gas, then where did the hydrogen come from in the first place?

The search for the answers to these questions has a history which goes back to the beginning of time itself. Modern science believes that the answers can be found in an event which is commonly called the Big Bang.

However, in opposition to the theory of an aimless random explosion, the Bible affirms that God created everything in the Universe with absolute purpose and intelligence at a definite point in the distant past.

The opening words in the Book of Genesis quoted above could not be more simple or more inclusive, “*In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.*” As the Hebrew language had no single word to describe the Universe, the phrase *hassamayim we’et ha’ares* – *the heavens and the earth* – was the only one they could use to describe the totality of all Creation or reality.

This can be proven through a linguistic analysis of the words *heaven and earth* used elsewhere in Scripture. For example, in *Genesis 14:19* God is called *Creator of heaven and earth*. In *Jeremiah 23:24* God speaks of himself as filling *heaven and earth* (See also *2 Kings 19:15*; *2 Chronicles 2:12*; *Psalms 115:15, 121:2, 124:8, 134:3, 146:6*; *Isaiah 37:16, 42:5*; *Jeremiah 51:15*).

The *heavens and the earth* is a way of saying everything that exists from the farthest reaches of outer space to the smallest grain of sand on the seashore. All things whether the Solar System, galaxies, nebulae, electromagnetism, gravity, every form of life, every form of matter and energy, and every single law by which nature operates were created by God – not out of any kind of pre-existing substance but out of nothing! As the Scriptures say, He “*Gives life to the dead and calls things that are not as though they were.*”

## **A World with no Beginning?**

Up until the 1920s virtually all astronomers believed that science had established that the Universe had existed forever in a static condition. They concluded that if the Universe was eternal, that it was never created, then there was no need for a Creator.



This all changed in 1915 when Albert Einstein published his general theory of relativity, which proved that cosmic space expands. This meant that the Universe was not static or eternal, but that it had an initial beginning.

The discovery was so unpleasant to Dr Einstein that two years later he added a cosmological constant to his equations, a hypothetical force which compensated for the cosmic expansion and he made the Universe static once more.

It was left to two other great scientists, the physicist Alexander Friedman and the cosmologist Georges Le Maitre, to develop the original thrust of Einstein's general Theory of Relativity and they proposed in the 1920s that the Universe was indeed expanding. This fact was to have not only far-reaching consequences on our understanding of the nature of the Universe, but on the claims made in the Bible as to its origin and purpose.

These two men reasoned that if the Universe is expanding over time, as Einstein's original equations indicated, then it had obviously expanded from something. This led them to the conclusion that at some time in the past all the energy in the Universe must have been closely packed together into an infinitely small and infinitely dense point.

This dramatic conclusion – which produced the first version of the universally known Big Bang Theory – proposed that contrary to the static model of the Universe, which had prevailed for centuries, the Universe had a definite starting point and that it has been changing ever since.

## **Hubble Confirms an Expanding Universe**

The next breakthrough, which marked a significant milestone in the advancement of our scientific knowledge of the origin of our Universe, came in the year 1929. Working at the Mount Wilson Observatory in California, the celebrated American astronomer

Edwin Hubble came to the conclusion that no matter where you gaze in the sky, all the other galaxies are moving rapidly away from us.

Hubble used the new Hooker telescope to discover that the distant light sources he observed were not individual stars, but were actually astronomical phenomena called nebulae. They were distant galaxies, each containing billions of stars like our own home galaxy – the Milky Way. Dr Hubble discovered that these enormous galaxies were moving away from our galaxy and from each other at tremendous velocities, rather like the expansion of the surface of a balloon.

If you take a balloon, blow it up and mark a number of small galaxies on the surface, and then blow it up some more, you will notice all the galaxies move away from each other. This is like the expansion of the Universe.

That is, the Universe is expanding, not because the galaxies are moving through space, but because the space between the galaxies is expanding. Although Hubble was not familiar with the big bang model, his observations confirmed experimentally that we do not live in a static Universe, but in one that is expanding.

After Albert Einstein had met Le Maitre and Hubble in person at the Mount Wilson observatory, and had personally verified through Hubble's enormous telescope that the galaxies were indeed expanding away from us at tremendous velocities, he realized that the Universe must logically have had a definite beginning in the distant past.

Einstein also confessed that adding the cosmological constant to his general Theory of Relativity was one of the biggest "blunders" of his life.

## **Not all Accept the Cosmic Balloon Discovery**

These new discoveries to the nature of our Universe produced a revolution in the thinking of many scientists and forced them to abandon all of their previous atheistic assumptions. The Static Theory was philosophically the most attractive one because it less resembled the Creation account given in the Book of Genesis.

If the Universe had a definite beginning in time – as the evidence revealed it had – then this radical truth strongly implied a supernatural Creator who stands outside of the Universe itself.

A Universe that comes into being, together with time, space, mass and energy obviously does not agree with the philosophy of atheism, or the pantheism philosophy of the New Age movement that teaches God is the Universe. The astronomer Dr Hugh Ross proves this point where he wrote in *The Creator and the Cosmos*:

If time's beginning is concurrent with the beginning of the Universe, as the space-theorem says, then the cause of the Universe must be some entity operating in a time dimension completely independent of and pre-existent to the time dimension of cosmos. This conclusion is powerfully important to our understanding of who God is and who or what God isn't. It tells us that God is not the Universe itself, nor is God contained within the Universe.

Naturally not everyone welcomed the idea that the Universe had a beginning because of the serious religious implications that this truth involved. In 1948, the popular Cambridge scientist Fred Hoyle helped to formulate a contrary theory. Hoyle admitted that the Universe was indeed expanding, but insisted that it was infinite and eternal with no beginning and was creating matter all the time.

This model called the Steady State Theory, meant that instead of matter emanating from a centre in the Universe in the distant past, it was being produced all the time equally throughout space forever.

In other words, the whole cosmic process was kept in balance as matter simply sprang into existence out of nothing at a regular rate to replace the matter which had died through expansion.

However, Hoyle's concept that the Universe had no beginning was said to be more of a philosophical one than anything else. The steady state model that proposed an expanding Universe that was eternal and without beginning or end certainly did away with, and was frequently used against, belief in a Creator.

Nevertheless, an overwhelming majority of scientists came to reject the steady state theory (which caused Hoyle and others to alter their theory to an oscillating Universe) not because of religious reasons, but because of observations made in the 1960s by the physicists Arno Penzias and Robert Wilson, whose discoveries did not fit the steady state model.

### **More Problems for an Eternal Universe**

Another reason why the Steady State Theory was rejected by a number of scientists is because it violates the Laws of Thermodynamics. As we have seen in previous chapters, the First Law of Thermodynamics states that matter and energy can neither be self-created or destroyed.

Matter can be converted into energy and energy into matter, but the sum total remains the same. The Steady State Theory, which proposed that matter was continually created out of nothing, and without cause, clearly violated this Law.

The Second Law of Thermodynamics, which states that in an isolated physical system things become less ordered and more random over time, caused another problem for Hoyle's theory.

This Law states that our entire Universe is running down as it decays to a lower order of available energy. Here is how one expert describes it:

As the rotation of the planets and their moons slow down, and as stars and complete galaxies burn themselves out, the matter in the Universe is becoming more and more disordered as its energy is dissipated.

The logical consequence of this is that the universe cannot be eternal. If it were, the stars would have ceased to shine long ago, and all the energy in our universe would have long since been evenly spread throughout space. At the same time, this suggests that if the universe is becoming less ordered, it must have been more ordered in the past, and have had a highly-ordered beginning.

Despite the evidence that our Universe had an initial beginning, others besides Hoyle have continued to resist the idea and have come up with a whole new range of theoretical alternatives.

One of them is the *oscillating model* in which the Universe is said to expand, collapse back again and repeat the cycle indefinitely. Another suggests that the Universe we see is just one of an infinite number of Universes.

In 1992, Stephen Hawking and cosmologist James Hartle employed what they called “imaginary time” to propose yet another alternative theory. But as Hawking explained in his book, *A Brief History of Time*, this imaginary time is simply a mathematical device which he and Hartle used to construct a model of the Universe.

There is not one single piece of evidence to any of these alternatives to a non-eternal Universe. There is no observational evidence to support any of them and none of them can be experimentally verified.

The general Theory of Relativity, the Laws of Thermodynamics, and the astronomical observations made by Edwin Hubble, Arno Penzias and Robert Wilson all give clear evidence which points to a Universe that had a definite beginning in the past and is changing over time as the prophet Isaiah announced almost three thousand years ago:

*He sits enthroned above the circle of the earth, and its people are like grasshoppers. He stretches out the heavens like a canopy, and spreads them out like a tent to live in.*

*(Isaiah 40:22-23)*

*It is I who made the earth and created mankind upon it. My own hand stretched out the heavens; I marshalled their starry host.*

*(Isaiah 45:12-13)*

## **Big Bang and Here We Are?**

The conventional wisdom today is that at some point between ten and twenty billion years ago our Universe started by means of a big bang. According to this theory, everything in the Universe, all the energy and matter that would be in the billions of stars and the billions of galaxies, was concentrated in a tiny, infinitely hot and dense point, commonly defined as a *singularity*.

It was so small that it could pass through the eye of a needle. From that point the singularity expanded very violently and rapidly in all directions, spreading out the energy and space itself as it went along.

A large number of secular scientists today subscribe to one form or another of the Big Bang Theory. The model most widely held is the inflationary version. This says that the early Universe went through a period of very rapid expansion, and inflated at an increasing rate rather than the decreasing rate we observe today. Scientists say that this explains how the force of gravity was able to form stars, galaxies and planets.

As stated previously, it is also believed that the Universe did not expand into existing space after the big bang, but it was space itself that expanded outwards.

The question that we must ask ourselves now is how can we know that all this is true? Obviously, scientists only appeared on the scene “fourteen billion years” after the initial big bang (if we are to agree with the big bang time scale), never mind the first few seconds! One of the difficulties we encounter when we consider the question of origins is that we are confronted with the limitations of scientific inquiry. I quote:

By definition, empirical science is the study of things in our Universe that can be measured and tested in a repeatable way by other scientists. But if an independent scientist in another laboratory cannot reproduce an experiment, then this experiment fails the universal scientific standard of repeatability.

The creation of our Universe is clearly a unique one time only event that cannot be repeated. Therefore, it is a real challenge for science to ever positively and authoritatively describe the process by which our Universe and life itself originally came into existence.

## **Big Bang Under Revision**

Despite all the apparent confirmations of the current big bang model, and the fact that it seems to work in explaining many features of the origin of the Universe, it now seems that the theory – only a few decades old – is in need of further examination, because the sums simply do not add up.

For example, if the conventional model of the Universe is true, then there is a vast amount of both matter and energy missing. Astronomers estimate that as much as 90% of the Universe could be made up of invisible dark matter and dark energy, which means that it is energy and matter that cannot be seen or detected in any of its usual forms.

In the 1930s the Swiss-American astronomer Fritz Zwicky noted that a mysterious invisible force appeared to be preventing some galaxies from taking part in the expansion of the Universe and proposed that this force was the gravity of so-called *dark matter* in and around galaxies.

It is important to emphasize that many calculations about the big bang rely on estimates about the amount and content of this dark matter; and if the present estimates changed by even 10% the big bang equations would produce a Universe much different from the one we have.

In fact, Dr Stephen Hawking says it would disprove the idea altogether. Theories of the origin, size and eventual end of our Universe depend a lot on this hypothetical dark matter, but what it is and if it exists at all remains to be seen.

## **The Finely Tuned Universe Problem**

The second unanswered question for the Big Bang Theory is how the Universe came to be so finely tuned in so many respects. It teaches that the entire Universe came into being some fourteen



billion years ago by a natural event. But this raises the important question as to how a random explosion could produce the elegant and dependable laws of nature that govern our Universe, some of which we addressed in the previous chapter of this book. To quote another example, the Big Bang Theory is unable to answer the question as to why the Universe is so near the critical rate of expansion. I like this explanation:

At the moment of Creation God caused our Universe, including space, energy and matter, to begin expanding at an extraordinary rate, which continues to this day. He also created the gravitation force to be precisely balanced with a marvellous precision to match the Universe's powerful expansion force. The Creator used the force of gravity to cause matter to combine together to form galaxies and stars, while the expansion of space caused the Universe to continue to grow in size and not collapse back upon itself.

How precisely did the expansion speed of the expanding space need to be balanced against the force of gravity? These two fundamental forces needed to be balanced to an astonishing level of precision that totally defies the odds of probability! To see what this means Dr David Wilkinson, a Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society, tell us to:

Imagine you had a machine which made universes. On this machine you would have two dials. One dial would control the expansion force of the Big Bang. The other would control gravity, the force which pulls everything back together. Set the dials to whatever you wanted and out would come a universe.

The trouble is you would find it to be a very boring experiment!

After a few billion attempts, you would begin to realize that in order to get a universe which would produce carbon-based life those two dials need to be set quite precisely. If you get the gravitational force too high, then the universe would appear but within a microsecond, gravity would pull everything back together into the opposite of a Big Bang, a Big Crunch!

If you get the expansion rate too high, then the Universe would expand at such a rate that gravity would be unable to form stars and galaxies. In fact, in order to get structure within the Universe these dials need to be balanced to within 1 part in  $10^{60}$  (1 followed by 60 zeros).

In Paul Davies' words, that is the same accuracy as shooting at a target one centimetre square on the other side of the Universe – and hitting it! Why is it that early in the expansion, the expansion force of the Big Bang was balanced so carefully with the gravitational force?

The respected Professor of theoretical physics Dr Paul Davies calculated how fine-tuned the speed of expansion after the initial moment of Creation was and reached this remarkable conclusion:

Careful measurement puts the rate of expansion very close to a critical value at which the Universe will just escape its own gravity and expand forever. A little slower and the cosmos would collapse, a little faster and the cosmic material would have long ago completely dispersed.

It is interesting to ask precisely how delicately the rate of expansion has been “fine-tuned” to fall on this narrow dividing line between two catastrophes. If at time I S (by which time the pattern of expansion was already firmly established) the expansion rate had differed from its actual value by more than  $10^{18}$  (1 followed by 18 zeros), it would have been sufficient to throw the delicate balance out.

The explosive vigour of the Universe is thus matched with almost unbelievable accuracy to its gravitating power. The big bang was not, evidently, any old bang, but an explosion of exquisitely arranged magnitude.

Similarly, Stephen Hawking admitted that, “The odds against a Universe like ours emerging out of something like the big bang are enormous. In *A Brief History of Time* he stated:

Why did the Universe start out with so nearly the critical rate of expansion that separates models (of the Universe) that re-collapse from those that go on expanding forever, so that even now, ten thousand million years later, it is still expanding at nearly the critical rate?

If the rate of expansion one second after the Big Bang had been smaller by even one part in a hundred thousand million-million, the Universe would have re-collapsed before it ever reached its present state.

Richard Dawkins also recognized this problem, and in his book, *The God Delusion*, he agrees that: “If the laws and constants of physics had been even slightly different, the Universe would have developed in such a way that life would have been impossible.”

However, having ruled out the intervention of God, Dawkins concedes that the creation of the Universe cannot have just happened, but that perhaps the reason it did is that there were lots of attempts.

In other words, there could have been many instances of the Universe expanding and contracting until it got to exactly the right conditions, but Dawkins says that science has now discounted that idea.

The other possibility he suggests is that there are billions of Universes, and it just happens that the one we can observe has got it exactly right. But if Dawkins chooses the multiverse hypothesis, what is the evidence to support it? It is a theory based on absolute blind faith!

As we have just seen, many secular scientists have admitted that even infinitesimally small differences in the original explosion that cosmologists see as the starting point of our Universe would have resulted in a world where conscious life would not have occurred. Yet all around us we witness the most precise and complex development of a Universe of incredibly intricate designs, that our scientists have only recently discovered.

The idea of a natural big bang explosion producing such order without the intervention of a supernatural Designer is – as the Oxford Professor of mathematics Sir Roger Penrose says – completely absurd. As we all know a random explosion would merely throw things apart, but, quite mysteriously, the big bang has produced the opposite effect.

## **The Excess of Matter over Antimatter Problem**

Another challenge to the Big Bang Theory is the slight excess of matter over antimatter. Remember the theory supposes that matter – hydrogen and helium gas – was created from energy as the Universe expanded. But experimental physics tells us that

whenever matter is created from energy, such a reaction also produces antimatter. I quote:

Antimatter has similar properties to matter, except the charges of the particles are reversed. So whereas a proton has a positive charge, an antiproton has a negative charge. Any reaction where energy is transformed into matter produces an exact equal amount of antimatter, and there are no known exceptions.

This means the big bang should have produced exact equal amounts of matter and antimatter, and that should be what we observe today. But the Universe is comprised almost entirely of matter, with only traces of antimatter anywhere.

This problem for the Big Bang Theory is more consistent with the biblical Creation account which says that God created everything in the Universe with absolute purpose and divine intelligence. Our Creator created the Universe to be essentially matter only and it is just as well that He did.

As astrophysicist George Smoot pointed out in *Wrinkles in Time*, had the Universe come into existence with equal amounts of matter and antimatter, a vast annihilation event would have occurred, leaving only very few particles of matter and antimatter in scattered isolated remnants. To put this more clearly, our Universe as we know it would not exist!

### **A Model, Not a Verifiable Theory**

It is important to point out here that many other key components quoted in the big bang model of the Universe – and there are quite a few – are no more than estimations. However, the small example of the unanswered questions we have just mentioned above should be sufficient to remind us that, for all its popularity

in certain circles, and for all the apparent confirmations and claims made on its behalf, it constitutes a model and not a verifiable theory.

The earliest moment of the Universe's formation, of which scientists claim to have experimental verification, according to their estimation, is some three-hundred thousand years after the Big Bang, when the radiation released by the formation of the first atoms was detected by the COBE Satellite.

In 1992 the newspapers, television and radios went wild when the NASA Space Probe sent back pictures of the first ripples in the Universe. The whole story revolved around data collected by a satellite called COBE – the cosmic background explorer.

The ripples that COBE discovered were taken as evidence of the seeds from which galaxies had formed after the Big Bang. When the first atoms were formed, a burst of radiation, released in all directions, created a snapshot of how matter was distributed in the early Universe.

The discovery was made by George Smoot and a team of scientists from Berkeley University, California, who received international stardom overnight and was offered two million dollars to write a book on the discovery.

The importance of this discovery was that it seemed to slot perfectly into the current Big Bang Theory, which says that the Universe expanded from a size small enough to fit through the eye of a needle to its present size over billions of years.

But in spite of all the excitement and publicity the COBE Satellite caused, many of its conclusions have occasioned hot dispute among scientists, and everything thought to have happened before that time, and especially in the initial moments is pure speculation and mathematical conjecture. As Edgar Andrews, Emeritus Professor of Materials Science at the University of London, said in *God Science and Evolution*:

No matter how close to the instant of origin one may be able to press the scientific model of the cosmos, it remains impossible for such an explanation to be applied at or before the zero-time point. Thus, it follows that science, even at its most speculative, must stop short of offering any explanation or even description of the actual event of origin.

If this is the case, as Professor Andrews and many others in the scientific field openly admit, then it would be wise for all of us to take heed to the humble and personal conviction of Albert Einstein when he said:

Everyone who is seriously interested in the pursuit of science becomes convinced that a spirit is manifest in the laws of the Universe – a spirit vastly superior to man, and one in the face of which our modest powers must feel humble.

### **Big Bang Also Abandoned**

With all the problems listed above, as well as others too numerous and technical to mention in detail here, quite a few secular astronomers – and Christians alike – are beginning to abandon the Big Bang Theory altogether. Although it is still the dominant model at present, an increasing number of physicists and astronomers have realized that it is simply not a good explanation of how the Universe began.

In the May 2004 issue of *New Scientist* an open letter appeared to the scientific community written mainly by secular scientists who challenge the model. Among other things, these scientists stated:

The big bang today relies on a growing number of hypothetical entities, things that we have never observed – inflation, dark matter and dark energy are the most prominent examples. Without them, there would be a fatal contradiction between the observations made by astronomers and the predictions of the big bang theory.

In no other fields of physics would this continual recourse to new hypothetical objects be accepted as a way of bridging the gap between theory and observation. It would, at least, raise serious questions about the validity of the underlying theory.

This statement has been signed by hundreds of other scientists and professors at various other institutions since its first publication. Despite all of the billions of dollars – and scientists too – that society has given to astronomers in the quest as to the origins of our Universe, scientists have failed to come up with a credible theory to account for its existence. In a 1980 publication of *New Scientist* the astronomer Professor Herman Bondi declared:

As an erstwhile cosmologist, I speak with feeling of the fact that theories of the origin of the Universe have been disproved by present day empirical evidence as have various theories of the origin of the solar system.

In *The Earth: Its Origin, History and Physical Constitution*, the great astronomer Sir Henry Jeffreys wrote:



I think that all suggested accounts of the origin of the solar system are subject to serious objections. The conclusion in the present state of the subject would be that the system cannot exist.

Here Professor Jeffreys admits that none of the atheistic theories can account for the Universe as it exists. Perhaps it would be better for us to return to the first words recorded by Moses in the Book of Genesis!

### **Those Things Science Cannot Explain**

To pull together the main points of this chapter we have shown that the First and Second Laws of Thermodynamics proves that the Universe could not have produced itself, but that it had an initial beginning. We have also shown that there are many unanswered questions and flaws in the Big Bang Theory and that many scientists no longer accept it as a good explanation of how our Universe began.

But even if we were to accept the fact that the Universe as we know it evolved in some incomprehensible way over billions of years, we are still faced with many questions: Where did the necessary energy come from to begin with? What was the source of such energy? Did anything exist before time and space? How did the laws of nature come about? And, most importantly, why is there something rather than nothing; why does the Universe go to the bother of existing?

If an infinite and omnipotent Designer – whose existence explains why science can explain what it can explain, and why it cannot explain everything – is ruled out, then science is left at the crossroads.

One reason for this is because science cannot go any further back than the moment at which the laws on which it leans began to operate. Fortunately for the general public, most scientists honestly admit the limitations of what science can explain in this area. The Danish physicist Niels Bohr, who pioneered quantum mechanics, wrote:

It is wrong to think that the task of physics is to find out how nature is. Physics concerns what we can say about nature... Our task is not to penetrate into the essence of things, the meaning of which we don't know anyway, but rather to develop concepts which allow us to talk in a productive way about phenomena in nature.

Here Dr Bohr points out that a scientist's task is to describe the Universe around us using the mathematical laws of physics. But science is limited to explain *why* the Universe exists or *why* these laws exist, and *why* the Universe follows these particular laws.

In 1997 the BBC ran a six-part series, entitled *Stephen Hawking's Universe*, in which the physicist enthusiastically pursued the idea of a "*theory of everything*," a total explanation of the Universe that could be expressed in a single line of mathematics.

And in *A Brief History of Time* Hawking speaks about a Universe without boundaries of space and time and about "*imaginary time*." However, he finishes his book with these words:

What is it that breathes fire into the equations and makes a Universe for them to describe? The usual approach of science of constructing a mathematical model cannot answer the question of why there should be a Universe for the model to describe. Why does the Universe go to all the bother of existing?

With a similar view to Professor Hawking, the astronomer Sir Martin Rees wrote in his book, *Just Six Numbers*, the following:

Theorists may someday be able to write down fundamental equations governing physical reality. But physics can never explain what breathes fire into the equations, and actualizes them in a real cosmos. The fundamental question of “Why is there something rather than nothing?” remains the province of the philosophers.

If this is the case, then every human being must be a philosopher, because the question as to why the Universe and life itself exists remains the most important and fundamental question for all of us. Every man, woman and child longs to know where we come from and why we are here. Even the hard-core atheist Bertrand Russell self-admitted:

The centre of me is always and eternally a terrible pain – a curious wild pain – a searching for something beyond what the world contains, something transfigured and infinite... I do not find it, I do not think it is to be found, but the love of it is my love.

The only reasonable answer to this question – that is compatible with science and truly satisfying to the soul of each individual – is that there is an infinite, transcendent and omnipotent God, who created the heavens, the Earth and every living creature that breathes upon it!

This is the only answer to what we all feel and know deep inside of us; that however vast the Universe may be, and however small and insignificant we may seem to be in it, there is a divine

meaning and purpose to our existence and that meaning and purpose lies in the hands of our Creator!

*When I consider your heavens, the work of your fingers, the moon and the stars, which you have set in place, what is man that you are mindful of him, the son of man that you care for him?*

*(Psalm 8:3-5)*

## **Why Not God?**

Some people may dismiss all of this as sheer wishful thinking. But if our extremely complex, and incredibly ordered Universe is not the result of natural processes – as the recent scientific discoveries powerfully indicate – why can it not be the result of something supernatural?

The fact that in human beings matter has intelligence, reason, logic, a sense between right and wrong, the capacity to create and, most importantly, an insatiable hunger for meaning and purpose, is in itself a sufficient indication that the Universe has a transcendent and personal origin and significance.

Now there are some who will obviously ask the question, “Who made God?” To such a question the simple answer is, “Nobody.” God is not a Being like all other beings in the Universe that demand a Maker. God’s existence is un-derived and independent. The Bible speaks of Him as the eternal God, who is *from everlasting to everlasting*, and God revealed Himself to Moses as *I Am*. There was never a time when He did not exist and there will never be a time when He will cease to exist.

Moreover, such a question implies that there must be someone or something greater than God, but this only pushes the question further back. Yet however far back we choose to go, we cannot deny the need for an uncreated Creator.

Towards the end of *A Brief History of Time* Stephen Hawking goes on to say that if we should ever discover why human beings and the Universe itself exist then, “It would be the ultimate triumph of reason, for then we would know the mind of God.” The Book of Revelation provides the precise answer to his question:

*You are worthy, our Lord and God, to receive glory and honour and power, for you created all things, and by your will they were created and have their being.*

*(Revelation 4:11)*

This verse tells us that nothing in all Creation needs any justification other than the fact that in His infinite wisdom God willed it to be that way, and in His infinite power He brought everything into being.

At the end of the Creation narrative in Genesis we are told that God saw everything that He had made and it was very good. God called Creation very good not only because He made it, but because the perfect harmony and beauty that the Universe displayed conformed to His wishes and reflected His perfect and beautiful nature.

As we have powerfully demonstrated in the previous chapters, a growing number of scientists in many disciplines are turning in this direction, and are being drawn to the conclusion that divine intelligence preceded and planned the natural Universe and the laws by which it is governed, “*So that what is seen was not made out of what was visible.*”

# 07

## *THE AGE OF PLANET EARTH*

*For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, but rested the seventh day.*

*(Exodus 20:11)*

Over the centuries there have been various interpretations among Christians and biblical scholars when it comes to relating the time scale of Genesis chapter one with the discoveries of modern science. During the last two-hundred years these interpretations have changed, or one interpretation has gained more support over the others.

In order to accommodate the geological ages and the time required for the Theory of Evolution, many Church leaders of the nineteenth and early twentieth century accepted the idea of an *old Earth*, and tried to fit millions of years into the Book of Genesis, by suggesting that the days of Creation in the opening chapters of the Bible were not literal, but figurative for very long ages.

So by the early twentieth century a large part of the Body of Christ adopted the popular belief that the days of Creation were *age days* and the Earth in which we live was billions of years in the making.

These Church leaders quickly compromised the plain teaching of Scripture and used various theories like the *Day-Age View*, the *Gap Theory*, the *1,000 year Day Theory*, and the *Local Flood View* to fit the discoveries of science into God's Word, not knowing that the idea of long ages for Earth's history was developed by geologists whose ideas about the Earth emerged from naturalistic atheistic assumptions, and not from scientific observation.

Only in the last few decades has there been a great upsurge among Christians, and a growing number of scientists, who have returned to the traditional view and interpret the days of Creation in Genesis to be solar days of twenty-four hours. This is because they see this view to be the only one true to Scripture, and the view that fits the scientific evidence far better than the old Earth evolutionary theory.

## **Origins of Old Earth View**

Today, most people around the world take for granted that the Universe and planet Earth are billions of years old. Prior to the 1700s very few people believed in an old Earth. The universal belief among Christians at that time was that God created the world in six literal days and later destroyed the Earth with every living creature upon it by means of a global Flood.

The Dutch anatomist and geologist Niels Steensen was one of the most important geological thinkers of the early seventeenth century. He established the principle of *superposition*, namely that sedimentary rock layers are deposited in a successive horizontal fashion, so that a lower stratum was deposited before the one above it. Steensen believed that the Earth was roughly about 6,000 years old and that the fossil-bearing rock strata were deposited by Noah's Flood.

Over the next century several authors, including the English geologist John Woodward, and the German geologist Johann Lehmann, wrote some books reinforcing Steensen's view. But in the last decades of the eighteenth century the idea of an old Earth began to take hold in geology when men like Abraham Werner, James Hutton, William Smith and George Cuvier used *their* interpretations of geology as the standard to interpret Earth's history.

These men rejected the biblical account of the universal Flood and attributed the rock strata record to natural processes occurring over long periods of time. Although some of them believed in multiple catastrophes, separated by long periods of time, the uniformitarian concept had by that time become the ruling dogma for geologists.

### **Idea of Universal Flood Dies out Completely**

The last massive blow to the catastrophic view came in the middle of the eighteenth century, when Charles Lyell published his very influential book, *Principles of Geology*, a work built upon the ideas of James Hutton. In his work Lyell established what came to be known as the *Uniformitarian Principle*, which states that only present-day processes of geological change, at present-day rates of intensity and magnitude, should be used to interpret the rock record of past geological activity.

In other words, Lyell stated that geological processes of change have been uniform throughout the history of our Earth. By explaining the whole rock record to slow gradual processes, he reduced the global Flood of the Bible to a non-event.

### **Biologists Influenced by Uniformitarian Ideas**

Later Charles Darwin, who was a good friend of Charles Lyell, along with other biologists, applied these slow and gradual uniformitarian processes to biology and developed his Theory of Evolution. Together these geologists and biologists used the Uniformitarian Theory to date the Earth's rocks and biological life and added millions of years to Earth's history.



By the end of the nineteenth century the age of the Earth was considered to be hundreds of millions of years old. Radiometric dating methods were later introduced, and over the course of time the Earth's age expanded to billions of years in the making.

These anti-biblical principles dominated geology right up to the 1970s until men like the prominent British geologist Derek Ager challenged the assumptions made by Lyell and his predecessors. The research and observations of these modern geologists greatly reduced the millions of years involved for the formation of the many geological deposits.

They argued that much of the rock records reveal evidence of rapid catastrophic erosion, or sedimentation, as opposed to long uniformitarian processes.

## **What Are Sedimentary Rocks?**

The sedimentary rocks are the fossil-bearing rocks and are inextricably linked to the Theory of Evolution. Sedimentary rocks generally consist of sediment like mud, sand or gravel that has been turned into rock. Sedimentary rock is usually formed under water and is easy to recognize due to its many layers.

A good example of this would be the layered rocks of the Grand Canyon. There are a lot of fossils around today, which means a lot of plants and animals died and left their fossilized remains in these sedimentary rock layers.

Evolutionists and most evolutionary geologists would have us believe that the formation of these rocks happened over millions of years, during which animals lived, died, and then were occasionally buried and fossilized.

When these fossilized animals and plants are found in the Earth's rock sequence in a particular order of appearance, such as invertebrates in lower layers, followed progressively upward by fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals, for many this is

considered convincing proof for the Theory of Evolution. But what most people are unaware of is that most rock layers are dated by the fossils they contain, and the fossils are dated by guessing their age based on the Theory of Evolution.

## **How Sedimentary Rocks Are Dated**

To date the rock layers scientists will choose a special reference fossil called an *index fossil* and then assume, based on the phylogenetic tree, that the *simple* index fossils were the oldest. Finding one of these *oldest* index fossils in a layer identifies that layer as the oldest. They then assign a date to that rock layer based on the Theory of Evolution and record that date on their geologic time scale.

This process is continued with the more complex index fossils, assigning each increase in complexity to a younger rock layer until they complete filling out the geologic time scale. Some fossils like clams, however, are found in all strata, which makes it difficult to decide which are millions of years old and which are not.

Now herein lies the problem with this method: Although the rock layers of the Earth were dated using index fossils, the index fossils were dated by guessing their age based on the Theory of Evolution. This, as many other scientists have also argued, is not a valid application of the scientific method. But when questioned about it many palaeontologists will tell you that they accurately date the fossil using the date of the rock layer in which it was found.

This means they assigned a date to the fossil, then dated the layer of earth which contained that fossil, and so concluded that they knew the age of the fossil because they knew the date of the layer. This method is known as *circular reasoning*.

Assistant professor at Kansas State University, Professor Ronald West, wrote an article in the scientific journal *Compass* in 1968 where he pointed out the inconsistencies of using the Theory of Evolution to interpret the fossil record. He wrote:

Contrary to what most scientists write, the fossil record does not support the Darwinian theory of evolution because it is this theory which we use to interpret the fossil record. By doing so we are guilty of circular reasoning if we then say the fossil record supports this theory.

The 1954 edition of *Encyclopaedia Britannica* agreed with Professor West:

It cannot be denied that from a strictly philosophical standpoint geologists are here arguing in a circle. The succession of organisms has been determined by a study of their remains embedded in the rocks, and the relative ages of the rocks are determined by the remains of organisms that they contain. This fact alone means that the geologic column cannot rightly be used to prove a vast age for the Earth, any more than it can be used as conclusive evidence for the Theory of Evolution.

### **Rock Layers Deposited Over a Number of Days**

When sediments turn into rock or becomes hard, we say it has become *lithified*. Experts say this occurs during sediment compaction, which drives out the water and glues together the sedimentary grains, and that this process is not time dependent, but rather depends on whether the rock becomes compacted or

not, and whether a source of cement is present, usually a mineral like calcite or quartz. If such conditions are met, sediments can be turned rapidly into rock.

Many such examples of rock forming rapidly have indeed been reported. In May 1980 one of the most devastating volcanic eruptions of modern times took place in Washington State USA. The eruption blew out the entire north face of Mount St. Helen's with a force equal to thousands of atomic bombs.

The blast completely flattened over 500 square kilometres of forest and tore the foliage and branches from trees, even uprooting their heavy trunks. Geologist Dr Stephen Austin, who investigated the devastating eruption of Mount St. Helens, showed that thousands of layers of rock were deposited over a number of days rather than being laid down gradually over geologic ages of billions of years.

This great eruption of Mount St. Helens, and the events which it set in motion, have done much to confirm the speculation that the geological formation of the Earth does not have to be the result of slow uniformitarian processes, but rather of a sudden and worldwide catastrophe.

### **Evidence for Global Flood Shocks Geologists**

In the last forty years geologists have begun to re-examine the role of catastrophe in the history of the Earth. They admit that the vast ages of time required for the formation of the Earth's rock layers are unproven, being based on assumptions about how quickly sedimentary rock layers were deposited in the unobserved past. Biologist and palaeontologist Leonard Brand wrote in *Geoscience Reports*:

The science of geology has abandoned Lyell's rigid uniformitarian view, and is recognizing the important role of catastrophe in Earth's history.

The strongest evidence that the Earth had a catastrophic past comes ironically from the fossils themselves. In today's conditions fossilisation is a rare event. It is supposed to occur when a living organism, whether a leaf of a tree, a fish or a dog, dies and falls to the ground.

Where it falls, either on dry land or into water, it is slowly buried in wind or water borne sediment. But this rarely happens, because as soon as the organism dies, the natural process of decomposition immediately sets in, or they would be eaten by other animals and blown around by the wind and rain until a complete skeleton was no longer available.

On the contrary, the impeccable state of preservation of most fossils we have today shows that these animals and plants were buried very rapidly and virtually alive by vast amounts of sediments before decay could destroy any details of their appearance and anatomy.

Such fossilization under present-day conditions is exceedingly rare, so evolutionary geologists who maintain that the present is the key to the past have difficulty in explaining how the vast number of fossils in the geologic record could have formed.

The only answer at hand is the global destruction of all the pre-Flood animals and plants brought about by the year-long Flood described in the Book of Genesis, though some fossils may also have been formed since the Flood due to localized residual catastrophic events.

Not only did the animals and plants have to be buried rapidly by huge masses of water-transported sediments in order to be fossilized, the vertical order of burial is also consistent with the biblical Flood.

The first fossils in the record are of marine animals; and it is only higher in the strata that fossils of land animals appear. This is because the Flood began in the ocean basins, and the ocean waters then flooded the continents. Following this, the flood-gates of heaven were opened which may have caused volcanism and earth-movement.

If most sedimentary rock layers were deposited rapidly over a short period of time, the animals and plants buried and fossilized in those rock layers may well have all lived at about the same time and then were rapidly buried progressively and sequentially.

### **Noah's Flood Is the Best Alternative**

In light of the evidence at hand many modern geologists now realize that the rock layers contain evidence of rapid accumulation, and that catastrophic processes, as opposed to the uniformitarian view, could just as easily have formed many parts of the geologic record that we see today.

But if we are looking for a worldwide catastrophe to account for the geological record of Earth's history, it would be impossible to discredit the One which is remembered by the whole human race and of which there are accounts in many of the world's historical records.

The well-known anthropologist Sir James Frazer collected over a hundred traditions of a Universal Flood in the folklore of peoples from every continent on the Earth. There are also many written accounts of a Universal Flood in the ancient Sumerian, Babylonian and Jewish literature. Many of these have been uncovered recently through the many fantastic archaeological excavations in the ancient Middle East.

## **Signs of Rapid Burial**

Not only does the biblical Flood explain the burial in water-borne sediment of so many fish, animals and plants, it also accounts for the accumulation of hundreds of fossils in animal graveyards throughout the world.

There are very extensive fossil-bearing rocks in North-Eastern Brazil known as the *Santana Formation*, which contain many of the best-preserved fossils we have today. Of these, the fish are the most extraordinary, as the evidence shows they were all buried quite rapidly before decomposition could set in.

Many of the fossils still have their scales intact, while others still maintain their dimensional form, with soft tissues and petrified eyeballs, just as they were at the moment of death. When a fish dies, one of the first indications of decay is the loss of scales. These fossils of the Santana Formation are a good indication of the extreme rapidity of their burial.

## **Woolly Mammoths Found Frozen in Siberia!**

The permafrost of Siberia, on the Liakhov Islands of Northern Siberia, contains other astonishing animal graveyards. Thousands of woolly mammoths are frozen in the ground as if in some gigantic deep freeze.

Some are found complete with flesh, skin and hair, and even with undigested food in their stomachs. More astonishing still, they are found alongside woolly rhinoceros, musk, ox, saiga, antelope, reindeer, tiger, bear and horse, creatures which we would not expect to find in the frozen wastes of Siberia.

One commentator says, "Many of these were found when the melting ice of Siberia poured out their remains, including a whole woolly elephant preserved fresh in the ice with the grass it was eating still green in its mouth." These creatures did not die in

their beds nor were they eaten by predators. They were overtaken by a sudden catastrophe.

## **Mammoth Bones Discovered in Columbia**

Researchers say that the mammoth bones which were discovered at a construction site on Ironton Drive in West Richland are one of the best archaeological finds ever discovered in Mid-Columbia. These massive bones were excavated and examined by the head of an archaeology team of a Washington university. The Columbian Newspaper recorded the interview:

Martin, head of a university of a Washington archaeology team brought in to examine and excavate the huge bones... *“We can’t say for sure how old they are until we get them back to the laboratory... This is one of the best finds we’ve had. The thing is very well preserved. I’m guessing it’s a mammoth.”* Martin called the site very productive. *“The neat thing about this site is, beside the mammoths, we are finding rodents, frogs, birds, rabbits and other small mammals all close together. Often a find is spread out all over.”*

He said the area of Ironton Drive, one mile from downtown West Richland, was once a flood plain of the Yakima or Columbia River. *“There is some reason that we are finding all the bones together”* he said. *“Somehow this area became a death trap for all of them, probably due to a flood.”*



## Further Proof of Widespread Catastrophe

The Old Red Sandstone, which covers much of Scotland, also contains fossils of thousands of fish buried in their rocks. The self-taught geologist and writer Hugh Miller investigated them in the nineteenth century and concluded that these fish did not die a natural death; they were overcome by a widespread catastrophe. He reported:

The remains exhibit unequivocal marks of violent death. The figures are contorted, contracted, curved; the tail in many instances is bent round to the head; the spines stick out, the fins are spread to the full, as in fish that die in convulsions.

The attitudes of all the fish fossils are attitudes of fear, anger and pain. The remains too, appear to have suffered nothing from the after-attacks of predaceous fishes... The record is one of destruction at once, widespread and total.

Evidence reveals that the fish of the Santana Formation and the Old Red Sandstone were overwhelmed in very large numbers by a sudden catastrophe that killed them and buried them alive very rapidly. Among these fossilized fish there are several which were caught during their dinner, some with a smaller fish halfway down their throat. Whatever happened to them was a widespread and total catastrophe comparable to nothing we see today.

In the Grand Canyon in Arizona there is a stratum of rock known as the *Redwall Limestone*. Geologists reckon that such a limestone would be deposited at the rate of about 30 centimetres per 1,000 years. Not so long ago it was discovered that the Redwall Limestone contains billions of nautiloids with a hard, straight shell, sometimes 60 centimetres long. "Judging from the

way that these creatures lie,” said one expert, “It is plain that they were buried instantaneously in a fast-moving underwater slurry. These rocks would appear to have been deposited in hours rather than thousands of years.”

## **Heaps of Dinosaur Bones Puzzle Palaeontologists**

The extinction of the Dinosaurs has been very puzzling to palaeontologists in their study of the fossil record. According to their timescale the dinosaurs died out about 65 million years ago, due to a disruption of the Earth’s climate caused by the impact of a giant meteorite.

The Jurassic Morrison Formation in Utah and Colorado contains a mass of bones, representing over 300 species of dinosaurs along with some mammals. One report says what is most unusual about these bones is that they are collected together in big fossilized heaps, and not scattered about over the area covered by the rock formation. It appears that they also were brought to their final destination by water and were killed all at once with their bones collected together.

## **Fossilized Trees Span Multiple Layers**

The evidence for a global catastrophe is no less compelling when we turn to the remains of fossilized plants. Fossil trees are often found in an upright position, where a single fossil occupies many geologic layers at the same time. These are referred to as *polystrate fossil trees*.

It appears very unlikely that these trees died and remained partly buried for millions of years until they became completely buried and fossilized. A flood, which would cause massive amounts of earth movement, is a much better explanation for the unique

placement of these fossilized trees and animals that are around the globe today. As another expert in the field pointed out:

Trees broken off or uprooted during a flood would float until they became water-logged. Then the denser root end of some of the trees would sink lower in the water, placing them in an upright position. Later, after completely sinking, the now upright trees would be buried in sediment, much like what happened to many trees when Mount St. Helen's erupted. Anyone scuba diving in Spirit Lake today can find many half-buried upright trees like these.

These fossils, and others that span multiple layers, reject and disprove the concept that geologic layers always represent long periods of time.

Therefore, dating fossils by the layer of earth they are found in to support the Theory of Evolution is not valid. We are not denying the fact that rock layers can be laid down over long periods, but that the existence of such layers in the earth does not prove the passage of any specific time. The eruption of Mount St. Helens and the chain of events which it set in motion have done much to confirm this point of view.

### **Biblical Flood Explains Other Geological Facts**

We have seen that the geological formation of the Earth is not necessarily the result of slow uniformitarian processes, but could also be the result of a sudden and worldwide catastrophe. We have seen that the deposition of sedimentary rocks can take place in a matter of days as opposed to millions of years.

And we have seen how the fossil record shows how many of the marine organisms and land-dwelling creatures perished due to a

global catastrophe when the waters transported their bodies and bones from all over the Earth to their final destination as the Flood waters receded.

We can also conclude that the sequence in which the different classes of animals are found in the fossil record is due to their location in the ecology of the Earth before the Flood, and in their mobility and behaviour during the Flood, and not in the sequence of their evolution, as is supposed.

Moreover, the Flood alone explains the accumulation of the many fossils in graveyards that are found around the world today. Indeed, the many geological facts which are inexplicable from a uniformitarian point of view can only be explained by the words recorded in the Old Testament:

*The waters swelled so mightily on the earth that all the high mountains under the whole heaven were covered; the waters swelled above the mountains, covering them fifteen cubits deep. And all flesh died that moved on the earth, birds, domestic animals, wild animals, all swarming creatures that swarm on the earth and all human beings; everything on dry land in whose nostrils was the breath of life died.*

*(Genesis 7:19-23)*

## **Why Does It Matter?**

The Word of God must be the final authority on all matters about which it speaks, whether it is to do with history, archaeology, science or spiritual issues. Once Christian leaders give way to the secular view that the Genesis account of Creation is not true literal history, but is to be interpreted to fit the latest scientific facts, they leave the way open for this to be done throughout the whole of Scripture.

If the opening chapters of Genesis are not historical, the whole of the Bible is undermined, especially its teaching on Judgement, Original Sin and Salvation, which is the very foundation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

In the first chapter of the Bible we read that when God finished Creation on the sixth day, He called everything “*very good.*” But when we compromise on the historic value of the Creation account in Genesis, by adding millions of years to Earth’s history, we are forced to believe that death and disease were part of God’s Creation before Adam sinned, as the alleged millions of years of Earth’s history in the fossil record shows evidence of animals dying from disease and violence before man appears on the scene, and before sin and the curse.

If we accept millions of animal deaths and thorns before the fall of man, we undermine the character of God and totally contradict and destroy the Bible’s teaching on the full redemptive work of Christ.

The prominent humanist Thomas Huxley pointed this out when he vehemently attacked those who tried to re-interpret Scripture to fit the popular scientific thinking of his day. He argued that if we are to consider the New Testament seriously, we must believe the accounts in the Book of Genesis to be historical truth.

Huxley was convinced that Darwin’s Theory of Evolution had proven that one could not intelligently accept the Genesis account of Creation and the Flood as historical truth, so when people tried to harmonize evolutionary ideas with Scripture, and re-interpret it, he quickly attacked their position.

To substantiate his claims, Huxley pointed out that various doctrines in the New Testament Gospels and Epistles are dependent on the historical reliability of the Creation account in the Book of Genesis, including Paul’s teaching on the doctrine of sin, Christ’s teaching on marriage and His warning of future judgement.

Huxley's point was that the religious leaders of his day had no choice but to accept the evolutionary theory and millions of years for Creation, but for them to be consistent they would have to reject the Bible as a whole.

How the hearts of those Christian leaders of the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, who held on to a literal reading of Scripture in the face of such strong, but false, arguments, would have rejoiced to witness the compelling evidence that scientists of the twenty-first century have produced.

At the expense of their intellectual integrity, these churchmen held to a literal reading of the Creation account in the Book of Genesis and insisted that if the Bible said it was true, then it was, whatever evidence to the contrary science may produce.

## **The Perfect New World**

The sin of Adam and Eve brought sickness, suffering and death into the perfect world that God originally intended for man to enjoy. As a result, the whole of Creation now groans in bondage to corruption and waits with eager longing for the final redemption of the children of God, when all things will be restored to a similar state before the Fall:

*We know that the whole creation has been groaning in labour pains until now, and not only the creation, but we ourselves, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly while we wait for adoption, the redemption of our bodies.*

*(Romans 8:22-24)*

In His mercy, God denied Adam and Eve access to the Tree of Life after they had sinned so that they would not have to live in their sinful state forever. The pronouncement of the death penalty on them was, in fact, both a curse and a blessing.

A blessing because it prevented them from living forever in a state of sin and all its consequences. But because God in His righteousness had to punish sin, He sacrificed animals to make a covering for Adam and Eve. However, such sacrifices could not remove their sin, but could only covert it. They pointed toward the time when the true Lamb of God would come and make the ultimate sacrifice and remove sin *once and for all*:

*And every priest stands day after day at his service, offering again and again the same sacrifices that can never take away sins. But when Christ had offered for all time a single sacrifice for sins, he sat down at the right hand of God, and since then has been waiting until his enemies would be made a footstool for his feet. For by a single offering he has perfected for all time those who are sanctified.*

*(Hebrews 10:11-15)*

Not only has God delivered all those who will come to Him through Jesus from the curse, He has also promised in His Word that He will one day deliver His Creation from its state of decay and corruption and make a New Heavens and a new Earth, where righteousness is at home.

The prophets Isaiah (*Isaiah 11:6*) and John tell us there will be no more carnivorous animals, no more crying or pain, no more death, and that God Himself will dwell with us:

*See the home of God is among mortals. He will dwell with them; they will be his peoples, and God himself will be with them, He will wipe every tear from their eyes, death will be no more; mourning and crying and pain will be no more, for the first things have passed away. And the one who was seated on the throne said, "See I am making all things new."*

*(Revelation 21:3-5b)*