

# The Bible or Darwin?

## Table of Contents

		Carbon 14	45
		Prehistoric	48
		Hutton, Lyell, Darwin.	48
Table of contents	i		
Forward	iii		
The Cosmological Argument	1		
Introduction	4	Darwin's Imagined myth	51
A. Spontaneous Generation	4	Made Up Evidence	51
B. Not Mathematically Possible	6	Challenger Expedition	52
C. Fossil Record contrary to Darwin	10	Gemmules Anyone?	53
D. Have you been <i>Evolutionized</i> ?		Groundless Beliefs	54
		Darwin's Henchmen	55
		Haeckel's Fraud	55
		Photographic Evidence	56
		Whom Will you Believe?	58
BODY of WORK	14		
Darwinian Evolution	14	THE MICROSCOPE TELLS ALL	58
Voyage of the Beagle	15	Scanning Electronic Microscope	58
Missing Evidence	16	Mathematics and the Cell	61
Darwin's Contemporaries	19	The Protein	62
The Rocks Cry Out	20	DNA (deoxyribonucleic - acid)	63
20 <sup>th</sup> Century Fossil Record	22	Probabilities and Darwin	64
New Fossils	22	Conclusion	66
Origin of Life	24	Probabilities and the Lottery	66
Who Believes in Changing Truth?	25	Intelligent Design	67
Be Not Conformed	26	The Case Against Random Chance	69
		(Blind and Ignorant) <b>NATURAL SELECTION</b>	70
What is Source of <i>m-i-l-l-i-o-n-s</i> of years	26	Of Mice and Men	73
Charles Lyell	28	The Enemy	74
James Hutton	29	Call To Action	75
Fire and Earth	32	Call To Reconciliation	76
Hutton's Other Ideas	35	STEPS TO PEACE WITH GOD	77
Not An Ancient Belief	37		
Catastrophism	38	God is GOD	80
Ultimate Purpose	39	Deceived	80
Agent's of Unbelief	40	Deceivers	81
THE DATING GAME	40		
Building On What rock?	40	INTRODUCTION TO BIBLICAL VIEW	83
Mt. St. Helens	41		
		Bible Review	85

Why Did JESUS Come to Earth?	88
Not Everyone that saith Lord, Lord	90
Professor Johnson	91
Translation of Johnson	92
WITHOUT FAITH it Is Impossible to Please God	94
Final Warning	95
Closing Argument	96
Materialism	98
As if a Roaring Lion	100
Call To Peace	100
The Sanctuary	101

# The Bible or Darwin?



**Which do you believe?**  
FORWARD

**THE COSMOLOGICAL ARGUMENT:** You and I can agree that we are here. And we know that we are the result of, or an effect of, two parents. They were the result or an effect of their parents, who are the result of their parents and so forth back to the beginning of the human race. If we trace it all back to a *beginning point, singular event or creation moment*, we must admit that there is only one of two possibilities. Either the human family was created by God in Adam, or as some erroneously now teach, we are an accident of Darwin's evolution. Evolution pretends we were formed in some primordial warm pool, pond or ocean. Dead pond scum came together to become a bacterium type life form. That single bacterial life was supposed to slowly change its DNA from bacteria into both plant and fish. The fish DNA is imagined to have become an amphibian, a reptile, also a bird and a mammal. That mammal, is imagined to be a tree dwelling rat-like creature. It's DNA is pretended to have slowly become a man. Evolution from *bacteria to Beethoven* is not provable or testable. It is a belief system. We are either the imagined (without proof) accident of Darwin's evolution that somehow spontaneously created itself **or** in the beginning God created the heaven and the Earth, the universe and all that is on planet Earth, including man. That Creator is more powerful and immense than the universe at its maximum expanse. HE is more powerful than all the energy in the universe. This Almighty Force must have existed before space, time, matter, energy or the universe. He Himself would have to be Eternal and All Powerful. In short, HE is Almighty God.

This then is the cosmological argument. It states that:

1. All that we observe is caused.
2. Nothing can cause itself.
3. Therefore, everything that is caused is caused by something other than itself.
4. A causal chain does not stretch infinitely backward in time. Therefore, there must be a First Cause.
5. The First Cause is Almighty, All Powerful & Eternal (self existent) and the Creator of things (from nothing).
6. We have found Creator God Who must exist or nothing that we observe can exist.

This argument ended arguments of unbelievers, until it was countered by David Hume (1711- 1776) - a well-known 16<sup>th</sup> century philosopher. His contention was: *an Eternal God is not necessary if the universe itself is eternal*. Hume's position was not as widespread as some assert. **[fn<sup>1</sup>]** An eternal universe, even then, did not appear to be true. It was argued by unbelievers until Albert Einstein's (1879 -1955 ) two theories of relativity. They showed the universe was expanding. An expanding universe is not eternal, as it has a beginning. Support for an expanding universe (a universe that had a beginning) came from observations of Edwin Hubble (1889-1953) the attorney, turned astronomer, for whom the Hubble telescope is named.

**Which do you believe?** God says you were created in His image and have a noble purpose. Darwin says you're an accident with no purpose. Which do you believe? **And** why is it an important question, as to which you believe?

---

<sup>1</sup> It was erroneously alleged by some that Copernicus, Galileo, Francis Bacon, Johan Kepler and Isaac Newton believed in an eternal universe, this is not true. Their writings show these men believed the Bible was true and Almighty God was Creator and First Cause. They were of the handful of men who ushered in modern science, the scientific method, by rejecting the pagan teaching of Plato and Aristotle based upon philosophy not experiments.

It is important, as it answers for each person: “*Why am I here?*” And “*Where will I go when I die?*” What you believe determines how you interact with the world. Your belief molds your behavior toward everything.

One knows he is fearfully and wonderfully created by God; has a purpose in this life and an eternal destiny with God in heaven. He knows Creator-God loves him. He knows God set out rules for his well being. He knows God is the Author of the Bible. He loves and obeys God. He loves and values his fellow man, who is created in the *image* of God. He respects and takes care of all of God’s creation.

In contrast, those who believe Darwin’s imagination, see themselves as *an accident* of evolution. They have no purpose for life. They have no future beyond this life. They have no ultimate rules for life, for their fellow man or for God’s creation. Evolutionists believe their own reasoning is, ultimate authority, thus they often live selfishly, by: “*if it feels good, do it.*” They sometimes roam the school halls with guns in their hands.

You will learn that Darwin’s evolution **is not** a reasonable alternative to the Biblical principle: **IN THE BEGINNING GOD CREATED THE HEAVEN AND THE EARTH** . If you listen with an open mind, you will learn that the Darwinian imagination is **without credible proof** and must be rejected.

We who are truly Christians then have this task of bringing people back to God’s Truth. WHY? Because public schools have falsely taught the last three generations that Darwinian evolution is true and taught that the made up vast ages of the Earth are real. Yet, you will learn that *big bang* and Darwin’s imagined evolution has always been contrary to the scientific evidence and when the known data and facts are considered, big bang and Darwin’s imagined evolution was and continues to be utterly **without credible** proof.

# INTRODUCTION

An unbeliever asks, Can I safely trust the Bible? Hasn’t evolutionary evidence proved the Bible unworthy of belief? When all the time, he should have been asking: Is there any credible proof for Darwin’s imagined evolution?!? NO! And if he sits through our seminars or reads our material, he would discover that evolution *was* and **is without any** credible proof.

The year is 1954. Evolutionist, Harvard Professor, Dr. George Wald (future Nobel Prize winner) published an article in Volume 191 of the **Scientific American**, a respected academic journal. The article has the evolutionary populace reeling.

Wald wrote there were only two explanations for the existence of the universe: 1) **spontaneous generation** (*living matter from nonliving matter*) or 2) **creation** “. . .a single, primary act of supernatural creation.” (*from outside of the universe to bring it into existence*). Dr. Wald said, “**There is no third position.**” He further concluded: “**spontaneous generation**” of a living organism was “**impossible.**” Wald wrote:

**“We tell this story to beginning students of biology as though it represents a triumph of reason over mysticism. In fact it is very nearly the opposite. The reasonable view was to believe in spontaneous generation; the only alternative, to believe in a single, primary act of supernatural creation. There is no third position. For this reason many scientists a century ago chose to regard the belief in spontaneous generation as a ‘philosophical necessity.’ It is a symptom of the philosophical poverty of our time that this necessity is no longer appreciated. Most modern biologists, having reviewed with satisfaction the downfall of the spontaneous generation hypothesis, yet unwilling to accept the alternative belief in special creation, are left with nothing.”** (Wald, George, “*The Origin of Life,*” *Scientific American*, vol. 191, 1954, p. 46.)

Dr. Wald continued:

**"One has only to contemplate the magnitude of this task to concede that the spontaneous generation of a living organism is impossible. Yet here we are -- as a result, I believe, in spontaneous generation."** (Wald, George, *ibid.*)

WHAT?!? You believe in something that you know is impossible? You say you are a scientist? And yet you hold beliefs contrary to scientific experiments and logic?

*Spontaneous generation* (or *abiogenesis*), is here conceded to be impossible. But wait! A type of *spontaneous generation* is a necessary part of non-theistic big-bang evolution. So, since *spontaneous generation* is, as Dr. Wald concedes, "**impossible**" then evolution from nonliving to a living organism could never have occurred. Thus, the **big-bang** evolution taught as true in public school is . . . impossible. . . . Think. THINK!

And this has been known by evolutionists since 1954. . . .

**1954!**

Evolutionists have effectively admitted, since 1954, the impossibility of neo-darwinian or gradualistic evolution. Yet, "evolution" has continued to be taught in the public schools as if true since this 1954 date.

Not only has Darwin's imagined evolution been taught in public schools as if true, the church of Jesus Christ has done virtually nothing to stop this teaching. The church has often condoned it or compromised with it.

Why have Christian churches, the pastors, and especially the seminary professors, failed to teach the impossibility of evolution? If they did, that would confirm faith in the Bible. Why have they, instead, been trying to make God's Truth fit into man's imagination? WHY? **WHY?!?**

As you know, evolution falsely teaches man evolved from bacteria to Beethoven from a primordial ocean of elements that "washed" from rained on rocks. This evolution allegedly took place over the 4.6 **b-i-l-l-i-o-n** years they contend Earth has existed. Do evolutionists believe this is possible? **Not really.**

**IT IS NOT MATHEMATICALLY POSSIBLE.** In 1966 MIT mathematician, Dr Murray Eden, at a symposium at the Wistar Institute in Philadelphia, presented a now famous paper entitled "***Inadequacies of Neo-Darwinian Evolution as a Scientific Theory.***" Dr. Eden demonstrated that one could not expect the first two genes of the ***first bacteria*** to form in **five billion years.** AND this could only happen, he reported, if you had a population of organisms weighing **a hundred trillion tons covering the face of the Earth.** How ludicrous then is the idea of chance formation of life in the primitive ocean of elements from rained on rocks?

At the same time French scientists, stated the mathematical odds were against formation of a single protein by neo-darwinian chance. It is so "mathematically improbable" that such an event could not have occurred.

It was also concluded that for Darwin's proposed *natural selection* to actually have worked there had to be massive numbers of mutations in the DNA. However, molecular microbiologists now insist that if there are ***too many mutations*** in DNA, the DNA would reject them, repair them or (except for a few rare exceptions) reject the cell with the too many mutations in the DNA.

What does that indicate Brother Hughes? It indicates ***natural selection could not work in the DNA.*** Why? The massive numbers of mutations necessary for *natural selection* to be able to randomly work to alter the DNA (and thus form a new species) would kill the cell. **Since** Darwin's imagined "species changing evolution" cannot work in the cellular DNA, where Darwinians concede it would have to work, evolution is impossible! Yes, Darwin's so-called "species changing" evolution is impossible!

So far, in the introduction, we have learned *spontaneous generation* is impossible and thus going from non life (big-bang evolution) via rained on rocks to a living cell, (in the primordial ocean of elements) **is impossible!** Since evolution needs to have at the least one non-life to living incident and since evolutionists concede that non-life to life is impossible, evolution is not a logical, plausible explanation of how life arrived on Earth.

Next we learned that there **has not been** enough time for evolution to work since it would take **five billion years** for *ecoli bacteria to begin* to come into being. Yet, since evolutionists incorrectly allege Earth came to rest here about **4.6 b-i-l-l-i-o-n** years ago, you have only had time to become a developing *ecoli bacteria*. So are you a developing *bacteria*?

Furthermore, evolutionists admit that you would ONLY be becoming a bacteria, **IF**, in place of the imagined ocean of elements from rained on rocks, there was “ . . . a population of organisms weighing **a hundred trillion tons** covered the face of the Earth.”

Sir Fred Hoyle (1915-2001 A.D.), a 20<sup>th</sup> century astronomer of Cambridge University, left Christianity (he said) because Gospel writers didn't agree on the number of angels at the Resurrection. Hoyle became an agnostic. Yet, in 1983 Hoyle wrote of Darwinism that it was “*like a superstition*”:

**"How the Darwinian theory of evolution by natural selection managed, for upwards of a century, to fasten itself like a superstition on so called enlightened opinion? Why is the theory still defended so vigorously? Personally, I have little doubt that scientific historians of the future will find it mysterious that a theory which could be seen to be unworkable came to be so widely believed. The explanation they will offer will I think be based less on the erroneous nature of the theory itself and more on the social changes and historical circumstances that surround its development."** (Hoyle, Sir Fred. *The Intelligent Universe*, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, NY [1983] p.25)

In 1984, human researcher, mathematician and engineer, I.L. Cohen authored “**DARWIN WAS WRONG**” (*A STUDY IN PROBABILITIES*). He demonstrated the mathematical and statistical impossibility of evolution. Cohen also confirmed there were not sufficient DNA mutations for *natural selection* to produce a new species.

In 1985, Dr. Michael Denton, a former evolutionist, authored “**EVOLUTION, A THEORY IN CRISIS**.” He presented many glaring weaknesses of the Darwinian invention and the growing evidence against evolution. Marvin Lubenow wrote “**BONES OF CONTENTION**” (1992). He disclosed the problems, hoaxes and frauds in so-called human evolution. In 1993, the author of **DARWIN ON TRIAL**, (1991) Professor Philip Johnson of Berkeley, invited several elite evolutionists and philosophers to Parjao Dunes, in California. Those men, no longer satisfied with Darwin's fancy, argued for the idea of *Intelligent Design*. One of those participants, Lehigh University PhD Dr. Michael Behe, wrote of *irreducible complexity*. (**Darwin's Black Box**-1996)

Dr. Behe was then an evolutionist and is a lifelong Roman Catholic. Dr. Behe had adopted the Catholic church's position of *big-bang evolution* as the method God had used for creation. However, after study, Dr. Behe rejected Darwinism as it was **impossible** at the molecular or biochemical (microscopic) level. He explained in **DARWIN'S BLACK BOX**, (*THE BIOCHEMICAL CHALLENGE TO EVOLUTION*) that evolution could not produce the first cell. Why? The cell is irreducible, awesomely complex and interdependent.

Three more 20<sup>th</sup> century volumes repudiated Darwinian evolution. In 1997 MIT's Lee Spetner, PhD convincingly attacked neo-darwinian evolution in his work, **NOT BY CHANCE**. University of Pittsburgh evolutionist, Dr. Jeffery Schwartz wrote **Sudden Origins** in 1999 stating there were now billions of fossils. But, there is not any chain of fossils leading from one species to another. Also in 1999 (*two years before his death*) astrophysicist, PhD Sir Fred Hoyle, (1915-2001 A.D.) known for the *STEADY STATE THEORY* and for coining the phrase **big-bang**, published **Mathematics of Evolution**. That book also showed Darwin's imagination to be mathematically impossible.

Lastly, you will remember that neo-darwinian *natural selection* needs a large amount of DNA mutations to produce a **species change**. However, molecular microbiologists indicate that the number of mutations necessary for Darwin and neo-darwinian imagined *natural selection* to work would result in the DNA either rejecting them or repairing them. And except for a few rare deleterious exceptions, when there are that many mutations it would kill that DNA and eventually the cell. That cell would be ushered out of and flushed from the system.

Thus there could be no first life, not only because of its impossibility to come from non-life, but also enough time has not yet passed, as it would take **five billion years** for the genes of the first bacteria to develop. (if there was “. . . a population of organisms weighing **a hundred trillion tons** covering the face of the Earth”). Finally, without an abundance of DNA mutations (so many that the organism would cease to exist) there could be no species changing evolution. Therefore, Darwin’s imagined evolution is **without credible proof**.

So we see the community of science does not uniformly support Darwin. There have always been many who vehemently opposed Darwin’s imagination. PhD scientists continue to oppose Darwin’s imagination.

The early 21<sup>st</sup> century continues to publish works hostile to Darwinism. In 2001 A.D. John Ashton published articles by fifty PhDs who contend God created **in six days**. While ***Unlocking the Mysteries of Life***, a 2002 A.D. video featuring many Darwinian evolutionists and former Darwinian evolutionists, concludes that complex, complicated life is a result of *Intelligent Design*. Dr. Walter Brown, spoke of Intelligent Design in his updated seventh edition of ***In the Beginning*** (2003A.D.) A DVD, ***The Privileged Planet*** (2004 A.D.) and Dr. Danny Faulkner’s ***Universe By Design*** (2004 A.D.) gave more support to a Creator of the solar system in which planet Earth has been placed. No thinking scientist any longer adheres to Darwinian evolution. And they are beginning to seriously doubt the *big-bang*.

But, Brother Hughes wasn’t there some evidence that evolution took place? . . . **No.**

**THE FOSSIL EVIDENCE IS AGAINST DARWIN.** Darwin wrote that if his theory was true, the fossil record would be “replete” (filled) with **chains of fossils** showing slow, step by step changes from one species to another species. But, Darwin wrote there was **“not any such chain”** in the fossil record of Darwin’s day. Do you understand? There is **not** one chain of fossils leading from one species to a new species. **NOT ONE!!!**

How did Mr. Darwin respond to that evidence? He said there had not been enough rock formations dug up yet. BUT, he hoped (in writing) in 1859, that future searches would find the fossil evidence. Was this evidence ever found? . . . **NO!**

One Hundred Eighteen (118) years later, in 1977A.D., after countless expeditions and millions of fossils had been unearthed, evolutionists admitted that there was no species changing evidence in the fossils. Harvard professor Stephen Jay Gould, and Niles Eldredge, a curator of The American Museum of Natural History, New York City, then concluded the fossil record did not then and would never support Darwin’s evolution. Was this taught in the public school **or** church?

It would be wonderful if I could state that the church and its professor-teachers have now come to grips with evolution, and have begun to teach that evolution is **without credible proof**, but they have not. The man in the pew struggles because he is taught two conflicting and contradictory positions -i.e. the Bible Truth and Darwin’s imagined evolution. He is therefore an ineffective witness of the Truth and for God and the Bible.

So why are not the pastors being taught the serious problems of evolution in seminary or Bible School? Why also are the pastors not educating the people of God to the fact that evolution is impossible? Is it because they are without the requisite knowledge? Or . . . have they been *Evolutionized*?

**“Have you been *Evolutionized*?”** God says in the Bible:

¶ **My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge:** because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to Me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children. Hosea 4:6

This stern warning admonishes us to reject anything contrary to God’s revealed Truth. This would include evolution.

God’s people are being destroyed for lack of knowledge of His law, and for accepting as if true man’s ideas which have been exalted above the knowledge of God. What about you? Have you exalted man’s ideas above the Word of God? Have you been “*Evolutionized*?” Allow me to give you a quick test in the form of a question:

Is it **possible** for dinosaurs to be alive today? The way you answered, in your mind, will reveal whether or not you have been “*Evolutionized*.”

**CHRISTIAN CIVIL ENGINEER:** In the summer of 2002 A.D. I was working with some other men (actual physical labor-smile) on an addition to the *Mt. St. Helen’s 7 Wonders Creation Museum*. At a lunch break I asked a Christian municipal civil engineer: Is it **possible** for dinosaurs to be alive today? He matter-of-factly said, “**No. Of course not.**”

To verify that he was responding to the question about possible living dinosaurs, I asked:

“Do you realize that when you state that you do not believe it is **possible** for dinosaurs to be alive today, you are admitting that you do not believe the Bible’s account of creation?”

“**What?!?** Yes, *I do*,” he said, a little irritated.

Calmly, but firmly I said, “No, . . . you do not. . . .

Would you allow me to explain?”

He had gotten to know me over our few days of working together. He knew I urged prayer when we encountered something about the construction we did not understand. He mentioned he heard me praying, “*Lord, guide my hands, even when I don’t know You are guiding them.*” He believed my thoughts worthy of consideration. I said:

**The Bible says all land breathing animals were created on the sixth creation day. That includes cattle, sheep, apes, snakes and dinosaurs. (*I continued*), If you consider large sea serpents (the plesiosaur) as dinosaurs, they were created on the fifth creation day. Also, the Bible paints a word picture of a live dinosaur clearly in Job, chapter 40 (verses 15-19) known as *Behemoth*.**

Nowhere does the Bible say that any of these land breathing animals had special reason to go extinct. Now granted, dinosaurs may not have been able to survive the climate changes after the flood. But, there is no reason a Bible believing Christian *could not believe* in the possibility of dinosaurs being alive today. On the other hand, in grade school and high school, evolutionists emphatically teach dinosaurs have been extinct 65 m-i-l-l-i-o-n years. No evolutionist can believe evolutionary teaching and also believe that dinosaurs are alive today. Yet, there is no conflict, for Bible believing Christians between Bible creation and the statement dinosaurs may be alive today.

He sat there silently as though processing what I had said. Then his expression changed and indicated that he had come to a conclusion as he silently nodded twice. I asked if I could send him a booklet concerning the subject (of having been evolutionized). He said that he would like that. An earlier form of this booklet is the material sent to him.

This seminar-booklet admonishes Christians to stop hiding out in the church. Come out! Look at the evidence presented in the scientific community, then realize that: darwinian evolution is ***without credible proof***. It never has had any basis in scientific fact.



Allow me to say that again!

Darwin's evolutionary imagination has never had a scientific basis, no factual scientific evidence. And Darwin admitted that his imagined ideas were contrary to the geologic evidence of his day. Thus Darwin's evolution has always been "**speculation**" from the imagination of Darwin's mind and contrary to the evidence.

Darwin's ideas exalt themselves against the knowledge of God and the true evidence. We are admonished (warned) in the Bible to cast (throw) down (to squash), everything that exalts itself against the (**true and faithful**) knowledge of God. [fn<sup>2</sup>] These materials are prepared to prove to inquiring minds, including youth directors, pastors and Christian laymen that Darwin's evolution is wrong! We will outline the facts against evolution so you can know *and boldly teach* the evidence against Darwin's imagined ideas.

**Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ; II Corinthians 10:5**

---

<sup>2</sup> 4) (For the weapons of our warfare [are] not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;) 5) Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ; 6) And having in a readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled. II Corinthians 10:4-6

# Body of Work

**Darwinian Evolution?** Allow me to begin at the beginning. Charles Darwin (1809-1882 A.D.) was born February 12, 1809, (the same birth date as Abraham Lincoln). Charles Darwin was the son of a well-to-do physician in England, Dr. Robert Darwin. It is reported that the doctor was 6'6" and weighed 320 pounds. Charles' mom was from the Wedgewood china family. She died when Charles was eight. The young man was then taught at a nearby boarding school. In 1825 Charles, being groomed to follow his father's profession, enrolled at University of Edinburgh. Charles didn't have the "stomach" for surgery. But, remember the practice of surgery then and for years to follow was a rather barbarian form of the healing arts by 21<sup>st</sup> century standards.

Surgeons performed surgery in street clothes. Cleanliness was not important. Doctors *usually* wiped off surgical tools with a cloth, but carried them from patient to patient in a doctor's bag. There was no sterilization or real cleansing of instruments. Infection was therefore, a common side effect of the simplest surgery. One in five surgeries was an amputation, performed with very little or no pain killer. Approximately one half of the amputation patients died of infection, secondary infection, shock or a combination of the three.

Other methods of medicine included bleeding patients to rid them of the "bad blood." It was **not** uncommon to bleed them of one half or more of their total blood supply. We now know it can be fatal to bleed. We give blood transfusions. Dehydration was prescribed by physicians. Now we hydrate. Doctors prescribed blood sucking leeches for infections. Leeches spread infection. And the leading cause of death was infectious tuberculosis. It is now believed doctors were the carriers. The

state of academic and scientific knowledge in those years was rather crude by 21<sup>st</sup> century standards.

While there were many brilliant minds, it was in this rather undeveloped environment of misunderstanding, that Darwin was educated. But, in 1827, after his problems with surgery, the 18-year-old Charles Darwin moved to Christ's College, Cambridge.

**Christ's College?** Yes!

***Most people are shocked to learn Charles Darwin was not trained as any kind of scientist, but . . . instead to be an Anglican (Episcopal) pastor*** at Christ's College Cambridge. Charles completed his pastoral studies in 1831. While at Cambridge, Charles met Professors John Henslow (1796-1861) and Rev., Dr. Adam Sedgwick (1785-1873). These men encouraged Mr. Darwin to take an around-the-world cruise on H.M.S. Beagle as an unpaid naturalist, before his first pastorate. On their advice, Darwin signed on for the global voyage.

**VOYAGE OF THE BEAGLE:** According to Darwin's *Voyage of the Beagle*, the H.M.S. Beagle, under Captain Robert Fitzroy, set sail on 27 December, 1831, taking five years to circle the globe.

When Charles boarded the Beagle, in 1831, he quoted the Bible as "the" answer in matters of morals. The sailors chided him for his beliefs. This slowly eroded his belief in the Bible. Also, while on the voyage, Charles Darwin read, at least, the first two volumes of Lyell's *Principles of Geology*. Soon Darwin interpreted what he saw, based upon what Lyell had written. Darwin began to believe in ***uniformitarianism***: (vast ages of Earth). That is the philosophy of slow, incremental changes in Earth geology. Darwin imagined this process could be extended to living things. He attempted to impose this process on birds, animals and plants. By the time they reached the Galapagos islands (1835) Charles had adopted Hutton's vast age pronouncements. From what Mr. Darwin saw, and the

application of the ideas of Hutton, Darwin later *imagined* a process that Darwin fantasized would cause one species to become another.

The ideas developed on this voyage markedly altered his life. When young Charles Darwin returned to England on 2 October, 1836, the decision to take the ocean trip before beginning his career as a pastor had sabotaged his ministry career. How could he take Holy Orders with no belief in the Bible? He lost his belief primarily because of Lyell's teachings.

On this trip, Mr. Darwin (trained to be a clergyman), switched his allegiance from God by reading the Lyell volumes. Each was "a prime" motivating factor, leading, twenty-three years later, to the publication of ***On the Origin of Species, By Means of Natural Selection, Or The Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle For Life***, in 1859. What Charles Darwin published was not based upon the evidence ***on*** or ***in*** Earth. It was ***not*** based upon his college training. (*Remember that Darwin was trained to be a pastor and never studied geology or other Earth science classes.*) He was not, as some allege, a naturalist. Thus it was his imagination that had been at work since the voyage that prompted this work.

**Missing Evidence:** In the work, Darwin also wrote some very telling statements indicating that evolution was a product of Darwin's imagination. If evolution had been true, he said we would find millions of fossils [fn<sup>3</sup>] (*innumerable*) slowly changing, from simple to complex in the fossil record. BUT, Mr. Darwin in ***Origin of Species***, conceded the complete absence of a chain of fossil evidence to support his imagined ideas. **I quote:**

---

<sup>3</sup> A fossil is the imprinted remains of a once living organism: plant or animal found in the rocks. It can be an imprint, skeleton, bone, tooth, footprint, etc. These are all parts of the "fossil record."

In the sixth chapter I enumerated the chief objections which might be justly urged against the views maintained in this volume. Most of them have now been discussed. One, namely the distinctness of specific forms, and their not being blended together by innumerable transitional links, is a very obvious difficulty. I assigned reasons why such links do not commonly occur at the present day, ...

But just in proportion as this process of extermination has acted on an enormous scale, so must the number of intermediate varieties, which have formerly existed on the earth, be truly enormous. Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? (Darwin, Charles. *On the Origin of Species, By Means of Natural Selection, Or the Preservation of Favoured Races, In the Struggle For Life*, Chapter 9, Online (6th?) edition, first published by John Murray 1859)

If your imagined ideas were correct, Mr. Darwin, there indeed should be “enormous” numbers of fossils (**millions upon millions**). There should be “intermediate varieties” (extinct animal fossils changing from one species into another). For example, there should be thousands of fossils showing a mouse front leg changing into a bat wing, if evolution was ever true. How many thousands or millions of intermediate varieties did you find before you wrote down your ideas in 1859? Mr. Darwin replied: (I quote)

**Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory. The explanation lies, as I believe, in the extreme imperfection of the geological record.** (Darwin, Charles. Ibid. underline and **emphasis** added)

**Translation:** There is no evidence of a chain of fossils (dead animals) linking one species to another. . . . NONE!

But, Mr. Darwin, you wrote there **should be some “truly enormous” numbers of chains of fossils**, **IF** your evolution was

true. So since there is no chain, to quote you, “not . . . any such . . . chain,” doesn’t that tell us darwinian evolution is not true? This is **devastating** evidence against Darwinian evolution. Don’t you, Mr. Darwin, acknowledge **that** when you write it: “*is the most obvious and gravest objection . . .*” against” your imagination?

People are stunned to learn Darwin’s imagined ideas were in opposition to the facts. A study of fossils found in rock strata of Earth, **did not** reveal “**any**” chain of evidence to support Darwin. The fossils opposed Darwin’s imagined ideas.

A continued translation of Darwin would be: “*I believe*” there is no proof because of the “*extreme imperfection of the geologic record.*” In other words, Darwin argued they have not dug up enough rocks yet to see what the complete record will show. But, when they dig up enough rocks, Darwin really, really, really hoped it would prove his imagination true.

**WHAT?!?** Is this supposed to be science?!?

How was that received by the scientific community?

First you must know Mr. Darwin was very nervous about what other scientists would think. He spent part of another chapter in the book apologetically naming great scientists of his day whom Darwin feared, would **all** reject his imagined ideas (*but perhaps one*). Charles Darwin wrote. I quote:

“. . . We see this in the plainest manner by the fact that all the most eminent paleontologists, namely Cuvier, Owen, Agassiz, Barrande, Falconer, E. Forbes, &c., and all our greatest geologists, as Lyell, Murchison, Sedgwick, & c., have unanimously, often vehemently, maintained the immutability of species. But I have reason to believe that one great authority, Sir Charles Lyell, from further reflexion entertains grave doubts on this subject. I feel how rash it is to differ from these great authorities, to

whom, with others, we owe all our knowledge. Those who think the natural geological record in any degree perfect, and who do not attach much weight to the facts and arguments of other kinds even in this volume, will undoubtedly at once reject my theory. . . ." (Darwin, Charles *On the Origin of Species*, chapter 9 6<sup>th</sup> Edition -Online edition London, John Murray 1859).

**Darwin's contemporaries:** But, Brother Hughes, didn't the great majority of well-known scientists of Darwin's day support Darwin? No way! Not on your life! Nunca. Ni en pintura. That can be translated roughly into: "No way." "Not in a million years."

**ILAUGHED:** One of the "greatest geologists," named by Darwin was Professor, Rev. Dr. Adam Sedgwick. He was the head of the geology department at Cambridge, a most prestigious British university. It was Darwin's former college. Professor Sedgwick read Darwin's book. He wrote to Darwin that his book was laughable and deceptive. Sedgwick wrote to Darwin about certain parts of the work, "**parts I laughed at till my sides were almost sore; . . .**" Sedgwick concluded Darwin's position untenable and absurd. Sedgwick went on to condemn "**other parts . . . because I think them utterly false and grievously mischievous.**" Sedgwick's letter quotes are found on the internet at <http://www.ucmp.berkeley.edu/history/sedgwick.html>

**Another of the scientists referred to by Darwin in** the above quote in *Origin of Species* (and other places in that work) was J. Louis Agassiz (1807-1873 A.D.) a Harvard professor.

Professor Agassiz was Darwin's contemporary. Agassiz wrote he was "*ignorant of where the darwinian school drew the facts on which it claims ground to state that . . .*" organisms evolved. Professor Agassiz further stated "*Darwin and his henchmen did not present facts which could prove that organisms descended from unlike types. . . .*" Scientific evidence was against Darwin and "*his henchmen.*" (Agassiz, L. J. Darwinism-Classification of Haeckel: - <http://www.athro.com/general/atrans.html>)

Agassiz elsewhere said highly complex organisms had been found in the oldest fossil bearing rocks. This clearly proved there was no evolution of species as Darwin contended. Why?

Darwin imagined life evolved from simple to complex and had been evolving since the earliest days of Earth. If the earliest fossil bearing rocks did not contain the simple or single celled organisms, then Darwin's simple to complex dream was wrong.

Also Darwin wrote the number of transitional fossils (fossils changing from one species into another) must have been "*truly enormous.*" But, there were no "facts on which" to settle this imagined belief. There was no record of simple to complex, slowly changing fossils in the geologic record. Therefore, the fossil findings of 1859 said, "NO" to evolution. Do you understand why?

If evolution had been true, Darwin wrote you would find enormous numbers of chains of fossils revealing ever so slowly, step by step, changes in fossils **as one fossil species changed** from simple to complex into another species. A pre tail or a pre wing would begin to appear, BUT NOT ALL ALONE. There would be generation upon generation slowly changing. In each generation there would be a small change to ever so slightly bigger. It should grow slowly bigger until it was functioning. **BUT, the fossil record of Darwin's day revealed just the opposite!** There was **not one chain** of slowly changing fossils from species to another. There were many highly complex organisms in the oldest fossil bearing (Cambrian layer of) rocks WITHOUT any evidence of the slow changes Darwin imagined. There was absolutely **NOT ONE** example of even one species changing or changed into another life form. NOT ONE!

Harvard Professor Agassiz declared evolution was not and could **not** be true. Why? Because there was no evidence, not one chain of *fossils changing from one species into another.* And *the oldest fossil bearing rocks displayed complex fossil forms with no evidence of changes from simple to complex.*

**THE ROCKS CRY OUT:** Remember that according to Darwin there **should have been** evidence of life gradually appearing and then changing from one species into another. This should

first appear in the oldest rocks. Yet, in the lower 1/3 of the oldest rocks the fossil record of 1859 revealed that there was not a single fossil. There were also no fossils found in the **second oldest** 1/3 of the rocks. This was proof against the imagined slowly evolving simple to complex changes Darwin proposed.

And what is more important is what was found in the strata of rocks two thirds of the way up. It was not simple life. It was not one species changing into another. No, at the first level of fossil bearing rocks, the Cambrian layer, there was the sudden appearance of highly complex fully developed life forms. Thousands of them. AND ALL with no evidence of prior evolving life forms. This was devastating to Darwin's imagined theory.

WHAT?!? There was no evidence of evolution?

Then **WHERE** was evidence for Darwin's ideas?

YES! Where was the evidence for what Mr. Darwin proposed? IT DID NOT EXIST! Darwin made it up in his mind. And Darwin knew it. Folks it is all made up. Always has been.

When one looks at the rocks and fossils (geologic evidence), the only scientific conclusion from the data is: **highly complex life forms suddenly and explosively appeared in the fossil record without any prior simpler life forms in the fossil record**. That is evidence against Darwin.

Do you understand? The 1859 evidence of the geologic record rejected Darwin's proposed simple to complex species changing evolution. *The rocks cried out* against Darwin, but cried out in favor of the Biblical creation edict: **"IN THE BEGINNING GOD CREATED THE HEAVEN AND THE EARTH . . ."**

All the evidence was against Darwin. Many eminent scientists of his day were against Mr. Darwin. Yet, you will

remember Darwin hoped his slow, gradual, simple to complex speculation would one day be revealed in the fossil record. Darwin said he believed the only reason the fossils did not confirm his imagined ideas were true was because of "**the extreme imperfection of the geological record**." In other words, more digging up of rocks would verify his ideas. So **was the evidence ever found?** No!

**20TH CENTURY FOSSIL RECORD:** We have already mentioned that Darwin's hoped for evidence was never found and that in 1977 A.D., Stephen Jay Gould (1941-2002A.D.), Harvard professor and Niles Eldredge, a curator of The American Museum of Natural History, New York City, concluded the fossil record did not support Darwin's evolution. But we did not quote them. The quote should leave no doubt in your mind that these men were rejecting Darwin's gradualism. Gould observed about the fossil record:

2 **Sudden appearance:** In any local area, a species **does not arise gradually by the steady transformation of its ancestors; it appears all at once and "fully formed."** [fn<sup>4</sup>]

Hmm. Do I understand correctly? Contemporaries of Darwin rejected his imagination. The 1859 fossil record was against Darwin. Darwin needed fossil proof. Evolutionists searched for proof for more than one hundred years. They found hundreds of thousands of additional fossils. But there was **not one set of fossils** changing from one species to another. This supported the earlier conclusion: **no simple to complex record**. . . . Darwin was WRONG!

**REMEMBER THERE WERE NEW FOSSILS?** The university of Pittsburgh Professor, evolutionist Jeffery H. Schwartz, published

---

<sup>4</sup> Gould, *Evolution's Erratic Pace*, Natural History, May 1977, p.14

his 1999 book, ***Sudden Origins***. The professor stated that they had found **billions** of new fossils, but no transitional chains of fossils leading from one species to another. He concluded that those who believe in Darwin's imagination or those who hold to more rapid (punctuated) evolution, know they need a significant number of fossil generations to appear in the geological formations, for one distinct "kind" to evolve into a more complex kind. Professor Schwartz wrote that there ought to be a sizable number of true transitional structures preserved in the fossils.

Then he dropped the bomb!

Schwartz noted **there are billions of non-transitional structures found**. But, (*with the exception of a few very doubtful creatures such as the controversial feathered dinosaurs and the alleged walking whales*) there is no chain of transitional fossils. Instead of filling in the gaps in the fossil record with so-called missing links, honest, thinking paleontologists discovered the absence of transitional chains in the fossil record. Thus, there was no evidence to support Darwin's imagined evolution. (*Schwartz, Jeffery H. **Sudden Origins** -New York. John Wiley, 1999*)

Are you still questioning *WHY* we conclude that Mr. Darwin was wrong? With all the evidence that is against his belief system, his imagined evolution, can you not now see? Do you now realize that his belief system was ***without credible proof?***

Come let us reason together.

Dr. Schwartz indicated that **billions** of fossils had been found. ***But*** there was no evidence of the innumerable changes (chain of fossils) from one species to another, as Darwin proposed. NOT ONE! Darwin wrote these would be found to prove his imagined gradual evolution. After more than one hundred years of searching, 20<sup>th</sup> century evolutionary PhDs Gould, Eldredge and Schwartz confirmed: Darwin was wrong.

His contemporary, Professor Agassiz was correct in declaring the fossil record said, "No" to Darwin's imagined evolution.

The 21<sup>st</sup> century fossil record continues to say "No" to Mr. Darwin's speculated imagination. ***It isn't going to change.*** After all, the evidence against him, is carved out in solid rock.

Darwin's hoped for proof was never and will never be found. And as Darwin admitted, in *Origin of Species*, the lack of fossil evidence was a "*most obvious and serious objection*" against his ideas. We could stop our inquiry here and conclude, based on Darwin's admission and the current (*almost one hundred fifty years of*) evidence, ***Darwin was wrong!***

**ORIGIN OF LIFE:** Darwin, *who improperly speculated all species on Earth evolved without God*, conceded evolution could not produce "first life." Mr. Darwin tried to overcome the question of ultimate origin or **first** life. Thus, in the last chapter of ***On The Origin of Species***, he confers on God a small "walk on" role to start first life:

***" . . . powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one;. . . "***

Darwin concluded life ***had not*** spontaneously arisen ***BUT*** after the first "few forms" or "one" Darwin imagined all other life was produced via random chance and *natural selection* [fn<sup>5</sup>] over **m-i-l-l-i-o-n-s** of years. But, the evidence is against Darwin.

Darwin proposed that after a first beginning by God, God was thereafter not relevant to the production or creation of any *kinds* or species. However, the Bible tells us clearly ***God created all the land breathing animal kinds on the sixth creation day.*** The

---

<sup>5</sup> The term **natural selection** was a term used by Darwin to convey the idea that **nature itself was a breeding selector** of those traits which were supposed to be beneficial to survival of the species. It was supposed to be at work only in life forms that reproduced.

Bible is contrary to Darwin's ideas that God made one or a few first lives that then evolved into all other life forms up to and including man. Darwin did not believe God created **man** "in His own image."(Gen.1:27) or breathed into man the breath of life and therefore the Bible and Darwin are irreconcilable.

At one time unbelieving philosophers thought cell life was quite simple and that **simple** life came from **non**-life on a regular basis. Now molecular biologists assure us that the smallest cell is more complicated than our most advanced 21<sup>st</sup> century computer. Did the computer just come into being by accident creating all of its own parts and assembling itself? Of course not! Yet, evolutionists want you to believe that something far more complicated (the cell) came into existence by accident. RIGHT!

**WHO BELIEVES IN "CHANGING" TRUTH?** The fossil record of 1859 **did not** support Darwin (Darwin-1859: Agassiz-1863). Darwin hoped fossil record evidence would be found. It never was found (Gould, Eldredge 1977, Schwartz 1999). Yet, evolutionists of the 20<sup>th</sup> century falsely claimed the fossil record as their "proof." In 1960 A.D. Dr. Carl Dunbar, PhD, wrote:

**Although the comparative study of living animals and plants may give very convincing circumstantial evidence, fossils provide the only historical, documentary evidence that life has evolved from simpler to more and more complex forms.** (Carl O. Dunbar, PhD (geology) *Historical Geology*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1960, p.47)

However, by 1981, this view was no longer their "truth." Thus Oxford zoologist Ridley, wrote:

**In any case, no real evolutionist, whether gradualist or punctuationalist, uses the fossil record as evidence in favor of the theory of evolution as opposed to special creation.** (Mark Ridley (zoologist) Oxford Univ.; *WHO DOUBTS EVOLUTION?* New Scientist, vol. 90, 25 June 1981, p.831)

**Conclusion:** Evolutionists proof or truth is ever changing. They claimed (until 1960, as proof for Darwin's imagination) the fossil record (which was known to be contrary to their position). Twenty-one years later they depart from **faith** in the fossils as "**the**" basis for evolution, to then say no evolutionist uses the fossil record "as evidence." Wow! What *changing* . . . "truth?"

**BE NOT CONFORMED:** Christians must **not** be conformed to this ever changing evolutionary ideology. Why? Not only is it in opposition to the Bible, it is contrary to the facts. Today, many former evolutionists do **not** pretend Darwin's evolution is true. Yet, public school students (for about five generations) have been propagandized, *brainwashed with* or filled with the fable of Darwin's evolution. It is "**the**" belief system taught, as if true, in public schools. And they teach it in science sections. WHY? It is not testable, replicable science. And it is something contrary to the evidence. It is, at best, a "made up" belief system.

## What Is the Source of this M-i-l-l-i-o-n-s of Years Idea?

Is the idea of *m-i-l-l-i-o-n-s* or *b-i-l-l-i-o-n-s* of years based upon facts? Is it based upon historical writings? Is the basis for this idea (radiometric dating) based upon scientific infallible proof?

Although this could be approached in many ways, for instance plowing into the way radiometric dating works, I believe a personal recollection might best give us a good starting point. So allow me to go back to my college days.

I was on a “joint dig” with students from CBN (Regent) graduate school and William and Mary College in Virginia. We came across what I believed was a piece of petrified wood. It was not unusual to me. I had seen them in my home in northern Michigan. But we were in some gravel pits where thousands upon thousands of yards of top soil had been dug away and we were supposedly down to levels deposited, at least, thousands of years ago. But the students from William and Mary and their professor became very excited at what I thought was a piece of common petrified wood. We had found, they declared, a fossil bearing rock. They were thrilled at this find.

The professor instructed them to be very careful and to document what they had done and probably told them to preserve or mark the site, et cetera. Then in the process of taking the fossil bearing rock back to the college, he said, “Don’t forget to mail it into the dating lab in at least three different sections or pieces.” The students all chuckled and laughed. I did not understand the humor.

I thought, “*Why are they going to mail it into the dating lab in at least three different sections?*” “*Are they making certain that the lab is accurate?*” “Why?” So, I asked.

“*Why do you mail it into the lab in at least three different sections?*”

The students all looked at me with smiles on their faces. And the professor looked at me somewhat surprised and then realized that he had “a new uninitiated kid.”

So chuckling he said to me:

***“They often come back with dates of more than a million years difference in age from the same rock specimen!”***

The other William and Mary students all laughed.

I WAS SHOCKED!!! More than a million years difference in age? How can that be? Wasn’t I told by my high school biology teacher and my college science professor that this radiometric, isotopic dating was infallible, scientific proof of the vast age of the earth? And here it was a joke! An inside joke of geologists and geochronologists. And they really KNEW that radiometric dating was a joke! It obviously did not work if when testing the exact same rock specimen (that was formed at one time when a piece of a mountain broke or fell off or a volcano exploded out a rock) would test millions of years difference in age. Now I was upset!

That Regent-William and Mary joint-dig and the revelation that the dating methods were inaccurate (and an inside joke of geologists and geochronologists) is what first caused me to begin to doubt the vast ages of the Earth. I begin to search for evidence as to whether or not these vast age ideas were based upon fact. Or were they as inaccurate as the professor admitted? If they were this inaccurate, what was the source of this vast age ideas? If it is so inaccurate, why is it so imbedded in the public educational system? And why is the church not speaking out against it to reveal the truth?

**Vast Ages:** To better understand this (millions or billions of years) vast age idea is only a belief system, not based upon fact or evidence, we need to meet and learn about the other key men responsible for the belief system. A belief system that (not accidentally) challenged belief in the God of the Bible. The three major players were: Mr. Darwin, who built upon the *uniformitarian* ideas of Charles Lyell, who had forged his ideas upon James Hutton’s complete vast age fantasy.

**Charles Lyell (1797-1875 A.D.)** Who was Charles Lyell? Much could be written about Charles Lyell and his life, yet it is sufficient for us to know: 1) Lyell was not a geologist. 2) He was not trained in any **scientific** field. What was his training? Most are amazed to learn 3) Lyell was educated as an attorney. Thus an



attorney (Lyell) wrote the **three (3)** volume work entitled *PRINCIPLES OF GEOLOGY* (1830-1835).

***An attorney wrote geology books?*** Yes.

Charles Lyell is credited with “making popular” Hutton’s vast age belief system: “**uniformitarianism**” in his three volume geology work. Lyell falsely contended that **all** Earth’s geology results from slow, gradual, continual, virtually eternal, erosion. This young attorney, Lyell, advocated the Hutton ideas with great force and believability. Lyell then had a profound effect on a clergyman, who was acting as a ship’s scientist (*naturalist*), named Darwin. As Mr. Darwin took a five-year voyage on the H.M.S Beagle, he read at least two of Lyell’s volumes. Thus, *Lyell* is the man who links Darwin to Hutton’s vast age ideas of **uniformitarianism**.

Mr. Darwin knew (but the world at large does not know) the assumption upon which evolution’s vast ages was based were views of a man named James Hutton. But, who is James Hutton? What was his background and education? Was he qualified to make such pronouncements? Why do we hear so little of Hutton?

**James Hutton (1727-1797 A.D.)** James Hutton is not well known except to those in related areas of study. James Hutton should be known widely, since his imagined ideas of vast ages of Earth, have “held captive” geology and other branches of science, now, for more than a century. His ideas were popularized by Lyell, then by Darwin. Darwin tailored the ideas that were supposed to apply to dead geological things, such as rocks to his imagined slow, incremental plant and animal evolutionary imagination. The Hutton-Lyell ideas were essential to the Darwinian imagination. Darwin knew he needed ***m-i-l-l-i-o-n-s*** of years for his imaginations to have ever been true. Darwin needed the vast-age philosophy. He spread the vast age ideas widely throughout society. It was a challenge to Creator

God. And indeed, it was James Hutton who fathered this revolution.

**Background:** James Hutton, as a young Scottish man, was *ever learning*. First he studied the **law**. (Another lawyer, you ask?) Well not exactly. When Hutton was clerking (apprentice in a law office), he spent much time helping a friend invent a process, rather than on his duties. Hutton was dismissed from his clerkship (fired). Hutton went back to school and earned a medical degree. After a short time at the practice of medicine, (some report no practice of medicine) Hutton, who had inherited a farm, became a farmer. (But, Hutton and his friend continued to develop the process). Now with other income, farmer Hutton became more interested in studying rocks and dirt of his land than in farming. (Yet, admittedly, Mr. Hutton did enjoy some farming success).

Soon Hutton began to speculate about the shape of Earth and how all dirt and rocks came to be. Hutton decided that *the key to the past is the present*. The thought of the era before Hutton (and most now believe) ***the key to the present is the past***. Hutton believed the opposite and imagined all Earth could be explained by a model of slow, gradual, continual erosion. Therefore, it was not God (Hutton alleged) and the Bible flood that was responsible for the topography of Earth, but natural forces.

Hutton’s delusions (*of natural processes, devoid of a supernatural Creator*) were not only contrary to the Bible, they were contrary to belief of Earth scientists of his day. It was a “reversed view” of Earth geology. His belief denied the dominant teaching of that day: **catastrophism** and the Biblical flood. And at first, Hutton was laughed at by the majority of the scientists of his day. BUT, there was a hard core of non believers who did not want to believe that everything was created by God or that God had once judged the world with a worldwide flood. So they searched and searched for an explanation of the world without God. Finally Hutton hatched the idea. It was nurtured by

unbelievers, of whom Hutton was one of its spokespersons. Is it a product of the imagination of men's minds?

Well, there is no historical record that the process Hutton imagined continued for as long as Hutton proposed. It could **not** be verified by any written or oral record. All of oral traditions (*the flood legends*) opposed Hutton's fancy. These flood legends were entirely consistent with the fact of the Biblical flood of Noah. [fn<sup>3</sup>] Furthermore, the vast majority of the educated people who worked in Earth science opposed Hutton.

So vast ages were **imagined and made up** by James Hutton?

YES!

AND . . . that's it?

THAT IS IT !

Didn't I tell you that it was so simple that you would ask, as did I, "***Is that all there is to the vast age rebellion?***" The simple, honest answer is: a profound **YES**.

---

<sup>3</sup> There are many legends of a great world wide flood. Native global flood stories are documented as history or legend in almost every region on earth. Old world missionaries reported their amazement at finding remote tribes already possessing legends with tremendous similarities to the Bible's accounts of the worldwide flood. H.S. Bellamy in *Moons, Myths and Men* estimates that altogether there are over 500 Flood legends worldwide. Ancient civilizations such as (China. China has such a legend, as does Babylonia, Wales, Russia, India, America, Hawaii, Scandinavia, Sumatra, Peru, and Polynesia) all have their own versions of a giant flood and a family that was saved and repopulated the Earth. <http://www.nwcreation.net/noahlegends.html>

And Lyell, the lawyer who wrote geology books was Hutton's vast age champion persuader?

THAT'S RIGHT!

Charles Lyell took the imagination of James Hutton and applied it to Earth geology. Now, men, who did not love God, men who wanted to cause you to have doubt and unbelief in the Bible, these men seemingly had a logical rallying point. For with the made up vast ages of Hutton and Lyell, they could cause you to doubt the Bible time line. They would have you also doubt the Biblical flood. They know that if you doubt those parts of the Bible, you would, of course, question the entirety of the Bible.

Vast ages were **invented** by men. But these men, did not say they were Godless. They, like King Herod, of old would have said, bring me word as to where is this new born Messiah, that I might worship Him also. [fn<sup>4</sup>] But, they have no intention of worshiping. They want to kill the Word of God.

The same technique is often used today, in the public schools and sadly (we must admit) in the church seminaries. It is an insidious attack against the Bible and God. It will, if left unchallenged, lead men to hell.

**FIRE AND EARTH (SLOW, CONTINUAL EROSION):** Hutton speculated about the fire in the Earth being responsible for everything. (That is not a Biblical view.) But did erosion and fire under the Earth come together? Hutton noticed dirt eroding (falling into) a creek. Dirt and worn rocks on Earth will erode into streams and be carried to rivers. (*You see, you start with some*

---

<sup>4 7)</sup> Then Herod, when he had privily called the wise men, enquired of them diligently what time the star appeared.<sup>8)</sup> And he sent them to Bethlehem, and said, Go and search diligently for the young child; and when ye have found [him], bring me word again, that I may come and worship him also. -Matthew 2:7-8

*truth*). Rivers carry this dirt to the ocean to be deposited upon the ocean floor. The extra weight builds up pressure forcing the ocean bottom downward.

Now Hutton was back to his fire. Here he began to allow his imagination to run wild. Hot magma (fire-rock) under the ocean had in the long distant past, (*Hutton imagined*) while no one was watching, (*Hutton fantasized*) responded to the pressure of extra weight of the dirt, forced earth plates to thrust upward forming brand-new mountains. Next, Hutton supposed mountains eroded grain by grain over *m-i-l-l-i-o-n-s* of years. Thus fire, by natural processes, Hutton said, caused mountains and the mountains eroded into the sea causing more mountains and again it happened and again, almost eternally. And if you add to that hallucination, an imagined eternal universe, you no longer need God. Hutton was saying it was not God's creation and it was not God's flood. If that is true, then Hutton wanted you to believe, God was not Creator or Judge. (Hutton wanted you to doubt the entire Bible).

One must admit that Hutton did in fact see erosion taking place. We can see it every day. That was a fact. Dirt does fall into streams. Dirt is carried to rivers as mud and silt. Rivers do deposit the silt (dirt) into oceans. Weight would cause pressure on the crust of the Earth. Magma does exist and it is fire in the Earth. These are established facts. However, that is the end of fact. WHERE FACT ENDS, FANTASY (OR IMAGINATION) TAKES OVER! NO one had ever seen mountain ranges popping up as Hutton imagined. No one had a record of an old mountain range eroding into the sea. There was no evidence of this happening over and over on a continual basis.

Hutton now imagines that this replaces all catastrophic events, including the flood of Noah's day as an explanation for the geology of Earth. And if that is true, then there was no judgement of God by flood. If there was no judgement of God, then man can do as he wants. And Hutton wants you to further

imagine and believe that there is no Creator God. Thus, Hutton hopes you ultimately conclude that the Bible and Christ are all myths.

But, beware Hutton, Lyell and Darwin lived in an era when it was popular to confess a belief in God, then they would have an audience who would listen. So they said,

"We believe in God." "We can look at the order in the universe and say there must be a God."

Yet they did not believe in the Creator God, described in the Bible. ***Beware of such men.*** Remember that belief in a God **is not** enough. As James warns us, writing under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit: the devils (*demons*) believe in God. [fn<sup>5</sup>]. And if the devils believe there is one God, we obviously know that it is not enough to believe in one God.

WHY do you say that Brother Hughes?

The same Bible tells us that hell was prepared for the devil and his angels [fn<sup>6</sup>]. These demons, who believe and tremble, are not going to heaven. Why would we believe that we could have eternal life with God, just by believing the eternal fact of God's existence? Man has sinned and separated himself from God. God made One Way for man to come to Him. That is, of course through recognizing our need and accepting Jesus Christ.

---

<sup>5</sup> Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble. -James 2:19

<sup>6</sup> Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: Matthew 25:41

The Way is not through a belief in big-bang evolution. No, these men (Hutton, Lyell and Darwin) and their followers are really saying you do not need to believe in the Creator God of the Bible. They want **you** to join them in their unbelief. They want you to believe that you are foolish and naive for KNOWING such a God and believing His Bible is Truth.

Yet, when we examine the facts and the evidence, we find that it is the belief of Darwin, Lyell and Hutton that is contrary to the facts and evidence. We find the evidence that our universe was created by and Intelligent Creator to be far more credible. We discover that the basic cell is so incredible, complex and irreducible, that it could only be designed, programed and yes created by an Eternal, All Knowing, God. What we conclude about Darwin big-bang evolution is that it is this evolutionary belief system that is utterly **without credible proof!**

**HUTTON HAD OTHER UNUSUAL IDEAS.** Finally we close this section, by seeing that Hutton had similar beliefs that we would never accept as true. Hutton thought the universe, (God's creation) as seen, **was an illusion of men's minds.**

WHAT?!? The sun, moon, stars, comets, Earth, the oceans, the mountains, the plants, the trees, and you and I are not real??? Doesn't society usually **confine** those who cannot distinguish between imagination and see reality as an illusion?

If we further follow the Huttonian reason, that the real world (God's creation) was an illusion, then Hutton might well have you imagine that God was also an illusion. Why? God says in the Bible that God created Earth, not as an illusion, but as a real place. God said HE created Earth and the universe all that therein is, in **six** days. Those are the facts of the Bible. But, if the universe is an illusion as Hutton wants you to believe, there is no God higher than Hutton's imagination or reason. Hutton would allege there is no Creator God, as God describes Himself in the Bible.

Yet, with all this conflict against God and the Bible, James Hutton labeled himself Christian. How? On the basis that he believed in one God. Hutton was in a "think group" that exalted their ideas above the knowledge of God as revealed in the Bible. [fn<sup>7</sup>] We know that belief in one God is not enough.

How much should you believe of a man (Hutton) who after much thought, decided the universe is an illusion? Didn't he have to come to this conclusion against all the evidence of his senses? Well Hutton came to his geological conclusion in a similar manner, musing over rocks and dirt to speculate, without proof, that Hutton's imagined ideas explained all Earth geology. Hutton, then reduced his mental dream (imagination, speculation) to writing in his "**Theory of the Earth**" (1785 & 1795).

The Hutton belief may have gone the way of other unusual ideas, but it was supported by another Scotsman, John Playfair, in his *Illustrations of the Huttonian Theory* (1802). But, the **uniformitarian** view of Hutton was **not** widely accepted until a third Scotsman, attorney, Charles Lyell, wrote his three-volume work: **Principles of Geology** (1830-1835) There he adopted the Huttonian fiction that Earth's geology is explained, not by God and the Bible, but by natural, slow, continual processes such as erosion that he said had been happening almost eternally (**m-i-l-l-i-o-n-s** of years).

---

<sup>7</sup> Mr. Hutton's "think group" that exalted the reason of man over God, included David Hume, a philosopher and author who opposed the supernatural and declared all Biblical miracles, **including the resurrection** of the dead, a violation of naturalism. Mr. Hutton was surely affected by these contacts and the beliefs of that group. If you believe the Bible is untrue and you search for support for your belief system, you might come up with the imagined ideas, now labeled **uniformitarianism**.

AND THAT IS THE SUM TOTAL OF WHY MANY BELIEVE IN THE VAST AGES OF THE EARTH!

Is that all there is to it, Brother Hughes? That is it!

**NOT AN ANCIENT BELIEF:** However, this method of slow, incremental, vast Earth age calculation: **uniformitarianism**, has been used by evolutionary geologists for **ONLY** less than two hundred fifty (250) years. Before Lyell's publication (**1830**), which spread Hutton's ideas, no credible geologist believed **uniformitarianism** described Earth geology.

Did you hear me? NO CREDIBLE man of science believed this imagination: (now labeled **uniformitarianism**) until Charles Lyell.

Brother Hughes, are you certain of that?

Let us consult professor, astronomer, theorist, author, vast age, Sir Fred Hoyle, PhD. (1915-2001A.D.). **I quote:**

**"... The great geologist Charles Lyell (1797-1875) repeated and extended Hutton's observations in the field, and soon came to the conclusion that Hutton's "principal of uniformity," as it became called, was indeed correct. Lyell's "Principles of Geology," the first volume of which appeared in 1830, was in considerable measure responsible for the disappearance of the Biblical time scale from all serious discussion. Indeed, Lyell's books were largely responsible for convincing the world at large that the Bible could be wrong, at any rate in some respects, a hitherto unthinkable thought." (Hoyle, Sir Fred. *The Intelligent Universe*, NY 1983, p. 29)**

As further proof of the common man's belief, we turn to William Shakespeare's plays. Shakespeare wrote for the masses and his plays held the common beliefs of his day. In the play, *As You Like It*, the female lead Rosalind says:

*The poor world is almost six thousand years old*, (William Shakespeare (1564–1616). *The Oxford Shakespeare. As You Like It*, Act IV. Scene I - (See: **The Complete Works of William Shakespeare**, Garden City Books, Doubleday and Company, Garden City, New York 1936 p. 687)

Yet these imagined ideas of Hutton's (of ***m-i-l-l-i-o-n-s*** of years) sound familiar. They are what you were taught in elementary science. They are being taught in the seventh, and eighth grade, high school and college. But, are they true? **NO!** There are a part of the fantasy of James Hutton. The fantasy that took over, where the facts ended.

**Conclusion:** And you thought they were teaching you ultimate reality or fact. Not true. **Hutton's ideas were not based upon fact or recorded history.** His vast age ideas came into being, after facts (reality) ended. And we remember Hutton's speculation was not only against the teachings of the Bible, but was also ***in opposition to*** the conventional belief of Earth scientists of his day, such as the noted Abraham Gottlob Werner (1749-1817A.D.), a German geologist. Thus, Hutton's conjecture of geology made little progress in his day.

**Catastrophism:** The opposition to Hutton's fantasy was from well known prominent members of the then scientific community. Abraham Gottlob Werner [1750-1817]; Georges Cuvier [1769-1832] anatomy, vertebrate paleontology); Louis Agassiz [1807-1873] glacial-geology, Ichthyology); Louis Pasteur [1822-1895] biogenesis law; pasteurization) These and many they influenced, believed the Biblical flood of Noah and its resultant ice age and other violent acts explained Earth. Most scientists taught and believed in the principle of **catastrophism.**

Catastrophism teaches Earth geology is best understood by focusing upon sudden violent actions (volcanos, tornados, floods, the flood of Noah et cetera) that produce long standing geological structures such as Grand Canyon or Mt St Helen's volcano and

its resultant geology. Since Earth's geology is best explained by catastrophism, Hutton's ideas are contrary to reality.

Many PhD's today believe in **catastrophism** and the Bible as the most logical report of Earth geology. You may wish to read articles by fifty (50) PhDs compiled by John Ashton in a book ***in six days*** Master Books 2001A.D.

**What is the ultimate Purpose?** Was not Hutton, through Lyell, really asking: *HAS GOD REALLY SAID EARTH WAS CREATED IN SIX LITERAL DAYS ONLY THOUSANDS OF YEARS AGO?* What is the ultimate source of all ideas that exalt themselves above the knowledge of God and call God a liar?

Many, including this writer, when first confronted with the idea that the devil was behind it all, chuckled. I was much too wise, and much too sophisticated, to believe that the devil was behind it. After all, I had graduated from a Big Ten University. I had graduated from Law School and attended graduate school.

But then I begin to think, "who is the real source of all lies?" Who was the first one to introduce sin by his lies? Did not Jesus identify him as the "father of lies?" For some, it is, at first, hard to grasp. Who was deceived Eve? And what was the ultimate purpose of the one who deceived Eve? Was it not to have her (and Adam) believe that God was not telling the truth? And what is the ultimate purpose of evolution? Are we not being asked to believe that the Word of God is, at least in part, a mistake or a lie? Is the purpose to deceive as Eve was deceived? Is it by the same creature of God that we are being deceived? You must decide! Is the Bible true, or are we to believe the imagined ideas of James Hutton?

"**Uniformitarianism**" then is a view from the imagination of James Hutton (1726-1797). Why do public schools insist we must believe it? There is no "scientific" reason, such as observation and replication to believe that all Earth geology has

been going on the same way for ***m-i-l-l-i-o-n-s*** of years. The idea was his speculation from the imagination of Hutton's mind.

You are not obligated to believe some man's imagination. You are especially not obligated to believe it when the vast ages, he proposes are not proven facts. But your faith in God and the Bible has been attacked since you were a child. This is true, especially if you had a public school education.

**MODERN AGENTS OF UNBELIEF:** The attack on your faith began in public school, before you read the Bible. Who was the agent of unbelief? It was your trusted and perhaps beloved elementary teacher. He or she began your walk down the pathway of unbelief with these seemingly innocent words:

**Today, boys and girls, we will learn about dinosaurs, who lived m-i-l-l-i-o-n-s of years ago in prehistoric times.**

You heard these words before you were in the fourth grade and every year thereafter. It was spoken to you by a public school teacher you respected and perhaps loved. She or he would not (*you believed*) lie to you. But, knowingly or unknowingly they had attacked your faith in the Bible. They had introduced you to the vast age imagination of James Hutton.

But, Brother Hughes, haven't they come up with accurate, infallible, scientific, dating methods to support vast age ideas? Glad you asked that question. I admit some have told us they have scientific, accurate dating methods, but do they? Hmm, if we only had a way to check them out to see if they were really accurate. Are they correct or is it all a part of their dating game?

## **The Dating Game** **(The Radiometric, Isotopic Dating Game)**

**BUILDING ON WHAT ROCK? (Uniformitarianism Geology?)**

Is the Earth **m-i-l-l-i-o-n-s** of years old? Does it really take **m-i-l-l-i-o-n-s** of years to tear down mountains or to form rock canyons more than 100 feet high as we were taught? **IF** we only had an event, **the date of which we knew**, we could check the dating methods for accuracy. **WAIT. We do!**

## **Mt. St. Helens, Washington**

*(last full eruption date: May 18th, 1980 A.D.)*

On May 18th, in the year of our Lord, 1980, Mt. St. Helens sat majestically at the end of Spirit Lake Highway. It was a beautiful snow-capped mountain often enveloped in low moving clouds. It looked as solid as any mountain. Certainly it appeared as if it would stand for ages. It was the conventional teaching that Mt. St. Helens would stand for ages as it slowly, grain by grain, eroded into mountain streams. The mountain streams would carry it to rivers. Rivers would take it (*grain by grain*) to the sea. However, conventional public school teaching was about to receive a most dramatic lesson in **catastrophism**.

At 8:30 A.M. this then was the picture: a beautiful snow-capped mountain that would stand for ages. Yet, suddenly and explosively at 8:32 A.M. a 5.1 magnitude earthquake struck on the bulging north side of the mountain. The bulging mountain collapsed outward and crashed down the side of the mountain. It was the largest land slide in recorded history. In three minutes the mountain had lost thirteen hundred (1314) feet off of the top. (*So much for grain by grain erosion over m-i-l-l-i-o-n-s of years*).

With the north side's protective rock covering gone, the built up pressure **exploded** with the destructive power equal to and exceeding the atomic bombs dropped on Japan to end World War II. The blast devastated the area. It leveled millions of one hundred foot trees in a one hundred fifty (150) square mile area. After the blast magma (*hot molten lava*) flowed down the mountain. The 2000°F heat melted the ice and snow and created a hot mud flow that careened down the path of least

resistance. In hours mud blocked rivers and created new lakes. (*And it was not grain by grain erosion over m-i-l-l-i-o-n-s of years that created lakes and blocked up rivers*).

There was some after shock activity that continued for two years. During the two years, there were three distinct sedimentary flows. In one of the after shocks, a mud flow carved through solid rock forming one hundred foot deep canyons in hours. (Oops! *Again it was not Uniformitarian grain by grain erosion over m-i-l-l-i-o-n-s of years*).

Years later (*in 1986 A.D.*) new lava domes began to form as more magma escaped from Mt. St. Helens. Now we know there is zero *radiometric age* when magma comes out of the volcanic eruption. It is only after magma encounters the earth atmosphere, that the radiometric clock begins to date the rock. Thus the date in 1986 would be zero ya (*years ago*).

In 1997, A.D. governmental authorities gave permission for geological rock samples to be gathered from Mount St. Helens (*Washington state*) for dating. Material was taken from the site of the new lava dome (*dacite*) formed in 1986 A.D. (However, we admit it is possible that some of the 1980 eruption may have been mistakenly taken). Thus, in 1997 A.D., five specimens were taken from the eleven-year-old (1986) dome at five different locations. They were tested to determine their age. The rock was subjected to conventional radiometric dating (*Potassium-Argon, etc.*) in established geochronology labs. (*Remember the rock should have dated eleven years old or too young to date*). The dating results indicated ages of lava rock to be **500,000** (ya) to almost three million years old. WHAT?!? Evolutionists admit these dates are wrong! Mt. St. Helens dating embarrassed them.

WAIT?!? We know **when** this dome formed. (*The earliest possible date of new lava would be the initial eruption of May 18, 1980 A.D.*) When we date rock of known age, we test the accuracy of

the vast age claims. WHAT do we find? We see obvious failures. Don't you begin to suspect radiometric dating?

Yet, we are instructed, by evolutionists that when we date rock of **unknown age**, the results are "scientifically" accurate. We are usually reassured by them telling us that the computations are "computer assisted" or "computer generated." Are those dates trustworthy or is it all a part of the Radiometric Dating Game? [fn<sup>8</sup>]

Why is this question about whether the dating methods are accurate important? Well, Bible believing Christians and Jewish believers **know** the Bible indicates life has only existed on the earth for a few thousand years and that all was created by God. But, if these radiometric dating methods had been accurate, then a part of the Bible would not be true. And if part of the Bible is not true, then how can we believe the rest of the Bible? After all did not the same Holy Spirit inspire it all?

In public school, we were told radiometric dating methods appear to give powerful support to the statement life has existed

---

<sup>8</sup> **Radiometric Dating** is supposed to estimate the age of rocks using calculations based on the decay rates of radioactive elements such as uranium, strontium, and potassium. By decay rates it is meant certain elements go through stages of change from one kind of element to another. The element that was there in the beginning is called parent element. The element that remains (after the decay of the parent element) is said to be the daughter element. Therefore, if the measurements were correct, you could, they allege, date the rock, by comparing the amount of a parent element supposed to be present at the time of the measuring event, such as a volcano erupting out hot molten magma which becomes lava. Hot lava does not begin its "decay" or its dating, until it comes out of the eruption. Then after a time, you compare the amount of element in the rock to the amount of a daughter element. If half of the parent is missing, it is said to be a half life and depending upon the age established for the half life of the rock (*half life equals the number of years estimated for the parent to daughter breakdown and loss of one half of the parent element*).

on the earth for hundreds of **m-i-l-l-i-o-n-s**, even **b-i-l-l-i-o-n-s**, of years. We are falsely instructed that of all the radiometric dates measured, only a few percent are deviant (anomalous, wrong). Evolutionists give the false impression that all but a small percentage of the dates computed by radiometric methods agree with the assumed ages of the rocks in which they are found and agree with each other. This is not true! . . . How do you know that Brother Hughes?

BECAUSE WHAT YOU ARE NOT TOLD is that more than one half of the dates obtained, are **absolutely KNOWN TO BE INACCURATE!** **They are rejected by evolutionary geologists!** (And these inaccurate dates are left out of the "studies" used by the evolutionist which conclude that radiometric dates are accurate).

We have already learned that rocks of known ages **do not** date properly. In the Mount St. Helen's example the rock should have tested as "too recent in origin to measure," not one half **m-l-l-l-o-n** to almost three **m-l-l-l-o-n** ya (*years ago*). These "pretended to be accurate" dating methods are quoted as proof of vast ages, by the same ones who reject more than one half of them. They use the half of the dates (*the ones they accept*) to create a false impression that they are accurate. Then they use these skewed results to oppose the Bible time line. Thus, evolutionists are using dating methods they KNOW are inaccurate to oppose the existence of The Eternal, Uncaused, Infinite, Almighty God. NOT SMART!

How would you feel standing before the Great White Throne Judgment and telling God that you did not believe in Him or accept what His Son's death on the cross for you and you rejected God because of tenuous radiometric dating proved His Bible to be inaccurate? DEFINITELY, NOT SMART!

Most of those who know God's Word is true, and thus know His Biblical time line is accurate, unfortunately **do not**



know the strong evidence against the “pretended” (*to be accurate*) radiometric dates.

**CARBON 14** Brother Hughes what about **C-14** fossil [fn<sup>9</sup>] dates? I now understand that there is no record of any chain of evidence from one species to another, but haven't those fossils been dated at more than **m-i-l-l-i-o-n-s** of years old? And doesn't that call the Bible time line into question?

You do not understand, do you? Okay! Let us put that silly idea to rest right away.

More than one third of a century ago, Professor Brew commented on the accuracy of C-14 dates:

**If a C-14 date supports our (evolutionary) theories, we put it in the main text. If it does not entirely contradict them, we put it in a foot note. And if it is completely ‘out of date,’ we just drop it.” (do not mention it at all). Few archeologists who have concerned themselves with absolute chronology are innocent of having sometimes applied this method, and many are still hesitant to accept C-14 dates without reservation.**  
[www.pathlights.com/ceencyclopedia/06dat5.htm](http://www.pathlights.com/ceencyclopedia/06dat5.htm) Symposium on prehistory of the Nile Valley reported by T. Save-Soderbergh and I.U. Olsson, Institute of Egyptology and Institute of Physics, respectively, University of Uppsala, Sweden. The title of his talk was “*C14 dating and Egyptian chronology*” in *Radiocarbon Variations and Absolute Chronology*, Proceedings of the Twelfth Nobel Symposium Ingrid U. Olsson (editor), Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm and John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York, (1970, p. 35) Cited by Pense, 3 (1):44.

C-14 dates fossils. Almost all of the other dating methods date the rock, not the fossil. But aren't we almost back to the

---

<sup>9</sup> Fossils are evidences of dead past life of plants or animals such as imprints, foot prints, bones, teeth, skeletons, a leaf or any remnant of an organism from the past. These animals and plants once had life and preserved in the rocks that form earth's crust.

same question we had from Mt. St. Helens? i.e. Are the radiometric methods that date rocks accurate?

Radiometric (isotopic) rock dating is **not accurate!** And evolutionists knew that more than twenty-five (25) years before the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Consider the following quotations:

**It may come as a shock to some, but fewer than fifty percent of the radio carbon dates from geological and archaeological samples in northeastern North America have been adopted as “acceptable” by investigators.** (J. Ogden III, *Annals of the New York Academy of Science*, volume 288 pp.167-173 (1977).

Finally allow me to close this segment with two quotes:

**It is obvious that radiometric techniques may not be the absolute dating methods that they are claimed to be. Age estimates on a given geological stratum by different radiometric methods are often quite different (sometimes by hundreds of millions of years). There is no absolutely reliable long-term radiological ‘clock’.** (*The Science of Evolution*: New York Macmillan Publishing Co. p.84 1977)

**... Only in a few cases geologically meaningful ages were obtained. In the majority of cases the ages are clearly off and the data disappear in a lab-data file.** (Jagoutz, E., 1994, *Isotopic systematics of metamorphic rocks*, p.156)

**It surprises most people to learn that these radiometric dating methods have long been known to be inaccurate. Most of us have had a science or biology teacher (or professor) tell us of the unquestioned scientific, radiometric dates of *m-l-l-l-l-o-n-s* or *b-i-l-l-i-o-n-s* of years for the rocks of Earth. Yet, the inaccuracy of these dating methods is an inside joke of the professors and researchers who work in the evolutionary field of dating.**

These inaccurate dating methods therefore are not valid proof for Hutton-Lyell and Darwin's slow, incremental, vast age

imagination named: **Uniformitarianism**. WHY? Because when we have rock of known age, it does not date properly. And because evolutionary geologists declared in writing (*as early as the year of our Lord, 1970*) that C-14 dating methods and other “radiometric dating” often are wrong. Thus, vast age is really without credible proof. And realize, before Lyell’s publication (**1830s**) which spread Hutton’s fancies, no credible geologist believed **uniformitarianism** described Earth geology.

As to the date of the introduction of vast ages, read the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, textbook. In 1985, two hundred (200) years after Hutton had first published, in Section 9, *Geologic Time and Earth History*, p.211, declared:

**“Almost 200 years ago James Hutton recognized that the earth is very old. But how old? Scientists tried to date the earth for many years, but their attempts were not very successful. Instead they had to rely on techniques which helped them place events in their proper order without knowing how long ago each event occurred. . . .”** (p. 211)

. . .

**During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the doctrine of catastrophism strongly influenced the formulation of explanations about the dynamics of the earth. Briefly stated, catastrophists believed that the earth’s landscape had been developed primarily by great catastrophes. . . . (Ibid.)**

Remember that Mt. St. Helen’s had occurred right before their eyes. They had seen canyons formed in several hours over a two (2) year period. But they continued to write:

**Features such as mountains and canyons, which today [the textbook says] we know take great periods of time to form, were explained as having been produced by sudden and often worldwide disasters produced by unknowable causes [the textbook says] that no longer operate. This**

**philosophy was an attempt to fit the rate of earth processes to the then-current ideas on the age of the earth. . . . [the textbook says] (emphasis added) - (Ibid.)**

This textbook statement about mountains and canyons forming over “great periods” is taught in public schools. But, do not forget that this grain by grain **uniformitarianism** supposedly occurred over and over in **prehistoric** times. We say that because this grain by grain erosion of mountains eroding flat and up-thrusting again has not been seen in present times nor is it reported anywhere in recorded history.

**PREHISTORIC?** Remember, prehistoric, by definition is before written history. Since it is before written history, the stories told can only have come from the mind or imagination of a man. And when it is from the imagination, it should begin: . . . **once upon a time in a land far away**. Their imagination is not entitled to anymore acceptance than Hans Christian Anderson’s fairy tale: *Emperor’s New Clothes* or other stories that begin, . . . **once upon a time in a land far away**. When Hans Christian Anderson wrote, he admitted it was his imagination and called it a fairy tale. Darwin, Lyell and Hutton also write from the imagination of their minds, but they want you to believe it is “science.” Why not call it what it really is, . . . a fairytale?

Also, note: The Merrill textbook designates, as a philosophy, **catastrophism**, **because** it is *a way of looking at things*. Thus, **uniformitarianism** is a way of looking at things and thus is a philosophy. WHY? There is no proof that **uniformitarianism** (*erosion of mountains flat, several times during prehistoric times*). That is men’s conjecture.

**Hutton-Lyell-Darwin:** These three men argued for this then new belief system: **uniformitarianism** (everything slow, gradual, continual). Not one of them, Hutton, Lyell or Darwin, was trained as an Earth scientist. **Not one!**

Today, they would **not** be published in any evolutionary journals. **Why?** They do not have the academic qualifications to publish. When evolutionists debate, write to criticize or want to exclude from publication, authors, they often cite lack of academic credentials as a reason to 1) not believe the author and/or to 2) exclude them from having articles published in evolutionary so-called “science” magazines. Perhaps farmer Hutton (*because of his medical degree*) might have had a chance at publication. What do you suppose would happen if an attorney with a new theory of geology wanted to publish? And we all know the result if a clergyman wanted to publish in an evolutionist journal. NO CHANCE!

Yet, these three men, attorney-medical doctor Hutton, attorney Lyell and clergyman Darwin, with no scientific training did publish works that turned the then scientific view, upside down. That is amazing!

Well, if these men, accepted and promoted the imagination of James Hutton, and that is the basis for Darwinism, how in the world has the Darwin imagination been sustained and accepted by so many seemingly intelligent persons? What caused **these** academic types to rally around this philosophy of vast ages and these imagined ideas of Darwin that were contrary to the evidence in the fossil record? (A record which Darwin admitted was contrary to his speculations).

You might be surprised at the simple imagined ideas, they have accepted without proof. Astrophysicist Hoyle asks the same question about what he labels the “*speculation*” of Darwin and the “*superstition*” of evolution.

Darwin’s weak imagined ideas certainly needed some help after much valid initial criticism by Professors Sedgewick and Professor Agassiz. So, some of the ones, Professor J. Louis Agassiz labeled ***Darwin’s henchmen*** supplied enough made up

evidence to sustain the imagined ideas of Darwin in the late 1800s. They spread them in the college, university and academic fields. Soon they were in the Normal schools where the teachers learned their trade.

Epic battles raged at universities where one professor (E. Haeckel) was convicted of fraud. Finally one dispute made it to the court systems in 1925. In that battle the Christian position won and evolution’s John Thomas Scopes lost. Evolutionists were committed to the ABG proposition (anything but God). While those who should have defended God, especially in the cemeteries, oops, I meant the seminaries, began to worry about being thought less of by the evolutionists and so crossed over to the side of man and his reason. They tried to reconcile the Bible (the Word of God, the Truth of God) to the imaginations of men that *exalted themselves against the knowledge of God*. They did not bother learning of the serious weaknesses in the evolutionary and vast age imagination. And the rest, so they say, is history. So those of us in the church allowed Darwin to be propped up with made up stories, phoney evidence and fraud.

...

Brother Hughes are you serious? Was Darwin propped up by made up stories, phoney evidence and outright frauds?

Read on!

# DARWIN'S IMAGINED MYTH

## BUILT UPON MADE-UP EVIDENCE, FRAUD, ERROR & HOAX

Darwin's ideas were under attack in the scientific community. But, Darwin became accepted by the public at large because of men, Professor Agassiz labeled, "*Darwin's henchmen*." They "made-up" false proof that misled multitudes. British naturalist Thomas Huxley(1825-1895) and German professor Ernest Haeckel (1834-1919A.D.) "**evangelized for**" Darwin. They made up proof to bolster his imagined ideas. WHAT?!? Yes, they made up evidence.

**MADE UP EVIDENCE: Early Life Form:** The disciples of evolution knew of the many problems and the attacks by contemporary scientists of Darwin, especially in the absence of fossil life forms early in the rock layers, than the explosion of life at the Cambrian layer of rocks. Evolutionists could not show any life forms, evolving. There was no life below the Cambrian rock layers. The explosion of life (a multitude of highly complex, fully formed fossils) was found **not** at the Earth's lowest and oldest rocks, but about 5/6 of the way up to the surface in the Cambrian layer. There was no trace of pre-Cambrian life. Opponents of Darwin took this as a perfect expression of God's creation. **(And it is)**. This had always been evidence for creation and of great concern to evolutionists. There was no testable proof of (incremental, slow, continual) evolution from one species to another. The rocks cried out against the imagination of Darwin.

Since there were no actual earlier life forms, the proof for evolution was not only lacking, the rocks cried out against evolution. So, how did the evolutionists react? . . . Were they converted?

Not in a **million** years. No WAY Jose!

Instead, the Professor Agassiz labeled "henchmen" **made up** two phoney pre-Cambrian forms and gave them names: Eozoon and Bathybius. The purpose of the made up forms was to support Darwin's fragile ideology and war against the Bible.

Ernst Haeckel (1834-1919A.D.), a primary henchmen, made it his life's practice to create deceptions to fortify Darwin's frail imagination. He and Huxley said the so-called life forms (**which in reality, never existed**) were part of the **monera** of life, a term made up by Haeckel. These so-called discoveries were met with skepticism. However, Darwin was delighted with pre-Cambrian life forms. Therefore, Eozoon entered the 4<sup>th</sup> edition of **Origin of Species**. Darwin stated "**It is impossible to feel any doubt regarding its organic nature.**" This assertion by Charles Darwin was incorrect. Darwin's disciples argued these primitive life forms allegedly covered the floors of the seas. Did they? How would we know?

**CHALLENGER EXPEDITION:** The **Challenger** expedition of the 1870s set sail to explore the world's oceans and hoped to find these life forms. Great amounts of deep sea mud were dredged and lifted onto the deck of **Challenger**. The so-called life forms were not found. But, as they preserved samples for later analysis by adding preserving alcohol to the mud, that B word, Bathybius **suddenly appeared**. WHAT?!? Why was it appearing now? They then had to admit the so-called early life form was a precipitate of calcium sulfate. It was produced when deep sea mud reacted to the alcohol. It was **not** organic life. So reported an evolutionist, then Harvard Professor, Stephen Jay Gould. [fn<sup>10</sup>]

---

<sup>10</sup> Gould, Professor Stephen Jay . *Natural History*, volume 87 No. 4 American Museum of Natural History (1978)

Was Darwin correct in saying eozoon and bathybius was organic life? No! It was not organic (alive, living). It occurred only upon mixing deep sea mud with preserving alcohol. It was not a life form. It was a chemical distillate.

Again Darwin and his disciples were without a pre-Cambrian form of life. Evidence again only supported and proved sudden creation of complex organisms in the Cambrian rock layer. Darwin was wrong! So, Brother Hughes, they all converted to Biblical Christianity? Right? No!

**Gemmules Anyone?** Darwin's most colossal error, aside from the imaginary evolution itself, was his false belief in **gemmules**. Gemmules? What are gemmules?

"Gemmules" were said to be quite small. Darwin asserted they were able to carry a parent's "**acquired** characteristics" (such as large muscles on a body builder) via gemmules through the blood into the sperm of the male and the egg of the female. Darwin mistakenly believed the acquired characteristics were passed through the blood of both father and mother through "gemmules" to the children.

Thus a father who was a weight lifter, who acquired large muscles, and later fathered five daughters would have five large strong muscular girls? Would a mom, who developed a very slim waist and feminine body, pass this onto her sons? Fortunately for the girls of the muscled weightlifter and boys of a feminine mother, the gemmules imagination is as **inaccurate** as the other errors written by Darwin, in two publications *Origin of Species* (1859) and *Descent of Man* (1871).

What proof did they have of these gemmules, other than the imagination of the mind of Darwin? **None!** I.L. Cohen, educated as an engineer, a lifelong researcher into humankind's past and noted author, stated: **I quote:**

**We now know that gemmules did not exist outside of Darwin's imagination. Many scientists defended this theory, simply because they assumed it to be true. Gemmules were taken quite seriously at the time - they had been advanced by an authoritative scientist and couched in 'scientific' terms.**

**With time, however, it was realized that heredity did not work according to the fantasies of Darwin's imagination. Instead Gregor Mendel's theory of genes. . . proved to be scientifically correct...; in those years Darwin's magnetism was much too strong to overcome. The scientific community of the 19<sup>th</sup> century preferred to continue theorizing with Darwin's hypothetical pronouncements, rather than evaluate the solid, factual data submitted by Mendel. His significant laboratory results were brushed aside by all the "learned" scientists, as though they meant nothing. Instead Darwin's illusory gemmules theory was paid serious attention and subscribed to as being established scientific fact. [fn<sup>11</sup>]**

**GROUNDLESS BELIEFS:** Eozoon, bathybius and gemmules, were humiliating errors, groundless beliefs. These grave errors were first laughed off, then hidden. Why? Darwin's notion was tenuous, at best. The Truth shining in on it might destroy it as quickly as the noonday summer Kansas sun melts butter left out on a dish near a window. Evolutionists, rather than admit darwinism was in serious trouble, allowed their misplaced faith in Darwin to carry them deeper into error. When the errors became apparent, evolutionists preferred to bury them or keep them quiet. Why? Negative results and discoveries within a decade and one half of the darwinian articulation caused serious doubts about Darwin's announcements.

Previously quoted author I.L. Cohen, in 1984, wrote:

---

<sup>11</sup> I.L. Cohen, *Darwin Was Wrong* (Study in Probabilities) New Research Publications, Inc. NY (1984) p.18

Unfortunately, . . . realistic carefulness and scientific humility was not widely exercised during the 19<sup>th</sup> century and Darwin's theory was virtually acclaimed as the arrival of the scientific Messiah. Still more unfortunately, we continue to consider that theory as law, without having the intellectual courage to question anew each aspect of it as if there were no alternatives. Darwin's theory is not scientific law - it still lacks conclusive proof in spite of its plausibility and popularity. (*Darwin was Wrong* (footnote 8-p.20)

. . . The repetition and reemphasis of a concept by the majority of the scientific community does not make it objective truth. (*Ibid.* (footnote 8) -p.21)

As was said, eozoon appeared in Darwin's 4<sup>th</sup> edition of *Origin of Species*, with Darwin's support and approval but, there is no mention of eozoon or bathybius in the 6<sup>th</sup> edition. (I do not believe I have seen the 5<sup>th</sup> edition)

**DARWIN'S HENCHMEN:** Now back to those men Professor Agassiz termed "Darwin's henchmen." These men seemed to have more interest in making Darwin's imagination viable than did Darwin, himself. They built Darwin's imagination up with argument, debate and "made up" the proofs that misled multitudes. It was however outright fraud, deception and misrepresentation that kept Darwin's imagination viable in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early to mid 20<sup>th</sup> century.

**HAECKEL'S FRAUD:** The singular most vicious man who promoted Darwin was the German Ernest Haeckel (1834-1919A.D.). He was a professor who enjoyed the spot light. Haeckel was an unbeliever. He became a disciple for Darwinian thought in Germanic countries.

Haeckel falsely taught man passed through stages of the Darwin imagined evolutionary past. This supposedly happened as the baby was being formed in his mother's womb. Darwin hailed embryology as support for evolution. Darwin announced

it was of "primary" importance as evidence for the proof of evolution. Therefore the human embryo was alleged to first appear similar to a fish, next an amphibian, then a mammal. Haeckel did this by falsifying his and other's drawings, paintings and carvings. Haeckel KNEW the human embryo had a distinct and totally human look at every stage. Haeckel was a deceiver, a liar and he intended his deception to lead men from God. Haeckel knew the human embryo appeared "human" in its mother's womb. **It did not go through stages!** The change in the womb was never true. Haeckel knew it. He was a master deceiver who misled thousands.

Haeckel was convicted by his university and his colleagues of fraud for altering his own, and others' evidence of developing embryos. Haeckel admitted he made up the false evidence.

**Photographic Evidence:** In 1979, *PARENT'S MAGAZINE* published an article with pictures. There were photographs of the human embryo at every stage of development.

**The development of the child-from the union of the parents' cells to birth-has been studied exhaustively. As a result, long held beliefs have been put to rest. We now know, for instance, that man, in his prenatal stages, does not go through the complete evolution of life- from primitive single cell to a fishlike water creature to man. Today it is known that every step in the fetal developmental process is specifically human.** (Schwabenthan, Sabine. *Life Before Birth*, Parent's Magazine, October 1979 p.50) (underline added)

Now there was photographic proof of Haeckel's fraud. There is no credible argument that we pass through some supposed evolutionary past. Again one of Darwin's arguments was finally put to rest with devastating finality.

If evolutionists had thought about it, they would realize the Haeckel fraud was not consistent with the long, slow, gradual Darwinian imagination (evolution). Evolution was **not** imagined to have occurred in a short period, such as nine months. Evolution was said to begin with blind random chance and supposedly developed slowly, continually, incrementally, over **m-i-l-l-i-o-n-s** of years. That which was good was supposedly preserved by *natural selection* as it became the dominant species (not come and then go in days or weeks). This rapid “evolution in the womb” was contrary to the imagined slowly changing, simple to complex formula of Darwin’s invention. But, the unsuspecting public believed the lie because evolutionists, proclaimed themselves: “scientists.” They are just men who believe the imagination of Darwin.

**What Haeckel had done was much worse than criminal fraud! Why? If believed, it will keep one from God. Therefore, it could send a person to the lake of fire as his/her place of eternal existence.**

Since we are fearfully and wonderfully made by God, Christians knew the Haeckel fraud was not true. By 1979 A.D. there was pictorial proof. Who would argue against photo evidence? Yet Haeckel’s fraud stayed in public school textbooks in other forms. Ask the graduates of the 1990s-2005 A.D.

We have much more material on so-called human evolution with its controversy, its errors, frauds and hoaxes. You will find a pig’s tooth mistaken for a man, a filed off orangutan jaw stained to make a match with a totally human skullcap, and others. You will find that the idea of human evolution is just as groundless as other forms of evolution. It is in our seminar booklet materials entitled: **AM I A MONKEY’S NEPHEW?** Just know that there were advanced ideas that man had an ape like ancestor. However, there has never been found what Darwin proposed a clear chain of men from simple to complex changing ever so slowly over **m-i-l-l-i-o-n-s** of years. Say, why do you suppose they call what they are seeking the MISSING link?

**The Enemy:** This is the enemy. God’s enemy. The Bible’s great foe. An imagined ideology devised by three men (Darwin-Lyell-Hutton). It had no basis in fact. Evolution was kept alive, in its early years, by fraud and deception of “**Darwin’s henchmen:**” Huxley and Haeckel (eozoon, bathybius and embryology fraud). It was continued with made up Java man and Piltdown man. Without these frauds, evolution would **not** have survived.

**WHOM WILL YOU BELIEVE?** You decide whom you will believe. These imagined ideas of men or the Bible, the Word of the Living God. The men put their pants on very much the same way as every other man, one leg at a time. They needed to eat, sleep and otherwise function as a total human being. They had to die. More than one hundred years has passed since all their deaths and not one of them has risen from the dead. Only One has **ever** risen from the dead. Who?



JESUS CHRIST of Nazareth!

## **EVOLUTION’S FINAL DEATH** **-THE IRREDUCIBLE, COMPLEX CELL**

# **The Microscope Tells all**

**THE SCANNING ELECTRON MICROSCOPE:** For those clinging to the big bang Darwinian evolutionary fiction, the final death of the imagination came in the mid 20<sup>th</sup> century with the development of the scanning electron microscope. Why with this new and powerful microscopic technique, you may ask? Allow me to explain by reviewing some history of the microscope and the electron microscope that can be verified on the internet.

The first usable Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM) debuted in 1942. The first non research instruments were available about 1965. The late development was due to the electronics involved in "scanning" the beam of electrons across the sample to read it. These microscopes, with this image scanning development, awed mid 20<sup>th</sup> century scientists. The magnification increased from the former 1000 level up to 100,000 times, later up to one million times magnification.

The microscope of Darwin's day (19<sup>th</sup> century) was basically the 17<sup>th</sup> century microscope. The man who brought the microscope from *toy to tool* and into common use and thus is often said to be the father of microscopy, was Anton van Leeuwenhoek of Holland (1632-1723 A.D.). He was able to grind and polish the lens so as to have an amazing 270 power magnifications. He was the first to see and describe bacteria, yeast plants, the teeming life in a drop of water, and the circulation of blood corpuscles in capillaries.

Robert Hooke, (1635-1703 A.D.) English Chemist, Mathematician, Physicist, and Inventor confirmed what the uneducated Leeuwenhoek was doing. Hooke improved the microscope and is credited with the early compound (reflecting) microscopes developed around 1660. He had copied the design of Isaac Newton's reflecting *telescope*. There were some improvements so that by the time Darwin published in 1859, they had developed a method to magnify up to 1000 times.

Charles Darwin, himself, may well have **not** had such an instrument. The common microscope magnified at the level of the 270 magnifications. This technology of the microscope (use of light, optics and mirrors) remained the "state of the art" until the development of the electron microscope.

Dr. Hooke is also known for his introduction of the word "**cell**." He described the features of plant tissue (cork from the

bark of an oak tree) as cells. He was able to discover them under the microscope. So Robert Hook is more than one who took two men's ideas and developed them. He also was innovative and an originator.

In the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, electron microscopes were thought of as "science fiction." They were a system that did not depend solely upon light or magnification of lenses. Although the Electron Microscopes (EMs) *function* as did their optical counterparts, there is one grand exception. Electron Microscopes use a focused beam of electrons instead of light to "image" the specimen and gain information as to its structure and composition. These scientific instruments use a beam of highly energetic electrons to examine objects on a very fine scale. What is seen is roughly similar to television images.


Electron Microscopes were developed due to the limitations of the light microscopes which are limited by the physics of light to 500x or 1000x magnification and a resolution of 0.2 micrometers. In the early 1930's this theoretical limit had been reached and yet, there was a scientific desire to see the fine details of the interior structures of organic cells (nucleus, mitochondria . . . etc.). This required 10,000x plus magnification which was just not possible using "light microscopes." Therefore there is no way that Charles Darwin could have reasonably understood the intricate complexity and the irreducibility of the cell.

The Transmission Electron Microscope (TEM) was the first type of Electron Microscope to be developed and is patterned exactly on the Light Transmission Microscope except that a focused beam of electrons is used instead of light to "see through" the specimen. It was developed after World War I by Max Knoll and Ernst Ruska in Germany in 1931. It was part of the technological surge toward the inevitable armed conflict to come.

The basic steps involved in all Electron Microscopes are that a stream of electrons is formed (by the Electron Source) and



accelerated toward the specimen using a positive electrical potential. This stream is confined and focused using metal apertures and magnetic lenses into a thin, focused beam. This beam is focused onto the sample using a magnetic lens. Interactions occur inside the illuminated sample affecting the electron beam. These interactions and effects are detected and transformed into an image. (Think about a television camera that could make a single stand of hair magnified into the size of a fully grown tree.) The above steps are carried out in all Electron Microscopes regardless of type.



Now man could magnify the cell to 50,000, then 100,000 and later to one half million power. This utterly unheard of magnification unveiled the complexity of the cell with many intricate systems. This revelation led to the comprehension of the information coding of the DNA and RNA systems.

Thus, this electron microscope technology revealed awesome complexity in the basic building block of all life, the cell. If this awesome and intricate complexity was in the basic building block of life, this had to demolish the remaining simple to complex ideology necessary for evolution to be true. Why?

Darwin and his backers believed all cells were rather simple. If evolution had been true, and if the cell had been simple (*as Darwin imagined*) there would have been the possibility of a simple to complex development. The scanning electron microscope shattered this myth of the “simple cell” by revealing literally thousands of parts in the cell. All of the parts were interdependent one upon the other for the cell to have life. ***It was not*** simple! It was fearfully, wonderfully and irreducibly complex. It couldn't “happen” or “evolve” from simple to complex.

**MATHEMATICS AND THE CELL:** Two things mandate the impossibility for neo-darwinian *random chance* to have produced the first cell. Also, it would be impossible for the cell to survive

the plethora of mutations necessary for Darwin's imagined selective process. This process was supposed to have blindly selected and appropriated the necessary mutations for there to have been a species change. It couldn't have happened. It would have killed the cell that it was trying to change.

**Proteins:** As we learned in middle school science, the cell is the building block of all life. Geneticists generally agree they **cannot** explain *species changing evolution* at the molecular or cellular level. But if that were not enough of a problem for evolution, consider now the impossibility of the chance production of the basic components of the cell, the protein

All cells are made up of protein. Proteins are made up of amino acids. Dr. Thomas Kindell, without considering the necessity of the genetic information of the complex DNA or the necessity of the various types of RNA necessary to build a protein reduced the problem to the simplest mathematical terms. Could chance produce the first protein? Dr. Thomas Kindell demonstrates the impossibility of the production of one protein.

The production of the first protein by chance would have to be done against the very scientific laws of chance upon which neo-darwinism relies. These laws would have to be “supernaturally” violated not twenty or fifty times, but the bonding of amino acids must defy chance a minimum of 410 times in a row, without one error. 410 left handed amino acids must bond ***without one*** right handed amino acid. This is mathematically, philosophically and scientifically impossible.

Dr. Kindell's calculations are found in *Evolution on Trial* (1996) on page 73. These calculations indicate that we would never see this happen in the lifetime of God's universe. Even if one believed in the imagined big bang vast ages of 12 ½ to 20 ***b-i-l-l-i-o-n*** years it wouldn't happen. But, if it might have happened by accident or chance, it would take the ***first*** protein 31 quadrillion years to come into being.

**And that is only the first protein, not the first cell.**

**DNA** DNA presents another devastating problem for Darwin's evolution. DNA (**deoxyribonucleic-acid**) is in every living cell. DNA is "**the**" storehouse for **all** the information of the cell. This includes the information necessary for the production of the cell, for the duplication of the cell, the repair of the cell. Yet, DNA with the information to make every part of the cell (including the basic protein just mentioned) can only survive in the cell already existing cell. WHAT?!?

DNA has the massive information [fn<sup>12</sup>] needed to produce the cell, yet DNA resides in the already completed and existing cell. How then could one evolve into the other? They cannot. DNA needs the completed cell to exist and the cell needs DNA to come into being, duplicate or repair.

Darwin wrote in ***On the Origin of Species*** that if we could ever demonstrate or show something that could not come into existence through many slow, incremental changes that his theory would immediately collapse. [fn<sup>13</sup>] Little did Darwin know that this barrier to belief in his imagined ideas was already in existence in every fearfully and wonderfully created cell.

Darwin and his "lieutenants" falsely believed the cell was rather simple in plants and animals. If evolution had been true, and if the cell had been simple, there would have been the possibility of Darwin's step by step, "*numerous, successive, slight modifications*" from simple to complex development. But, the scanning electron

---

<sup>12</sup> **There is enough information** in each human DNA fill more than one thousand books each of more than one hundred pages.

<sup>13</sup> If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down. But I can find out no such case. *On the Origin of Species* By: Charles Darwin Chapter 6 - Difficulties on Theory (online (6<sup>th</sup>) edition- London 1872)

microscope shattered this myth of the "simple cell" by revealing literally thousands of interdependent parts. (All the parts dependent one upon the others for the cell to have life).

By the mid 20<sup>th</sup> century, the neo-darwinists knew that the cell **was not simple as** Darwin imagined. Yet, the neo-darwinists admitted if evolution was true, it would have to begin in the cell. Neo-darwinian chance cannot work to produce the cell or its first protein. Darwinism cannot work at all. **The cell** is fearfully, wonderfully made. It is irreducibly complex. It could not occur by chance in the imagined "primordial pool."

I.L. Cohen wrote that the last of the upper echelon evolutionists, who actually may have rationally (but mistakenly) believed Darwin was correct, should have been freed from the deception of Darwinism with the development of the scanning electron microscope. The scanning electron microscope revealed the DNA. This new illumination and magnification allowed science, for the first time, to be able to measure the first principals of life. The scanning electron microscope gave science a measuring device of great precision.

It was away back in 1954 that Wald made the first pronouncements of the impossibility of evolution. And in the 1960s and 1970s has been more than a third of a century since the assault on darwinism began in earnest. Evolutionists found it necessary, because of new discoveries and realizations, to abandon Darwin and his imagined ideas.

Since 1977A.D., scientists have been abandoning Darwinism and so stating in articles in evolutionary journals. Thus, no thinking scientist today holds to the fantasy of the darwinian theory. Yet, this theory continues to be taught in elementary and high school textbooks, as if it was true. Doesn't that really upset you? ***It should!***

**PROBABILITIES AND DARWIN:** Is Darwinism scientifically probable? I.L. Cohen, an engineer, research scientist and

author reflected upon the discovery of the scanning electron microscope. It was used in the 1950's to reveal DNA and RNA. Cohen evaluated darwinian and neo-darwinian evolution. He translated it into the mechanistical meaning of the DNA/RNA. Cohen then applied mathematical probability concepts to the imagination of Darwin labeled evolution. Cohen concluded, in a book by the same name, Darwin was Wrong (1984A.D.)

I.L. Cohen also considered the complex DNA molecule in relationship to evolution. There are more than one million proper connections in a single human DNA. There must be an errorless first connection of all one-million helix strand connections. It is estimated that three to five errors in one million is too many for the DNA to preserve itself. And Darwin's imagined selective process needs to have far more errors (mutations) from which to select if it were to effectuate a species change. But, except in a few rare cases the number of mutations necessary for Darwin's imagined process to work would ensure the destruction of the DNA and cell. (Cohen 1984; Denton 1985; Behe 1996; Spetner 1997; Hoyle 1999) Thus it was concluded to be impossible! Do you understand why?

Mathematicians always assign a probability to an event's occurrence. In a coin toss, you have a fifty percent (50%) probability of a head or a tail. Yet when you have so many factors that instead of the simple one out of two, an event reaches ten to the fiftieth power against its occurrence, it is said to be mathematically improbable. (This is the closest mathematicians will come to saying they believe an event is impossible) When I.L. Cohen calculated the probabilities of chance making the connections of the complex DNA strands, it was vastly greater than  $10^{-50}$  (ten to the fiftieth power) **against** random chance selection (Cohen 1984). Thus, the probability against random connection of one DNA is mathematically fixed against it and thus against evolution. The probability that neo-darwinian chance could have connected the DNA of even one

cell is 0%. Mathematics is against neo-darwinian chance, as agent for first life, or first DNA proper helix strand connections.

**Conclusion** Cohen (1984) Behe (1996) Spetner (1997) (Brown-7th 2001) and (Gillien-3rd 2003) note that millions of nucleotides within a human DNA spiral must align in very specific sequences. [fn<sup>14</sup>] These complex connections **could not** be the result of unguided random chance as neo-darwinians assert. Further, with the overabundance of mutations necessary for Darwin's imagined selective process to function, the cell would not survive. Chance could not produce the first cell. Further, unguided *natural selection* could not help and align the DNA helix strands. Also when trying to effectuate a species change under the Darwinian imagination, there could not be sufficient mutations from which to choose to bring about a species change into effect. Thus, the *origin of a new species* could not be the result of Darwin's imagined evolution. Darwin was wrong.

**Probabilities and the Lottery** In 2005 A.D. we heard of a lady in Las Vegas, winning a million dollars in the same casino at the same slot machine (or bank of slot machines) where she had won a million dollars the year before. That chance happening is so unusual that it was covered by the mass media (newspapers and national TV). Another time we heard of the same person winning a state lottery twice in the same year. That also made headlines in newspapers. Why? We know it is almost impossible. It is against mathematical odds. Brother Hughes, how does this affect our discussion of the DNA in cells?

---

<sup>14</sup> They must connect and reconnect to the same point on the helix strand ladder and before connecting, must choose the right **one of four** connectors: A C G T for each of millions of connections. And if they chose the wrong connector there will be no connection. Five errors in a million that cannot be repaired is said to ensure the destruction of the DNA.

Big bang evolutionists ask you to believe that **first**, random chance created the first cell (living from nonliving material, which they admit is impossible). Next they assert *random chance and natural selection* could work to produce and replicate cells. But chance and *natural selection* cannot connect DNA helix strand connections or function to change that cell into something other than what it already is. WHY? After we have a replicable cell, unintelligent *natural selection* is to make selections equivalent to the same intelligent person winning the state lottery every week for more than one thousand years.

Why this is preposterous! After the third or fourth time, we would scream: "**FIX!**" We would be correct. No one could randomly win over and over again. We conclude that for there to be these DNA helix strand connections in multiple celled organisms, the fix is on! There is intelligent direction. Christians know this Intelligence is God.

Admittedly my mathematical credentials are limited to high school geometry, advanced algebra, trigonometry and one semester of teaching middle school math. I am no mathematician. However, I do understand that just as no one can randomly win the lottery over and over and over, neither can blind, random chance make the DNA connections once and certainly not again and again, even if there was the addition of unguided *natural selection*. There has to be **Intelligence** causing it and directing it.

**Intelligent Design:** CHURCH! WAKE UP!!! For the sake of the present and future generations, awake and know that an Intelligent Designer God created us, fearfully and wonderfully. He creates so that left-handed amino acids bond against all probabilities to make proteins. God also creates the process by which the millions of proper perfect DNA connections take place over and over again.

Although Darwin knew the fossil record was contrary to his imagined ideas, we must admit Darwin did not know of the irreducibility of the cell. Most of his followers in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and all of his adherents of the 21<sup>st</sup> century learned of the awesome complexity of the cell. In the 1930's there was the first rumbling to reject Darwin's imagination (*Schmidt-"Hopeful Monster"*). The neo-darwinians (1930s-1940s) were much more aware of genetics and complexity. Yet, they were about a decade shy of the revelation of the explosive complexity and irreducibility of the living cell. This was not revealed until the perfecting of the scanning electron microscope. With its development and the discovery by man of the DNA (*Watson-Crick 1956*) honest darwinians realized Darwin's imagination was in great peril. In the 1960's Henry Morris (*Whitcomb, Gish and others*) led the outright revolt against Darwin. They left Darwin and returned to the truth of the Bible. Then in the 1970's prominent Darwinists abandoned Darwin's imagination for a new one labeled "punctuated equilibrium" (Gould-Eldredge - 1977A.D.). Then in the early eighties evolution was being openly questioned in international meetings (*Patterson 1981*). Many abandoned Darwin for another theory or no theory.

In 1985, Michael Denton published ***Evolution A Theory in Crisis***. This work exposed many serious problems with the imagined ideas of Charles Darwin. Many honest Darwinians could no longer pretend Darwin's ideas held any validity. The hallowed halls of evolution were attacked with articles and books from Berkeley, Harvard, University of Pittsburgh, University of Michigan, Lehigh University, University of Cardiff, Oxford, Cambridge, et al. Soon the most former Darwinists were seeking to find the real truth.

In 1993 A.D., Professor Phillip E. Johnson of Berkeley invited several prominent educators teaching at evolutionist universities to meet in Parajo Dunes, California. After much discussion they rejected Darwin and sought another answer. They were no longer seeking the best "darwinian" answer. They

were opening themselves up to all ideas. Finally, they were seeking the truth. Most of them adopted Intelligent Design.

On the other hand, some, after admitting the impossibility of evolution (or one of its parts) continued to hold to that which they know is impossible. Really? Yes! Remember Dr. George Wald of Harvard? He was still alive in the 1980's and 1990's. He represents a significant number who will strive to hold to the bankrupt and invalid view of Charles Darwin only because they know the only other possible logical conclusion is ***IN THE BEGINNING GOD CREATED THE HEAVEN AND THE EARTH.***

### **THE CASE AGAINST RANDOM CHANCE:**

Dr. Jerry Bergman, with a PhD in *Evaluation & Research* as well as a PhD in *Human Biology*, writes:

**Scientists once argued that [early cellular] life was relatively simple, could spontaneously generate, and regularly did so. They now realize the human cell is the most complex machine known in the universe, far more complex than the most expensive computer and that life couldn't evolve but must have been created instantly as a full functioning unit.**(In *Six Days*, Master Books 2001 A.D)

Please understand that *big bang evolution* wants you to believe that a much more complicated project (the production of the first living cell) took place without guidance of a conductor, composer, an artist or Designer Creator God.

**Imagine asserting that the majestic (composition of) Messiah composed itself apart from Handel or that the Last Supper painted itself without Leonardo daVinci.** (*Fatal Flaws*, Thomas Nelson TN 2003 A.D.)

Darwin imagined a process by which organic life is said to have changed from simple to more complex species, through very small changes, ever improving and improving over m-i-l-l-i-

o-n-s of years. But this cannot be true when the basic building block of all life is already awesomely complex. We now know every organism (organic life) is built from the wondrously complex cell. How then can an ideology, that must start at this lowest, simplest, level, work in a cell which is wondrously complex? It cannot. Darwin was wrong.

Twenty-first century scientists are permitting themselves to look beyond Darwin and, if necessary, look past naturalism. They are seeking the truth. Many are astounded to find that in their search for truth they are finding the God that Hutton, Lyell and Darwin unsuccessfully fought to disprove the Bible and dethrone God.

**Natural Selection: An ally of random chance?** But, Brother Hughes, what about Darwin's natural selection?

Do not be deceived by the term "*natural selection*." As Darwin used it in "*ON THE ORIGIN OF SPECIES*" he wanted you to believe that this selective process could change one kind of an organism into another creating a new species. However, since he could not give one example of a species change ever occurring in history or being revealed in the fossil record, Mr. Darwin had to rely on his imagined *selection* processes and hope you would daydream along with him. Then he wanted you to believe these processes, working together with random chance, did somewhere in the past, did "once upon a time," produce hundreds of thousands of new species.

Brother Hughes, are you telling me that Charles Darwin wanted me to believe that in the distant past hundreds of thousands of species changed from one kind to another without leaving one bit of evidence? Yes! That is exactly what Charles Darwin wanted you to believe. He asks you to believe that it all happened hundreds of thousands of times without leaving any evidence in the fossil record. Yet, as Darwin wrote, there should be innumerable (hundreds of thousands) changing slowly, step

by step, from one species into another, yet there is not any such chain in the fossil record, Darwin confessed.

But Brother Hughes, wouldn't there have to be some evidence? Yes.

And there is not any such chain? Not one?

Answer: No not one.

Why, Brother Hughes, then Darwin was wrong

Correct! Darwin's imagination was in fact wrong!

Darwinian evolutionists of the 20<sup>th</sup> century searched, but could not find any evidence in history or the fossil record of a species change. Nor was there any ongoing process during the hundred and fifty years since Darwin of any species change; not even when manipulated by man. So, they took several processes which were not ever going to change one species into another and labeled them "*natural selection*." Why?

Evolutionists hoped you would believe that these processes they labeled "*natural selection*" were the same processes of which Darwin wrote. They were not the same. As you will see, the ones they claimed to see were never going to change one species into another. Consider the following.

1. When chemicals are sprayed on mosquitoes and 90% of them dies, it is not *natural selection* that causes the next generation to be resistant. The next generation is resistant because all nonresistant insects (90% of the population) were killed. The ones that died could not resist the man-made chemicals sprayed directly at them. But the ones that were resistant survived to procreate. With the resistant competing population gone, the others procreated the next generation, of which most were resistant. They started out as mosquitoes and ended up as mosquitoes. That is not a species change. That is not

what Darwin was talking about in his *Origin of Species* as the method he hoped to find that would change a mouse into a bat.

2. When a moth population changes from predominately light colored moths to dark colored moths, it wasn't a species changing event. They began as moths and ended up as moths. The population changed because the predators (*birds who feed on moths*) could more easily see the light-colored moths and ate them. The dark-colored moths who were camouflaged better into their background became the majority of those who survived to reproduce. That is not natural selection that changes a species, it is at best, bird or predator selection of the easiest things to eat. I am aware of the revelation in the 1990s relating that the entire so-called moth experiment was staged. (As reported by Judith Hooper, *Of Moths and Men: an Evolutionary Tail*, 2002, p. Xvii, p.265)

Yet, if the experiments had both occurred, they would not be the imagined selection processes for which Darwin hoped to find evidence someday. But, since Darwinists could not find any evidence of the imagined process that changed species, they wanted you to believe the examples of the mosquitoes and moths was the same *natural selection* process that Darwin wrote would change one species into **another. It was not!**

Modern scientists now admit that neither of these processes would change one type of organism into a different species. In both cases you start off with a mosquito or moth and you end up with a mosquito or moth. Thus, the process is not some mystical unknown process that can change a mosquito into a fly. There is no species change of the organisms.

Why didn't Darwinists give examples of species changing?

Because Darwinists cannot give one example of an organism changing from one species into another. Why? There has never been one example revealed in the fossil record. So, Darwinists told you about moths and mosquitoes. They attempted to deceive you to believe that the same process could change a crawling mouse into a flying bat.

We have heard that Darwin's imagined *natural selection* was supposed to be some almost supernatural force of nature [fn<sup>15</sup>] that could change one species into another. We have also learned that the Darwinian imagination (of species changing *natural selection*) HAS NEVER been seen, nor was any evidence of a chain of fossils showing a change of species ever found. There is no objective evidence of a change of (for instance) a mouse into a bat or a reptile into a bird. There is no present day evidence, no historical record known (back to the Egyptians) of any species change.

**OF MICE AND MEN.** We know that male and female mice exist. And we know that male and female bats exist. Could unguided natural selection produce a male and female bat beginning with a mouse population? We admit there is no evidence, but could it happen? No. Allow me to explain.

Unguided *natural selection* would be doing contrary things in the same organism population. Natural selection would have to select proper, helpful mutations for a male, while selecting the contrary parts for the female at the same time. At the same time natural selection would have to be preserving the organism (species) that already existed. DNA's preservation instincts

---

<sup>15</sup> Carl Baugh of *Creation in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* states that he believes (after reading much Darwin) that Mr. Darwin was replacing the Creator with this mystical natural process he labeled *natural selection*. But the process that allowed the more resistant mosquitoes to take over the population or the process that would have allowed one color moth to become dominate is NOT the same process that Darwin dreamed would change species.

would fight change. Mutations are repaired. Too many mutations result in the death of the mechanism and its replacement by a copy of a healthy DNA. All this is imagined to happen at the same time, unconsciously at the biochemical DNA level.

Be realistic. Blind *natural selection* could not know if it was yet preserving or changing into a male or female of the new species or preserving the organism. And all three: species survival, species change to male and species change to female, would have to all be occurring simultaneously. *THINK*. It is logically impossible for three opposites to be occurring at once.

Why has not the church proclaimed these facts from the pulpits? The problems with Darwin's imagined evolution have been well known and documented for more than Fifty (50) years. FIFTY YEARS! Therefore not only the present population of Pastors, but the proceeding population of Pastors and youth directors should have known of the problems of Darwin's imagined ideas. Yet, Christian scholars and seminaries failed the body of Christ. It is no wonder that God declares in the Bible: My people are **destroyed** for lack of knowledge![fn<sup>16</sup>]

This scripture is a grave warning . . . or it is utter nonsense. You are called upon to decide. And what about the prophetic warning that foretells belief systems such as Darwinism that will attempt to exalt themselves against the knowledge of God? [fn<sup>17</sup>] Does indicate God knew of this long before Hutton, Lyell and Darwin's false pronouncements?

---

<sup>16</sup> ¶My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to Me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children. Hosea 4:6

<sup>17</sup> Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ; II Corinthians, chapter 10, verse 5

**The Enemy:** So this is the enemy, God's enemy, the Bible's great foe. An ideology devised by three men: James Hutton (1726-1797), Charles Lyell (1797-1875) and Charles Darwin (1809 -1882). These three men put their pants on very much the same way as every other man, one leg at a time. They needed to eat, sleep and otherwise function as a total human being. They had to die. It might be pointed out that more than one hundred years has passed since their deaths and not one of them has risen from the dead. Only ONE has arisen! Cast down (*put down, detach from* ) these imaginations of Darwin.

Remember, (***I know I am repeating***) to form the first living cell, evolution, without God, requires non living (dead) to living, (*spontaneous generation*). That is impossible! (*Dr. George Wald, 1954*). Then the cell( which all science agrees is the basis for all life in all living organisms, plant or animal) cannot be produced by neo-darwinian chance as to do so would require nonliving to become living. And thereafter many neo darwinists admit there is not the quantity of mutations necessary for Darwin's *natural selection* to make species changing selection at the DNA level. The numbers of mutations necessary would destroy the cell. This was revealed by the scanning electron microscope. Darwin's imagination was and is utterly **WITHOUT CREDIBLE PROOF!**

Therefore, you must choose! Every knee will bow, every tongue confess (Isa 45:23) that Jesus Christ is Lord. (Romans 14:11) *But the unbelieving shall have their part (find their place) in the lake which burneth with fire . . . -Revelation 21:8 [fn<sup>18</sup> ]*

**CALL TO ACTION:** It is time for Christians to stop hiding out in the church. Come out! Look at the evidence presented in the scientific community and realize once and for all that darwinian

---

<sup>18</sup> But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death. Revelation 21:8

evolution is totally without proof. It never has had any basis in scientific fact. Allow me to say that again. Darwin's evolutionary thought has never had any scientific evidence, no scientific basis in fact. It is speculation from the imagination of men's minds. And now it was demonstrated that Darwin's evolution could not possibly be the agent for first life or for species change. . . . Now you KNOW you did not come from a "rained on rock" or "pond scum." You did not evolve from an apelike creature. . . . You KNOW you are fearfully and wonderfully made by God.

You must realize God is and His Word is True.

**But without faith it is impossible to please Him (God): for he that cometh to God must believe that HE is, and the HE is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. -Hebrews 11:6**

You should have faith in God! Do You? **Big-bang Darwinian evolution** imaginations have been destroyed. It was an evolutionist who admitted: creation is the only other logical conclusion. Dr. Wald then wrote: "**There is no third position**" So which will you believe?

Will you believe Darwin's evolution that is utterly without credible proof? Creation **is** the only other possibility! Since God and His creation has **not** been discredited, you now know you can safely trust God and His Bible. Now you are without excuse! The only way you can guarantee you will spend the time after this life is over in the lake of fire is for you to reject God's love and God's Truth. God's love for you allowed God the Son to come and die in your place. Why? The wage of your sin (what you deserve for your sin) is death. But, Jesus paid your death penalty. God's justice is now satisfied. Therefore, you can live eternal life with God in heaven. God's love has made a Way for you. So if you die and go to the lake of fire now, it's because you have disregarded the Truth and ignored what God has done for you. You have rejected God. And for what? A bankrupt, misleading and false philosophy that is utterly **without credible proof.**

**CALL TO RECONCILIATION** It is time to choose. Choose the One Who has fearfully and wonderfully made you and knew you



in your mother's womb. God has made the Way to come back and be reconciled to Him. It is Jesus. But, you must choose Jesus. Choose Jesus, Who has never lied. Choose Jesus, Who died on the cross to pay your sin penalty. Choose Jesus. HE is the Only Way to God the Father. Come to Him today! How? There is only One Way. You must receive Jesus as your Lord and Savior. Accept God's wonderful plan for your life. And after God has saved you, tell others what He has done for you.

If you choose God, through a dramatic, life changing encounter with the Creator of the universe and Redeemer of man kind, then when this life is over, you will go to the place God has for you when you die. Jesus said to His disciples, "***I go to prepare a place for you***" You will never regret your choice in this life. And you will certainly be happy in the life to come. . . . Make peace with God now!

## Steps to Peace With God

In all of life there is nothing more wonderful than experiencing peace with God. First know that God loves you and has a wonderful plan for your life. The Bible states we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. But secondly we know that we have all sinned. Thus, we deserve the penalty of our sins. Thirdly, God the Father allowed Jesus to come and pay our penalty for sin. The wages of sin is death. But, the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ, our Lord. God has made the Way of Peace back to Him. All you have to do is to accept it. The Way of Peace is found in a Person, The Only One Who lived as a man (to know your temptation) but was without sin. HE became the sinless sacrifice for sin. Fourthly you must accept what Jesus did for you. Jesus died on the cross to pay for your sins, so you could have eternal life with God in heaven. You must choose: God's Truth and heaven; or realize that when you die you will exist eternally in the lake of fire. It's your choice!

If you are ready to have a serious, life changing encounter with the living God, the Creator of the universe and the Redeemer of all mankind, and only if you are ready for your life to radically and completely change, draw near to God with faith and ***please join me in prayer.***

Heavenly Father, Thank You for loving me. God. Lord, the school system taught Darwin's evolution was true. I now admit Darwin's evolution was contrary to fact. It is impossible! I confess that I am fearfully and wonderfully made by You Creator God. When man sinned, God the Son agreed to come to earth, in the form of man to reconcile me back to You, Father-God. I confess that You are Truth. I confess I was wrong. I repent of my sin of unbelief and all other sin. I Jesus Christ died to pay for my sin. I ask You to forgive me. Lord Jesus, come into my life. Give me that life changing experience. Save me radically. Change my life. At this very moment, ***I receive Jesus Christ into my heart and life***, into my entire being. Please Holy Spirit, live in me. Be my Lord and my God. I also ask, in the Name of Jesus Christ, that I be delivered from every demon in hell. I receive Your deliverance, Lord Jesus. I thank You for this life changing encounter with You, Lord. This I pray in the Name of Jesus. Amen

## PARTIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. The Holy Bible Authorized King James Version-1679 A.D. Tn Thomas Nelson Publishing -(1990 A.D.)
2. Ashton, Jon, Ed. *In six days* Green Forest AR Master Books (2001 AD)
3. Behe, Dr. Michael *Darwin's Black Box*, (biochemical challenge to evolution) New York, The Free Press (1996 AD)
4. Cohen, I.L. *Darwin Was Wrong*, (A study in Probabilities) New Research Publication, Inc -NY (1984 AD)
5. Darwin, Charles *On the Origin of Species*, John Murray - London 1859 AD 6<sup>th</sup> Edition - (Online Edition 2004 AD)
6. Denton, Dr. Michael *Evolution, A Theory in Crisis*, Adler & Adler Pub Bethesda, MD,(1985 AD)
7. Hamm, Ken *The Lie [Evolution]*, Master Books Green Forest, AR (1999 AD)
8. Kindell, Dr. Thomas *Evolution on Trial* Reasons For Faith Eagle Point OR (1996 AD)
9. Lubenow, Marvin *Bones of Contention* Baker Books Grand Rapids, MI (2004 AD)
10. Hoyle, Dr. Sir Fred *The Intelligent Universe* Holt, Reinhart, Winston NY (1983 AD)
11. Hoyle, Dr. Sir Fred *Mathematics of Evolution* Alcorn Memphis, TN 1999 AD)
12. Morris, Dr. John *The Young Earth*, Master Books, Green Forest AR (1994 AD)
13. Safarti, Dr Jonathon, *Refuting Evolution* Master Books, Green Forest, AR (2000 A.D.)
14. Safarti, Dr Jonathon, *Refuting Compromise* Master Books, Green Forest, AR (2004 A.D.)
15. Spetner, Dr. Lee *Not By Chance* Judaica Press, Brooklyn NY (1997 AD)
16. Sunderland, Luther D. *Darwin's Enigma*, Master Books, El Cajon, CA (1988AD)
17. Wald, Dr. George "The Origin of Life," Scientific American, vol. 191, 1954, p.46
18. Woodmorappe, John *The Mythology of Modern Dating Methods* Institute For Creation Research, El Cajon CA (1999 AD)

## GOD IS GOD

We need to see God as He is: All Knowing, All Powerful and able to do more than we can think or ask. God created us from these complex building blocks named cells. We are not one, but we are **trillions** of these complex cells. Scientists have now confirmed the Psalmist's pronouncement and we can join the psalmist and say to God, ***I will praise Thee; for I am fearfully [and] wonderfully made: marvellous [are] Thy works; and [that] my soul knoweth right well.*** (Psalm 139:14)

## DECEIVED?

If you have doubted God and/or the Genesis account of His creation, is it because evolution is affecting your belief system? Perhaps now you begin to see you have been deceived by the evolutionary ideology of Darwin and his followers. Your faith is being destroyed by this evolutionary ideology. Yet, upper echelon evolutionists heartlessly fail to prevent Darwin imagination (with its known impossibility) from being taught as if true and accurate in public schools, to young and impressionable children. That is terrible! WHY?

Evolutionists, knowing the strong evidence against evolution, encourage the teaching of evolutionary ideology **as if it was true**. They do not want to include the now strong evidence against evolution. What could be more heartless and cruel than to teach, as if it is true, that which, has serious problems and *very strong evidence against Darwin*? That is deception, misrepresentation and fraud!

Folks those in the upper echelon evolutionists KNOW the theory of evolution is unworkable. They know it is contrary to the fossil evidence. They know it is mathematically impossible for it to produce one protein. They know if evolution were true, it would have to work in the DNA genetic material. They know that process cannot produce one proper, perfect helix strand connection in only one DNA molecule. They also know the number of errors (mutations) necessary for Darwin's *imagined selective process* to work would ensure the death of the cell. Thus ***Darwin's evolution should not be taught as if it is true in our school systems.*** It is deception with eternal consequences.

The eternal consequences are that if you believe Darwin, you do not believe God and His Bible. If you reject God, you therefore choose for yourself eternal death. God does not damn you to eternal torment. You choose it! Unless you repent and are converted and choose eternal life, you will end up in the lake of fire torment, forever. So STUDY . . . and do not be deceived!

**DECEIVERS:** Evolutionists are deceivers. The evolutionist is one of two kinds, either he/she continues to be deceived or she/he knows Darwin was wrong and is one of the intentional deceivers. But knowing or unknowing, the result is the same. They are deceiving innocent children. They are offending those little ones who would believe. They are taking them from the Truth of God to a bankrupt and discredited imagination of man. This is evil and treacherous. I can think of nothing much worse.

Such deceit has eternal ramifications for and to the child. It is akin to September 11, 2001; a sneak terrorist attack. The attackers are after our innocent, indefensible children. This attack occurs in your public school system every day. What should be the response of Christian parents? Who is at fault for the teaching that could result in your child spending eternity in the lake of fire? The world might tell you it takes it takes a village to raise a child, but the God of the Bible makes it clear that it is the responsibility of the parents. [fn<sup>19</sup>]

---

<sup>19</sup> **Proverbs** 22:6 says: ¶ Train up a child in the way he should go: when he is old, he will not depart from it.; **Deuteronomy** 4:10 . . . the LORD said unto me, Gather me the people together, and I will make them hear my words, that they may learn to fear me all the days that they shall live upon the earth, and [that] they may teach their children.; **Deuteronomy** 6:7 And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up.; **Deuteronomy** 11:19 And ye shall teach them your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down, and when thou risest up.; **Judges** 3:2 Only that the generations of the children of Israel might know, to teach them war, at the least such as before knew nothing thereof;

Why are we allowing the imagination of Darwin to be taught in the public schools? . . . Remember that ninety-two (92%) of the population believes in a God. (<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,99945,00.html>) Polling was conducted by telephone on September 23-24, 2003 A.D.

The more liberal CBS reports:

“Americans do not believe that humans evolved, and the vast majority says that even if they evolved, God guided the process. Just 13 percent say that God was not involved. Poll taken by telephone November 18-21, 2004. <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2004/11/22/opinion/polls/main657083.shtml>

Christian parents, if at all possible, should not permit their children to attend public school. WHY? The student’s faith in God is placed at risk! If the child is taught not to believe in the Bible and Jesus, such unbelief can have an evil eternal outcome! Pray for God to make a way! . . . Eternity is at stake!

All right, allow me a moment to TRY to settle down, to become more philosophical, homiletical (to explain) and hermeneutical (interpretation) of the Bible view.

# INTRODUCTION TO THE BIBLICAL VIEW

The Bible begins: ***IN THE BEGINNING GOD CREATED THE HEAVEN AND THE EARTH...*** If you call yourself a Christian, you must believe these first ten words of the Bible. If you do not believe these ten words, . . . you are not a Christian. . . . But, if you do believe them, that is not enough. The Bible asks us, ***Do you believe in one God?*** The Bible says, You do well, “the devils also believe and tremble.” [fn<sup>20</sup>] Are the devils going to heaven? . . . No!

Neither will you go to heaven if you only know there is a God or about God. It is a matter of the heart! To know **about** God or know *of* His Bible is good. BUT, it is not the same as **KNOWING GOD!** How do I know God? Be born again! Jesus said, If you are not born again you will not see the kingdom of God. There are four important things you must know!

1. **God loves you and has a plan for your life. His plan is better than our plan. It includes living with Him forever in heaven. God does not want you to experience eternal death in the lake of fire and torment. God wants all to come to repentance. However, God is God and he cannot abide with sin.**
2. **The first couple Adam and Eve sinned and broke the Spiritual connection to God. Therefore, they and all of their offspring are separated from God. But all (including you and I) have sinned and we became separated from God not only because of Adam’s sin, but our own sin, also. Because of this separation, man cannot experience that love of God. And because of this separation man has no hope of**

---

<sup>20</sup> Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble. James 2:19

eternal life. To have this hope he needs to be reconnected to the Source of eternal life.

3. **Jesus Christ, God the Son from eternity, saw man’s sinful way. Man had no hope of making heaven his home. BUT, Jesus agreed to put on the body of man, come and live on Earth and be the eternal sacrifice needed to satisfy the justice of God. Wherefore by one man (Adam) sin entered the world and death by sin. Also by One, Jesus Christ, all are made righteous before God. Jesus is the lamb of God, the eternal sacrifice for all the sin of mankind. So since you and I have sinned, Jesus died for our sin.**
4. **Man must receive the gift of Jesus which is eternal life. Jesus stands at the door (of our heart) and knocks. You must open the door and invite Jesus Christ, God the Son into your heart and life. That is the only way to be born again. Without being born again, you will not see the kingdom of God.**

Thus to truly know God you must surrender your will, your supposed higher intellect and confess that you are the created one. You are separated from God and that without Jesus you cannot have eternal life. Jesus is the Way!

A friend of mine put it this way in a song.

There’s only one way to heaven.  
The Bible says so.  
Without Jesus,  
you won’t go!

Ask Creator God to reveal Himself intimately, personally, and unmistakably. God can and will reveal Himself to you. You must ask, truly wanting and expecting an answer. God has

revealed Himself to multiplied millions, from kings to peasants. God wants all to come to Him.

**BIBLE REVIEW:** In the Bible, God introduced Himself as Elohiym in (Genesis 1:1). **IN THE BEGINNING GOD (ELOHIYM) CREATED . . .** God immediately begins revealing HIMSELF as a caring, meticulous, purposeful, Designer. Do not believe what evolutionists or atheists or those educated in some of our cemeteries, er, seminaries, say. These, who do not understand the Bible, have said dumb things like the Bible does not make a cosmological or scientific statement. ARE they totally without understanding?

The Bible opens with **IN THE BEGINNING**... In the beginning of what? The beginning of time. The next words is **GOD**. Who is the cause of time? GOD! Who is God? God is the One Who was outside of time and space and matter. God existed before time, space and matter (the universe). There was NOTHING! The next word is **CREATED**. God (Who was eternally existent), created (made from nothing) what? God created **THE HEAVEN** (space) **AND EARTH** (matter).

Thus, the Bible does make a clear cosmological statement. The Bible opens with: **IN THE BEGINNING GOD**.

The beginning is before time, before the universe, before space, before matter. God existed. This God existed outside of anything we now know. God existed in **our** Nothingness. He was there before time so God was Eternal. This Eternal God created FROM NOTHING (as nothing was yet created that we know). This Eternal Cause made up (from nothing) everything in the universe. God also created time, space (the heaven) and first matter (the earth).

First Earth is covered with water. This is contrary to the big bang imagination of a molten mass that needed to be rained on for *m-i-l-l-i-o-n-s* of years. (This is what big-bang erroneously teaches). Over this formless, empty and dark deep (waters), God the Holy Spirit is hovering (rachaph {raw-khaf'}) the water in a caring and loving way. What power was released? **AND GOD SAID, "LET THERE BE LIGHT"**: Immediately: Light *is*. Light dispels

the darkness. God divides the darkness from the light and there is the first Day and Night. That is the first day.

**AND GOD SAID, LET THERE BE A FIRMAMENT** (expanse, vault of heaven) to divide the waters (on the earth) from the waters (above the earth). **AND IT WAS SO**. God called or labeled the firmament: heaven. And that was the second day.

On the third day, **GOD SAID, LET THE WATERS UNDER THE HEAVEN BE GATHERED TOGETHER UNTO ONE PLACE**. Thus the dry[land] appears in the other place. So we hear of a single continent in Genesis. It takes evolution twenty centuries to come up with a similar idea of one continent and continental drift. Of course by then the world wide flood in Noah's day had changed everything. **AND GOD CALLED THE DRY LAND EARTH**. But God is Creator, so **GOD SAID, LET THE EARTH BRING FORTH GRASS, THE HERB YIELDING SEED, AND THE FRUIT TREE . . .** And **IT WAS SO**.

Next was the fourth day. **AND GOD SAID, LET THERE BE LIGHTS** in the heaven to give light upon the Earth. **AND GOD MADE TWO GREAT LIGHTS**, the sun and the moon and all the stars **TO GIVE LIGHT UPON THE EARTH**. God made them for seasons, **AND TO DIVIDE THE LIGHT FROM THE DARKNESS**.

On the fifth day of creation, all was ready for God to bring forth in the sea and in the air, magnificent creatures. **AND GOD SAID, LET THE WATERS BRING FORTH ABUNDANTLY** all that live in the seas; creatures with life (fish, frogs, porpoise). And fowl ([owph]-Str.Heb.Lex. No. 5775) flying creatures, (fowl, insects, birds) that **MAY FLY ABOVE THE EARTH**. So God created **GREAT WHALES** (large [tanniyn] sea monsters. (We might call them plesiosaur) and every living creature **WHICH THE WATERS BROUGHT FORTH ABUNDANTLY**. God had brought forth sea creatures and flying things on this fifth day. **AND GOD BLESSED THEM . . .** This was . . . **THE FIFTH DAY**.

On the sixth creation day God brought forth all the land breathing animals and beasts that roamed the face of the earth, this would include, apes, snakes, dragons, (dinosaurs), cows, lions, ostriches.

26) **AND GOD SAID, LET US MAKE MAN IN OUR OWN IMAGE, AFTER OUR LIKENESS: AND LET THEM HAVE DOMINION OVER THE FISH OF THE SEA, AND OVER THE FOWL OF THE AIR, AND OVER THE CATTLE, AND OVER ALL THE EARTH, AND OVER EVERY CREEPING THING THAT CREEPETH UPON THE EARTH.**

What a wonderful God, Who created us in His image. And He died for our sins. God is concerned, personal, and near, not distant and unconcerned as some teach.

The Bible reveals God first created man (Adam) from the dust of the earth. God then breathed into him the breath (spirit) of life. God placed man (Adam) in a perfect environment with fruit to eat, animals for play. Adam named ALL the animals. God walked daily with man (Adam).

But God had created Adam to need completion, to need love, to want to protect, to desire, to guide. In short Adam was created needing a wife and family.

At that time, God knew Adam had recognized his need for Eve. Adam had a desire for Eve, a need to care for, protect her and procreate with God and Eve. God created Eve from Adam's rib as Adam slept.

When Adam awoke, he probably could not believe the gift God has given him in this first wife-mother. Eve must have been the most beautiful, most intelligent, most sensitive, most perfect wife a man could dream of having. Eve had to be the best. She was a direct creation of God. She was God's gift to Adam.

However, in the space of time, things changed. Adam, must have forgotten from Whom Eve came. Because he was created with the ability to love and the power to reject, he watched as the devil and Eve had a conversation.

The serpent talked with Eve.


GENESIS.3:1

Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? 2) And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: 3) But of the fruit of the tree which [is] in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. 4) And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: 5) For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. 6) And when the woman saw that the tree [was] good for food, and that it [was] pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make [one] wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat. 7) And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they [were] naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons. 8) And they heard the voice of the LORD God walking in the garden in the cool of the day: and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the LORD God amongst the trees of the garden.

The care and concern of God for man thereafter could be summed up in understanding **Why** Jesus came to Earth in the form of a man.

**For God so loved the world, that He gave His only Begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.**  
John 3:16

**WHY DID JESUS COME INTO THE WORLD ?**



Jesus said, "THIS DAY IS SALVATION COME TO THIS HOUSE, FORASMUCH AS HE ALSO IS A SON OF ABRAHAM. 10) FOR THE SON OF MAN IS COME TO SEEK AND TO SAVE THAT WHICH WAS LOST." Luke 19:9-10

We have all heard Jesus came into (appeared as a man in) the world to seek (hunt, pursue) and save (deliver, recover, redeem) those who are lost (confused, hopeless, deceived) and separated from God. Let us try, with God's help, to understand what that implies, considering the entire Biblical account of man.

God had given Adam and Eve one rule to obey. God said you can eat off any tree, except the tree in the midst of the garden. It was the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. God said, **thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.**

What did Adam (and wife) do? They broke the one rule God gave them. They sinned. They ate of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Genesis 3 recalls when the serpent deceived Eve. **They** ate the forbidden fruit (Adam was *with her*-Genesis 3:6). Then what happens? DEATH. This death was not when life comes to an end. It was Spiritual Death: man becomes disconnected from God, the Source of eternal life. Now that Adam was not going to live forever, He began to wear out, run down, age. He was headed for physical death. Thus, Adam's being disconnected from God led to his eventual physical death. But, we must also realize physical death is NOT going out of existence. Death is passage into another reality, an Eternal existence. Where? Your choice: heaven or lake of fire.

There are 3 Deaths:

- Spiritual death. (Adam separates from God)
- Physical death (of man) precedes
- Eternal death (in the lake of fire)

How horrible must be that Lake of fire and eternal torment. It is so bad (appalling, dreadful, horrible) that God (the Father-Son-Holy Spirit) was willing to allow the Son to come into the world. HE "became flesh"(lived in human form) for one reason. Why? HE offered Himself as "The Lamb," The Sacrifice, of God. Jesus, God (in man's form) allowed His fleshly body to die in your place. He paid your penalty for sin. The wages of sin is death, (eternal death). But the gift of God is eternal life, through ONE, Jesus Christ our Lord. It is a correct

understanding that unless you are reconnected to the Source of eternal life, the eternal life Giver before your physical death, you will die and go to eternal death in the lake of fire. Jesus is the Only Way of escape.

Jesus lived a sinless life on Earth to be God's sacrifice, so you (and I) might have eternal life in heaven with Him. How may we escape eternal death and torment in the lake of fire? Accept what Jesus did as HE died in your place.

Thus the Bible is summarized in John 3:16

**For God so loved the world, that He gave His only Begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.**

If you embrace this simple, profound verse, you can be born again. Then you will understand what God was willing to do to bring you to Him. Receive, for yourself, what God has done for you. Receive His Gift of eternal life. Remember, "You must be born again." Only after you are born again will you truly and intimately KNOW God. This comes through the four steps we shared earlier and surrendering to Him in prayer admitting your need for a savior.

But to grow in the knowledge of God, one must read the Bible. Many who call themselves believers have never read the Bible, from cover to cover. Those who are able to read and have not read the Bible, wonder why they have so many questions. The Bible answers:

Romans 10: v. 17; ***So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.***

While Hebrews 11:6 contains advice and instruction:

***But without faith [it is] impossible to please [Him]: for he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and [that] He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.***

**NOT EVERYONE THAT SAITH LORD, LORD...** I want to talk to you about some who call themselves Christian, but reject some (or

all) of the words of the Bible. They try to make the Bible conform to what vast age evolutionists teach. Many do not realize that numerous evolutionists know (with no doubt) darwinian evolution is **NOT** defensible. In ignorance of this, Christians are being destroyed. God said: MY people are destroyed for lack of knowledge. . . . Hosea 4:6

Why do Christians try to add vast ages to the Genesis creation account? Most are intimidated by men in white lab coats with computer printouts. Christians don't know these men in white lab coats defend an ideology from the imagination of three men: Darwin, Lyell and Hutton. Furthermore, many evolutionists have now rejected Darwinian evolution.

Yet, so-called Christians, fail to believe God's Bible mostly because they have been falsely taught that big-bang evolution was true. We were taught this error, after many upper echelon evolutionists had begun to seriously doubt Darwinism. These so-called Christians try to make the Bible fit men's belief. Isn't that upside down or backwards?

Why would one who is truly born again, is reconciled to The Only Truth believe the fantasy of the creation (man) and reject God? Adding to the Bible or speaking for God when he has not specifically told you what to say, is dangerous. [fn<sup>21</sup>]

An example of this type Christian, is author, Professor Philip E. Johnson of Berkeley Law School. Professor Johnson was to many in the 1990s their champion. He wrote ***Darwin on Trial***, Regnery Gateway, Wash. D.C. (1991). Johnson states:

**I am a philosophical theist and a Christian. I believe that a God exists who could create out of nothing if He wanted to do so, but Who might have chosen to**

---

<sup>21</sup> But the prophet, which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die. - Deuteronomy 18:20

**work through a natural evolutionary process instead. I am not a defender of creation-science [fn<sup>22</sup>], and in fact I am not concerned in this book with addressing any conflicts between the Biblical accounts and the scientific evidence.**

**My purpose is to examine the scientific evidence on its own terms, being careful to distinguish the evidence itself from any religious or philosophical bias that might distort our interpretation of that evidence. I assume that the creation-scientists are biased by their precommitment to Biblical fundamentalism, and I will have very little to say about their position. The question I want to investigate is whether Darwinism is based upon a fair assessment of the scientific evidence, or whether it is another kind of fundamentalism.** (Phillip E. Johnson, ***Darwin on Trail***, Regnery Gateway, Wash. D.C. (1991) p.14

**Translation of Johnson:** I (Johnson) do not really believe the literal Bible from Genesis to Revelation. I label myself a philosophical theist. It sounds intellectual (are you impressed?) Johnson thinks a God exists. Yet, Johnson says God might not have Created as HE clearly tells us in Genesis. Johnson does **not** believe Genesis or that he can defend the Bible as it is written. He purports to fight against a philosophy that teaches the Bible is not true as written, then he, himself says the Bible is not true as written.

---

<sup>22</sup> Johnson defines creation-science as *young-Earth, 6 day, Special Creation people who believe every word of the Bible as written is the absolute truth*. Johnson does not believe the Bible as written. He is apparently believes God cannot communicate with man; or at the least man is ignorant. **Someone** (Johnson) must explain what God really meant. Why does he so limit our all knowing God?



Dr. Johnson's purpose is to put aside the Word of God and argue man's reason (Johnson's against Darwinians). Whereas Johnson does not believe Darwinism, he also says fundamentalist creation-scientists are biased by the Bible. Johnson will check his theory against that of other men (so-called scientists). Then he will tell us what he believes.

The inspired Bible is the *Book of Faith* for Christians! How can a person say I am a Christian, yet not believe the Bible? You cannot rationally deny any of the Bible, and claim to be a Christian. If one does **not** believe a part of the Bible how can he believe in any of it? It is the same Holy Spirit Who dictated it all.

In contrast to professor Johnson, I am a precommitted Biblical fundamentalist believer. I might embarrass him, if he is forced to admit he might also be a Christian. Dr. Johnson believes in God, but is he a Bible believing Christian? He may be, but doesn't sound very committed to God's Bible. He can add **m-i-l-l-i-o-n-s** or even **b-i-l-l-i-o-n-s** of years to the Bible without any effort. Then **THOSE** (who add years) tell us what God is **really** trying to tell us, when God moved upon men to write the Bible. (These men have changed the simple truth of God to fit the Hutton vast age imagination. They believe only **they** (with their education [indoctrination]) are smart enough to understand what God meant to say.

How arrogant.

How preposterous.

How dishonoring to God and man.

When a man adds time to the Biblical account of Creation, he is saying God *is not capable of* communicating with His highest creation: man. Don't these highly educated [highly indoctrinated] men realize that they have joined satan in saying Hath God said?

Did God create us?

Yes.

Who made our mind?

**God.**

Do you really believe God would have trouble communicating with the mind HE created? **No!**

Would God need men to tell others what God intended to say or convey in Genesis? **NO!**

Does God trust us, common folk to understand and believe God and His Word? **Yes.**

All we need is faith in God and His Word.

Do you believe the Bible to be the Word of God? If "Yes," then you either are a Christian or you are very close to becoming one. If "No," then you must be concerned about whether or not you are a Christian. **WHY?**

Without faith it is impossible to please God.

You cannot deny the *Bible of God* (have faith) and say you believe in (have faith) the *God of the Bible*. If you accepted the Bible as true at one time and then were talked out of it by some man, you **may** be saved. But you will be most miserable having no assurance of the Truth. Think!

How can you claim to be one who believes the Bible is the Word of the God of all Truth and yet deny the Truth of the Bible?

The Holy Spirit either dictated and inspired the entire Bible or He inspired none of it. **THINK!** It is the same Holy Spirit who inspired those parts you rely upon for the promise of eternal life in the world to come. But, how can you accept that Truth and reject the plain words of Genesis also inspired by the same Holy Spirit. If God the Holy Spirit inspired some, He inspired all. Logically you must either believe the entire Bible or none of it.

God never intended you to be tossed about with every new teaching that comes along. God is not the author of confusion. God asks you to believe His plain words.

*For without faith, it is impossible to please God, but he that cometh unto God must believe that He (God) is and that He (God) is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. (Hebrews 11:6)*

## **FINAL WARNING**

**IS EVOLUTION COMPATIBLE WITH CREATION?** Evolution is the chief opponent of the Biblical view. Scientists have known Darwin's evolution **cannot** be reconciled with Genesis for decades. D.B. Gower, a biochemist of the 20<sup>th</sup> century stated, in 1975: **I quote:**

**The creation account in Genesis and the theory of evolution could not be reconciled. One must be right and the other wrong.** . . . (D.B. Gower, "**Scientists Rejects Evolution**," Kentish Times, England, Dec. 11, 1975, p. 4)

**Do not** believe people who tell you there is a way to reconcile God's Creation with evolution. There is not! Is it a lie (of some) that the Bible and evolution are compatible?

Remember, many of Darwin's contemporaries, men in schools of higher learning, opposed Darwin. Professor Louis Agassiz of Harvard stated the fossil record of Darwin's day showed complex organisms suddenly appearing fully formed in the fossil record. That was and is evidence favoring Creation. Also remember that in 1977 evolutionists Gould and Eldredge admitted the fossils did not support Darwin's gradualism. At about the same time (1975) D.B. Gower, the biochemist wrote Genesis and evolution could not be reconciled. He also made a point about the fossil record. **I quote:**

**"The story of the fossils agreed with the account of Genesis. In the oldest rocks we did not find a series of fossils covering the gradual changes from the most primitive creatures to developed forms, but rather in the oldest rocks developed species suddenly appeared. Between every species there was a complete absence of intermediate fossils."** (D.B. Gower, *ibid.*)

Fifty (50) PhDs, most former evolutionists, have now rejected Darwin and neo-darwinism. WHY? They discovered evolution is without evidence and/or that the evidence best fits the Bible. Each of these PhDs has written an article. They write as to why they now believe God created **IN SIX DAYS**. Please read the book by the same name, **IN SIX DAYS** (Master Books-2001 A.D.)

## **Closing Argument**

In May 2005 A.D., two members of the National Academy of Sciences from Penn State University wrote to Dr. Steve Abrams, the chairperson of the Kansas State Board of Education. They wrote concerning the controversy over the adoption of new sciences standards in the state of Kansas. They wrote to:

*"voice my strong support for the idea that students should be able to study scientific criticisms of the evidence for modern evolutionary theory along with the evidence favoring the theory."*

Later he wrote:

*Many of the scientific criticisms of which I speak are well known by scientists in various disciplines of chemistry and biochemistry, in which I have done my work. I have found that some of my scientific colleagues are very reluctant to acknowledge the existence of problems with evolutionary*

*theory to the general public. They display an almost religious zeal for a strictly Darwinian view of biological origins.*

In closing this was written:

*Intellectual freedom is fundamental to the scientific method. Learning to think creatively, logically and critically is the most important training that young scientists can receive. Encouraging students to carefully examine the evidence for and against neo-Darwinism, therefore, will help prepare students not only to understand current scientific arguments, but also to do good scientific research.*

*I commend you for your efforts to ensure that student are more fully informed about current debates over neo-Darwinism in the scientific community.*

*Yours sincerely,*

Professor Phillip S. Skell  
Evan Pugh, Professor of Chemistry, Emeritus  
Penn State University

The Bible says: *He that is first in his own cause seemeth just but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him.* -**Proverbs 18:17** This verse, to someone who has been around a court of law might read, the first one to present the facts, evidence and beliefs of his cause of action, he seems to be correct and the one to whom justice is owed or an award or judgment given by the judge or jury. However, when the (“neighbor”) other party to the controversy arrives to question, cross examine or present a different set of facts, the first set of facts presented may not be so formidable. So let us hear from an evolutionist neighbor.

**We take the side of science (*sic-evolution*) in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, in spite of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, in spite of the tolerance of the scientific (*sic-evolution*) community for unsubstantiated “Just So’ stories, because we have a prior commitment, a commitment to materialism. It**

**is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our a priori adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counterintuitive, how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine foot in the door.** (Richard Lewontin, PhD “**Billions and Billions of Demons,**” *The New York Review* - January 1997 p.31 as quoted by Dennis R. Petersen, **Section Two Unlocking the Mysteries of Evolution, *Unlocking the Mysteries of Creation*, endnote 6 p.229, - 2002A.D.)**

Richard Lewontin is a confirmed evolutionist and a member of the academic community, so we will translate his quote. To do this we must first understand his definitions. When he says science, he is speaking of evolution. And when he states he is a materialist, he is confiding that he does not consider God or anything outside of the area of the physical world or physical cosmos for his belief system.

**Materialism** is defined by the American Heritage Dictionary as:

*The theory that physical matter is the only reality and that everything, including thought, feeling, mind, and will, can be explained in terms of matter and physical phenomena.*

When we understand at the least these factors we read his quote, as:

**We take the side of *evolution* in spite of the patent or clear absurdity (nonsense) of some of its constructs (some of which we base it upon), in spite of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, (it has not kept its promises to give us the good life and explain all the problems and abolish sickness, disease) in spite of the tolerance (acceptance) of the *evolutionary* community for unsubstantiated**

(unfounded, and unproven) “**Just So**” stories, (things that cannot be proven and appear more and more to be akin to fairy tales from the imagination of men’s minds) **because we have a prior commitment**, (we have agreed to believe without any further proof that Darwin was correct) **a commitment to materialism** (that everything can be explained by the physical world and the reaction of our senses to it). **It is not that the methods** (such as the scientific method or evidence or the ability to duplicate or prove our evolutionary position) **and institutions of science** (scientific learning) **somehow compel us to accept a material** (totally physical) **explanation of the phenomenal** (extraordinary and physical) **world, but, on the contrary**, (to tell the truth the evidence may be leading us away) **that we are forced by our a priori adherence to material causes** (but we exclude everything but the physical world and our evolutionary belief system) **to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations**, (we will not think of meta physical or non evolutionary ideas) **no matter how counterintuitive**, (even though in truth it goes against the evidence and our common sense) **how mystifying** (baffling, bewildering or stupid it may seem) **to the uninitiated** (to those who do not adhere absolutely to our unproven set of beliefs). **Moreover, that materialism is absolute**, (And we say that the only truth has to be, or conform to, our physical and evolutionary beliefs, therefore) **for we cannot allow a Divine foot in the door**. (We cannot consider a Creator or even Intelligent Design as the next step would be God and we have been fighting that since we adopted our evolutionary belief system).

Do you understand?

This is a clear evolutionist saying that he is on the side of evolution, even though he admits that much of Darwin’s imagined evolution is clear nonsense (**patent absurdity**):

Evolution, he conceded is based upon made up and unproven stories. Moreover, he admits that science does not compel him to take this position. But that it is his belief in that which is clearly nonsensical, unproven, made up stories of Darwin’s imagined evolution drives him to reject God or Intelligent Design, Even though Intelligent Design or the Creator, may well be true, **we are forced** (*says professor Lewontin*) by our **prior commitment to evolution to not accept Intelligent Design or Creator God**, even though that makes more sense and even appears to be true.

So now you know the rest of the story. **CREATOR GOD IS NOT REJECTED BECAUSE THERE IS A VIABLE SCIENTIFIC ALTERNATIVE. GOD AND THE BIBLE ARE REJECTED BECAUSE OF A PRIOR COMMITMENT TO AN IMAGINED IDEA (DARWINISM) THAT IS CLEAR NONSENSE BASED UPON MADE UP, UNPROVEN STORIES.** And evolutionists are going to face God some day. Are they to tell Him, this is the reason they did not believe in God? Is this the reason they will give for not accepting Jesus sacrificial death on the cross for the reconciliation of themselves back to God? Who is deceiving them? Who is asking them, Hath God said? They have been *Evolutionized!* Friend, have you also been *Evolutionized?*

**WHO IS THAT GOING ABOUT “AS IF” A ROARING LION?** It is no secret that evolution is the chief ideological opponent of God, His creation and the Bible. But who is the chief enemy? Who says God is a liar? Who goes about as if he’s a roaring lion? It is not Charles Darwin or his present day adherents. They are mere agents. Agents of whom? Whom is this evil one using as his agents? Are you one of his agents?

## **Perhaps You Need To Make Peace with God**

Perhaps you now realize Darwin’s evolution is not true. You had been deceived. If you now realize this, you need to make peace with Creator, God. The Bible says we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. To make peace with God, you must be reconciled to your Creator. It is so simple a fool should not err therein. God so loved the world that HE gave

His only Begotten Son that whosoever believes in Him (and accepts what HE did for them) shall not perish (in the lake of fire) That person will have everlasting life. That person will escape the lake of fire. He or she will be reconciled to God. Jesus is the Only Way back to God the Father.

## THE CALL TO PEACE:

Heavenly Father, (Pray after me.)

I confess that You and Your Word is Truth. I confess that I have been *Evolutionized* and I need to come back to You. You told us that if we are separated from You, Father, or from Your Truth, in any way, we can reconcile to You. I want to come back to You, Father, through Jesus Christ my Lord. Please forgive me for my unbelief and all my sin. I call upon You Lord Jesus. Please give to me, a life changing encounter. Please give me that total change. Please come into my heart and life. Please change me radically! Please deliver me from every demon. *I now receive Jesus Christ into my heart and life.* I receive Your deliverance. Please reconcile me to the Father. Holy Spirit, please lead me into all Truth. I ask and pray this in the Name of the incomparable, Jesus Christ, God the Son. Amen and amen.

If you prayed that prayer and meant it sincerely from within, you have called upon the Name of the Lord to give you a life changing encounter with and through the Lord Jesus Christ, the Bible says you are or will be born again. *For whosoever* calls upon the Name of the Lord, shall be saved. (Romans 10:13)

**God is Good      All the time.**  
**All the time.      God is good.**

### The Sanctuary

Lord prepare me,	to be a sanctuary
Pure and Holy,	tried and true.
With thanksgiving,	I'll be a living
Sanctuary	for YOU!!!

## PARTIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. The Holy Bible Authorized King James Version-1679 A.D. Tn Thomas Nelson Publishing -(1990 A.D.)
2. Ashton, Jon, Ed. ***In six days*** Green Forest AR Master Books (2001 AD)
3. Behe, Dr. Michael ***Darwin's Black Box***, (biochemical challenge to evolution) New York, The Free Press (1996 AD)
4. Cohen, I.L. ***Darwin Was Wrong***, (A study in Probabilities) New Research Publication, Inc -NY (1984 AD)
5. Darwin, Charles ***On the Origin of Species***, John Murray - London 1859 AD 6<sup>th</sup> Edition - (Online Edition 2004 AD)
6. Denton, Dr. Michael ***Evolution, A Theory in Crisis***, Adler & Adler Pub Bethesda, MD,(1985 AD)
7. Hamm, Ken ***The Lie [Evolution]***, Master Books Green Forest, AR (1999 AD)
8. Kindell, Dr. Thomas ***Evolution on Trial*** Reasons For Faith Eagle Point OR (1996 AD)
9. Lubenow, Marvin ***Bones of Contention*** Baker Books Grand Rapids, MI (2004 AD)
10. Hoyle, Dr. Sir Fred ***The Intelligent Universe*** Holt, Reinhart, Winston NY (1983 AD)
11. Hoyle, Dr. Sir Fred ***Mathematics of Evolution*** Alcorn Memphis, TN 1999 AD)
12. Morris, Dr. John ***The Young Earth***, Master Books, Green Forest AR (1994 AD)
13. Safarti, Dr Jonathon, ***Refuting Evolution*** Master Books, Green Forest, AR (2000 A.D.)
14. Safarti, Dr Jonathon, ***Refuting Compromise*** Master Books, Green Forest, AR (2004 A.D.)
15. Spetner, Dr. Lee ***Not By Chance*** Judaica Press, Brooklyn NY (1997 AD)
16. Sunderland, Luther D. ***Darwin's Enigma***, Master Books, El Cajon, CA (1988AD)
17. Wald, Dr. George "The Origin of Life," Scientific American, vol. 191, 1954, p.46
18. Woodmorappe, John ***The Mythology of Modern Dating Methods*** Institute For Creation Research, El Cajon CA (1999 AD)