

Acadia University
The Birth of Man

By
Frederick Christopher Bouter

Classics 230. Ancient History, Mon./Wed. 2:30-3:45 p.m.
G.F. Vellek, Dr. Phil.
1 March 1982

INTRODUCTION

Human thinking throughout history has been like the powerful waves of an onrushing tide, surging and uprooting every feeble obstacle of mortal thought. So also the theory of evolution has reappeared as a sweeping spring tide after about two thousand years of more or less Christian influences, not unlike this year –1982– in which scientists foresee a huge tide because of a special alignment of the giant planets of our solar system. This tide has come up over both poly- or pantheistic and monotheistic thinking. Lucretius, a student of Epicurus, wrote in his scientific poem to Memmius:

Humana ante oculos foede cum vita iaceret/in terries
oppressa gravi sub religione,/quae caput a caeli regio-
 nibus ostendebat/horribili super aspectu mortalis in-
 stans,/primum Graius homo mortalis tollere contra/est
 oculos ausus primusque obsistere contra, . . . quod
 contra saepius illa/religio peprit scelerosa atque
 impia facta: . . . principium cuius hinc nobis exordia
 sumet/nullam rem e nilo gigni divinitus umquam. . . .
 nam certe neque consilio primordia rerum/ordine se suo
 quaeque sagaci mente locarunt. . . 1

Epicurus, the man from Greece, attacked the reigning religion of his time on account of its atrocious sacrifices it was known to have organized. His criticism was total in that he argued that the universe had not come into being through the agency of divine beings, but that it came into existence without any design, that is by chance; thus taking away all grounds of worshiping the gods. Epicurus, Lucretius' brainfather(341-270 B.C) had many followers during several centuries, but biblical beliefs eventually ousted him. It seems however that in his day he was not as much an atheist as a religious reformer.

So also Charles Darwin, a one time divinity student, creationist, and believer in Christ, was overcome by doubt, lost faith in Christianity altogether, and started seeking an alternative explanation for the origin of life. He never became an atheist, but regarded himself more or less an agnostic. In a letter to Sir Charles Lyell he expresses his being impressed by the majesty of the universe, and that it is reasonable to believe in a God who put design and purpose in it. But "Would any one trust the convictions of a monkey's mind?"²

In the more recent California Textbook Controversy some evolutionists reacted to a creationist's challenge in an emotional way, which suggested that in some respects Evolution is indeed a religion rather than a science.³ In this essay we hope to make clear, scientifically, how to think about species, and how about the origin of life. The latter point, however, does not belong to the province of science but to that of theology, as will be obvious. We beg the reader to condone our bringing in of religion into this study. But it is because the topics are connected to one another at the base, as is abundantly clear also from the following quotation.

George Bernard Shaw, one of the outstanding play-
 wrights of all time, once mentioned that Darwin's theory
 became public at a time when the world was "fed up"
 with the notion that everything had happened through
 the "arbitrary personal act of an arbitrary personal
 God, of dan gerous, jealous and cruel personal char-
 acter ..." and that is why many people literally
 jumped at Darwin's theory and took it far beyond the
 realm of science and literally made it a religion. 4

Evolutionistic Theories

Lucretius was not the only ancient philosopher that proposed, although vaguely, concepts of organic evolution.

Anaximander(611-547 B.C.) proposed one of the earliest theories of spontaneous generation of life from primordial fluid. Aristotle(384-322 B.C.) believed in a perfecting principle continually operating to improve the living world.⁵

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries quite a number of evolutionary ideas were suggested, but only Darwin's seemed the most reasonable one. He was the first one to explain the already much believed in principle of evolution by means of the mechanism of natural selection. ⁶

Darwin's claim boils down to this: The species evolved gradually under the changing conditions of their respective habitats. Thus earthly life, that is plants, animals, and man, is considered to have grown into one big 'family'. ⁷

Today a lot of evolutionists that are a little bit better acquainted with the facts are not as sure of this any more. They still think that the animals evolved one after another, not necessarily out of one another.⁸

A great deal of scientists believe in so-called Neo-Darwinism. This is a combination of Darwin's theory of continual variability, and Gregor Mendel's genetic experiments. ⁹

A lot of scientists adhere to a so-termed polyphyletic evolution. It means that the species did not develop out of one common form, but out of several absolutely unknowable forms.¹⁰ The general public scarcely knows anything about all those uncertainties, and in most cases has only heard of some Darwinian or Neo-Darwinian explanation. (It seems that it takes about fifty years before studies at universities influence the population). The serious problem is that those concepts persist to be spread around as gospel truth. Even in colleges, where students are to learn the facts, completely biased material has been given for years on a row now. Man is said to have evolved in the following way, allegedly according to the fossils: Eoanthropus, Pithecanthropus, Sinanthropus, Heidelberg man, Neandertal man, Homo sapiens, 11 or, Zinjanthropus, Mount Carmel, La Chappelle-aux-Saints, Cro-Magnon, Grimaldi, Chancelade.¹²

It surprised me that now at last it is conceded to the public that the so-called missing links never have been found, nor ever will... If men were men and apes were apes, it was argued, the connection could be proved by discovering a fossil that stood halfway between the two. But no "missing link" fossils were found—nor would they ever be, for we know today that while both men and apes descended from common, but very remote ancestors, they bear the relationships of cousin rather than that of grandparent to grandchild.¹³

We only want to comment here that the fossils always were used to substantiate men's and apes' common ancestry. By stating that the links never have been found the theory cannot even exist as a theory. A lot of evolutionists today, because of the unfindable links, reason that evolution took place by means of giant leaps.¹⁴ They do not realize however that they make themselves ridiculous, for we would have to believe then that for example an animal all of a sudden developed an eye, a wing, or whatever.

The above given theories only deal with life on earth. The familiar Big Bang theory explains that the universe came into existence when a gaseous mixture exploded. This hypothesis is based upon observations according to which the universe is expanding all the time at an enormous speed. Thus winding the thing back someone got the idea that the whole clock might have been triggered by an explosion.¹⁵

Then there is also the 'old-fashioned' steady state or continuous creation theory, according to which masses of matter are being created (just out of the hat of the illusionist, that is out of nowhere), which then in some mysterious way take the form of stars expanding and expanding into the endless void of the god-deserted space.¹⁶

Main Proofs Adduced for Evolution

The main cards that hold up the wobbly-nobbly house of evolution are summed up excellently as follows:

Classification. The fact that it is possible to arrange the various kinds of plants and animals into categories of species, genera, families, orders, etc., is supposed to suggest that there are genetic relationships between them.

Comparative Anatomy. Similarities in skeletal structure, such as between apes and men of horses and elephants, are assumed to imply evolutionary kinship.

Embryology. Similarities in embryos of different kind of animals and the supposed “evolutionary” growth of the embryo into the adult animal are taken as evidence that the animals are related and that they have passed through an analogous evolutionary development into their present forms during the geologic past.

Biochemistry. The fact that all living organisms are composed of certain basic chemical substances (amino acids, proteins, DNA, etc.) is supposed to prove that all living organisms have a common ancestry.

Physiology. Certain similarities in physiological factors, especially blood precipitates, and of behaviour characteristics are offered as further evidences of genetic kinships.

Geographical Distributions. The tendency of certain kinds of plants and animals to vary in character with geographic location, and especially to assume distinct characteristics when isolated from similar populations in other regions, is presumed to suggest evolution.

Vestigial Organs. Certain supposedly useless structures and organs (e.g., the appendix in man) are believed to represent “vestigial” of characters which were once useful and functional in a previous evolutionary state.

Breeding Experiments. The many new varieties of plants and animals that have been developed by hybridization and other breeding techniques are taken as indicative of the evolutionary potential implicit in living organisms, which presumably has been realized over the geological ages through the mechanism of “natural selection,” just as “artificial selection” has been by man to develop new varieties.

Mutations. The observed fact that entirely new varieties arise suddenly in a particular organism (or “population” of organisms) is offered as the best present-day visual proof of evolution; these new characteristics are called “mutations” and it is said that, if these turn out to be favorable, they will be preserved by natural selection and thus contribute to the long-term evolutionary process.

Paleontology. The fossil record of former living things, as preserved in the sedimentary rocks of the earth’s crust, is offered as an actual documented history of organic evolution, with the degree of complexity of the fossils supposedly increasing with the passage of geological time, thus marking the gradual development of the present organic world from primitive and simple beginnings about a billion years ago.¹⁷

We are glad that more and more evolutionists themselves start realizing that there is something wrong with their “articles of faith.” A professor of comparative biochemistry and Physiology at Southampton University dropped a bomb in the scientific world that made the Darwinian theory shake to its very foundations. His name is G.A.Kerkhut. We quote his list of seven basic assumptions that are partially concealed in the postulate of organic evolution:

(1) Non –living matter gave rise spontaneously to

living matter in biogenesis.

(2) Spontaneous biogenesis according to (1) occurred just once, so that the whole of present day life has descended from a single primeval cell. This assumption has been confirmed by the observation that the genetic code is the same in all forms of life (plant and animal) known today. The identical extremely complex code of life could scarcely have arisen spontaneously and independently at different points of time and under different conditions by chance alone. Therefore it is assumed that biogenesis, which is supposed to have involved the origin of the genetic code, took place only once.

(3) Virus species, bacteria, plants and animals have all evolved from one another – they are all related to each other once.

(4) The metazoans arose from the protozoans according to the principle of spontaneous random mutation and natural selection without planning.

(5) The invertebrates are all genetically related to each other.

(6) The vertebrates are all genetically related to the invertebrates.

(7) All vertebrates are genetically related to one another. 18.19.

Macroevolution and Microevolution

A lot of creationists who believe that God created the universe, and all the various forms of life on earth, have often been held up to ridicule on the grounds that they rejected emotionally the claims of evolution in the face of all scientific proofs. Now, it is important that we get a few things straightened out right here. Whenever they reject the theory of evolution, then they mean macroevolution, not microevolution. The former is a philosophical postulate about nature, the latter is a confusing name for the scientifically demonstrable changes within a species; the former exists only in the minds of those that want to believe it, and is outside the field of science, the latter is wonderfully beautiful fact. The term macroevolution comprises all the various theories, in all their nuances, that have something in common with Darwinism or Neo-Darwinism. 20 We will touch upon these in the next section. Microevolution is the wrong word for the great number of varieties that exist within a species.

The well-known species canis familiaris (domestic dog), has very many differences in itself, as anybody knows. So also with the mink, and with the monkeys, of which hundreds of varieties are known. Science has proved that all those varieties can interbreed. No sensible person disclaims that.

21

Refutation of Macroevolution

However, evolutionistic thinkers say that because varieties within a species interbreed, so also did the species, and possibly the genera; and in such away speciation (the development of one species out of another) must have taken place. But sober fact is that science in no possible way can demonstrate this. By interbreeding they beget the mule. The mule however is sterile, and so all further development stops. Science itself here proves that species stay within their set limits.

We repeat the hard fact here that the missing links still are and will be missing. It might be that people here in the intellectual backwoods, das Hinterland, of the world did not yet overhear this somewhere sometime. Science writers for Newsweek admitted the following:

In the fossil record, missing links are the rule:
the story of life is as disjointed as a silent news-

reel, in which species succeed one another as abruptly as Balkan prime ministers. The more scientists have searched for the transitional forms between species, the more they have been frustrated.²²

Now you must well understand that this concerns all life! There are no, absolutely no fossils that substantiate the gradual speciation of any form of life, whether you take plants, animals, or yourself... There are no links between the insectivores and the primates. The Ramapithecus is just a hominoid (ape).

Hominids (nearest link between man and ape) are either playing at hide-and-seek, or never roved about the face of the earth. The latter becomes more and more obvious. Dryopithecus is a genuine fossil ape, so is the Kenyapithecus. To top it all, a living high-altitude baboon has been found in Ethiopia, the Theropithecus galada. It has many features in common with the Ramapithecus and the Australopithecus.

These facts overthrow the classification method of any fossil as a hominid on dental and related grounds. Louis Leakey concedes now that his Zinjanthropus bosei, or "East Africa Man", is a variety of Australopithecus. The Australopithecus is a collective name for two species of Australopithecines, the Australopithecus africanus et robustus. Louis Leakey's son Richard claims that these two species are really male and female. This takes away the notion that the more gracile one of the two, the africanus, is a hominid. Recently Richard substantiated the indication that the australopithecines were long-armed, short-legged knuckle-walkers, similar to extant African apes. However Leakey believes that he has evidence that an other animal, the Homohabilis, called so by his father, was walking upright, and is believed to have the same age as the Australopithecus. Robinson and others, notwithstanding, have contended that the creature is the same as the africanus.

The Pithecanthropus erectus is a sad case of outright fraud. Found in 1891 by the Dutch Physician Dubois, the skull later on was found to have been a chimpanzee or a gibbon. Dubois premeditatingly kept two human skulls, discovered at just about the same level, for over thirty years from the scientific public, only that his find might be hailed as a missing link. For years people were misled by his Java man, a forgery, no more. The evidence for the Peking man would be judged a hearsay and not admissible for substantiation, if it were to be brought into a court of law. The Nebraska Man is an incredible blunder on the part of eminent paleontologists, and other authorities. This "man", "christened" Hesperopithecus heraldcookii, was reconstructed on basis of a single tooth. Pictures were lavishly printed, and fed to the public as their man-like ape, or ape-like man forbear. They swallowed it. After five years however it was decided that the thing belonged to an extinct peccary, or pig... "This is a case in which a pig made a monkey out of an evolutionist!". Ironical, isn't it? In 1912 the "Dawn Man", daubed Eanthropus dawsoni for the occasion, and better known as the Pitldown Man, was introduced to the scientific world by no less persons than Arthur Smith Woodward, Director of the British Museum, and Charles Dawson, a medical doctor and amateur paleontologist. About forty years later the skull was thoroughly re-examined, and found to be a forgery made up of a human skull and a modern ape's jaw. It had been treated with a file, potassium bichromate, iron salts, and carborundum. The perpetrator of this terrible act of scientific villainy has never been discovered, but it is strange that Professor Smith-Woodward permitted only a few scientists to examine or even handle the thing. Plaster casts were made very often. However plaster-casts are virtually useless for accurate work. The Roman Catholic priest, Rev. Patrick O'Connel, indicates that the remains of the Sinanthropus disappeared by design rather than by accident because of the war... The Neanderthal Man is today classified as Homo sapiens together with the Swanscombe Man!

In the light of all this it is understandable that Dr. Robert Eckhardt, a paleoanthropologist at Penn State published an article headlined as follows, "Amid the bewildering array of early fossil hominoids (that is 'apes' remind you), is there one whose morphology marks it as man's hominid ancestor?" Richard Leakey discovered a skull even more modern than so-called Peking Man, but in a deposit allegedly about three million years old! In a lecture he made the shattering statement that he was convinced that these findings eliminated everything we have been taught about human origins and, he went on to say, he had nothing to offer in its place...

But still the artist of National Geographic, because of his evolutionary bias, portrayed the finding with a simian nose; notwithstanding the fact that the appearance of the soft anatomy, such as the hair, ears, and nose cannot be reconstructed from osteological remains... How long yet will they keep kidding one another? 23.24.

Moreover the orthodontist, dr. John W. Cuzzo, concludes after years of experience with skulls and jaws of his patients that the variety is so enormous that it is exceedingly difficult to determine whether fossil remains are a human's or an ape's.²⁵ The well-known Heidelberg Man, having left only a large jaw-bone, has teeth that are quite human, and even its receding chin is found in a lot of people today. The following quotation is of the same character:

The so-called Colorado Man (also constructed from a tooth) was later found to have belonged to the horse family. An ape-man skull, also found in Colorado, was exhibited in a museum until it was found to be the skull of a pet monkey buried a few years previously. A bone found near Seattle and identified as an ancient human fibula turned out to be part of a bear's hind leg.²⁶

For somebody brought up with evolutionary doctrines this must sound unbelievable. But the case is worse really. The theory of the evolution of the horse is often used as one of the best proofs for evolution. We mentioned already the controversial book of the mild evolutionist Professor Kerkhut. Here follows one of the reasons why his book came as a bombshell.

It becomes immediately apparent from Kerkut that the present evolutionary tree is vastly different from that which was current fifty years ago. At that time there was a direct line up through to Equus. Today the tree is much more indirect and more branched. Kerkut remarks that it is extremely difficult even for the scientist to obtain a critical account of the basic facts for horse evolution. In fact, a main difficulty in the analysis of the evolution of the horse lies in the fact that one cannot easily distinguish the difference between the reconstructed and the genuine original fossils..... It is important to know that set up and displayed skeletons of Eohippus, Archaeohippus, Megahippus, Onohippus or Parahippus do not exist at all. On this state of affairs Kerkut remarks: "At present, however, it is a matter of faith that the textbook pictures are true or even that are the best representations of the truth that are available to us at the present time." The more one investigates the evolution of the horse, the more complicated it all becomes. Those who know the real facts behind the alleged evolution of the horse do not speak any longer of a simple, clear, proven phylogenetic tree. The horse evolutionary tree as it was previously conceived of and taught, exists only in the minds of those who do not have access to the actual data. In fact, today, books could be written on the development and evolution of the story of the evolutionary history of the horse (as Kerkut points out).²⁷

The theory of geologic ages, one of the main pillars of evolution, was made up about 1840, and is still essentially the same. However not many people know that the complete geologic column cannot be found on earth in one place. It has been made up in theory by means of superimposing strata from various parts of the world. The complete column would add up to about one hundred and fifty miles! The geologic time-scale in fact has been assembled on the assumed evolutionary relationship of the fossils. (There are very many fossils, but they all divide into still living or extinct organisms. No links are found). Thus the main proof of evolution is founded on the supposition of evolution! It means that scholars have been reasoning in a circle... You are very lucky to find a few strata of the

column, and even then (and no student seems to know this) the strata are out of the allegedly normal order, with one or more completely missing, and with older ones on top of younger ones. In supposedly very ancient strata various fossils are found of organisms that according to evolutionists died hundreds of millions of years ago. It came as quite a surprise for them to find those at all in intervening strata. Another strange thing for evolutionistic thinkers is that so-termed polystrate fossils are found, that is fossils extending through various strata. Bear in mind that the rock systems are supposed to be formed gradually in millions of years. 28

The following find is incredible for evolutionists. In the fossilized mud of the Paluxy River bed clear, human footprints are found crossing those of dinosaurs, namely a three-toed one and a four-toed brontosaurus! And although Dr. Bird admits that the tracks are perfectly human, he declares them not genuine only on the basis that according to the evolutionary theory dinosaurs died long before man did. It seems that he suppresses them into his subconsciousness, for later on he mentions only the tracks of the dinosaurs, describing them often. 29

Also the trustworthiness of the carbon-14 method is shaky, even if you think evolutionarily. All the forces of nature are supposed to have developed gradually. Radio activity is just one of the phenomena that slowly became what they are now. But that means that in no way we can trust that the ratio of loss has been the same over all those hundreds of millions of years. 30 Also Velikovsky mentions the imbalancing of the ratio. 31

Also the following consideration takes away all funniness, and makes the case of evolution a deadly serious one. The theory of the old and new stone ages (paleolithic, neolithic), iron and bronze ages is in fact very uncertain. Just as the one of the geological column it has been based upon the assumption that man must have developed gradually. Piggott admits that grinding and polishing stone, and pottery cannot be used for chronology; radio-carbon dates with their imperfections are the best we have according to him. 32 However many other scientists today begin to realize the uncertainties of that method.

Archeologists begin to understand now that highly cultured societies arose suddenly, and that up till about six millennia ago there are no traces of civilization. Ouweneel cites for example Wiseman, King and Woolley. It is unbelievable that man was making hand-axes for about a hundred thousand years in the Acheulian culture, and that then all of a sudden highly intelligent cultures exploded into existence. Of course there have been cave men that made stone axes. But such cultures exist even today. So also in the past highly civilized and primitive societies were found at the same time. There is no objective evidence for an evolution of culture. In fact deterioration overcame the old civilizations of the past, and they only shifted from one place to another. The same holds for language and writing.

Evolutionists are absolutely puzzled about the high niveau of ancient tongues. Sumerian schoolboys, about five thousand years ago, knew so much about mathematics and astronomy as modern historians would not have regarded possible. Take for example also the cave paintings. The unfading paint that looks as fresh as an hour modern man for all he is worth has not been able to reproduce. No, ancient man was probably even more intelligent than today's. Our technology has only more advanced with the passage of time. Also so-called primitive cultures that exist in many places today, are no rudiments out of the Paleolithicum. In fact their languages are far more intricate than ours. 33

Just as the geologic and stone ages have been thought up because of evolutionistic thinking, so also the ice ages. There has been an ice age, but probably not longer than a few hundred years. Among evolutionists there are very many different opinions; the one of the four ice ages is the most popular. However geologic phenomena must be, and are best explained in terms of catastrophism because of a giant flood that swept the earth. The flood theory is not popular today, but that is in the face of scientific facts. Among the thousands of flood traditions that are found among all peoples and races on earth, there are more than three hundred that clearly back up the biblical story of a worldwide flood in the time of old, good Noah. 34

We have discussed man now, but what about the origin of life, and the nature of matter? Today scientists try to reason archebiopoiesis (first generation of life), or autobiogenesis (spontaneous generation of life out of lifeless matter) by means of natural laws that reign now. But if evolution is true then the now laws came only into existence along with the alleged, multiple stages of evolution. That means that it is impossible to use today's laws to guess how the supposed spontaneous generation of life occurred billions of years ago. In fact it makes evolution entirely improbable. For if everything is supposed to have been evolving from the simplest state to the highly organized systems of today,

then also the natural laws, that is physical, biochemical, etc., have been evolving from the simplest grade up till the amazing systems of today. It means that in their simplest degree they were absolutely incapable of generating life spontaneously. This consideration alone is abundant, rational evidence that macro-evolution is altogether impossible. No, the universe testifies, yes, cries out that the Divine Creator spoke her into existence by the grand, majestic power of His Word. This is the simple truth for anyone that hears God's call. Let such a one bow for his or her Maker! Evolution? Forget it! God created the universe.

According to Einstein matter is a form of energy. Well God, the infinite source of all energy, converted some of it into matter. But where does the world come from according to the evolutionist? The geological strata of the earth have been growing and growing according to his stratigraphical geology. The universe has been expanding and expanding according to his astrophysics. The stars were born out of some mysterious kind of a gaseous explosion according to his astrophysico-automaterioarchegenesis. But where did this gas come from?

Ultimately out of nothing... Unbelievable isn't it? Yes, it is indeed! A person must be very childishly naive and credulous to believe such a thing. For nothing is nothing, and out of nothing comes nothing, for there is nothing to draw anything out of nothing... But in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth... Believe it!

Evolutionistic Thinking in other Fields

Once people believe in the evolutionary concept concerning the origin of life, this rotten thinking permeates all the aspects of their lives. Politics, sociology, theology, education, arts, ethics, psychology, etc., etc., all are impaired by this infectious, cancer-like disease. We only want to mention here the Atheistic Communism of Marx, the animalistic pansexualism of Freud, the Ubermensch of the moronic, bloodthirsty Nietzsche, the God-defying, Jew-, gipsy-, and mentally retarded slaughtering Hitler with the idiotic idea of his Aryan race, today's terrorism, rioting among students, etc., etc. About the last item we only want to mention this. Young, susceptible students that are being taught evolution are apt to live their newly acquired knowledge out in the reality of life. What happens is that they regard themselves, more or less consciously, superior to their teachers, since after all they are the next step up the evolutionary ladder! The result is rebellion, disrespect, and ultimately utter mayhem and pandemonium... 35.36.37.

The God of Creation

God not only created matter, and with matter the universe, but He also keeps on sustaining it. The godly Apostle Paul said: Trough faith we understand that the universe has been made by God's word, with the consequence that everything that is seen by us, has not originated out of the things that appear in our sight. All things have been created by Him and for Him. He existed prior to all things, and all things subsist together because of His power. At many times and in many ways since way back in history God has spoken to the Israelite ancestors by means of His prophets. But now at last He has addressed us directly through the person of His son, whom He has established heir af all things, by whom He also made the universe, who, being the forth-beaming of his glory, and the full expression of His Nature, upholding all things by means of the word of His power, having brought about by Him self the purification of our sins, sat down on the right hand side of the Majesty in the highest. (Hebr.11:3; Col.1:16b,17; Hebr.1:1-3. The translation is our own).

Jesus Christ then is upholding the universe. How does He do it? As follows. We know that matter is made up of molecules, and molecules of atoms, and subatoms, and sub-subatoms. Scientists have not discovered the smallest particle, the real atom, that is the "uncuttable" one. But the thing must exist, and that particle keeps all the bigger ones in motion, and thus the whole universe, as far as matter is concerned. But what source of energy keeps that particle going? It must be Christ, our Creator, who sustains it. As soon as He stops that, the universe collapses, just as for instance a "black hole" in the universe; that is a star that has collapsed because of its own gravity, and of which the density is so great that no light can escape; in fact it swallows up light of other stars (another indication for the corpuscular character of light). This is only a material explanation, but it serves to illustrate that the universe is a thought, produced out of God's Brain, that is Jesus Christ's Brain! The

universe is a mystery, and we are part of it! The nature of life is an even greater mystery. Paul says (1 Cor. 5:38) that God gives to everything a body in the way He wants it. It means that God's spirit is involved in the material growing processes of all organisms! Dr.J.B.S. Haldane thinks about it in another way: Haldane was driven to believe that the laws of chemistry and physics must have been different in the Precambrian from what they are now, since the ordinary laws of chemistry and physics, as we know them today, do not allow complex proteins to arise spontaneously, the laws of chemistry must have been different when it arose!

However anybody that has accepted God's revelation in the bible understands that this kind of imagination is only a hopeless attempt to dodge God, just as for instance the idea of the oscillating universe (Big Bang—Expansion—Collapse—Big—Bang—Expansion—Collapse—Big Bang, etc, ad infinitivum incredibilem). This sort of reasonings is the height of folly of course. For how can there be laws at all to generate life, if there is only lifeless matter. The wise step is to say that God is the one that constitutes these laws, and that puts life into lifeless matter. It is a case of the Divine Mind over lifeless matter, and not one of lifeless matter over our minds. For no person right in his mind would say that out of lifeless matter laws were borne, that is living, active laws, to cause later on in that selfsame matter, that lifeless matter, spontaneous generation! It would be nonsense to the tune of the pile of bricks out of which a man was borne to make a building of it... "Newspaper reports that a gene, or a virus, or a cell, or some other component of life, has been created in a test tube always seem to miss the critical point that certain elements of life (notably enzymes, as well as another gene, or virus or cell) always have to be present to make the synthesis work.³⁸ Moreover even if man would succeed in engineering some kind of life, that feat would only serve to show the impossibility of spontaneous generation, all by chance, in a primeval soup of lifeless matter.³⁹

In Genesis it says that God made everything after its kind. The word "kind" here is probable synonymous with "species", sometimes with "genus", and possibly once with "family". However it positively excludes transmutations across the kinds. Modern research has discovered that every type of organism has its own unique DNA structure, which can only determine the procreation of that same kind.⁴⁰ Darwinian thinkers say that the species evolved one out of the other by means of transmutations and macroevolution. Fact is however that transmutations never take place. A dog stays a dog, and never becomes a cat. Only variation within a species is possible. There are for example nearly two hundred dogs; all of them are interbreedable. Thus macro-saltations, or "typostrophes" do not take place. In fact abnormal changes, that is mutations are almost always lethal.^{41.42}

Since God is a rational God, we can except that He has created everything in a rational way. The theory of the vestigial organs is a hoax, in this light. A German anatomist composed a list of about one hundred and eighty of those rudiments that supposedly were of use in an earlier stage of our evolutionary development. Now we know that we could not do without most of them. The few that are still used for theory, are for example the appendix, coccyx, etc., all of which can be explained to be useful for us, though not absolutely necessary to survive. So also the arguments on basis of classification, comparative anatomy, embryology, and physiology do not hold. Since God created a specific environment for all living organisms, it is clear that all kinds of creatures will have to live in the same environment.⁴³ Even evolutionistic embryologists that are competent in their field do not believe any more that phylogeny recapitulates ontogeny, that is that the embryo shows in short the evolutionary history of that species. But still the theory, though having been proven to be a phantasy, is being used to impress ignorant students, and the man in the street.⁴⁴

So also the geographical distribution of varieties is a proof for creation rather than against it. It shows that God made His creatures with the inherent capability of changing according to the conditions of their habitats. However this changing never transgresses the boundaries that God set for each species, and thus cannot be used at all as a proof for speciation. No, it pleads for Gods genius to prevent extinction of the species involved.

Everywhere has God imprinted His triune character upon the universe, the Trinity consisting of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. We live in space, matter and time. Space consists of length, breadth, and height; matter is energy that generates and is manifest in motion, and is experienced and interpreted in phenomena, and we know time as past, present and future. Everywhere we see cause, event, and consequence; source, manifestation, and meaning. The light of the sun consists of light-rays, warmth-rays and actinic rays (that cause growth in organisms). Light-rays consist of three basic colours, namely blue, red, and green. Etc., etc. and remember, God created YOU with a spirit, soul, and body! ⁴⁵.

Now consider the following. Insurance rates have been based upon the law of probability $M \times N$, that is if the chance that event A will happen is one in M, and of event B one in N, then the chance that both will happen is one in $M \times N$. Of course for the creationist there is no question of chance all, and as far as he is concerned the chance that life, and the whole universe indeed, came out of nowhere, is one in infinitude, that is the chance lies in the infinitude, and only God is infinite! But let's be generous, very generous for the occasion, and say that the chance that matter came out of nowhere is one in 10 1000, the chance that life was formed out of lifeless matter, somehow somewhere sometime, one in 10 1000,000,000,000. By multiplying the one with the other we obtain the chance that both events took place. However we must assign values to every phenomenon in the universe. Think for example of all the parts of your body, of the billions and billions of stars, of all the laws, and facts. For instance seven planets of our solar system, Mercury to Uranus, show a rigid distance system in terms of the earth's distance to the sun. 46. The moon has the exact distance, size, orbit, and reflection of light to be beneficial for us (too big a moon would cause deadly floods because of the gravitational pull). 47. Our body cells are changed every seven years, so that we have a completely new body every year-week. The significant thing is that our personality does not change because of this physical renewing. A clear indication of our spirit controlling the matter of its body. 48. Then take the sun. If it were closer we would burn to death, if more remote we would freeze. Take the spectrum, etc., etc., etc. Thus if we would allot chances to all those things, and multiply them with one another we virtually reach infinitude! You see, the universe, yes, your own body simply sings it constantly into your ears that God created the universe. That's why Paul says (Rom. 1:18-20) :

For God's fury is being revealed from heaven over all irreverence and unrighteousness of People that suppress the truth by means of their unrighteousness. For what can be known of God is manifest in them, because God has shown it to them. For His invisible characteristics, namely His eternal power and divinity, are being understood since the creation of the world by means of the understanding of the things that have been made. (Translation is our own).

Rejecting Your Creator

It is not for nothing that people from way back in antiquity have believed in God, or in "gods". Many erred in that they worshipped images representing things that God had made rather than that they honoured Himself. But yet they felt the majesty with which God had invested nature, and they worshipped... So also today people worship. For instance sport fans adulate sport stars, others get into a bacchanalian frenzy experiencing pop music, scientists worship the sacred cow of scientism (this holy cow is supposed to save the world from all trouble, and is one of the satanical substitutes for the Saviour Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God), artists and snobs bow down for pieces of art (many of which are an insult for a normal person), students and professors meditate religiously about their studies (if they are conscientious at all), others work themselves to death for the almighty dollar (which has been falling and falling). In short, everybody has his or her own "altar" on which sacrifices are offered up to their respective "gods". We feel just like Paul when standing on the Areopagus, about two thousand years ago, he addressed the Athenians, the Stoic and Epicurean philosophers, with the following discourse (Acts 17:16-34) :

But in Athens, while Paul was waiting for them, his spirit was painfully excited in him seeing the city given up to idolatry. He reasoned therefore in the synagogue with the Jews, and those who worshipped, and in the market-place every day with those he met with. But some of the Epicurean and stoic philosophers attacked him. And some said, What would this chatterer say? And some, He seems to be an announcer of foreign demons, because he announced the glad tidings of Jesus and the resurrection. And having taken hold on him they brought him to the Areopagus, saying, Might we know what this new doctrine which is spoken by thee is? For thou bringest certain strange things to our ears. We wish therefore to know what these things may mean.

Now all the Athenians and the strangers sojourning there spent their time in nothing else than to tell and hear the news. And Paul standing in the midst of the Areopagus said, Athenians, in every way I see you given up to worship of the gods; for passing through and beholding your shrines, I found also an altar on which was inscribed, to the unknown God.

Whom therefore ye reverence, not knowing him I announce to you. The God who has made the world and all things which are in it, he, being Lord of heaven and earth, does not dwell in temples made with hands, nor is served by men's hands as needing something, himself giving to all life and breath and all things; and has made of one blood every nation of men to dwell upon the whole face of the earth, having determined ordained times and the boundaries of their dwelling, that they may seek God; if indeed they might feel after him and find him, although he is not far from each one of us: for in him we live and move and exist; as also some of the poets amongst you have said, 'For we are also his offspring.' Being therefore the offspring of God, we ought not to think that which is divine to be like gold or silver or stone, the graven form of man's art and imagination. God therefore, having overlooked the times of ignorance, now enjoins men that they shall all everywhere repent, because he has set a day in which he is going to judge the habitable earth in righteousness by the man whom he has appointed, giving the proof of it all in having raised him from among the dead. And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked, and some said, We will hear thee again also concerning this. Thus Paul went out of their midst. But some men joining themselves to him believed; among whom also was Dionysius the Areopagite, and a woman by name Damaris, and others with them. (Translation is John Nelson Darby's).

Now, this all wouldn't be so bad, if people only recognized their Creator in all those things, and if they thanked him for all the marvellous blessings that He has been bestowing upon us. Come on, my friend, do not think that we are condemning you. We wish you all possible happiness. For God furnishes us richly with all things for our enjoyment, as it stands written in 1 Timothy 6:17. But do not forget that God will hold us responsible for everything we do. Solomon said in Ecclesiastes 11:9,10:

Rejoice, young man, in thy youth; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth,
And walk in the ways of thy heart, and in the sight of thine eyes; but know that for all these
things God will bring thee into judgement. Then remove discontent from thy heart, and put
away evil from thy flesh; for childhood and youth are vanity. (Darby's).

We find the theory of evolution one of the most terrible cases of worldwide brainwashing. For demagoguery is not only found in communistic countries, but in the Western world as well. God will hold all those people responsible that have abused their key-positions to force their atheistic and agnostic, which in fact is anti-God, philosophies upon others. We have shown in this essay that important facts are being withheld from the public. This is mass-manipulation, a serious crime against the commandment "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour." If this trend is not reverted, it will grow into a diabolical oppression of true, mental freedom. People will be stripped of normal sense; the world will be a lunatic asylum, if it isn't already...

A lot of people say that it is irrational to believe in a Creator, and that no competent person would believe in such an old-fashioned, outdated, and inadequate notion... But the truth is that it is irrational to believe that we, rational beings, came into existence through such an irrational process as chance evolution is. The Bible is perfectly rational in that it appeals to our rational sense in stating that a rational Creator made rational beings in the rational way of creating them in a rationally created universe. That is true logic! But to believe that our rationality is the product of irrationality, is nonsense to say the least. It distracts both of God in a blasphemous way, and it goes against every grain and fibre of our rational beings. It bludgeons us into forcing our rational beings into the impossible strait jacket of irrationality. But no Christian founded in biblical, that is divine, truths, is about to be budged by as much as an inch into such blasphemous nonsense. Critics claim that we are only being emotional. But we are emotional because they want to rob us of our rationality. The unintelligent ones! They are blinded by the prince of darkness. They have no understanding of the spiritual powers that beset us. Nor can they. For how can anybody understand the spiritual, if he has been made so crazy as to believe the nonsensical concerning things material? Therefore we preach Christ. He only is able to set us free. And his freedom does not only mean rationality. No, it goes far beyond that. It includes the spiritual, the divine... God says in Psalm 53:1, "The fool says in his heart there is no God." And indeed no matter how learned a person is, if he fails to understand that God exists, then he is just a fool. Evolutionists only use the theory of evolution to substantiate their

foolishness, which is the rejection of their Creator. We conclude this essay by exhorting you to turn to your own Creator. Do not reject Him, for that is only harming yourself. You have nothing to lose,* as a lot of people keep thinking, but only to win.

(Anyone that does not believe in Christ as his or her saviour has lost everything already; for if your soul is lost everything is lost).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Lucretius, De Rerum Natura (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1975), I 62-67; 82,3; 149,50; V 419,20.
2. Robert T. Clark and James D. Bales, Why Scientists accept evolution (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1976), pp. 29 ff.
3. L. Duane Thurman, How to think about Evolution (Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1979), p. 33.
4. Editor, Fritz Ridenour, Who says God created... (California: G/L Regal Books, 1978), p. 110.
5. L.D. Thurman, op.cit. p.18.
6. Immanuel Velikovsky, Earth in upheaval, (Great Britain: Hazell Watson & Viney Ltd., 1974), p.204.
7. Editorial Consultant, Elizabeth Martin M.A., The Natural World, (Norwich, England: Jarrold & Sons Ltd., 1976), Sections 7 ff.
8. H. van Praag, Parapsychologie en evolutie, (Amsterdam: H. Meulenhof, 1980), p. 56.
9. Willem J. Ouweneel, Operatie Supermens, (Amsterdam: Buijten & Schipperheijn, 1976), p. 167.
10. L.D. Thurman, op.cit. pp. 108 ff.
11. Hutton Webster, History of Civilisation, (Boston: D.C. Heath and Co., 1940), pp. 16 ff.
12. W.E. Caldwell and M.F. Gyles, The Ancient World, (Illinois: The Dryden Press Inc., 1966), p. 4.
13. F. Clark Howell, Early Man, (Virginia: Time-Life Books, 1979), pp. 13 ff.
14. Jane Kidd, The Complete Horse Encyclopaedia, (London: Hamlyn, 1976), p. 14.
15. Robert Jastrow, God and the Astronomers, (New York: Warner Books, 1978), 1 ff.
16. Adrian V. Clark, Cosmic Mysteries of the Universe, (New York: Parker Publishing Co., 1969), pp. 17,18.)

17. Henry M. Morris, Evolution and the Modern Christian, (Philadelphia: The Presbyter. and Reform. Publ. Co., 1969), pp 16-8.
18. A.E Wilder-Smith, A Basis for a New Biology, ([n.p.]: Telos-International, 1976), p. 15. Prof. Wilder-Smith quotes Kerkut's book, The Implications of Evolutions, (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1965), p. 6.
19. A.E Wilder-Smith, Man's Origin, Man's Destiny, (Neuhausen-Stuttgart: Hänssler-Verlag, 1974), pp. 301 ff.
20. L.D.Thurman, op.cit. pp 85 ff.
21. M.R. Dehaan, Genesis & Evolution, (Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1981), pp. 75 ff.
22. Newsweek, November 3, 1980.
23. Duane T.Gish, Ph.D., Evolution The Fossils say no!, (California: Creation-Life Publishers, 1977), pp. 72-107
24. Wilder-Smith, Man's Origin, op.cit. pp.131 ff.
25. Dr. W.J. Ouweneel, Het ontstaan van de wereld, (Hilversum: Evangelische Omroep, 1980), p. 116.
26. Henry M. Morris, Ph.D., That You Might Believe, (Illinois: Good News Publishers, 1978), pp. 64,5.
27. Wilder-Smith, A Basis, op.cit. pp. 113 ff.
28. Henry Hiebert, Evolution: Its collapse in view?, (Alberta: Horizon House Publishers, 1979), pp. 71 ff.
29. Wilder-Smith, Man's Origin, op.cit. pp. 135 ff.
30. Dr. W.J. Ouweneel, De Ark in de Branding, (Amsterdam: Buijten & Schipperheijn, 1977), pp. 73 ff.
31. Immanuel Velikovsky, People of the Sea, (New York: Doubleday & Co. 1977), pp. xv ff.
32. Stuart Piggott, Ancient Europe, (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965), pp. 26,7.
33. Ouweneel, Operatie, op.cit. pp. 200 ff.
34. Ouweneel, De Ark, op,cit. Pp. 47, 142-4.
35. Morris, Gish, and Hillestad, Creation. Acts, facts, and impacts, (California: Creation_Life Publ., 1974), pp. 157 ff.
36. John C. Whitcomb, and Henry M. Morris, The Genesis

Flood, (n.p.: The Presbyterian and R eformed Publishing Co., 1981), pp. 443 ff.

37. L.C.Dunn, and Th.Dobzhansky, Hérédité, race, et société, (Bruxelles: Charles Dessart, 1964) ,pp. 113 ff.

38. Wilder-Smith, Man's Origin, op.cit. p.18

39. Boardman, Koontz, and Morris, Science and Creations, (California: Creations-Science Research Center, 1973), pp.37,8.

40. Henry, M. Morris, The Genesis Record, (California: Creations –Life Publishers, 1976), p.63.

41. John, C.Whitecomb, The Early Earth, (Michigan : Baker Book House, 1976), pp.77 ff.

42. Morris, Many Infallible Proofs, (California: Creations-Life Publ., 1980), pp. 249 ff.

43. Dr.W .J.Ouweneel, Kanttekeningen bij Genesis één,(Winschoten, The Netherlands: Uit het woord der Waarheid, 1974), pp. 130 ff.

44. Ouweneel, Operatie, op.cit. pp. 157 ff.

45. Henry, M. Morris, Biblical Cosmology and Modern Science, (New Jersey: Craig Press, 1970), pp.38 ff.

46. Helen Sawyer Hogg, The Stars Belong to Everyone, (Toronto: Doubleday Canada Ltd., 1976) , p.147.

47. John C. Whitcomb, and Donald B. DeYoung, The Moon. Its Creation, Form, and Significance, (Michigan : Baker Book House, 1978), pp. 145 ff.

48. Erich Hitzbleck, Schöpfungswunder im Tierreich, (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verslag, 1968), p. 131.