

# Creation: Is It Important?

## **Believing God in an intellectualized culture.**

A culture strongly influenced by Elite naturalists whose a priori belief is that there is no God.

— Foolish intellectuals. —  
Psalm 14:1 and 53:1

## **Creation: Is it important?**

In an age of intellectualism, Christians often try to avoid the issue of a straightforward reading of Genesis by believing it's not really important. They say, "Faith in Jesus Christ is what's important." That's true. But having faith in Jesus Christ without a complete understanding of Jesus Christ is like seed sown on rocky soil; it has no root and withers. (See Matthew 13:6)

## **Why is it Important?**

### **Without understanding what God says about Creation ...**

#### **You're starting in the middle of the story**

Why believe the middle, but not the beginning?

#### **You have no explanation for suffering and death**

Why do bad things happen to good people?

#### **You're saying Jesus is wrong**

Jesus believed Genesis, and quoted it as literal history

Luke 16:31 Moses and Prophets; John 5:46-47 Moses; Matthew 19:4 Male/Female;  
Matthew 19:8 Moses/Divorce; Matthew 19:56 One flesh; Matthew 23:35, Luke 3:36-38  
Abel; Matthew 24:37, Luke 17:27 Noah;

#### **Genesis is foundational to all Christian doctrine (Ps.11:3 if the foundations be destroyed...)**

The origin of life, The origin of man, Government and Laws, Marriage, Culture, Nations,  
Death, Chosen people, Sin, Clothes, The Gospel, Restoration of all things

#### **Death before Sin?**

Death because of Sin!

#### **What is death?**

Judgment – punishment for sin

Separation – represents our current relationship with God

A blessing! An opportunity to be reconciled to God

#### **The Gospel:**

God created man with no imperfection and designed him to live forever

Man had fellowship with God

Man rebelled and became separated from God

Man cursed with death

God provided a path of redemption through death

Jesus, God's son, took the penalty for our sin, and conquered death

Through faith in Jesus, we can spend eternity with God.

#### **If the first Adam is allegorical, why should the last Adam be real?**

# Creation: Is It Important?

## Why can't we just teach the essentials?

Some will cry, "This topic is so divisive, why can't we just concentrate on the essentials of our faith?" Creation is the ultimate "essential". It is the first order of essence; an inseparable part of the gospel

## Inerrancy of Scripture

Are there errors in God's Word? Are parts of God's Word wrong? If one part is wrong, how do we know other parts aren't wrong?

## Authority of Scripture

Can we throw out the parts of God's Word we don't like? The only way one would know anything about being a Christian is through God's Word. Without God's Word, there can be no Christians, for we would know nothing about Jesus Christ and what he has done for all people. We have faith in Jesus Christ, and we believe the things he believed and taught: God's Word. This is what it means to be a Christian. If you don't like God's Word, instead of being a Christian, perhaps you should be something else.

Luke 16:31 "He said to him, 'If they do not listen to Moses and the Prophets, they will not be convinced even if someone rises from the dead.'"

Luke 24:25 He said to them, "How foolish you are, and how slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken!

1John 5:10 "...the one who does not believe God has made Him a liar..."

Romans 3:3-4 "...let God be found true, though every man be found a liar..."

Romans 4:3 For what does the Scripture say? "Abraham believed God, and it was credited to him as righteousness."

Psalms 119:160 Thy word is true from the beginning: and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth for ever.

Many people, even some Christians, have been intimidated into thinking that you have to give up science in favor of faith, or give up faith in favor of science. The world has convinced them that science & God are enemies.

Evolutionists will often begin statements supporting their view with phrases such as "No rational person," or "No educated person" with intent to intimidate those who disagree with their dogma. This is really an emotional appeal to the uneducated and insecure who, wanting to appear rational and educated, will tend to side with the evolutionist. Who wants to appear to be irrational? Whenever an evolutionist wants to belittle a creationist, he will appeal to rationality by saying, "The rational person will agree with me." What he really means is, "I'll call you rational if you agree with me."

In Darwin's day the same tactics were being used. Consider the following quote by Thomas Huxley (perhaps Darwin's most staunch supporter and probably the single greatest reason Darwinism spread so rapidly), and what they were saying about the "rational man":

"No rational man, cognizant of the facts, believes that the average Negro is the equal, still less the superior, of the white man. And if this be true, it is simply incredible that, when all his disabilities

# Creation: Is It Important?

are removed, and our prognathous relative has a fair field and no favor, as well as no oppressor, he will be able to compete successfully with his bigger-brained and smaller-jawed rival, in a contest which is to be carried on by thoughts and not by bites.”

-Thomas H. Huxley, *Lay Sermons, Addresses and Reviews*, p.20 as reprinted in *The Long War Against God*, Dr. Henry Morris, p.60

So, from evolutionists' perspective of Huxley's day, the *rational man* believes the supposedly lesser-evolved black man will never be able to compete with the supposedly more highly-evolved white man.

Don't be intimidated.

You don't have to "check your brain at the door," as some say, to believe God — although you might have to check your brain if you try to believe God **and** in evolution.

## God and Evolution:

Some have consciously split their minds to allow themselves to believe in God and evolution at the same time. They try to divide their beliefs into what they call "the realm of faith" and "the realm of science." In matters of the physical world, they give "science" preference, and in matters of morality and spirituality, they give "faith" preference.

These people believe "science" does not involve faith, and that "faith" need not become entangled with science. This is quite a challenge to do in practice, because the divisions are not that clear-cut. God has told us the truth, and it is not limited to moral and spiritual matters.

Let me say both creation and evolution require faith. They are both interpretations of our world, whether with God or without God. Neither belief can be observed.

### *Theistic Evolution or Progressive Creation:*

While some try to separate God from science, others try to reconcile the Bible with Evolution. Both Creationists and Evolutionists agree this is the most ridiculous position of all. It simply cannot be done unless you relegate the entire Bible to allegory. That's not much of a reconciliation.

## “Why can't a Christian believe both the Bible & Evolution?”

### Sequence

First of all, the sequence is out of order. For example, the sun wasn't created until day four, plants were created before the sun, and flying creatures before land creatures. Evolution (the Big Bang theory) says the sun came first, and flying creatures evolved from land creatures, and many more inconsistencies appear, the closer you look.

# Creation: Is It Important?

## Time

Next, the belief in “millions of years” is inconsistent with what God says in His Word. Even trying to impose the “Gap Theory” or the “Day/Age Theory” produces some mighty strange conclusions. You simply can’t insert any significant period of time without doing severe damage to the truth of God’s Word.

## Death

Then, God says death came through sin. Evolution says death has been around for millions of years. Death is a rather nasty way for a loving God to have created. “Evolution would be the most wasteful, inefficient, and cruel process that could ever be conceived by which to ‘create’ human beings. It is absurd to suggest that the omnipotent, omniscient, loving, and saving God of the Bible could ever be guilty of such a thing!”

-The Long War Against God, Dr. Henry Morris, p.109

Many evolutionists, including the late Carl Sagan, point this out in ridicule.

Atheists seem to understand the situation better than the majority of Christians: “Christianity has fought, still fights, and will fight science [sic] to the desperate end over evolution, because evolution destroys utterly and finally the very reason Jesus’ earthly life was supposedly made necessary.... If Jesus was not the redeemer who died for our sins, and this is what evolution means, then Christianity is nothing!”

-Genesis and Evolution, *American Atheist* 30 (Jan.1988):7, as quoted in *The Long War Against God*, Dr. Henry Morris, p.119

## No Justification

Finally, the only reason to believe in evolution is if you don’t believe in God and His Word. That’s a rather precarious position for a Christian to hold, don’t you think?

## ***Creation has three points in its favor right from the start:***

1. There is an adequate cause for the effect,
2. Intelligence and a plan,
3. God was there. Evolutionists were not.

You see, it’s not God v. Science. It never has been. It’s truth v. Orthodoxy. It’s the Judeo-Christian religion v. the Secular Humanist religion. It’s God v. Evolutionists. It’s God v. the ungodly. “It’s the Word of God v. Man’s fallible theories.” -*Creation* 23(2) March-May, 2001, p.18

Even in Galileo’s day, it was not God v. science but rather, God v. *the orthodoxy of an ungodly priesthood*, whose view of the Bible was distorted by the pantheistic teachings of Plato, Socrates, and Aristotle, standing in the way of truth. We have a similar orthodoxy today that calls itself “**the Scientific Community**.” In their way of thinking, it is unscientific to believe any explanation that indicates the existence of God — even if it’s true!

# Creation: Is It Important?

Twentieth (and twenty-first) century man has redefined science. (See *Science is a Game*)

“Richard Dickerson, an authority in chemical evolution says, ‘Science, fundamentally, is a game. It is a game with one overriding and defining rule. Rule No. 1: Let us see how far and to what extent we can explain the behavior of the physical and material universe in terms of purely physical and material causes, without invoking the supernatural.’”<sup>1</sup>

“Thus, evolutionary 'science' is not necessarily a search for truth, as we used to be told, but a **game** in which they try to find naturalistic causes, even for the origin of the universe and all in it.”<sup>2</sup>

This arbitrary assertion leads to one of two necessary conclusions:

1. Either science and truth go separate ways (if God turns out to exist) or
2. There is no God.

The humanistic evolutionist, of course, believes the second.

However, neither of these conclusions is correct because the assertion is false. The *truth* is that God is the **author** of science. Science and belief in God go hand in hand.

Some have been intimidated into believing that you need to interpret the Bible through our current understanding of the world; that is, to apply contemporary scientific interpretation, and modify the Bible accordingly. Christians must resist this temptation. One need only look at the current state of medical science to see clearly how little man knows. Scientific “facts” are regularly discarded in light of new “facts.” Even dietary “facts” have changed significantly in the last five years.

So, should we take the word of fallible men who were not there over the Word of our infallible God who was there? Of course not! “We should judge the words of man against the word of God, and not the other way around.” —Ken Ham

It is presumptuous and arrogant of us (especially as Christians) to try to interpret God’s revelation through our incomplete knowledge of the world rather than to interpret our world through God’s revelation.

“Many erroneous medieval interpretations of biblical texts (e.g., the idea of a flat earth) were wrong, not because the actual Scriptures were wrong, but because expositors had tried to explain them in terms of the then-accepted scientific ideas. The Dark Ages were dark, not because Scripture discouraged scientific investigation (the “dominion mandate” of Genesis 1:26-28 actually *commands* scientific research), but because the Platonic philosophy with which the church fathers tried to compromise did so.”

-*The Long War Against God*, Dr. Henry Morris, p.206

In the early ages, “if Christians had built their world view on the Bible —as Kepler, Newton, and others tried to do much later— [instead of building it on Greek “science”] the development of true science might have come much sooner.”

-*The Long War Against God*, Dr. Henry Morris, p.203

---

<sup>1</sup> Gleaned from *Games Some People play* by Henry Morris, *Creation*, 23(4) Sep-Nov 2001, p.35

<sup>2</sup> Gleaned from *Games Some People play* by Henry Morris, *Creation*, 23(4) Sep-Nov 2001, p.35

# Creation: Is It Important?

You might ask, “What about all the scientific discoveries that indicate there is no God and that evolution is a fact?”

There *are* no such scientific discoveries. These statements are based on the biased conclusions of fallible people. All facts must be interpreted. Science doesn’t draw conclusions; people do.

[Ken Ham example:]

Which of these statements are true about scientists?

1. They wear white lab coats
2. They work in laboratories
3. They are unbiased
4. They have white hair

(The answer: none)

Are scientists infallible? No, they are human, and therefore prone to error.

## Believe it — Jesus did!

Evolutionists like to use the phrase “The present is the key to the past.” But that’s a misleading, ideologically motivated reflection of a philosophy diametrically opposed to the Bible. That philosophy is uniformitarianism. It means that everything we see can be explained in terms of natural processes we see every day. It rejects catastrophes, and shuns special events as explanations for things. As Christians, we know *the Bible is the key to the past*. As people, we also know extraordinary and non-repeatable catastrophic events have occurred in the past.

Jesus reinforced this position.

Luke 16:31 “But he said to him, ‘If they do not listen to Moses and the Prophets, they will not be persuaded even if someone rises from the dead.’”

Matthew 19:4-5

4 And He answered and said, “Have you not read that He who created them from the beginning MADE THEM MALE AND FEMALE,

5 and said, ‘FOR THIS REASON A MAN SHALL LEAVE HIS FATHER AND MOTHER AND BE JOINED TO HIS WIFE, AND THE TWO SHALL BECOME ONE FLESH’?

Matthew 19:8 Jesus replied, “Moses permitted you to divorce your wives because your hearts were hard. But it was not this way from the beginning.

## Gospel References to Genesis 1-11:

	Reference	Topic	Genesis Reference
1.	*Matthew 19:4	Created male and female	1:27, 5:2
2.	*Matthew 19:56	Cleave to his wife; become one flesh	2:24
3.	*Matthew 23:35	Righteous Abel	4:4
4.	*Matthew 24:37-39	Noah and the Flood	6:1-22, 7:1-24, 8:1-22
5.	*Mark 10:6	Created male and female	1:27, 5:2
6.	*Mark 10:79	Cleave to his wife, become one flesh	2:24
7.	*Mark 13:19	Creation which God created	1:1, 2:4
8.	Luke 3:34-36	Genealogies: Abraham to Shem	11:10-26
9.	Luke 3:36-38	Genealogies: Noah to Adam to God	5:3-29

# Creation: Is It Important?

10.	*Luke 11:51	Blood of Abel	4:8-11
11.	Luke 17:27	The flood came and destroyed them all	7:10-23
12.	John 1:13	In the beginning God	1:1
13.	*John 8:44	Father of lies	3:45

\*Words of Christ

## Other passages referencing Genesis 1-11:

	Reference	Topic	Genesis Reference
14.	Acts 14:15	Who made the heaven and the earth	2:1
15.	Acts 17:24	God made all things	1:1-31
16.	Acts 17:26	From one man [God] made every nation of men	<i>Indirect</i>
17.	Romans 1:20	The creation of the world	1:1-31, 2:4
18.	Romans 4:17	God can create out of nothing	1:1-31
19.	Romans 5:12	Death entered the world by sin	2:16-17, 3:19
20.	Romans 5:14-19	Death reigned from Adam	2:17
21.	Romans 8:20-22	Creation corrupted	3:17-18
22.	I Corinthians 6:16	Two will become one flesh	2:24
23.	I Corinthians 11:3	Head of the woman	3:16
24.	I Corinthians 11:7	In the image of God	1:27, 5:1
25.	I Corinthians 11:8	Woman from man	2:22-23
26.	I Corinthians 11:9	Woman for the man	2:18
27.	I Corinthians 15:21-22	By a man came death	2:16-17, 3:19
28.	I Corinthians 15:38-39	To each. . . seeds of its own (kind)	1:11, 1:21, 1:24
29.	I Corinthians 15:45	Adam became a living being	2:7
30.	I Corinthians 15:47	Man from the earth	3:23
31.	II Corinthians 4:6	Light out of darkness	1:35
32.	II Corinthians 11:3	Serpent deceived Eve	3:16, 3:13
33.	Ephesians 3:9	Created all things	1:1-31, 2:1-3
34.	Ephesians 5:3031	Cleave to his wife, become one flesh	2:24
35.	Colossians 1:16	All things created by Him	1:1-31, 2:13
36.	Colossians 3:10	Created in His image	1:27
37.	I Timothy 2:1314	Adam created first	2:18-23
38.	I Timothy 2:14	Woman deceived	3:16, 3:13
39.	I Timothy 4:4	Everything created by God is good	1:10-31
40.	Hebrews 1:10	In the beginning God made heavens and earth	1:1
41.	Hebrews 2:78	All things in subjection under man	1:26-30, 9:23
42.	Hebrews 4:3	Works were finished	2:1
43.	Hebrews 4:4	Rest on the seventh day	2:2-3
44.	Hebrews 4:10	Rest from His works	2:2-3
45.	Hebrews 11:3	Creation of the universe	1:1
46.	Hebrews 11:4	Abel offered a better sacrifice	4:35
47.	Hebrews 11:5	Enoch taken up	5:21-24
48.	Hebrews 11:7	Noah's household saved	7:1
49.	Hebrews 12:24	Blood of Abel	4:10
50.	James 3:9	Men in the likeness of God	1:27, 5:1
51.	I Peter 3:20	Construction of the Ark, eight saved	6:14-16, 7:13
52.	II Peter 2:5	A flood upon the ungodly, eight saved	6:8-12, 7:124
53.	II Peter 3:45	Earth formed out of water and by water	1:67
54.	II Peter 3:6	The world destroyed by water	7:17-24
55.	I John 3:8	Devil sinned from the beginning	3:14
56.	I John 3:12	Cain slew his brother	4:8, 4:25
57.	Jude 11	The way of Cain	4:8, 4:16, 4:25
58.	Jude 14	Enoch, the seventh generation from Adam	5:3-24
59.	Revelation 2:7	Tree of life	2:9
60.	Revelation 3:14	Beginning of the creation of God	1:1-31, 2:14
61.	Revelation 4:11	Created all things	1:1-31, 2:1-3
62.	Revelation 10:6	Who created heaven. . . and the earth	1:1, 2:1
63.	Revelation 14:7	Who made the heaven and the earth	1:1, 2:1, 2:4
64.	Revelation 20:2	The serpent of old, who is the devil	3:1, 3:14
65.	Revelation 21:1	First heaven and first earth	2:1
66.	Revelation 21:4	No more death, sorrow, crying or pain	3:17-19
67.	Revelation 22:2	Fruit of the tree of life	3:22
68.	Revelation 22:3	No more curse	3:14-19
69.	Revelation 22:14	The tree of life	2:9

Taken from:

# Creation: Is It Important?

*In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood, [Does the New Testament Support Genesis 1-11?](#), by Dr. Walt Brown.*

## Some interesting points:

- a. Every New Testament writer refers to the early chapters of Genesis (Genesis 1-11).
- b. Jesus Christ referred to each of the first seven chapters of Genesis.
- c. All New Testament books except Galatians, Philippians, I and II Thessalonians, II Timothy, Titus, Philemon, and II and III John have references to Genesis 1-11.
- d. Every chapter of Genesis 1-11, except chapter 8, is referred to somewhere in the New Testament.
- e. Every New Testament writer apparently accepted these early chapters of Genesis as historically accurate.

Taken from:

*In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood* by Dr. Walt Brown.

## Take God at His word — Your salvation depends on it!

That's what faith is all about!

Why do we need a savior? *To save us from our sin.* If evolution happened, death was already occurring before man evolved. But if death came before man, and was not a consequence of Adam's sin, then sin is a fiction. And if sin is a fiction, we wouldn't need Christ to save us from it. (See 1Corinthians 15:21-22 and 45)

## Reconcile evolution with the Bible?

### **Why you must not:**

God is not a liar!

1John 5:10 "...the one who does not believe God has made Him a liar..."

Romans 3:3-4

What then? If some did not believe, their unbelief will not nullify the faithfulness of God, will it? May it never be! Rather, let God be found true, though every man be found a liar, as it is written, "That you may be justified in your words, and prevail when you are judged."

Proverbs 30:5 Every word of God is tested; He is a shield to those who take refuge in Him.

### **Why you can't:**

#### **A. -God said 6 days -**

Not only in Genesis 1, but He wrote it in stone with His own hand!

Exodus 31:18 When the LORD finished speaking to Moses on Mount Sinai, he gave him the two tablets of the Testimony, the tablets of stone inscribed by the finger of God.

Exodus 20:11 For in six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, but he rested on the seventh day. Therefore the LORD blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy.

**"But I believe the word 'day' doesn't necessarily mean an ordinary day."**

Let's consider the Hebrew word for day, "yom." Some will say that this Hebrew word is non-specific and can refer to an indefinite period.

While this word *can* mean an indefinite time period, it almost always means a literal day. Furthermore, it *always* means a literal day when modified by a number (i.e. 2nd day), or when



# Creation: Is It Important?

accompanied by the words “evening,” “morning,” or both. In addition, it also *always* means a literal day when used in plural form as it is in Exodus 20:11.

The early chapters of Genesis are a chronological historical narrative. Every indication is that they are to be taken literally.

Some have tried to say that Genesis 1 and 2 describe separate creation events, however there are several reasons why this cannot be, two of which are mentioned in points B & C below. The distinction to make regarding Genesis chapters 1 and 2 is that Genesis 1 is a summary of what God did in creation week, while chapter 2 essentially says, “Now, let’s look at some detail in a few important areas.”

## **B. -Inconsistent order**

1. Creation sequence
  - a. Heavens and earth,  
Light, night and day
  - b. Expanse [stars, space]
  - c. Dry land, plants
  - d. Stars, sun, moon
  - e. Sea creatures, birds
  - f. Land creatures, man
2. Man is not the result of millions of mutations, but the finalization of God’s creative work.

## **C. -Billions of dead things before sin**

The fossil record is “Billions of dead things buried in rock layers laid down by water all over the earth.” -Ken Ham

The fossil record is “dead things.” God (the Bible) says death came into the world through sin. Under evolutionary hypothesis, it marks millions of years of suffering and death. How could a good God call that “very good?” (Genesis 1:31)

## **D. -Jesus said things would be restored**

To the way they were in the beginning. He didn’t mean a state of struggle and death. He meant harmony and life.

Matthew 19:28 Jesus said to them, "I tell you the truth, at the renewal of all things, when the Son of Man sits on his glorious throne, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

Acts 3:21 whom heaven must receive until the period of restoration of all things about which God spoke by the mouth of His holy prophets from ancient time.

Rev.21:5 And the one sitting on the throne said, “Look, I am making all things new!” And then he said to me, “Write this down, for what I tell you is trustworthy and true.”

The word “new” here means restored not different.

*Isaiah 11 -Wolf w/ Lamb*

# Creation: Is It Important?

## What is Evolution?

Evolution is an attempt at explaining the existence of everything through natural processes. Evolution can take many forms, of which Darwinism is only one.

“The essential attribute of an evolutionary concept is that it identifies ultimate reality with the universe of matter, space, and time, rather than with the transcendent Creator of that universe.”

-*The Long War Against God*, Dr. Henry Morris, p.207

In other words, evolution is any belief system that maintains the idea that the universe is self-originating and was not created. From a biological standpoint, “...the natural generation of living creatures out of earth materials.”

-*The Long War Against God*, Dr. Henry Morris, p.213

Greek Stoics and Epicureans even in Christ's day believed “everything on the earth evolved directly from the earth material itself.”

-*The Long War Against God*, Dr. Henry Morris, p.212

The Gnostics held similar beliefs.

Romans 1:25 Instead of believing what they knew was the truth about God, they deliberately chose to believe lies. So they worshiped the things God made but not the Creator himself, who is to be praised forever. Amen.

Evolution was invented to explain our existence without God. A Christian has no reason to believe atheistic teachings. A Christian **must not** believe in evolution!

## What about Science?

What is science? It is the study of observable, repeatable processes and events in the present.

"Millions of years in the past..." Is that Science? The best you can do when “scientifically” studying the past is to perform actions in the present using processes existing in the present to make conjectures and speculations about the past. Science doesn't draw conclusions, people do.

### ***How old is the earth?***

Six to ten thousand years. Ten thousand years is really stretching the limit. It's most likely right around six thousand years.

What about millions of years? Millions of years? Who says? Science? No, Evolutionists. In every case where someone has stated something is more than approximately 6000 years old, if you examine their assumptions and methods, you can see that it isn't necessarily so.

### Appearance of age:

“But, it looks old.”

Well, it **is** old. Six thousand years is a long time.

# Creation: Is It Important?

“No, I mean it looks millions of years old.”

How do you know what millions of years of age looks like? Can you tell the difference between a six thousand year old rock and a six million year old rock? No, you can't.

“Maybe God created the world to look old.”

God would not create something to appear older than it is. That would be deceptive. When we say something looks old, we are assigning the age, not God. Remember, God told us how old the world is. It is not His fault if we don't believe Him, It is not His fault if we see His creation and reach an incorrect conclusion based on our preconceived ideas. If we conclude the world, indeed, the universe, is older than God said it is, that's our own misinterpretation.

Do we know what six million years looks like vs. six thousand years? No. Were you there? Shouldn't we take the word of someone who was there? Do we have the word of someone who was there? Absolutely! God was there. God is infallible.

People's own fallible interpretation of the facts leads them to conclude great age. When they assert a date of more than 6000 years, it's based entirely on their assumptions.

Since 1900 Evolutionists have increased the estimated age of the earth by 100 times. Why? Because the more they discover, the more they realize there is not enough time to explain their hypothesis — Evolution.

## **What about evidence?**

“There is so much evidence for evolution that it is a fact!”

Oh, really? An infamous leader once said if you repeat a lie often enough it will be believed.

“...Evolution is proclaimed everywhere as a basic and sure fact of science, yet without one iota of scientific proof. No one in all human history has ever observed one species evolve into a more complex and better-adapted species by natural selection or any other mechanism. No one has seen evidence of any mechanism that would make evolution work. In the fossil record of the past, with billions of fossils preserved in the earth's sedimentary crust, no one has ever found any fossils showing incipient or transitional structures leading to the evolution of more complex species. The same applies in greater degree to the evolution of higher genera, families, or any other classification.

“Yet large numbers of examples are known of deterioration and extinction, both in the present and in the records of the past. It is estimated by modern ecologists that several species of plants or animals are becoming extinct each day, yet no one has ever seen a truly new species evolve! All of this is perfectly in accord with the universal scientific law of increasing entropy (that is, decreasing complexity) in the world, but is directly contrary to the supposed law of evolution.<sup>3</sup>

The problem of evolution is not one of just details, but the entire issue of mechanism.

---

<sup>3</sup> *The Long War Against God*, Dr. Henry Morris, pp.256-257

# Creation: Is It Important?

“Today we are less confident and the whole subject is in the most exciting ferment. Evolution is ... nagged from within by the troubling complexities of genetic and developmental mechanisms and new questions about the central mystery —speciation itself.”<sup>4</sup>

This was 100 years after Darwin’s book that supposedly solved the problem! It makes you wonder “...why evolutionary Biologists persist in believing in evolution at all. Where’s the evidence?”<sup>5</sup>

## Natural Selection:

Taken from *Creation*, 23(3) Jun-Aug 2001 p.28-29:

- a. Natural selection adds no information. In fact, it reduces it.
- b. Evolution requires a way to add new information.
- c. Mutations (genetic copying mistakes) must be invoked to explain how new information arose in order for natural selection to ‘guide’ the assumed evolutionary process.
- d. Mutations studied to date all appear to be losses of information — not surprising for a random process.
- e. It is thus quite illegitimate to use instances in which natural selection is happening (reducing the information in populations) as examples of ‘evolution happening’.
- f. Natural selection, operating on the created information in original gene pools, makes good sense in a fallen world. It can fine-tune the way in which organisms ‘fit’ their environment, and help stave off extinction in a cursed and dying world. By splitting a large gene pool into smaller ones, it can add to the amount of observed variety within the descendants of an original kind, just as with the many varieties of horse from one type. Even new ‘species’ can come about like that, but no new information. This helps explain greater diversity today than on board the ark.

Natural selection is a downhill process. It gets rid of information. The only way to get the information back is to breed the species with a variety that still has the genetic information.

## What scientific evidence is there for creation?

We live in the same world with evolutionists — we share the same facts!

### ***Let’s look at some evidence:***

#### Dating methods:

Most scientific dating methods indicate a young earth. Evolutionists tend to emphasize dating techniques that fit their belief in old earth (mostly radiometric) and ignore those that show a young earth.

Radiometric dating:

- C-14 –may indicate an old earth\*
- K-Argon - may indicate an old earth \*
- U-Pb - may indicate an old earth \*
- Radio halos –indicate a young earth

\*Radiometric Dating assumptions:

- That there was a known initial quantity of the elements at the start
  - That the decay rates of the elements have been constant
  - That there were no external influences, such as contamination, that changed the sample
- None of these assumptions can be proven.

---

<sup>4</sup> Keith S. Thompson (Biology professor @ Yale), “The Meanings of Evolution,” *American Scientist* 70, 1982 p.529, as quoted by *The Long War Against God*, Dr. Henry Morris, p.24

<sup>5</sup> *The Long War Against God*, Dr. Henry Morris, p.24

# Creation: Is It Important?

## Non-radiometric methods

- The very existence of fossils. Many have fragments of bone mixed in with them. -indicate a young earth!
- Red blood cells found in dinosaur bones. Not possible if more than a few thousand years old. - indicates a young earth!
- Earth's magnetic field -indicates a young earth!
- Helium in atmosphere -indicates a young earth!
- Supernova remnant expansion -indicates a young earth!
- Moon's recession from Earth -indicates a young earth!
- Quantity of salt in the sea -indicates a young earth!
- Number of people alive today -indicates a young earth!

(See <http://www.smgolden.com/where-are-all-the-people.php>)

## **The fossil record:**

- There are huge gaps between non-living & single cell, single cell & multi-cell, invertebrates & vertebrates, & etc.
- All 32 mammal orders appear abruptly & fully formed.
- No evolutionary change at all. Creatures that are now living are identical to many found in the fossil record: Cockroaches, bats, rats, turtles, mosquitoes.
- The Coelacanth, a particular fossil fish thought to be extinct is now known to live off the coast of Madagascar.
- Historical documents indicating dinosaurs as contemporary with man.

## **Dinosaurs**

Some prominent evolutionists have said if it can be proven man and dinosaur were contemporary, the theory of evolution will be falsified.<sup>6</sup>

Richard Dawkins, Oxford

Steven Stanley, Johns Hopkins

Ernst Mayer, Harvard

Niles Eldridge, American Museum of Natural History

Guess what...

On a recent expedition into Cameroon (Africa), researchers made some surprising discoveries about the people's familiarity with particular animals.<sup>7</sup>

They described an animal the tribes people called Embulu-em'bembe or Mokele-mbembe and Li'kela-bembe. That is, "Neck like a giraffe, legs like an elephant, small snake-like head, 30 foot tail."

---

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.bible.ca/tracks/dino-human-coexistence-implications.htm>

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.genesispark.org/genpark/behemoth/behemoth.htm>

Behemoth or Bust: an expedition into Cameroon investigating reports of a Sauropod dinosaur. Dave Wortzel, TJ (Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal), ISSN 1036-2916, Vol.15(2), 2001, p.62-68

# Creation: Is It Important?

And they described an animal they called Emela-Entouka, which means "Elephant Killer." This animal is also called also called Ngoubou, "A dangerous brutish beast with one to four horns on its nose and forehead." On being shown dinosaur images, the tribes-people identified a triceratops image as being this animal.

The Baka people of Cameroon, when presented with black and white pictures of animals they would know, and moving into pictures of animals they were not expected to know [creatures from different parts of the world as well as extinct creatures, such as dinosaurs], identified sauropod creatures and the Triceratops as creatures with which they were familiar.

Other peoples in equatorial Africa also identified the Pterodactyl [Kongomato] as familiar.

How would they know these creatures in their culture if they had not existed with them at least in the past if not in the present? They have no access to dinosaur digs or scientific journals. They have no television or even encyclopedias.

There is reason to believe that Grendel in the Scandinavian Epic tale Beowulf was T-Rex.<sup>8</sup>

Its skin was impenetrable to spears and arrows. It could eat a warrior in one mouthful.

The hero was able to kill the Grendel beasts by climbing on their backs and tearing off an arm, after which the creature would go back to its lair and bleed to death. He did this to more than one Grendel.

There is also strong reason to believe Beowulf is a historical account; not a fictional tale.

You see, it's the Bible that makes sense of the world.

We need to preach the science in our churches as well as the theology.

We need to answer the questions of this age and connect the Bible to the real world.

## ***Polystrate & out of place fossils***

-Trees crossing through multiple rock strata

-Modern and unexpected items found deep in sedimentary rock beds

*(In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood, by Dr. Walt Brown. 7th edition #22)*

## ***Geology***

-Helium from radio decay: If earth is as old as evolutionists say, there should be a million times more helium atoms in the atmosphere. Helium atoms cannot escape the atmosphere.

*(In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood, by Dr. Walt Brown. 7th edition #75 & #76)*

---

<sup>8</sup> After the Flood, Bill Cooper, 1995, New Wine Press, online at <http://www.ldolphin.org/cooper/>  
Available in book form from [www.answersInGenesis.org](http://www.answersInGenesis.org) and [www.icr.org](http://www.icr.org)

# Creation: Is It Important?

## ***Astronomy***

### **Comets:**

If evolution were true, at the rate of their current dissipation, all comets would have ceased to exist millions of years ago. Comets exist. The oldest can be no more than about 5000 years. They had to come from somewhere. Their orbits and supposed composition seem to indicate they have a common origin.

Evolutionists, in an effort to address the fact that if evolution were true comets would not exist, have concluded there must be a renewal source for comets. They call this comet source “the Oort cloud” named for the man who came up with the idea. It’s supposedly a region in space surrounding our solar system containing chunks of ice and debris. According to the “Oort cloud” explanation, on occasion, for reasons unknown, chunks get knocked out of this region and begin a journey toward the sun.

This Oort cloud is completely undetectable; the only reason for believing it exists is to explain the origin of comets. The only “proof” of the Oort cloud’s existence is the necessity for it to exist to fit the evolutionist’s belief in long ages.

### ***This is not bad science — it’s not science at all!***

“Well, from a Creationist viewpoint, where did comets come from?”

According to Dr. Walter Brown, when God opened the fountains of the deep to initiate the flood, jets of water, rock, & debris were shot into space and began their elongated orbits around the sun. So they do have a common origin —right here on earth. It’s beyond the scope of our discussion to go into the scientific details of Dr. Brown’s explanation, but it’s based on actual science, not on the need for something to exist. You can read his entire theory at

<http://www.creationscience.com/onlinebook/> .

There were plans to actually land a space probe on the next major comet that comes this way. Now they have decided to just collide with it instead. Dr. Walt Brown has predicted it will be a fluffy snowball with a relatively small rocky core. Well, they did it. When the probe collided with the comet, most scientists were amazed at the fluffy consistency and the amount of material ejected by the impact. Also, they determined the core was much smaller than they had expected.

Upon analysis, they will likely find it consists of materials found on earth. That’s will be the extent of the science of it — the materials they find. However, evolutionists will conclude the earth came from structures like comets sticking together (they have already alluded to this). Creationists will likely conclude Dr. Brown was right — comets originated on earth at the onset of the flood. Here is just one example of the same evidence but a different conclusion.

Here’s an interesting fact: Hyperbolic comets (comets whose orbit will not return them to the solar system) are never seen entering the solar system. Now, both sides of the debate can use this observation, but Evolutionists must resort to imaginary entities (The Oort Cloud) for which no

# Creation: Is It Important?

evidence exists. Even so, if comets come from the Oort Cloud, one should expect at least a small percentage of comets to be on a hyperbolic trajectory. None have ever been.

Creationists simply acknowledge this as a clear indication that comets originated on earth.

## Spiral galaxies

"...[A] great disappointment in astrophysics has been that we still do not have a clear understanding of how these structures were formed. We do not even know whether the smaller structures were formed first and then coalesced into the larger ones, or whether the larger structures formed first and then broke up into smaller ones.... It is also a bit disturbing that all these estimates of the ages and compositions of the stars rest on elaborate calculations of what is going on inside them, but all that we observe is the light emitted from their surfaces."

-Steven Weinberg, "Origins," *Science* 230 (Oct. 4, 1985):16; as quoted in *The Long War Against God*, Dr. Henry Morris (Also Brown 7th edition #64 & #96)

A more recent discovery reveals that the Cosmic Background Radiation (CBR) thought to be the outer reaches of the big bang lies in front of many distant galaxies. If this is true, either those galaxies were not part of the big bang, or CBR does not indicate there was a big bang.

## Big Bang theory

Regarding the "Big Bang," most people (even most scientists) do not understand it. They envision a dense ball of hot matter exploding into an empty space. What they don't realize is that the dimension of space must be included in the expansion. The dimensions of space itself were part of the exploding ball. Space itself expanded.

(Humphries, also Brown 7th edition #55, #56, & #57)

Astronomer and Mathematician Sir Fredrick Hoyle, who was by no means a Creationist said, "Big-Bang cosmology refers to an epoch that cannot be reached by any form of astronomy, and, in more than two decades, it has not produced a single successful prediction."

-Hoyle, F., *Home is where the wind Blows*, 1994, as reported in *The Skeptic*, 16(1):52

"Cosmology is unique in science in that it is a very large intellectual edifice based on very few facts. The strong tendency is to replace a need for more facts by conformity."

-Hoyle, et al., *Nature* 346:807-812, Aug.30, 1990

In other words, Big Bang is a desolate theory, and in the absence of facts about stellar evolution, the orthodoxy imposes its beliefs on researchers.

If evolutionary assumptions about starlight and distances are correct, the farthest galaxies should show us what the early universe looked like. Because the light would have taken 11 billion years to get here, these distant galaxies should look young. They say that the universe is only 13 billion years old. Many of the farthest galaxies, 11 billion light years away, still look old!<sup>9</sup> That is, they appear much older than the 2 billion years available under the current theory of stellar evolution. They have the form of mature galaxies: long-arm twisted spirals and etc. How did these galaxies become so "old" at a time when the universe itself was only 2 billion years old?

---

<sup>9</sup> Glimpse at Early Universe Reveals Surprisingly Mature Galaxies <http://www.spaceref.com/news/viewpr.html?pid=14524>



# Creation: Is It Important?

## **Moon**

According to estimates prior to the first lunar landing, 4.6 billion years should have resulted in the accumulation of between 50 and 590 feet of dust. However, it's only 3/4" deep, indicating a *maximum* age for the moon to be only 7000 years. Evolutionists have done some serious back peddling on this by revising their hypothesis on space dust to greatly reduce the expected accumulation.

*(In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood, by Dr. Walt Brown, 7th edition #87)*

The moon is moving away from the earth (because of conservation of angular momentum) at such a rate that it would have to be billions of years younger than evolution requires for it to still be in orbit around the earth.

*(Brown Technical notes)*

## **Sun**

Evolutionists claim that the ancient sun was fainter than the sun is today. However, even 25% less heat would put the Earth in a permanent deep-freeze.

*(In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood, by Dr. Walt Brown, 7th edition #50)*

There is no indication the sun evolved or has ever been significantly different from what we see today.

## **Earth**

Meteoritic dust—based on current accumulation rates, there should be much more than there actually is on the earth today. *(In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood, by Dr. Walt Brown, 7th edition #83)*

The decay of the earth's magnetic field is 50% every 1400 years. At that decay rate, the magnetic field would be overwhelming if you estimated back only 100,000 years, let alone millions, or even billions. *(In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood, by Dr. Walt Brown, 7th edition #84)*

## **Planets**

Planetary rotations are inconsistent with the spinning matter and accretion hypothesis for their origins. Rotations of the planets are radically different from each other, some are off plane and some are retrograde (spinning backwards).

*(In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood, by Dr. Walt Brown, 7th edition #46)*

## **Comets**

No comet can be more than ten thousand years old.

*(In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood, by Dr. Walt Brown, 7th edition #90)*

# Creation: Is It Important?

## **Stars**

(AAC Astronomy course)

In 1987, one of the stars a blue dwarf and red giant binary system underwent supernova. According to the theory of stellar evolution, the red giant was to have collapsed into a supernova. However, when some of the "dust" cleared, they determined that the blue dwarf went supernova instead.

Evolutionary theory had predicted the red giant would collapse into itself and nova, but the blue dwarf went nova instead. At the time, I was taking an astronomy class, and it was stated that this completely refuted the theory of stellar evolution. The professor said, "This completely contradicts everything we have believed about stellar evolution." "We'll have to start all over on our paradigm of stellar evolution." "All existing theories of stellar evolution are now disproved."

Of course, since then, evolutionary astronomers have attempted several new explanations for why they were so wrong about stellar evolution in the past.

## **Computer Simulations**

What about computer simulations that prove evolution? All computer simulations are created by intelligent beings. Such programs do only what the programmer has instructed. That being the case, they present stronger evidence for creation than evolution.

## **Biology**

Evolutionism is not new. Pre-Darwinian Evolution was known as The Great Chain Of Being.

-*The Long War Against God*, Dr. Henry Morris, p.38

And long ages have long been a belief of pagan religions. p.46, *ibid*.

[Mathematician] Sir Fredrick Hoyle calculated that the chance of obtaining the required set of enzymes for even the simplest living cell was one in 10 to the 40,000.

-*Evolution from Space*, 1981, Hoyle & Wickramasinghe

The number of atoms in the entire universe is estimated at only 10 to the 80. He called the evolution of life on earth "nonsense of a high order."

-Hoyle, F., "The Big Bang in Astronomy", *New Scientist*, Nov.19, 1981

Sir Fredrick Hoyle originated the 'Tornado through a junkyard assembling a Boeing 747' example, saying that believing in evolution is like believing a tornado could sweep through a junkyard and assemble a Boeing 747.

-Hoyle, *Nature*, 294(5837):105, Nov.12,1981 [www.answersingenesis.org/news/hoyle.asp#f3](http://www.answersingenesis.org/news/hoyle.asp#f3)

In Darwin's day people viewed living cells to be about as complex as a ping-pong ball. Today we know that it's practically a universe in itself.

"The clear testimony of all present relationships in the organic world is...one of stability of the basic kinds...with provision for ample variation within the kinds. There

# Creation: Is It Important?

are...unbridgeable gaps between the kinds, and no amount of variation has made even a start at crossing these gaps.

“On the other hand, if evolution is the true cosmology, the gaps should not be there at all. That is if all organisms have really descended by slow development from a common ancestor... they ought now to be inter-connected by imperceptible gradations from one form to another. In fact, it would be impossible to develop any kind of classification system at all, since we could never tell where one kind of organism stopped and the next began.”

“...The actual stability of the kinds... give[s] powerful testimony that the evolutionary assumption is false.”

-H. M. Morris, *Many Infallible Proofs*, p.264

“Evolutionists believe that the first living organisms were developed naturally, by innate processes, from non-living chemicals....

“However, ‘spontaneous generation,’ as it used to be called, is certainly not occurring in the present world, and even evolutionists agree with creationists on this. In terms of science, therefore, there is no such thing as the origin of life. Science deals with present processes, and these do not generate life from non-life....

“The evolutionist, therefore has to assume that the processes themselves have evolved, and that at some time in the past they could change inert matter into living matter, even though they cannot do it now....

“In other words, to explain the origin of life in naturalistic terms, the evolutionist has to assume an atmosphere which does not exist, an oceanic composition which does not exist, and processes which no longer exist, to explain the generation of hypothetical primitive organisms which no longer exist! This is no doubt material for interesting conversation, but it is not science.

-H. M. Morris, *Many Infallible Proofs*, p.270-271

“...In the absence of a fossil record, the credibility of evolutionists would be severely weakened. We might wonder whether the doctrine of evolution would qualify as anything more than an outrageous hypothesis.’

-Evolutionist Dr. Steven M. Stanley, “*Macroevolution: Pattern and Process*”, 1979 [-H. M. Morris, *Many Infallible Proofs*, p.273-274]

“However, the fossil record turns out to be a very unconvincing witness for ‘macro-evolution,’ since it is marked by the ubiquitous absence of any truly transitional forms between different basic kinds of organisms.

“The only evidence that exists concerning life in earlier ages is in the fossil record, and, therefore it is... an actual documented account of the history of organic evolution on earth.

“...The evidence that [evolution] has occurred is the supposed change in life forms in the fossils with the advance of geologic time.

# Creation: Is It Important?

"...[T]he fossil record does not show evidence of evolution. ...Indeed the clear-cut gaps in the fossil record between...the various basic kinds of organisms seem to prove exactly the opposite.

"For if evolution is really true, there ought to be no such gaps. The fossils ought to show continuous intergradations from one kind into another — at least on a statistical basis in relation to the abundance of fossils recovered. But this is not the case.

[See also *In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood*, by Dr. Walt Brown, 7th edition #10]

"Furthermore, if evolution is a universal process of nature, and organisms are in a perpetual process of transformation, one would suppose the forms of life in one age would be completely different from those in another. But this is so much not the case that animals and plants in the present world usually have easily identifiable relatives in the fossil world...

"...[T]he earliest and most primitive form of life yet discovered... found in the Precambrian rocks of southern Ontario... [are] still living today.

-H. M. Morris, *Many Infallible Proofs*, p.273-274

There is a profound absence of transitional forms at every point of evidence.

## What about vestigial organs?

There are none. Not knowing the purpose of a structure does not mean it has no function or that it has lost its function. All organs once identified as vestigial are now known to have a function.

Steven J. Gould – Resorted to the line of reasoning that the imperfections in the panda's thumb "prove" evolution. This is contrary to the normal argument used by evolutionists that evolved are perfectly suited to their natural use.

It's irrelevant. "The fact that an originally perfect structure deteriorates with time says nothing at all about how it was produced in the first place."

-*The Long War Against God*, Dr. Henry Morris, p.25

## **Morphology**

### What about similarity of features?

Evolution says, "Living entities that look alike came from common ancestors."

Creation says, "Living entities that look alike came from a common design."

Ape to man or man to ape? Some evolutionists today are speculating that the apes we see today descended from man, instead of man descending from these apes.

God created "kinds." Man<sup>10</sup> came up with the designation of "species." Variation within "kinds" was always part of God's design. One "kind" turning into another "kind" simply does not occur.

---

<sup>10</sup> Carl Linnaeus (1707–1778), the Swedish botanist who developed the double-Latin-name system for taxonomic classification of plants and animals, believed the Genesis creation account. <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/nab2/can-creationists-be-real-scientists>

# Creation: Is It Important?

“Evolution fails to fit the facts.”

-H. M. Morris, *Many Infallible Proofs*, p.279

## Language

Languages are more complex the farther back you go — exactly the opposite of what evolution would predict.

-*The Long War Against God*, Dr. Henry Morris, p.253

[See also *In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood*, by Dr. Walt Brown, 7th edition #13]

## Religion

Religions all stem from monotheism, belief in a creator, and an eternal afterlife. Then they degenerated into polytheism, pantheism, and animism. Evolution predicted just the opposite. Researchers are baffled.

-*The Long War Against God*, Dr. Henry Morris, p.292

**Consciousness** – Self-awareness — Evolution cannot explain this.

**Altruism** – Taking action on the behalf of and to the benefit of another, often at the risk of one's own life.

— Evolution cannot explain this.

[*In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood*, by Dr. Walt Brown, 7th edition #11]

## Evolution falls on every front!

The Creation/flood theory explains almost every facet of the world and the universe — even the things Evolutionary hypotheses cannot even address.

“The simplest, most logical and most scientific model of origins is still that of special creation.

-H. M. Morris, *Many Infallible Proofs*. p.279

“...[A]ll the direct and obvious ‘predictions’ of the creation model will be found to correspond directly and simply to all the observed facts in the real world.

“The evolution model, on the other hand, continually encounters contradictions which require a multitude of auxiliary assumptions to be imposed upon its basic formulation. For example... its assumption that life has evolved from non-life encounters the stubborn fact that life is not evolving from non-life at present; therefore a secondary assumption is made that environmental conditions in the past were drastically different than at present, despite the utter lack of evidence supporting such an assumption and despite the contradiction of this assumption with the evolutionist's first assumption of uniformitarianism. The fact that life is not evolving from non-life at present, however, is exactly and directly what the creation model predicts!

-H. M. Morris, *Many Infallible Proofs*, p.282

New discoveries?

What will we do if new discoveries indicate evolution is true?

# Creation: Is It Important?

**No fear: God is the author of Science.**

The facts of science will never be in opposition to God — only man's opinions. Your starting premise will determine your conclusion regarding facts of science.