

WRITINGS OF JOE CREWS

by Joe Crews

A collection of theological writings, sermons, and essays by Joe Crews, compiled for study and devotional reading.

23 Chapters

Table of Contents

1. 00.00. Crews, Joe - Library
2. 01.00. Amazing Wonders of Creation
3. 01.01. God's Handiwork
4. 01.02. Is Chance Precise and Predictable?
5. 01.03. How Did Moses Know?
6. 01.04. Watering the Earth — God's Miracle
7. 01.05. God Solves the Weight Problem
8. 01.06. No Sprinkler System Like This
9. 01.07. Why Clouds Don't Break
10. 01.08. Lucky Accident or Design?
11. 01.09. God's Heating System—The Gulf Stream
12. 01.10. Goggles and Bifocals
13. 01.11. Birds and Bees
14. 01.12. And He Loves Me
15. 02.00. How Evolution Flunked the Science Test
16. 02.01. Introduction
17. 02.02. Spontaneous Generation
18. 02.03. Chance Life—A Ridiculous Improbability
19. 02.04. Mutations—How Big the Changes?
20. 02.05. Fossils Support Creationism
21. 02.06. The Mystery of the Empty Strata
22. 02.07. Uniformity or the Flood?
23. 02.08. Survival of the Fittest

00.00. Crews, Joe - Library

Crews, Joe - Library Crews, Joe - Amazing Wonders of Creation Crews, Joe - How Evolution Flunked the Science Test

01.00. Amazing Wonders of Creation

Amazing Wonders of Creation By Joe Crews

Copyright © 2007 by Lu Ann Crews All Rights Reserved. Printed in the USA.

Published by Amazing Facts International

01.01. God's Handiwork

God's Handiwork In spite of being marred by transgression, nature still bears an eloquent testimony to the love and power of a Divine Creator. After resting under the heavy curses of sin for almost 6,000 years, the incredible beauty of God's handiwork continues to amaze and enthrall. When we thank God for our blessings, we should never forget to mention these incomparable natural wonders that add so much meaning to every moment of our lives.

What would this planet be like without its restful carpet of living green grass and foliage? God did not have to clothe the ugly, bare soil with such a covering. Functionally, there needed to be no bright colors. Human beings could have survived on a bleak planet of gray ground and colorless plants. But they could not have survived as happily. The Creator Himself was not only a lover of beauty; He loved His creatures so much that He wanted them to be happy, too. That's why He draped the earth with a half-million varieties of contrasting blossoms and leaves. And hidden inside each tiny bud, God placed secrets that would challenge the genius of earth's greatest scientists.

How strange it is that so many of those who wrestle with these mysteries do not recognize the Creative Power that produced them. Even though many naturalists stand in awe of the creature, few seem to recognize and honor the Creator. Breathing the marvelous blend of nitrogen and oxygen that makes it possible for them to live, evolutionists refuse to acknowledge that the precise 79 percent to 21 percent mixture of gases was provided by something other than blind chance. Looking through eyes so delicately arranged that no combination of scientific genius can even understand, much less duplicate, their operation, unbelievers deny the miracle which makes it possible for them to see. Through ears, which connect to a brain more complex than the largest computer on earth, doubters listen to lectures on humanism and evolution.

Who are these people who scorn the record of God's creative power? They are only a tiny fragment of finite humanity, whose very existence, breath by breath, depends upon the operation of laws over which they have no control. Rejecting the divine origin of that for which they find no empirical evidence, many scientists ascribe miraculous qualities to matter itself. They build up theoretical creeds in which they place absolute faith, even to the point of believing that blind, unintelligent "nature" created life out of non-life.

01.02. Is Chance Precise and Predictable?

Is Chance Precise and Predictable?

What kind of faith is required to believe that all the orderly processes of nature were produced by chance? Almost every plant and animal exhibits amazing adaptations that can only be described as miraculous. If these highly complex functions had no intelligent Creator or Designer, then our reasoning powers are staggered by the millions of "coincidences" that operate with infinite precision to produce perfect beauty, function, and reproduction on the earth.

Could they indeed be the products of accident or chance? Every law of science on the subject decrees that undirected, random nature tends toward deterioration rather than order. Surely the most persuasive evidence in favor of creationism is that of nature itself. The Bible suggests that the animals and earth should be asked about their own origin. In Job 12:7-9, we read: "But ask now the beasts, and they shall teach thee; and the fowls of the air, and they shall tell thee: and the fishes of the sea shall declare unto thee. Who knoweth not in all these that the hand of the Lord hath wrought this?" Job says if you want to know how God operated in the work of creation, ask these various forms of life, ask the earth, and the earth will explain how mightily God has wrought in these things.

So that's exactly what we're going to do right now. What does the earth have to say to us concerning the great power of God? Did you know there are miracles in every square inch of this earth? From the towering mountains to the vast, restless ocean and throughout the limitless universe of God, there is the throb and hum of life. From the microscopic to the immense, we can discover the fingerprints of the mighty Creator who brought all things into existence.

When I look at the universe and see the amazing fact that it is in perfect balance, that life in this world has been perfectly adapted to the conditions we find here, I know that some great intelligent power is behind it, making it operate in such an accurate manner. The Genesis account of the Bible has been completely vindicated by all the findings of true science. The writings of Moses have been found to be scientifically as well as historically accurate. In this booklet, we're going to look at the water and land in particular. By studying the mysteries of land and sea, we will see how wonderfully they support the biblical story of Creation.

01.03. How Did Moses Know?

How Did Moses Know?

Let's go back to Genesis and take a look at the story as God gave it to Moses. Genesis 1:6-8 says, "And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters. And God made the firmament, and divided the waters that are under the firmament from the waters, which were above the firmament; and it was so. And God called the firmament Heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day." Long, long ago the waters that were over the earth were actually right down here upon the surface. We know that there is a vast ocean in space, suspended in the atmosphere. We'll find out just what purpose it serves in a moment, but at one time that water was resting right here upon the earth. God divided it and lifted a part of it up into the heavens while part of it remained here.

Now look at Genesis 1:9-10. "And God said, Let the water under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so. And God called the dry land Earth; and the gathering together of the waters called He Seas: and God saw that it was good." How did Moses know there would be several oceans or seas? He had absolutely no human way of knowing there could be more than one body of water in the entire world. He never went around to see how many oceans were in the world, but God inspired this truth in Moses' mind. He said there were seas or oceans.

Here's another good question to ask. How did Moses know that all these various bodies of water would be connected and would rest in only one bed? Now, isn't that what he said? "Let all the waters be gathered into one place and let the dry land appear."

In the next verse, he says there were seas or oceans. It is a scientific, geographical fact that all the oceans of the world are joined together, and they do all rest in a common bed. Moses could not have known that of himself. He didn't say this of dry land. No, it was divided up into continents. Part of it would be over here and another big, discrete mass of it would be in another location. But concerning the waters, he said it would all be in one place, and yet it would be divided into oceans. I think it's tremendous that the Bible is so scientifically accurate as to reveal these things.

01.04. Watering the Earth — God's Miracle

Watering the Earth — God's Miracle

Now let's see how intelligence and design came into the ratio of land and water. One-quarter of the earth's surface is dry land, and three-quarters is covered with water. In the United States alone we have three and three-quarter million square miles of dry land, and all of it has to be watered and cared for. In fact, if it weren't watered, there would be no vegetation and no growing grass or trees.

Just imagine for a moment that the ratio of land and water was changed from what it is at present. The proportion of water and land determines the rainfall on the earth. Suppose the ocean was only half its present size. That would mean our rainfall would only be one-quarter of what we now receive. What would that mean for the three and three-quarter million square miles of land we have in these United States? All of it would be turned into a vast, dry desert! But on the other hand, if half the present land were added to the ocean, there would be four times as much rainfall as there is now, and the entire United States would be turned into a vast marshland where human life would be almost impossible.

Now suppose that mankind had to water this entire three and three-quarter million square miles of land. How could we ever spread out that water and irrigate the land effectively? What a tremendous task that would be! "There's plenty of water in the ocean," someone might observe, "we could simply use it to water the dry land." Although it may sound reasonable, there are three problems connected with it. First, transportation. We'd have to get the water out of the ocean and spread it evenly over the land. The second problem is the salt it contains, which would kill all the green plants. The third problem is weight. Water is 800 times the weight of the atmosphere, presenting the challenge of how to transport and disperse it.

01.05. God Solves the Weight Problem

God Solves the Weight Problem

How has God solved the weight problem? First, He uses heat. We know heat expands things and cold contracts them, and that water is the material most subject to expansion. In fact, when turned into steam, it becomes 1,600 to 1,700 times its original volume. Remember, though, this water is 800 times heavier than the atmosphere. But God simply sends down the warming rays of the sun, turning the water into a vapor that is 900 times lighter than water. Now it is one-eighth times lighter than the atmosphere. So this vapor is easily lifted up out of the ocean, carried into the sky—perhaps miles into the air—and formed into great cloud masses.

The second problem is deadly salt, but God simply evaporates the water and leaves all the mineral deposits and impurities behind. Taken up into the clouds, the water is sweet and soft, perfectly adapted to irrigate the earth.

01.06. No Sprinkler System Like This

No Sprinkler System Like This

What about the third problem—transportation? The water that is lifted up is still hanging over the ocean, which doesn't need any more water. God sends along winds to blow the clouds and spread them out over the dry land area where it is needed. But how to get all the water down out of the clouds? Here is another wonderful miracle. Cold will contract, of course, so when the clouds pass over the mountain peaks, the cold air reaches up and begins to cool those clouds, turning the vapor into a condensation of moisture.

Now consider what would happen if the clouds gave up all the water they contain at one time—it would flood the entire surface of the earth with three feet of water! Therefore, the cooling process must be gradual. For example, if the temperature of the cloud is lowered by 9 degrees, it will drop half its water! So God arranges for a gradual cooling process to let the rain come down in gentle to vigorous showers to provide the amounts needed to revive the earth. What an incredible process! Of course, some of it rains back into the ocean, but it is needed there to provide the necessary amount of oxygen for fish living in salty ocean beds.

Did you know that these great facts of nature were all known and understood long before the scientists and naturalists discovered them? Ecclesiastes 1:7 is a most interesting verse. "All the rivers run into the sea; yet the sea is not full." Why not? The text continues to give the answer. "Unto the place from whence the river comes, thither they return again."

The Bible says the reason the seas do not overflow is that the water is taken up again and returned to where the rivers come from. And so there is a constant movement of water going up from the ocean in vapor form, carried as clouds over the land, and brought down again as rain, which forms rivulets that find their way back to the sea. Even though the great naturalists felt they had made a new discovery when they found out about the cycles of clouds, they could have known it all by reading the Scriptures.

01.07. Why Clouds Don't Break

Why Clouds Don't Break

Another text with scientific information is Job 26:8. "He bindeth up the waters in his thick clouds; and the cloud is not rent under them." This is a beautiful text, explaining that the clouds don't break and spill all their water at once, even though millions of tons of water are drawn up from the oceans into the clouds. And, of course, Job was correct. We've just found that God has a process of gradual cooling that releases the water little by little as it is needed to irrigate the surface of the earth. God revealed it to Job long before mankind figured it out.

I'm sure all of us know that water has weight, and that its pressure increases dramatically as the depth increases. Certain fish that exist in the very bottom of the ocean are especially engineered by God to withstand this tremendous pressure. If brought quickly up to the surface, they practically explode. The pressure that God put into their muscular structure is still there on the inside when they are brought up where the pressure is not exerted from the outside.

This is a wonderful fact, but do you realize that we, too, live in the bottom of an atmospheric sea, which also has tremendous weight? At sea level we are living down at the bottom of a very heavy, dense covering. As the ocean is to the fish, so the atmosphere is to us. Every moment we live, a pressure of 14 pounds per square inch is exerted upon our body structure, and that's pretty heavy. We think a man is strong if he can carry 200 pounds on his back. In fact, the strongest man that ever lived put only 415 pounds over his head. Yet, every single form of life in this world, whether it's a 90-pound woman or a burly man, has a constant pressure of over 15 tons at sea level pushing and pressing upon them from every direction. That's 30,000 pounds!

Even the filmy, gauzy insects have been designed by God to withstand their proportion of this pressure. That little gnat, so light and frail that it seems anything could crush it, is built by God to withstand the weight of the atmosphere. Can you think this happened by mere chance? Consider Job 28:25. "To make the weight for the winds; and he weigheth the waters by measure." The Bible says the wind has weight.

The air, in other words, is heavy. The atmosphere has weight. If you climb a mountain, the higher you climb, the thinner the atmosphere becomes, and you feel distressed and uncomfortable. Why? Because the pressure is not as great. You see, God has built in a certain amount of pressure that balances that on the outside at sea level. If you went high enough, you would be just as stressed as the fish brought up from the ocean depths. How wonderful that God has designed each living creature to be perfectly comfortable in its own environment.

01.08. Lucky Accident or Design?

Lucky Accident or Design?

Now consider another, even greater, miracle. The atmosphere around us is made up of two main ingredients—nitrogen and oxygen—whose mixture is always the same, whether at the highest mountaintops or in the deepest caves. The perfect balance is 79 percent nitrogen and 21 percent oxygen. You might ask, "Why is it this way?" Is there some particular reason for it? Is it important that we have this exact mixture of nitrogen and oxygen?" Yes, I can assure you it is most important. If the nitrogen were increased, our life processes would slow down and we would die. If the oxygen were measurably increased, our life processes would be rapidly increased. Our pulse rate would just run away and soon we would wear out and die. But God made it just right.

Suppose, for example, it was two-thirds nitrogen and one-third oxygen. If that proportion prevailed, and an electrical reaction caused the elements to combine, do you realize that the whole world would be turned into laughing maniacs? Everybody would be laughing because that would produce the laughing gas, N₂O, the same kind dentists sometimes use when extracting teeth. Or suppose it was divided half and half. That would produce nitric oxide, which is quickly fatal to all forms of life.

Was it just a lucky accident that it came out like this? Did some blind happenstance of nature produce this exact mixture that is necessary for life support? Or was there an intelligent design? This world would become chaotic if this atmospheric mixture slipped out of control for just a single instant. We would see one of the most tremendous of all explosions, because nitrogen is the basic component of gunpowder; and oxygen, of course, makes for rapid combustion. It would be "Goodbye, world!"

And yet some day, apparently, there is going to an explosion like this. Some day the elements are going to melt with fervent heat, the Bible says. Peter tells us in 2 Peter 3:10 that "the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat." I don't know how God will arrange that, but I do know that some great fire one of these days is going to burn, and the earth will be purified by this strange fire of God. And the elements will be involved in it because the elements are going to melt. Maybe God is going to change just very, very slightly the present proportion of nitrogen and oxygen, causing this great conflagration to take place. I do know this—we must be ready for that day when it comes. The Bible indicates it is near at hand.

Another of the mysteries of nature was described in the Bible long before it was investigated by science. We read about it in Job 38:8-11. "Or who shut up the sea with doors, when it brake forth, as if it had issued out of the womb? When I made the cloud the garment thereof, and thick darkness a swaddling band for it, And brake up for it my decreed place, and set bars and doors, And said, Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further: and here shall thy proud waves be stayed?"

What beautiful, poetic language we find here to describe the creation of the ocean. It speaks of it as being born and coming forth from the womb. God says that the cloud was the garment of it and

a thick darkness was a swaddling band placed around the ocean at its birth. But then God added, "Here ye may come but no further; here shall thy proud waves be stayed."

The scientists of this world have been amazed in learning the secrets of the tidal actions. They still don't understand all the deep, underwater cataclysmic actions that affect the tides and wave patterns. No naturalist on the face of the earth has figured out all the secrets of these swift tidal waves as they move to and fro in their own mysterious ways.

01.09. God's Heating System—The Gulf Stream

God's Heating System—The Gulf Stream By the way, these tides and movements of water have been in perfect balance to contribute to mankind's comfort. I think of the mighty Gulf Stream, for instance. We don't know everything about it, but we do know life in the United States would be almost impossible were it not for the fantastic influence of this great stream. It comes out of the Gulf of Mexico, goes along the eastern seaboard, and up into the northern sections of the world. It is like a river, flowing through the midst of the sea, and can be seen distinctly from high above because of its different color.

In fact, this river is about 70 miles wide and nearly 3,000 feet deep. When it leaves the Gulf of Mexico, the water temperature is 84°F., and off the coast of the Carolinas it is still a warm 80°F. This warming influence actually makes the northern coastal regions of America and Europe inhabitable; otherwise, they would be frozen wastelands.

Now notice what happens as this warm river reaches the entrance of the Arctic region at Baffin Bay, where it meets a frigid polar stream that is rushing southward. As a result of the titanic collision of these two giants, the polar stream is forced to dive down thousands of feet, where it continues its southward course, coming up finally in the West Indies during their hottest season, thus cooling down the terrible tropical heat. The Gulf Stream gets deflected eastward, going up along the British Isles, making these habitable.

It was in God's plan for this to happen. I don't believe for a moment that all this happened by chance or accident. Without that deflection of the Gulf Stream, some of those northern lands would be locked in eternal winter. Surely God was behind the entire plan.

01.10. Goggles and Bifocals

Goggles and Bifocals

Let's hurry along now and take a quick look at the creatures of nature and see how intelligence and design came into the picture. Think for a moment of the fish that inhabit the oceans. They are constantly subject to attack from their enemies from above—like the gulls that swoop down to make their meals off marine life. Do you know that fish have specially constructed eyeballs enabling them to look almost instantly in any and all directions? They see behind, below, above and on the sides; furthermore, their eyes are designed to take into account the refraction of light.

Yes, fish can see 30 percent farther than other visual instruments because God designed the eyeball of the fish to take into consideration the refraction of light. We tend to think it's a wonderful accomplishment when the oculist manufactures special goggles for divers that compensate for refraction in the water, yet God did it for fish long before. Goggles could never have come into existence by chance, yet evolutionists contend that a fish's specialized eyeballs just happened.

In the waters of Malaya lives a fish with bifocal lenses built right in its eyes. This little sardine-sized fish is prized for food by the seagulls especially. They are constantly swooping down to gobble up this little fish if they can. So the little fish has to watch carefully for this approaching danger. It must have good far vision, but since it feeds on the microscopic larvae that abound in the water, it must have very good near vision as well. And do you know the Creator provided a little membrane that comes halfway up on its eyes, giving it bifocal vision? That little fish can look up and see the gulls coming or look down and see those nearby bits of life that it can feed on!

We think it wonderful that the skilled optometrist and oculist can perfect glasses permitting us to see near and far away, yet here is a fish that has been around for thousands of years—and God made it that way from the beginning. It did not just develop blindly; it had to be created. Intelligent design was behind it.

01.11. Birds and Bees

Birds and Bees

Now let's examine two Pacific coast water birds. I can find no stronger evidence of design in nature than with the Ousel, a very friendly little bird that lives near mountain streams. It can usually be found where the water is swift-flowing and splashy. This buoyant bird will be floating along, apparently weightless, and then suddenly sink to the bottom like a piece of lead. There he walks around picking up bits of food on the streambed. After taking his fill, he goes over to the bank, shakes himself, and mysteriously sets himself afloat again like a wisp of smoke.

It has been discovered that this strange bird has some special equipment—a muscular apparatus that can instantly exhaust every bit of air from its body, letting it sink down; then when it walks out, it can take in air again and float off once more. Now, that's special creation, isn't it? The evolutionists would say, "Well, it needed to have this bit of apparatus, so nature provided it." Of course, they don't say what nature is, but maintain that it just grew by some accidental development. The truth is that God provided it. He made this particular bird as He did because He saw that it needed this for survival.

Another kind of bird found on the Pacific coast lives on a diet of large worms that live in holes in the sand. Because this worm is down at the very bottom of its hole, the bird must go down to get the worm out. It so happens that, although its beak is exactly the right length to reach into the hole, the narrow hole keeps the beak squeezed shut. What a predicament—to be able to see and reach a luscious worm but not be able to open his beak to pick it up! Do you know what God arranged for this particular bird? He created a tiny flap much like a surgeon's forceps at the bottom of the beak. With this special organ the bird can pick up the worm, back out of the hole, and gobble it down!

Isn't it wonderful that God thought of a little bird and made something special so it could get its food conveniently? If He so loves the little birds and provides the things to make their existence comfortable, don't you think He's willing to provide everything that we might need? He loves us even more. Remember, He knows when the sparrows fall.

Some years ago, a scientific magazine published an article by a clever biologist who did not believe in evolution. In *Evolution Goes to Pieces on a Bee's Knee*, the author first reviewed the evolutionist's teaching that when the need for a certain organ develops in any creature, the organ is produced in response to that need. Nature itself, or some blind chance, supposedly comes along and produces the necessary organ to fit the creature for survival. Then he cited the example of the bees. When bees crawl into pollen-filled blossoms, their breathing apparatus gets all stopped up with pollen. In fact, they can't even breathe while they are inside gathering their pollen.

Now it so happens that every bee has a special brush located on its knees—a stiff brush—that it uses to clean out its breathing apparatus when it comes out of the flower so it doesn't suffocate. This biologist noted that if it were true that these insects develop special equipment in response to a need, the very first bee to exist did not have those brushes on its knees. When it went into the

flower, it would have suffocated; consequently, the whole bee family would have become extinct right then and there. No, rather than these brushes developing slowly through the ages in response to a need, they were provided by God to meet the need and save the very first bee that was made.

The conclusion is that God anticipated the needs of His creatures and made them with every necessary apparatus. How thankful we ought to be that God can supply all our needs in advance. The Bible says the fool hath said in his heart, "There is no God." Only a God of love and power could have made the marvels we see about us. And if He cares for the tiny animal world, He cares for us, too. He loves us even more than He loves that little bird out on the West Coast, and He wants to save us. He wants to take us at last to a place where nature will be in perfect balance again and where all of the curse of sin will be forever removed.

01.12. And He Loves Me

And He Loves Me Can we doubt the love of God, who makes such infinite provision for everything He created? Nothing has been left alone to suffer extinction or deprivation. Only man's bungling interference with the delicate balance of nature has brought sorrow and tragedy. If God cares for the needs of the tiniest cell of the smallest plant or animal, don't you think He loves us enough to care for us?

One of the most thrilling facts I learned about the miracles of nature concerned the lowly cocklebur. Surely it is one of the most despised of all plants due to its clinging, pricking nature. Yet consider the marvel of its reproduction. Every pod of the cocklebur has two seeds inside to guarantee its survival. But during the first year only one of the seeds will begin to grow. The other seed waits till the second year to start growing in order to perpetuate two seasons of growth. But if something happens to the first seed so that it does not grow and produce, the second seed begins to grow immediately instead of waiting for the next year. What built-in wisdom of God communicates to that waiting seed that it should begin to grow when the first seed is destroyed? No evolutionist has been able to harmonize miracles like this with their theories of naturalism and chance.

Surely we can see that God's care extends to the meanest and lowest order of growing things. Are we not more precious to Him than the cockleburs? If He works miracles to safeguard a clinging, contrary cocklebur, will He not guide the ways of those for whom He gave His life? May God open our eyes to the wonder and wisdom of His great work of creation. Tonight when you kneel to pray, remember to thank God for the landscape of beauty that always lies beyond the manmade mess of human obstruction.

Learn More: [Get To Know Jesus](#)

02.00. How Evolution Flunked the Science Test

How Evolution Flunked The Science Test By Joe Crews

Copyright © 2006 by Joe Crews All Rights Reserved. Printed in the USA.

Published by Amazing Facts International

02.01. Introduction

Introduction

Recently I talked to a man with a fantastic amount of faith. Not one shade of doubt crept into his animated description of man's origin and destiny. He was an evolutionist I met on an airplane. With incredible confidence he bridged the eons of prehistoric time to explain the existence of modern plant and animal life. His detailed description of human ascent from a tiny, one-celled monad was so vivid and convincing that one could almost believe he had seen the microscopic amoeba turn into a man.

What is this evolution doctrine that inspires so much faith in its disciples? How has it turned great scientists into dogmatic opponents of any other viewpoint? Many evolutionary scientists have united their professional influence to forbid any classroom instruction contrary to their own views. Does the theory of evolution merit this kind of fanatical support, which would silence all opposing ideas? When religious people take such a position, they are called bigots, but scientists seem to escape that charge. In February of 1977, nearly 200 members of the nation's academic community sent letters to school boards across the United States, urging that no alternate ideas on origins be permitted in classrooms.

This indicates that the evolutionists are feeling the threat of a rising revolt against the stereotyped, contradictory versions of their theory. Many students are looking for honest answers to their questions about the origin and purpose of life. For the first time, the stale traditions of evolution have to go on the defensive. But let's take a look at what they have to defend. Then you will understand why these evolutionary scientists are people of such extraordinary faith, and why they are so fearful of facing competition at the school level.

02.02. Spontaneous Generation

Spontaneous Generation

How does the evolutionist explain the existence of that first one-celled animal from which all life forms supposedly evolved? For many years the medieval idea of spontaneous generation was the accepted explanation. According to Webster, spontaneous generation is "the generation of living from nonliving matter ... [it is taken] from the belief, now abandoned, that organisms found in putrid organic matter arose spontaneously from it."

Simply stated, this means that under the proper conditions of temperature, time, place, etc., decaying matter simply turns into organic life. This simplistic idea dominated scientific thinking until 1846, when Louis Pasteur completely shattered the theory by his experiments. He exposed the whole concept as utter foolishness. Under controlled laboratory conditions, in a semi-vacuum, no organic life ever emerged from decaying, nonliving matter. Reluctantly it was abandoned as a valid scientific issue. Today no reputable scientist tries to defend it on a demonstrable basis. That is why Webster says it is "now abandoned." It never has been and never can be demonstrated in the test tube. No present process is observed that could support the idea of spontaneous generation. Obviously, if spontaneous generation actually did take place in the distant past to produce the first spark of life, it must be assumed that the laws that govern life had to be completely different from what they are now. But wait a minute! This won't work either, because the whole evolutionary theory rests upon the assumption that conditions on the earth have remained uniform throughout the ages.

Do you begin to see the dilemma of the evolutionists in explaining that first amoeba, or monad, or whatever formed the first cell of life? If it sprang up spontaneously from no previous life, it contradicts a basic law of nature that forms the foundation of the entire theory. Yet, without believing in spontaneous generation, the evolutionist would have to acknowledge something other than natural forces at work—in other words, God. How do they get around this dilemma?

Dr. George Wald, Nobel Prize winner of Harvard University, states it as cryptically and honestly as an evolutionist can:

"One has only to contemplate the magnitude of this task to concede that the spontaneous generation of a living organism is impossible. Yet here we are—as a result, I believe, of spontaneous generation." *Scientific American*, August 1954 That statement by Dr. Wald demonstrates a much greater faith than a religious creationist can muster. Notice that the great evolutionary scientist says it could not have happened. It was impossible. Yet he believes it did happen. What can we say to that kind of faith? At least the creationist believes that God was able to speak life into existence. His is not a blind faith in something that he concedes to be impossible.

So here we are, face to face with the first contradiction of evolution with a basic law of science. In order to sustain his humanistic explanation of the origin of life, he must accept the exploded, unscientific theory of spontaneous generation. And the big question is this: Why is he so violently

opposed to the spontaneous generation spoken of in the Bible? A miracle of creation is required in either case. Either God did it by divine fiat, or blind, unintelligent nature produced Wald's impossible act. Let any reasonable mind contemplate the alternatives for a moment. Doesn't it take more faith to believe that chance could produce life than it does to believe infinite intelligence could produce it?

Why did Dr. Wald say that it was impossible for life to result from spontaneous generation? That was not an easy concession for a confirmed evolutionist to make. His exhaustive search for a scientific explanation ended in failure, as it has for all other evolutionary scientists, and he had the courage to admit it. But he also had an incredible faith to believe in it even though it was a scientific impossibility. A Christian who confessed to such a faith would be labeled as naive and gullible. What a difference the cloak of higher education makes upon our easily impressed minds! How much simpler and sweeter the faith that accepts the inspired account: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" (Genesis 1:1).

02.03. Chance Life—A Ridiculous Improbability

Chance Life—A Ridiculous Improbability

What would be involved in the accidental development of a single living cell? The fact is that the most elementary form of life is more complicated than any man-made thing on earth. The entire complex of New York City is less complicated than the makeup of the simplest microscopic cell. It is more than ridiculous to talk about its chance production. Scientists themselves assure us that the structure of a single cell is unbelievably intricate. The chance for a proper combination of molecules into amino acids, and then into proteins with the properties of life is entirely unrealistic. American Scientist magazine made this admission in January of 1955:

"From the probability standpoint, the ordering of the present environment into a single amino acid molecule would be utterly improbable in all the time and space available for the origin of terrestrial life. " A Swiss mathematician, Charles Eugene Guye, actually computes the odds against such an occurrence at only one chance in 10(160). That means 10 multiplied by itself 160 times, a number too large even to articulate. Another scientist expressed it this way:

"The amount of matter to be shaken together to produce a single molecule of protein would be millions of times greater than that in the whole universe. For it to occur on earth alone would require many, almost endless, billions of years" (The Evidence of God in an Expanding Universe, p. 23).

How can we explain the naive insistence of evolutionists to believe something so extremely out of character for their scientific background? And how can we harmonize the normally broad-minded tolerance of the educated, with the narrow bigotry exhibited by many evolutionary scientists in trying to suppress opposing points of view? The obvious explanation would seem to be rooted in the desperation of such evolutionists to retain their reputation as the sole dispensers of dogmatic truth. To acknowledge a superior wisdom has been too long cultivated by the evolutionist community. They have repeated their assumptions for so long in support of their theories that they have started accepting them as facts. No one objects to their assuming whatever they want to assume, but to assume happenings that go contrary to all scientific evidence and still call it science is being dishonest.

02.04. Mutations—How Big the Changes?

Mutations—How Big the Changes?

Now let's look at a second basic evolutionary teaching which is contrary to scientific law. One of the most necessary parts of evolution, which is supposed to provide the power for changing the amoeba into a man, is mutation. This refers to abnormal changes in the organism that are assumed to be caused by chemical changes in the genes themselves. The genes are the hereditary factors within the chromosomes of each species. Every species has its own particular number of chromosomes that contain the genes. Within every human being are 46 chromosomes containing an estimated 100,000 genes, each one of which is able to affect in some way the size, color, texture, or quality of the individual. The assumption is that these genes, which provide the inherited characteristics we get from our ancestors, occasionally become affected by unusual pairing, chemical damage, or other influences, causing them to produce an unusual change in one of the offspring. This is referred to as a mutation. Through gradual changes wrought in the various species through mutation, it is assumed by the evolutionists that the amoeba turned into an invertebrate, which became an amphibian, then a reptile, a quadruped, an ape form, and finally a man. In other words, the species are not fixed in the eyes of the evolutionists. Families are forever drifting over into another higher form as time progresses. This means that all the fossil records of animal history should reveal an utter absence of precise family boundaries. Everything should be in the process of changing into something else—with literally hundreds of millions of half-developed fish trying to become amphibious, and reptiles halfway transformed into birds, and mammals looking like half-apes or half-men.

Now everybody knows that instead of finding those billions of confused family fossils, the scientists have found exactly the opposite. Not one single drifting, changing life form has been studied. Everything stays within the well-defined limits of its own basic kind and absolutely refuses to cooperate with the demands of modern evolutionists. Most people would give up and change their theory when faced with such a crushing, deflating blow, but not the evolutionist! He still searches for that illusive missing link which could at least prove that he hasn't been 100 percent wrong. But let's look at the vehicle that the evolutionists have depended upon to provide the possibility of the drastic changes required by their theory. Sir Julian Huxley, a principal spokesman for evolution, said this:

"Mutation provides the raw material of evolution." Again he said, "Mutation is the ultimate sources of all ... heritable variation" (Evolution in Action, p. 38).

Professor Ernst Mayr, another leader of the evolutionists, made this statement:

"Yet it must not be forgotten that mutation is the ultimate source of all genetic variation found in natural populations and the only raw material available for natural selection to work on" (Animal Species and Evolution, p. 170).

Please keep this clearly in mind: Evolutionists say that mutation is absolutely essential to provide the inexorable upgrading of species that changed the simpler forms into more complex forms. BUT—the scientific fact is that mutation could NEVER accomplish what evolution demands of it, for several reasons. As all scientists agree, mutations are very rare. Huxley guesses that only about one in a hundred thousand is a mutant. Secondly, when they do occur, they are almost certain to be harmful or deadly to the organism. In other words, the vast majority of such mutations lead toward extinction instead of evolution; they make the organism worse instead of better. Huxley admits: "The great majority of mutant genes are harmful in their effect on the organism" (Ibid. p. 39).

Other scientists, including Darwin himself, conceded that most mutants are recessive and degenerative; therefore, they would actually be eliminated by natural selection rather than effect any significant improvement in the organism. Professor G. G. Simpson, one of the elite spokesmen for evolution, writes about multiple, simultaneous mutations and reports that the mathematical likelihood of getting good evolutionary results would occur only once in 274 billion years! And that would be assuming 100 million individuals reproducing a new generation every day! He concludes by saying:

"Obviously ... such a process has played no part whatever in evolution" (The Major Features of Evolution, p. 96).

Does this sound sort of confusing to you? They say mutation is necessary to make the changes required by their theory, yet they have to confess that it is scientifically impossible for multiple mutations to make the changes. This is too typical of the puzzling twists and turns made by our evolutionist friends in their efforts to uphold an exploded theory. So the second point of contradiction with true science has been established.

Mutations, of course, do effect minor changes within the basic kinds, but those changes are limited, never producing a new family. They can explain many of the varieties of both plant and animals but can never explain the creation of basic kinds as required by evolution.

02.05. Fossils Support Creationism

Fossils Support Creationism

Since we have discovered that the fossil record gives no support to the idea of species gradually changing into other species, let us see if fossil evidence is in harmony with the Bible. Ten times in the book of Genesis we read God's decree concerning the reproduction of His creatures—"after its kind." The word "kind" refers to species, or families. Each created family was to produce only its own kind. This forever precludes the drifting, changing process required by organic evolution where one species turns into another.

Take note that God did not say there could be no changes within the family. He did not create all the varieties of dogs, cats, horses, etc., in the very beginning. There was only a male and female of each species, and many changes have since occurred to produce a wide assortment of varieties within the family. But please keep it straight in your mind that cats have always remained cats, dogs are still dogs, and men are still men. Mutation has only been responsible for producing a new variety of the same species, but never originating another new kind. Selective breeding has also brought tremendous improvements such as hornless cattle, white turkeys, and seedless oranges, but all the organisms continue to reproduce exactly as God decreed at Creation—after its kind.

The "common ancestor" that evolution demands has never existed. There is not a "missing link." Man and monkeys are supposed to stem from the same animal ancestry! Even chimpanzees and many monkey groups vary tremendously. Some are smart, others dumb. Some have short tails and some long. Some have no tails at all. Their teeth vary in number. A few have thumbs and others do not. Their genes are different. Their blood is different. Their chromosomes don't jibe. Interestingly enough, apes only breed with apes, chimpanzees with chimpanzees, and monkeys with monkeys.

But when we start comparing humans with monkeys, we get even more impossible differences than those among the simian types. In fact, these differences constitute another unanswerable support for the Bible rule of "after its kind." The fact that some monkeys can be trained to smoke a pipe, ride a scooter, or even hoist a test tube in a laboratory does not prove that scientists are evolved animals, or that monkeys are retarded, developing humans.

It has already been stated that evolutionists expected the fossil record to support their theory of species changes. Their doctrine demanded vast numbers of scaly reptiles transforming their scales into feathers and their front feet into wings. Other reptiles supposedly should be changing into fur-bearing quadrupeds. Did they find those thousands of multi-changing creatures? Not one! No matter what particular strata they sifted through, all the fossils were easily recognized and classified within their own families, just as God decreed. If the evolutionary doctrine were true, the strata would be teeming with hundreds of millions of transition forms with combination features of two or more species. Not only so, but there would have to be millions upon millions of observable

living links right now in the process of turning into a higher form. Darwin confessed:

"There are two or three million species on earth. A sufficient field one might think for observation; but it must be said today that in spite of all the evidence of trained observers, not one change of the species to another is on record" (Life and Letters, vol. 3, p. 25).

How interesting! Then why insist that it had to be that way? This is one of the marvels of those who cling to a traditional theory. Even the most ancient fossil forms in the lowest fossil beds have stubbornly retained the same features of their modern counterparts, and it is amusing to listen to the exclamations of surprise by the evolutionists. The creationist is not surprised at all. His Bible told him it would be that way, and he hasn't been forced to puzzle over contradictory evidence.

02.06. The Mystery of the Empty Strata

The Mystery of the Empty Strata

Another frustration for the poor evolutionist is the strange case of the empty strata. As one digs deep into the earth, one layer or stratum after another is revealed. Often we can see these layers clearly exposed in the side of a mountain or roadbed cut. Geologists have given names to the succession of strata that pile one on top of another. Descending into Grand Canyon for example, one moves downward past the Mississippian, Devonian, Cambrian, etc., as the scientists have tagged them.

Now here is the perplexity for the evolutionists: The Cambrian is the last stratum of the descending levels that has any fossils in it. All the lower strata below the Cambrian have absolutely no fossil record of life other than some single-celled types such as bacteria and algae. Why not? The Cambrian layer is full of all the major kinds of animals found today except the vertebrates. In other words, there is nothing primitive about the structure of these most ancient fossils known to man. Essentially, they compare with the complexity of current living creatures. But the big question is: Where are their ancestors? Where are all the evolving creatures that should have led up to these highly developed fossils? According to the theory of evolution, the Precambrian strata should be filled with more primitive forms of these Cambrian fossils in the process of evolving upward.

Darwin confessed in his book, *Origin of the Species*:

"To the question why we do not find rich fossiliferous deposits belonging to these assumed earliest periods prior to the Cambrian system I can give no satisfactory answer ... the case at present must remain inexplicable; and may be truly urged as a valid argument against the views here entertained" (p. 309).

How amazing! Darwin admitted having no way to defend his theory, but he still would not adjust his theory to meet the unanswerable arguments against it.

Many other evolutionary scientists have expressed similar disappointment and frustration. Dr. Daniel Axelrod of the University of California calls it:

"One of the major unsolved problems of geology and evolution" (*Science*, July 4, 1958).

Dr. Austin Clark of the U.S. National Museum wrote concerning the Cambrian fossils:

"Strange as it may seem ... mollusks were mollusks just as unmistakably as they are now" (*The New Evolution: Zoogenesis*, p. 101).

Drs. Marshall Kay and Edwin Colbert of Columbia University marveled over the problem in these words:

"Why should such complex organic forms be in rocks about 600 million years old and be absent or unrecognized in the records of the preceding two billion years? ... If there has been evolution of

life, the absence of the requisite fossils in the rocks older than Cambrian is puzzling" (Stratigraphy and Life History, p. 102).

George Gaylord Simpson, the "Crown Prince of Evolution", summarized it:

"The sudden appearance of life is not only the most puzzling feature of the whole fossil record but also its greatest apparent inadequacy" (The Evolution of Life, p.144).

In the face of these forced admissions of failure to find supporting scientific evidence, how can these men of science continue to press so dogmatically for their shaky views? No wonder they fight to keep students from hearing the opposing arguments. Their positions would crumble under the impartial investigation of honest research.

The absence of Precambrian fossils points to one great fact, unacceptable to the evolutionists—a sudden creative act of God that brought all the major creatures into existence at the same time. Their claims that creationism is unscientific are made only to camouflage their own lack of true evidence. The preponderance of physical scientific data is on the side of creation, not evolution.

02.07. Uniformity or the Flood?

Uniformity or the Flood? The subject of strata beds leads into the interesting question of how these layers were formed, and why the evolutionists have guesstimated their age in the billions of years. The dating of those layers has been done on the basis of the theory of uniformity. This theory assumes that all the natural processes at work in the past have operated exactly as they do today. In other words, the creation of those strata can only be explained on the basis of what we see happening in the world now. Scientists must calculate how long it takes for sedimentation to build a foot-deep stratum. Then that age is assigned to any 12-inch layer, no matter how deeply located within the earth.

Is that a valid assumption to make? Have all the natural forces of the past been just what we can demonstrate and understand today? How naive and conceited to compel ages past to conform to our limited observation and experience! We can assume what we please, but it proves absolutely nothing except our own gullibility. The Bible explains very graphically about a Flood that ravaged the face of this earth, covering the highest mountains and completely destroying all plant and animal life outside the ark. The destructive action of the Deluge is expressed by these words in the Bible:

"The same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened. And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights" (Genesis 7:11, 12).

The existence of those strata can be scientifically accounted for in perfect harmony with the Bible record. The universal Flood of Genesis provides a much more reasonable explanation of the strata than evolution's speculations. As the waters receded from the earth, powerful tides and currents carved out the great canyons in a short time. Layers of debris, according to the specific weight, were laid down, compressing plant and animal life into a compact seam or stratum. Only thus can we explain the vast oil reserves and coal beds around the world. These are the result of vegetation and animal bodies being buried under extreme heat and pressure. No such process of fossilization is taking place today. No oil or coal is forming by present natural forces at work. Uniformity fails here.

The fact is, there had to be a gigantic cataclysmic overturn of nature, killing and burying millions of tons of plant and animal life. The position of some fossils standing upright through one or more strata indicates that the process was not slow or age long. The material had to be deposited quickly around the body of the animal, or it could not have remained in its erect position. The flood buried millions of fish, many of them contorted as though suddenly overtaken by a phenomenal force. Marine fossils have been recovered from the highest mountain ranges, and a checklist on other scientific evidences points to a universal deluge over the entire planet.

02.08. Survival of the Fittest

Survival of the Fittest

"Natural selection" is a coined phrase of the evolutionist to describe the survival of the fittest. Simply stated, it is the natural process that enables the strongest of each generation to survive and the weaker, more poorly adjusted ones to die out. The assumption of evolution is that since only the strongest survive to father the next generation, the species will gradually improve, even advancing into other more highly developed states on the evolutionary scale.

Darwin believed that natural selection was the most important factor in the development of his theory. Many of the top teachers of evolution today are hopelessly at odds on the question of how vital it is. Sir Julian Huxley believes in it, as this statement indicates:

"So far as we know ... natural selection ... is the only effective agency of evolution" (Evolution in Action, p. 36).

He is disputed on this by another one of the heavyweights in the field, Dr. Ernst Mayr:

"Natural selection is no longer regarded as an all-or-none process but rather as a purely statistical concept" (Animal Species, p. 7).

G. G. Simpson, who is regarded as the leading interpreter of the theory today, rejects these opposite views. He said,

"Search for the cause of evolution has been abandoned. It is now clear that evolution has no single cause" (The Geography of Evolution, p. 17).

By the way, when you read about the great unity and agreement that exists among the scientists regarding evolution, don't believe a word of it. Each one is busily experimenting with new speculative possibilities as to how the changes took place and then abandoning them as they appear more and more ridiculous. The one basic tenet they do agree on is that there was no divine fiat creation as described in the Bible.

But come back a moment to the matter of natural selection. What is the evidence that it can actually reproduce all the changes involved in the transition from amoeba to man? Is there scientific proof that it can even make one small change? When it comes right down to answering those questions, the spokesmen for evolution do some of the fanciest footwork in semantics you ever saw and make some of the most amazing admissions. Even though Simpson supports natural selection as a factor, he recognizes the scarcity of evidence in these words:

"It might be argued that the theory is quite unsubstantiated and has status only as a speculation" (Major Features, pp. 118, 119).

But listen to Huxley's circular reasoning on it. He says:

"On the basis of our present knowledge natural selection is bound to produce genetic adaptations: and genetic adaptations are thus presumptive evidence for the efficiency of natural selection" (Evolution in Action, p. 48).

Did you follow that gem of logic? His proof for natural selection is adaptation or change in the organism, but the change is produced by natural selection! In other words: A=B; therefore B=A. His "proof" proves nothing. Were the changes produced by natural selection, or did he invent natural selection to explain the changes? It is just as likely that the changes produced the natural selection theory. The ludicrous thing is that even the changes from species to species have never been verified. As we have shown already, there is not one shred of fossil evidence or living evidence that any species has changed into another. So Huxley's proof for natural selection are changes which never happened, and the changes which never happened are offered as proof for natural selection. Surely this is the most vacuous logic to be found in a science textbook.

But let us continue with Sir Julian's explanation about the reliability of this natural selection process:

"To sum up, natural selection converts randomness into direction and blind chance into apparent purpose. It operates with the aid of time to produce improvements in the machinery of living, and in the process generates results of a more than astronomical improbability which could have been achieved in no other way" (Evolution in Action, pp. 54, 55).

Don't miss the force of that last sentence. The evolutionary changes wrought by natural selection are "astronomically improbable," but because our friend Huxley sees no other way for it to be done, he believes in the astronomically improbable. Poor man! He is wrong when he said the complex order of life today could have been achieved in no other way. God created the wonders of cell and gene and all the millions of processes that leave the Nobel Prize winners baffled.

But since Sir Julian doesn't believe in a divine creation, he has to invent a miracle-working process to explain the existence of these complex creatures—obviously got here somehow. To illustrate the omnipotence of his "natural selection" god, Huxley computed the odds against such a process. The computations were done on the likelihood of every favorable evolutionary factor being able to produce a horse. Now keep in mind that this is all a chance development through the operation of nature, time, mutation, and natural selection. In his book, Evolution in Action, Huxley gave the odds this way:

"The figure 1 with three million naughts after it: and that would take three large volumes of about 500 pages each, just to print! ... No one would bet on anything so improbable happening; and yet it has happened" (p.46).

We commented before about the faith of evolutionists to believe in the impossible. Since this figure of compound probability is effectively zero, how can a scientific mind, in the absence of any demonstrable evidence, be so dogmatic in defending his theory? Why did Huxley employ a mathematical formula to illustrate the impossibility of his theory working? Perhaps he used the figures to accent his personal testimony. Just as born-again Christians seek occasions to bear their personal testimony of faith in Christ, Huxley demolishes the scientific possibilities of his theory in order to magnify the personal faith aspect of his personal testimony for the god evolution.

Marshall and Sandra Hall in their book *The Truth—God or Evolution?* share their reaction to Huxley's absurd faith in the chance production of a horse. It will provide a fitting climax of proof that evolution indeed flunked the science test.

"And, let us remind you who find such odds ridiculous (even if you are reassured by Mr. Huxley), that this figure was calculated for the evolution of a horse! How many more volumes of zeros would be required by Mr. Huxley to produce a human being? And then you would have just one horse and one human being and, unless the mathematician wishes to add in the probability for the evolution of all the plants and animals that are necessary to support a horse and a man, you would have a sterile world where neither could have survived any stage of its supposed evolution! What have we now—the figure 1 followed by a thousand volumes of zeros? Then add another thousand volumes for the improbability of the earth having all the necessary properties for life built into it. And add another thousand volumes for the improbability of the sun, and the moon, and the stars. Add other thousands for the evolution of all the thoughts that man can have, all the objective and subjective reality that ebbs and flows in us like part of the pulse beat of an inscrutable cosmos!

Add them all in and you long ago stopped talking about rational thought, much less scientific evidence. Yet, Simpson, Huxley, Dobzhansky, Mayr, and dozens of others continue to tell us that is the way it had to be! They have retreated from all the points which ever lent any semblance of credibility to the evolutionary theory. Now they busy themselves with esoteric mathematical formulations based on population genetics, random drift, isolation, and other ploys which have a probability of accounting for life on earth of minus zero! They clutter our libraries, and press on the minds of people everywhere an animated waxen image of a theory that has been dead for over a decade. Evolution has no claim whatsoever to being a science. It is time all this nonsense ceased. It is time to bury the corpse. It is time to shift the books to the humorous fiction section of the libraries" (pp. 39, 40).

These examples of evolutionary folly are only the tip of an iceberg, but they reassure us that we have no cause to be embarrassed for our creationist faith. Millions of Christians have been intimidated by the high-sounding technical language of educated evolutionists, many of whom are vitriolic in their attacks on special creation. What we do need is more information on exposing the loopholes in the evolutionary theory; its base is so riddled with unscientific inconsistencies, often concealed under the gobbledygook of scientific jargon.

To follow our ancestry back through the sons of Adam, "who was the son of God," is so much more satisfying than to search through dismal swamps for bleeping monad forebears. The human race has dropped, even in our lifetime, several degrees deeper into moral perversion and violent disorder. Humanists cite our animal ancestry as an excuse for much of this bizarre behavior. Why blame people for action dictated by their bestial genes and chromosomes? This rationalization, like a temporary insanity plea, provides license for further irresponsible conduct. The true cause for evil and the true remedy for it are found only in the Word of God. Sin has defaced the image of God in man, and only a personal encounter with the perfect Saviour will bring a reversal of the problem of evil.

Listen to this material in audio format

Part 1 | Part 2

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
 - 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net