

# Evolution or Creation

by Dr. A.E. Wilder-Smith

---

*Dr. A.E. Wilder-Smith argues for creation over evolution, emphasizing the evidence of God's existence through science and nature.*

**Duration:** 1:17:44

**Scripture:** Genesis 1:27, John 1:3, John 8:32, John 17:17, Romans 1:18-19, 1 Peter 3:15

**Topics:** "Evolution"

---

## Description

In this sermon, the preacher emphasizes the importance of being ready to give a reason for our faith. He uses humor to engage the audience and create a relaxed atmosphere. The preacher then introduces his unique perspective on the creation of nature, claiming that Jesus was the creator. He explains that his understanding of God's creation is based on scientific evidence and encourages the audience to study and understand the truth for themselves.

---

## Transcript

Now, ladies and gentlemen, tonight I have to talk to you about the great debate, the great debate, God or chance, that is, evolution or creation. And I'm going to do the same passage of Scripture, I'll just read out to you, so that it really does remain with you for some time to come, to introduce this subject. And it's the passage in Romans, chapter 1. I'm going to read it out too carefully.

Verse 19. For what can be known about God is plain, and he means it's plain to the godless. That goes out of verse 18, the wickedness of men and the ungodliness of men.

What can be known about God is plain to them, to the wicked and the ungodly, because God has shown it to them. It isn't that they've sought God. You know, men run away from God.

It's God has shown it to them. He's been the active one in doing it. And here's how he does it.

For ever since the creation of the world, God's invisible nature, namely his eternal power and dignity and deity, has been clearly perceived in the things that are made. Now, science is the study of the things that are made. We study matter in time.

The Holy Scripture says here through Paul that God has shown himself actively to all men in the study of nature. That is in the study of plain science. Then he says, since God has done that, men are without excuse.

Just listen to it. Ever since the creation of the world, his invisible nature, that is his eternal power and deity, the eternal power of God and God's deity, his Godhead, think of that, has been shown plainly to all men, especially to the godless and especially to the wicked, in the study of science. Okay? Therefore he says, since he's shown it to them actively in the study of science, the things that are seen, he's shown the invisible things, so that they, the godless, are without excuse.

That is, God expects us to be reasonable creatures. That is, creatures able to use the gray matter up here, and when he shows something to us, that we realize the consequences. We call that in science, inductive thought.

That is, we're able to extrapolate from the visible to the invisible. And he says, the extrapolation is so simple and so plain, that the godless, the atheists, and the wicked are without excuse. Now, don't think that we're going to argue with God when we stand before him.

We shall be speechless, because we're without excuse, unless we take this lesson. Now, it's a very, very serious thing to say. When I read it as a young man, you know, it really upset me, because it sounds very bigoted and dogmatic.

But in my old age, I've come to the absolute firm conviction that it's logically absolutely the case. Now, I'm going to show you that, with God's help and your attention tonight, that it's just as the Apostle Paul says. And I'm going to show it to you from the scientific point of view.

You must do the rest with your pastor here from the theological point of view. Now, let's just have one short word of prayer, because I've got to dive into the pool, and I need a deep pool to dive into to be able to swim tonight. We'll pray together.

We ask thee, Lord Jesus, that thou who didst make us in thine own image, so that in ourselves we can see thee, fallen as we are, so that we're without excuse, if we don't see thee in thy creation. We ask thee that thou mightest be so good as to open our minds, open our understandings, as thou didst to thy disciples, that we may see thee, thy truth, as thou art, that the truth might make us free. We ask thee to give us the truth, to me and to all of us, this night, and we praise thee for doing that, because the truth sets us free.

Thy word is truth. Amen. Now, ladies and gentlemen, this question of the great debate is really the debate on whether there's a creator who created the creation, or whether there isn't.

And I'm going to go into a bit of the creation tonight to show you that there's a creator, and that we can know him right well just by studying science. Now, I know that the Bible gives us the one side, the revelation of God in thought and concepts, and that revelation is in the book, in the Bible. But the other revelation, which is equally effective, says the Scripture, to bring us to God, not necessarily to Jesus, because that's a special revelation of God, which he's given us in his word.

But he's given us a revelation of himself, and if we find himself, we should find that God, the Father, and God the Son, are one. I am one with the Father, says Jesus. So, back to that anyway.

But when we're talking about the scientific side, you've got to be very careful, especially in America, to keep off the theological side, otherwise you'll get, you know, people saying that you don't separate the church from the state and all that sort of thing. Now, if you ask the average American in the cities whether he believes in God, I believe over 90% say they do, whether they're Christians or not. About that figure, somewhere.

If you go to Europe, which has been brainwashed more effectively than you have by the Marxists, and no Christians have done, very few Christians have done anything about it, you find that 52% of the people on the street, adults, by a Gallup poll, say they don't believe in God. They're atheists. They don't say they're agnostics, they say they don't know.

But they say they do know, that there isn't one. And of those 52%, when asked, why don't you believe in God, 85%, 83 or 85%, said that they didn't believe in God because Darwinism, evolution, had made it unnecessary, indeed ridiculous, to believe in God. So 82, 83% of the atheists there say that Darwinism is the reason for it.

And that's why I've concentrated so much of my attention on Darwinism. Now, let's just have a look at why they talk like that. If you look at biology, you find that we are metabolic machines.

Now, don't worry. A metabolic machine is an apparatus for getting energy for its own purposes from the environment. You get your energy from the potatoes and steaks which you eat, and thereby you're a machine.

Now, you're more than a machine, but your psyche rides on a machine, and you're given the executive ability you have to do things with your hands, to do things with your feet, and to think about things with your head, because you are a machine and can extract the energy required to do these things from the environment. Now, I'm going to ask you one thing, and I want you to think about this throughout the whole evening. Do you think that anybody would dare to stand up in a lab and say that any machine, that is something with a purpose, a machine has a purpose? Say a car has a purpose to transport you.

A sewing machine has a purpose to sew. A milking machine has the purpose of milking cows. Okay? Do you think that any machine, and a machine is per definitionem, purposeful, do you think it ever arises by chance? I mean, it's just a simple, perfect, straightforward question.

The answer is no. You have to insert into the machine information from without to make matter, aggregate itself to produce the machine. I mean, if you thought that by shaking iron ore together in Birmingham with coal or coke, that you get out a Cadillac, you'd have to shake a mighty long time to do it.

Because you know, everybody knows, that a Cadillac or a sewing machine is a combination of matter with extrinsic information put into it. The iron and the steel and the plastic and all the rest of it, if I dare say that a Cadillac has plastic in it. But if it does, then all those things are put together with the help of information which does not reside in the machine.

That is, all machines prove that you've got to have an engineer to make them. If anybody would stand up and say to me that a machine requires no engineer, then I say, dear sir, do you know that matter is not purposeful? Matter doesn't have concepts, like a Cadillac is a concept. Matter does not contain in itself sewing machines.

And sewing machines have concepts. Where do they come from? Well, they turn around and say to you, they arose by chance. Well, then I say, what you're saying is this.

This is for the students amongst you. What you're saying is this, that teleonomy, which is the correct term for purpose, I have to use both. You see, otherwise if there are scientists here, they say he's a crude sort of a person who doesn't know his term any.

And I wouldn't like you to say that, you know, because you might not listen to me then. And if I mystify you with one or two terms, but I explain them at the same time to be nice to you, then you might listen to me, okay? Matter itself is the term atelionomic. It doesn't have purpose in it.

It doesn't think. It doesn't have concepts. But it'll take a concept.

It'll store a concept. It'll store a machine. But it can't make them.

So you've got to put in the information from outside, which of course is the reason why I say that if you find matter, which we know from the three laws of thermodynamics, particularly from the second law, that there's no concept in it, that is machine concept in it. It has other concepts, like the concept of deviancy. If you say that, then you've said immediately, well okay, if matter does make machines, you've got to have an engineer to put the information onto the matter to make it a machine.

But machines don't form spontaneously. But you are, among other things, a machine. Your psyche is not a machine.

I know that. Your soul isn't a machine. But your personality runs on a machine.

And when your machine wears out, your psyche takes flight. And if you're redeemed, the Lord, you wait until the resurrection when God will give you a new machine which is eternal, namely the resurrection body. But that's how things work.

Now look, what they say to us is this, that perhaps you have the first picture. What would they say to us is this, that the machine arose by chance. I put the formulae up there on the board.

I've got nothing suitable to show it, but never mind. If you take the first formula, you'll find there that matter itself, are you listening? This is a bit theoretical, but we need it. Matter itself is made from energy.

Don't ask me to define what energy is, because I don't know. But matter is made from energy plus know-how. That is, plus concept.

That is, plus mathematical formulae. You can make from matter, as Einstein showed. You can make from energy matter.

We can make the trans-uranium elements now by that. So the first formula I want to show you is that you've got to have concept onto energy to make matter. Where are you going to get the concept from? That's teleonomic.

The orbitals around a nucleus are conceptual. They're mathematical formulae. Mathematical formulae, you know, don't arise by chance.

You try it. Neither the chemical formulae. They require concept and active thought and energy to do it.

Now that's the first formula. The second formula is this, that matter plus energy, say the evolutionists, give you life. Matter plus energy give you life.

That's what the Neroinians say, and that is a defective formula, a formula which we know to be untrue. The real formula for life is matter plus energy plus know-how or concept or thought, if you like, logos, equals life. That is if you take sardine can with all the proteins in it and you put in energy, you don't get life

out.

That's the second formula. We've done this millions of times. That's what the Darwinians teach.

They did an open system. Matter plus energy gives you life. We've done it billions of times in all the cans of sardines and other things to be made, and it just don't work.

It just doesn't come out. But we do know this, that if you take the same sardines plus energy, that is in an open system, plus concept, then out comes life. The whole thing bursts into life.

And the concept, you put in on a spore. The concept is written up instructions on how to make an organism, and you put it in, and out will come life. So we know that the creationist formula is right.

There's no doubt about this being two models which you can choose. The first, the second one, matter plus energy equals life. We know that's defective.

Why are we wasting our time on it? No scientist would ever work on that basis. The American government doesn't work on that basis, because if it thought that you can sardines in an open system, such as a can is, you can put in energy and dig it out. If they thought that there'd be the slightest chance of you people getting poisoned by a new organism, they'd forbid all canning.

You see, they forbade cyclamate, didn't they? Because you might get one in a million person with cancer as a result of it. If they thought that was the case, they wouldn't let it go on. But at the same time, they force, or are trying to force, teaching in the schools, that second formula, which we know to be wrong.

It isn't true. And they know a thousand million times over, that if you take the same system, sardines plus energy, plus a concept of spore, which is just written codes in concepts, concepts and codes, codes and concepts, know-how, chemical instructions, that if you do it, the whole thing blows up with life. We know these things.

Well, why argue about them? It is so obvious. But you know nobody teaches it. That's the trouble.

Now I'm going to show you how this works. This is just simply the preliminary canter, so you get used to my accent, you see. Okay, just take this one.

This is an easy one, but it'll help you. If you take--perhaps we'd have the second picture up. If you take a puzzle, a jigsaw puzzle--now you know what a jigsaw puzzle is, don't you? In case my terminology in the ordinary things of household life are wrong.

Say you take a jigsaw puzzle of the Matterhorn. You know what the Matterhorn is, don't you? The mountain I climbed when I was young, and other people have climbed and so on. It's a lovely mountain.

It is, you see, done by Picasso himself. If you take that as a jigsaw puzzle, a thousand pieces, all fitted together nicely. You put your child on the floor and say, now Tommy, you put that together.

He'll sit there, and he'll try the pieces out, and he'll put them in, and he'll try the pieces out, and put it in. Gradually, gradually, the jigsaw puzzle comes out. Okay? Now it requires careful fitting together to get the concepts of the beautiful Matterhorn out.

Now look, if you've got your puzzle now nicely on the floor, and you put it in a laboratory shaking machine, you know, these things that shake bottles, like this is the way the farmer rides, you see, ever so slowly, and they shake, and they shake, and they shake all night. How long would your puzzle remain? You put the whole puzzle put together on the machine. What happens to it? Does it remain the puzzle, or does it break itself up? Breaks itself up, doesn't it? It falls to pieces.

You mustn't get near and jog the boy while he's putting it together, because if you step on it, you know, everything will fall to pieces. Now look, I'm going to ask you a question. If you had the thousand pieces of this Matterhorn puzzle, and you put them in the shaking machine, how long would you have to shake until you got the Matterhorn concept out? Ah, isn't it a joke? This requires a little bit of sharp thought.

Would you ever get the complete puzzle out? The thousand pieces, do you think you would? Well, I mean, the chances are so small that you almost might write infinity, mind you. I mean, to get it out. Oh, that would be a terrible job, wouldn't it? Because you keep breaking down again.

Actually, what happens is you get an equilibrium, and two or three pieces will fall together, and if they're small enough, they'll remain stable even in the shaking. And if they get bigger, they get more fragile, so they break down again. And if they break down a bit too far, because you're shaking, you will build them up again.

So you get an equilibrium of a small part of the puzzle and nothing else. Now, any chemist will tell you that. That's an equilibrium reaction.

Now, I'm going to do a little experiment, and then you'll see what I'm after. I'm going to take each piece. You see, I've labeled them up there, piece A, piece B, piece C, piece D, piece E, piece F, and I'm going to fit them so together in my little workshop with a loaded spring and a ball, a ball bearing, in each piece, so that when you slot it in, it stays there.

Now, the chemist will call that an entropy hole, which is used for making substances, because, you see, I'm going to use these puzzle pieces as an illustration of the atoms of which we're made. Okay? Now, if you put piece A and put piece B together, and then push them into one another, and slot them in with a spring and a ball, they'll slot in and won't come out again. So you've made the reaction irreversible.

This is very, very important. Irreversible. It slots in and won't slot out.

Now, when you take piece A and piece B that have slotted in right, and they'll only slot in when they're right, and then they'll stay there, not come out again. Then you take piece C, and you fit it into piece A and B with another slot which is specific, and will only stay when it's right. And you see, you shake them, then A, B, C, plus D, and you put a slot on that, specific, that it fits right, until you get right through the whole thing.

Now, if you shook puzzles like that, do you think that you, by shaking, be able to get out the Matterhorn picture? Come on. Get some oxyhemoglobin up there and give me the answer. You would, wouldn't you? It would come out like a Polaroid picture.

You know, you take a Polaroid picture, and suddenly, from that pictureless mass, you get a shadow of a picture, and then the whole thing comes out, and in two or three minutes, you've got a marvellous picture arisen from a no picture. Now, if all the pieces were like that of the puzzle, you could put it on the shaking machine, and gradually, before your eyes, the Polaroid picture would appear. Because you see, by

shaking, they'd slot in, but they wouldn't slot out.

Okay? Now, think of that. That is produced by making your reaction, are you listening, go in one direction and not another. That is slot in, but not slot out.

Now, if the reactions go just as easily in as they do out, you can shake till the cows come home, and you will get no picture. You'll only get a small bit of equilibrium lower down. Now, there were plenty of chemists, you know, plenty of organic chemists, lots here in America, who believed that matter was made like that.

Lots of Darwinists do today. They think that if you take matter, which is to be compared with my puzzle pieces, jigsaw puzzle pieces of the Matterhorn, they think that if you shake long enough, life will come out, like the Matterhorn come out. Will it, or will it not? The answer is no.

Because we know that we function, are you listening, we function on the basis of reactions, millions of them, which are reversible. That is, they slot in, and they slot out. The very fact that we require at least 2,000 enzymes to make us go, to start the motor, enzymes only work on reversible reactions.

And they establish equilibrium more quickly. They don't shove the equilibrium around. They just let it stay there, but they do it ever so quickly.

So that you will get, if you put an enzyme, a coagulant system like that, you get ever so quickly a very, very small piece, like an amino acid formed, but nothing else, because it's reversible. And the very fact that all scientists who know their job, know that the reactions of life to go, are just like the bits of that puzzle. They go in, and they go out.

And the fact that we're dependent on enzymes to do it, proves the point. If you put one piece of a crystal, of sodium cyanide, prussic acid, the sodium salt of it, on your tongue, you will die instantaneously. Why? Because the enzymes are poisoned, and there's no forward and backwards reaction, which stops the total metabolism.

They're all reversible, and it stops that, and you die on the spot. It's an awful sight to see. But we know that these are the cases.

The only way to do it, is to slot them in, so that they don't slot out, to stop the reversibility. Now the problem is, is nature like that? Is matter like that? And we all know that it isn't. Because matter, particularly the matter of which we're made, is reversible.

Now, how are you going to do it? I just draw a little conclusion here, so that you can see how to do it. If you see matter slotting in, oh thank you. If you see matter slotting in, and not slotting out.

If you see our puzzles here, like the Matterhorn, slotting in the bits of the puzzle, slotting in and not slotting out, what's your conclusion? Do you think those bits of matter arose by chance? Do you think that complicated slotting device, which is necessary to make by chance, just by shaking, the Matterhorn picture come out? Would you ever say that those bits of puzzles started by chance, and designed themselves by chance? They show every sign of design. Okay, now if you do do this experiment in matter, say you take methane, ammonia, and water, and pass an electric current through it, that is you shake it, you will get out the amino acids, the alanine of life, and that will happen by chance. But does it happen by chance? Of course not.

It'll happen apparently by chance, but the real reason is that the bits have been designed to fit the amino acids. No other explanation. They fit perfectly, but they're only a small part of it.

If you try to go right up to the total Matterhorn picture, the total picture of life, you can't do it, because they're not organised like that. Now that was the means by which one professor of evolution, while he was busy teaching evolution in his class, and teaching that if you shook the elements of life together on a shaky machine, you passed energy through, and shook, and shook, and shook. He taught, he wrote a book called Biochemical Predestination, as the explanation of life, that out of chance, order could come, by De Gea.

One student went up to him and said, Sir, have you ever thought of that? And gave him that little book of mine, called The Creation of Life, where I've pointed this out. And he read it, and in six weeks, he was a believer in God. When they gave him the other book, Man's Origin, Man's Destiny, in a few months, he saw that the one who did it was Jesus himself, and he became a Christian.

You see, these things, if you think, they testify to you, in such a strong language, to anybody who's done his homework in science, that he must draw the conclusions, that in matter, he sees all the evidence for the eternal designer of the bits of matter, which make the whole. Now, there's a second stage here, that in a mixed audience such as we have, I won't do. It will take me half an hour to do, and I don't think it's worth doing now.

I've given you the start. If you want, look it up. Look it up in the natural sciences, know nothing of evolution.

What I've shown is this, that if you get the small bits out in equilibrium, you can only get the large bits out by not having the information stored on the molecules themselves, but have them injected directly from outside. And you can see how he did it. But it takes quite a little bit of study to do these things, and you have to do your chemistry to understand them.

I'm going now to talk to you, just a little line under that. I'm going now to talk to you about how you can say this another way, and yet get very clear, a very clear picture of how God did it, or the mechanism by which he did it. The evolutionists say that if you give time long enough, you will get out the Matterhorn picture, which is life, biology.

Darwin started to preach this, you know, and he did so in his book called The Origin of Species in 1859. And he showed, as he thought, that all life was better explicable on the basis that chance did it. And of course the English, the British at that time, were very, very pious, and they were rubbing arms against the preaching of this doctrine that if you shook the machine long enough, you'd get your answer fall out of the bottom.

And in 1860, a great debate--this is the great debate, the first one, and all other debates have followed the same style. They had that at Oxford, and they asked Bishop Wilberforce, Samuel Wilberforce, who was Professor of Mathematics at Oxford and Bishop of Oxford, a very, very good theologian and mathematician. They asked him if he'd debate Huxley.

He didn't debate him. He was a very, very nice man. So he said he would, and he produced a huge meeting there in Oxford--they arranged that--with the British Association for the Advancement of Science.

And they said that they'd give Wilberforce the first word. So he stood up in a huge concourse of people, and he said this. Now this is what most of you would say, what I used to say, and which you can say today if you know how.

You've got to be very careful how you say it. He stood up and he said all machines must have a creator. He said, for example, that his watch obviously presupposed a watchmaker, because the metal of which the watch is made can't do the mathematics to get the wheels the right size and get the spring the right strength.

And therefore, if you see gold and steel put together so nicely, so they mathematically parallel the rotation of the earth around the sun and around itself, that that must be information that's put in from outside and wasn't on the metal, although the metal can hold it. And he produced what we used to call Paley's, P-A-L-E-Y, Paley's natural theology. He said, if you see a knife, that the knife is sharp, has a handle on it, and that the information to make the sharpness and the handle on it doesn't reside in the metal nor in the wooden handle.

Therefore, it must have been put there, and a cutler is necessary where a knife is, where you can see that argument. And he argued that right through, and that argument was valid until 1926, when they pushed it out of the University of Cambridge. It was an entrance examination.

To get into Cambridge until then, you had to know that. But then they put it away because of evolution. Now, Huxley got up, and he said, well, he was very pleased to hear that, because that was an old argument, and we could easily demolish that.

And he asked Bishop Wilberforce if he would give him one or two axioms to work on. So Bishop Wilberforce said, yes, of course he would. The first thing he says, would you give me six eternal typewriters that don't go wrong? Typewriters just come out in those days, you see, so it was a thing to take.

Oh, well, the bishop said, I don't see why you want six eternal typewriters, but I'll give you them if you want them to argue with. He said, I do. Then he said, I want six apes that don't die.

And I want enormous amounts of paper, infinite amounts of paper to go in the machines, and gallons and gallons and gallons and gallons of ink, so they don't run out of ink. Said the bishop, if you want them. He said, you're a professor of mathematics, you can deal with these things.

Give them me. So he said, okay, he would. Now said Huxley, you let those apes chain to the typewriter six and six.

You let them type. You let them type at random till eternity is almost past. Well, that'd be a very long time, wouldn't it? He said, yes, that's what we want, is almost eternity.

I'd like eternity if I could. But he said, I can't argue with eternity, because we don't have it, but we'll have almost eternity. So the bishop said, okay.

He was mystified about this. This is the valid argument today. I'm not talking old hat, you know, here.

This was in Science, your journal, quite recently. Somebody wrote in, I think it was Science, it was American, Scientific American, one or two, wrote in to the editor and said, if you cut out the name of your

creator in your journal anymore, I won't buy your paper. And the editor wrote back and said, if you're so ignorant, I don't mind if you don't buy our paper, because you're a hopeless case.

Because the argument with Huxley and Wilberforce settled once and for all that chance will do what a creator does if you give it time. And here's the argument, which is still valid today. Let your typewriters be typed upon by the apes and let them go.

The bishop said, okay, let them go. Now, before time quite ran out, almost at the end of it, we look at what they've typed. Okay? Said the bishop, what have they typed? He said, I looked through millions and millions of papers and I found one paper with, the Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want.

He maketh me to lie down in green pastures, he leadeth me beside still waters. Well, the bishop almost went purple when he heard that. He said, you mustn't say things like that.

But he said, I must. You're a professor of mathematics. Don't you know the probability formula, bishop? Well now, professor of mathematics, couldn't very well say he didn't know the probability formula, could you? I mean, that wouldn't do.

So he said, of course I know the probability formula. But he said, you believe it? Do you believe it? Well, the bishop said, of course I believe it. Well, he said, don't you see that where  $P$ , where  $T$ , which is time, equals infinity,  $P$ , which is probability, equals one.

That is, you've given off time enough for a reaction that's going on, typing, then you will, with certainty, get anything and everything out. You just let it go long enough and you'll get out the 23rd Psalm. But, the bishop said, the 23rd Psalm was written by David.

And here you're saying it wasn't written by David. Oh, no I'm not, said Huxley. What I'm telling you is that chance can do anything that you can do if you give it time enough.

That's the nature of the probability formula. The earth now is very many billions of years old. And the reactions that make you have been going on all this time, if you give time enough, just as your Carl Sagan says, life will arise.

Therefore, they've been listening, and they've been looking. They sent labs to Mars and to Venus, to have a look and see how life was coming along. That was just it.

I had Irwin in my house with his children recently, and I asked him about it. And he said, yes, we were told to look for this rock and that rock, and then it would be examined for chemical evolution which was starting. And they never found one chance in five million that there was any sign of chemical evolution at all.

Well, Huxley said, so you do see, Bishop, that if you have time enough, all the works of God, including yourself, will be produced. Because where  $t$  equals infinity,  $p$ , probability, equals one. Do you understand me, Bishop? Well, poor professor of mathematics had to understand him.

So it's only a question of time, and you can do the works of God without God. David's works, made by David, were just as well made by chance, if you give time enough. So you see, all you've got to do is have a very old Earth, a very old solar system.

And if you touch that question, you know, this is the nitty-gritty of it. This is the neurologic point. If you touch the age of the Earth and take away the infinite time, you've torn it.

You've just about done it, because it all depends on that. That's where you've got to be careful about, do you understand me? That's where it turns. Well, the poor old Bishop, he was absolutely upset by this.

He said, you don't really seriously mean that a man like me could have written by chance? Yes, he said, I believe in mathematics, and obviously you don't. Finished. So the Bishop said, look, we can't accept that, because we could say that all the things we have in our civilization were made by chance.

Exactly that, said Huxley, that's exactly what I'm telling you. There's no need to have the chance. What's more, said the Bishop, you know, said Huxley to the Bishop, what's more, I put sense into this universe and you put nonsense with your creationism.

The Bishop said, I don't understand you. Well, he said, it's time you did, because you see, you've got a world, an Earth, a solar system, made, as you say, by Jesus Christ, the Creator, and it's full of bad things. It's full of cancer, it's full of war, it's full of violence, it's full of death.

Those are bad things, aren't they? Yes, indeed they are, said the Bishop. Well, he said, if you've got a good God who made a bad world, that good God is a devil. Okay? Okay? When I got converted, you know, in England many, many years ago, I had a professor of physical chemistry, and he heard me witnessing to a student, and he stood behind me, and he said to me, now, Wilder Smith, I don't want any of this theological nonsense even mentioned in my lab.

He said, you know that I'm a Marxist, and indeed I knew it, and he said, I'm absolutely convinced that you're intellectually dishonest, and if you're intellectually dishonest, I don't want you in my lab. You can do endless harm with your froth of intellectual dishonesty, because if God made the world, as you say, and I'll admit that he might have done, then he made it bad, and he made it good, and if he made it bad, he's a devil, and if he made it good, he's an angel. Now, you can't answer those things.

Now, you shut up about these things. I've described it in my little book, in my little book, *Why Does God Allow It?* That was the conversation with my professor shortly after I got converted. He said, you Christians are intellectually dishonest.

You say you believe in a good God, and at the same time he's bad. You're just neutralizing what you said, and you said nothing. It's all froth, and all you do is you wallow in emotions instead of a bit of common sense which you were made, you haven't got any, no more.

Now, do you understand that? There are plenty, plenty who believe like that, and unless you can tackle them, unless you can show that you can give a reason at any time for the faith that is in you, you're disobeying a commandment of Jesus. For he said, be ready, the word of God says, be ready at all times to give a reason. Not just a smile and a song.

I like a smile and a song, but you're required, because God made you homo sapiens sapiens, to give a reason. And poor old Wilberforce, you know, when he couldn't give a reason, which sounded reasonably intellectually honest, he never spoke again on that subject. He was killed riding a horse, poor old man, and he never spoke again.

He couldn't. He was broken, because he publicly dishonored the cause of Christ by being unable to answer. Now, where's the answer? Where's the wrong answer? The holy scripture says in Romans chapter one, which I read out to you, that the whole of creation testifies to the deity and godhead of God.

And anybody that doesn't believe that, anybody that doesn't believe that, is without excuse. And you know, here was I, a young student, right in the middle of things, and couldn't get an answer. And it hurt me for a long, long time.

Do you know, I thought 35 years over this subject, to get an answer to that specific evolutionary great debate. And there it is. It's held in your scientific journals to be the basis of evolutionary theory today.

And they hold us to be intellectually lazy and dishonest. That's what they think we are. And you know we are.

That's plain fact. It took me 35 years, conscious and unconscious thought, to get this one out. And I did really think about it.

It haunted me, because you know, students come and ask me. I've had people say to me, what? Three earned doctorates, and half a dozen full professorships. And you believe that drivel in the Bible.

You believe that. You're dishonest. I've had people say it to me.

You read what they write about me. They say, it's incredible. I've had one evolutionist write to three universities where I've got these degrees, and say, is this man really qualified? Did he earn those degrees? Because he believes this drivel, which the Bible teaches, and doesn't know, obviously, what the other arguments are.

And he hasn't extricated anybody from his intellectual difficulties. That's what they think. Now we've got to stand up, as Christians, you know, a command of God.

If we love him, we should keep his commandments. One of the commandments is, be ready at all times to give a reason for the faith that's in us. Could you do it tonight? Now I'm going to give you the reason.

Are you ready? Have I got you conditioned? You better laugh a bit, because if you don't, you'll have no oxygen up there, and it'll all go blank, and you'll get a spluttery picture, like a television screen, with a car standing outside running, with no suppressors on its plugs. And you know what the screen is like then, don't you? And I want you to have a clear screen when you've finished. It's got to be without any sparks and splutters and shifting of the picture, so that you can, in all love and quietness, show that in decency and in honesty, you're persuaded that Jesus was the creator of nature.

Now I'm going to tell you how it's done. You won't find it anywhere else, because until I wrote it out in Man's Origin, Man's Destiny, and also in the Natural Sciences Know Nothing of Evolution, this was the picture. Since then, they've refused to take any paper from me, because of that reason, for this very reason.

Listen, let's do it properly now. I'm going to invent with you, and show you at the same time, where the error lies. Because there's an error, and there's a mathematical error, which poor old Wilberforce didn't see.

And you know, you get surprised by an error, especially when you're flummoxed on a question. It occurred to me this, I've been thinking about it, and I traveled from Chicago, from Wheaton to Chicago, and Chicago to Wheaton every day when I was a professor there. And you know, in Chicago, you get lovely weather.

Sometimes it's minus 40 degrees, and it's windy at the same time, and you can't even smile, because it hurts you to crack a smile, you know. Your face is frozen up. Well, I was in that state, and I got out of the train.

This is just to give you the interesting side details, and see how the Lord works. I got out of the train, and they always heat them up to about 90 or 100 degrees Fahrenheit, you know, in the winter, when it's very cold, just so you don't get cold. And when you get out, you get that windy city blast, and the sand, and the newspapers in your face, as you get out, you know.

So I just got out of this train, and was still sweating inwardly, and outwardly there were almost, you know, ice, icicles hanging down my beard. And got out, and was outside the Chicago Northwestern Station, and that wind up that road. And I stood on the curb, just to go across the pedestrian's crossing.

There was an awful amount of traffic, and I got blinded by papers, and choked by dust, and frozen by the wind, and I waited. And suddenly, just as I put my foot onto the pedestrian crossing, in no language, it is flashed on my mind where the error was. And there was enough in there for a whole book.

The mind is made like that. It gives you a flash. You'll have experienced it yourself.

You're all genii here in Pastor Chuck Smith's church, aren't you? Otherwise you wouldn't come. Now, it just simply, the fog cleared away, you know, like it does here. There's something gone.

Do you know what it was? It'll take me five minutes to tell it. So quickly do thoughts occur in the mind. They're absolutely marvellous, you know.

So quick. Supercomputer. You've all got it.

It only needs using. That's what it wants to do. Listen.

If you had a typewriter, such as Huxley demanded, that typewriter, this is vital, when the ape presses his thumb on key A, the A comes from his brain, down his arm, through his finger, onto the key, and the key goes through onto the paper, and he puts A on the paper. And when he lifts his thumb, the A stays on the paper. Now, when he presses B, B comes down from his brain, through his arm, through his thumb, onto the key B, goes through the machine, puts B on the paper.

Okay? And right through to Z. He does it like that, doesn't he? Now, you see, that paper, that machine with its paper in it, is a system, are you listening, which types, but doesn't untype. It only types in, but it doesn't type out. Now, that's very remarkable, because nature isn't like that, you know.

All the chemical reactions of which we're made, they type in, but they type out. Let me make it clear to you. The new typewriter that I have is a Wildersmith special.

It's going to make me billions of dollars one day, when my ship comes home. And it has on the right-hand side of it, it has on the right-hand side of it, to you, what we call a lever, what we call, you call it a lever, don't you? So, just to speak by interpretation, you know, I have to do this in Pastor Chuck Smith's church, because he wouldn't allow me to speak without interpretation. So, I'm going to give it you, I'm going to give

it you by interpretation.

I thoroughly agree with him. Don't worry about that, ladies and gentlemen. I conform, and willingly.

Now, this one has a lever then, which, when you push it to the right, are you with me? When you push it to the right, the lever under the keyboard, it types in, like an ordinary typewriter, you can type a letter with it. Okay, it types in, but it's irreversible. And if you make a mistake, you have to scratch and pick with the scratch and pick method, you know, to get the thing out, or type X tip over it, or something like that, calcium sulphate, so that you cover up your mistake.

But it doesn't remove the letter, the letter stays there, because the thing types in, but not out. Now, with my new super typewriter, you push the lever, the lever, pardon me, you push the lever to the left, not to the right, to the left. And then you have this super machine, that when the type, types on it, A, A comes down from his beautiful little head, down through his arms, onto the A, goes into the machine.

Okay, everything normal, everything in order, everything under control. But when he lifts his thumb, and lets the key out, the A that he's typed, untypes itself, rises without a trace, with no trace from the paper, goes back through the machine, up through his thumb, back into his head. Now, just let me make this quite clear, because if you miss this point, ladies and gentlemen, you will sink to the bottom of the pond, and I shan't be able to rescue you.

If he takes B, and he wants to type B, he takes the B, puts it down through his arm, because he's an executive, you see. He puts it down and types B, and the B goes very faithfully onto the paper. There's B there.

But as soon as he lifts his thumb, or his finger, the B rises without a trace from the paper, goes back through the B key, up through his arm, back into his little brain. So this machine types, and untypes, in equilibrium. It'll type in, and it'll type out.

It's like all the chemical reactions of your body. They'll type in, and they'll type out. Now, ladies and gentlemen, how long would Huxley have had to allow his apes to type, to get out the 23rd psalm on a machine like that? How long? How long? I wonder.

It's a sensible answer. You've got enough oxyhemoglobin up top, and God gave you a perfectly good brain, if you've only used it, and kept it nice and supple in a working order. How long would he have to type to get out the 23rd psalm by chance? He'd never get it, because you see, after you've untyped one nanosecond, you've untyped in one nanosecond as much as you've typed.

If you type a billion years, you've got no further forward, because every letter you type in, types out. It's completely reversible. You can't do it.

There lies the error. You see, the body, the chemistry upon which you ride, and which you use to think and act with, the chemistry types in, and types out. It is totally and completely reversible, proved by the fact that even to get the simplest form of life, you need enzymes, which catalyse the coming to equilibrium of all the reactions of which you're made.

So, all these reactions are reversible. You take the simple ones of Fox and Miller, where he makes his amino acids, and then he says, they will combine with one another to form proteins. They won't, unless you make them, and unless you put the lever over to the right-hand side, which you do with a program.

If you do that, then you can get on, and you can synthesise, and you could write the 23rd psalm. But organic nature is made like my super-wildest myth machine. It types in, and it types out, and there's one slight difficulty.

It types out rather more quickly than it types in, due to the second law of thermodynamics. So, you certainly will never, never, never, get out by Darwinian processes, which Darwin suggested. You will never get a synthesis done.

The only way to get a synthesis to produce nature, to produce the 23rd psalm, is to introduce a means by which you can stop the typing out, and force and encourage the typing in. Now, that means, I can't go into it now, because I haven't time. That means, that you've got to have programming to say, hey, you can go in, but you can't come out again.

Now, programming means that you put in a surprise effect. The surprise effect is this, that normally you'd expect it to go in, if you know your chemistry, the typing, and you'd expect it to come equally quickly out. You'd type in and type out.

That's what we normally expect. And in order to stop that, that's the law of nature. In order to stop that, you've got to program the machine with your genes and say, hey, in, but there you stay, and you don't come out again.

And that's not a law of nature. That's the law of programming. Programming is the function of the genetic code.

And the genetic code does not, being full of information or surprise effects, ever arise alone. Now, you see what Huxley had done, and how he'd swindled. It's what we call sleight of hand.

Nobody guessed that the typewriters that he'd used were really, are you listening? They were really creation machines. They allowed you to go in, and they didn't allow you to go out, because they're machines. But nature, without typewriters, organic nature, organic chemical reactions, are not like that.

They allow you to go in, slightly less easily than they allow you to go out, and therefore you can't synthesize with them. The only way to do it is to get a program put in, either from the head of a biochemist, or from the program of the genetic code, which will then do it. So, if you had a machine, a typewriter, which is really like nature, which Huxley was using, you'd have to make it like my typewriter, with the lever in the left position, and then you'd see immediately where his error was.

His probability formula will only work where it's irreversible. It won't work where it's reversible. Now, Piggishine, two years ago, got the Nobel Prize for seeing that.

I've written it in my Man's Origin, Man's Destiny, about 12 years before. But you see, the important thing is, no, no, no, I don't mean that at all. I don't mean that at all.

It's so simple, when you make it clear, such as I've tried to do tonight, that any school child can see it. But if you wrap it up in very complicated formulae, they won't, and they think it's a new invention. It's as old as the hills.

That when you remove, when you remove the equilibrium, and you put your system far away from equilibrium, as Piggishine says, then your reaction will go forward. That's what he said, and that's the

case. But he uses it to say that there's no necessity for creation if you just take it away from equilibrium.

We don't need a creator. It will happen then. But he's forgotten to say that only a program will do that, and programs don't arise by chance.

Now, let's just look at one more thing. The typewriter, as I've said, is my typewriter, the ordinary typewriter, not my typewriter. The ordinary typewriter is a creation machine.

It makes a decision every time you push a key. And the decision is this. It's automatic and inbuilt.

The decision is this, that you, A, will go in, but A, you won't come out. In nature, you'd expect A to go in, and then A to come out, because organic reactions are that way. So what you've done is you've inserted in Huxley's typewriter the principle of creation.

Every time that you press a button in Huxley's typewriter, you get one bit of information, which is not a natural law, but which is a surprise effect injected into the system. Now, if a typewriter is a machine which injects, every time you touch it, one decision, you are injecting informational surprise effects, and your machine is, in effect, really and truly a creation machine. So Huxley, in reality, had shown that in order to get the 23rd Psalm out, because the machine is a weak creation machine, you need a long time.

But one thing he didn't do, he did not show that you could make the 23rd Psalm without creative ability. That is, putting in the creation effect of a decision you go in, but you don't come out. So he really proved creation very neatly, but he never let on.

I don't think he ever saw it, because that has come out with the study of information theory. Now I've got the last bit of message for you, ladies and gentlemen, and you can then relax. If you can produce the 23rd Psalm--listen carefully--by the summation of creative reactions which are not reversible, a decision to go in, a decision to go out, you have to wait an awful long time until you've summated enough creative ability to make 23rd Psalm.

You have to have an awful lot of years because it's so weak. Now if you look at our genes, such as we did last night, and you see what they're like, they contain, you know, the ones we know, contain almost infinite amounts of bits and bytes of decision or information. And we can do it so quickly now because we know how to do it.

But when you look at our genetic code, and you count the bits of information, the stopping of a reaction in one direction, and the allowing it in another direction, it's so infinite that even the best of our scientists and geneticists and information engineers are asking themselves, however, however, did we concentrate into one egg, one zygote, so much concentrated intelligence or bits of information? Do you know this? That we've been working now for 30 years on Escherichia coli. And after this 20, 30 years of work, we're up to 90 percent of the information which is known to synthesize an Escherichia coli. Now if you read the books, the papers, which are working out point for point, bit of information, bit of information, byte of information, byte of information, and sum it up, you know, it's almost more than the stars of heaven.

Nature, organic chemistry can't do it. What do I conclude? It's weak to say a superintelligence to supply the creative power required to do it. And we've been working all these years on the simplest bacterium in the stomach, Escherichia coli.

And it testifies with superdecibels, for anybody that can read it, the superintelligence which was able to make chemistry like that. We can count the bits and the units of intelligence today. And as soon as we know 100 percent, and that's 10 years, 5, 10 years off, we'll be able to make it.

Just as God made it, by funneling in the surprise effects to it. Now there's no comparing the bits of information in, say, a human brain. The human brain has more intelligence concentrated in it, more bits of information, than any other structure in the whole known universe.

It's the most complicated piece of reduced entropy. That is bit of intelligence, manifest intelligence, in this whole solar system. There's no doubt about that.

And then we've counted, or tried to count, the neuron synapses in the brain. But you know, it's uncalculable, it's incalculable, so complicated. Every bit, every cell is connected to every other cell, x times, to get the intelligence and the consciousness we need.

You can see it, it's calculated, we know it. Then, think of this super thought. All that intelligence and structure, the most structured organism in the whole universe, is up here.

All that is written down in algorithmic form. An algorithm, you know what that is, it's a simulated form. All that information is written on one sperm, one egg, the size of pinhead.

It's billions of bits of information, on the size of pinhead. Now you know that if you can write things small, and miniaturize, that's a sign of super intelligence. You're better than the Russians.

They need big computers to do it. You have microcomputers on microchips. It's absolutely incredible, the amount of intelligence on one sperm and one egg.

Just think of it. Now the last thing I'm going to say to you is this, ladies and gentlemen. Don't think that the scientists don't know this.

They do, but they will not, for ideological reasons, apply it. Because there's one thing they say right from the start. We're not going back to that unthinkable idea of a creator as having done it.

That is unthinkable, and if you bring that, we won't accept it. What I've said in my books, and what about if you have to? Now Jesus said this. Paul said it, actually.

He said this, that in Jesus Christ, the fullness of the Godhead dwells bodily, and the fullness of the intelligence and omniscience of the Godhead is in Christ. Now if Jesus is like that, it also says all things were made by him and for him. And truly, ladies and gentlemen, we're wonderfully and marvelously made.

One thing God does expect of us is that having been provided with such an instrument as he has done, that we exercise it. You exercise your body, you do jogging, and all those sorts of things. Excellent that you should, because he who destroys the temple of the body, destroys the temple of the Holy Ghost.

But you see, what we've forgotten to do is to convince the world that we're without excuse if we deny our creator. Now if your government were to apply one-tenth of the budget it spends on fighting communism and dictatorship, were to spend one-tenth on the scientific literature which makes Marxism and materialism in the present state of the art of science untenable, you'd have them down in no time. Because they stand up and say that their atheism is scientific, and it isn't.

It's unscientific. These books which I've written, circulated in Russian and in German, right throughout communistic countries. And those people, you know, the dear Christians there, they're using this, grabbing this information to be able to give a reason for their faith in the Lord Jesus.

Now I'm finishing with this story. I wrote that book called *The Natural Sciences Know Nothing of Evolution*, and two years after I'd written it, I had a letter from the Pope, the Pope room, and from his Radio Vatican people there. And they said, you know, these are, some of them, you know, very, very serious, true, faithful believers, some of them.

I've experienced that, and I'm glad to say it here. They wrote to me and they said, look, we're broadcasting every month to Czechoslovakia and other countries behind the Iron Curtain, to provide the believers there, Catholic and others, with the ammunition they need to fight this awful tyranny of materialism. We've been broadcasting that now for every year.

We don't have very much money for this sort of thing. Would you give us a free license to translate that book into the languages behind the Iron Curtain, particularly Czech? They've started with Czech. And anybody who cares to write, we put it in an unmarked envelope, and they've treated it on thin paper so that it can go in as a letter.

And we're going to send it to anybody you like. But you know, those people are living in the uttermost tyranny, but inwardly they're free in their mind because they know this tyranny is a lie. And they live by that.

That's how they're sustained. Now, I had a letter in his own handwriting, the Pope, quite recently, just before we left, thanking me in Latin for this weapon against the tyranny in Poland and in the other countries, because, you know, the truth makes you free. And this is the truth.

I don't only believe in the biblical truth. I believe in that with my whole heart, every word of it. But I also believe in the truth of God's creation.

And I've tried to give you just a little excerpt of the truth of God's creation. And even this truth will make you free and make you praise the Lord. We'll pray together.

We ask thee, Lord Jesus, that thou hast made us, might enlighten us to spread thy truth, to make thy children free. We thank thee that thou hast made us as sons and daughters of thyself, the same species as thyself, for we're the offspring of God. We ask thee that thou mightest reverse the effects of the fall and uncloud our minds, that we may see nature and thy word as they both are.

And in seeing them both, we might see thee and be changed stepwise and stagewise into thy very image. Do this, Lord Jesus, by revealing the truth, even the scientific truth, to us, to make us free. Amen.

---

Audio: <https://sermonindex1.b-cdn.net/0/SID0542.mp3>

Source: <https://sermonindex.net/speakers/dr-ae-wilder-smith/evolution-or-creation/>

# *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](http://www.sermonindex.net)**