

GOD AND EVOLUTION

Francis D. Nichol

REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
WASHINGTON, D.C.

1965

www.MaranathaMedia.com.au

CONTENTS

1. How Old Is the Earth?
 - Changing Views on the Earth's Age
 - Do the Rocks Prove Evolution True?
 - Is the Evolution Theory Credible?
 - Radioactive Time Clocks and Evolution
 - Energy Into Matter
2. The Origin of Life
 - Changing Ideas on the Origin of Life
 - Spontaneous Generation Versus Creation
 - "An Act of Philosophical Faith"
3. The Religious Aspect of Evolution
 - Does Time Perform Miracles?
 - A Sure Protection Against Evolution
4. Creationism On The Internet

Changing Views on the Earth's Age

HOW old is our earth? It is natural that this question should arise, for many of us find ourselves constantly ex-posed to the prevailing winds of thought in our modern age. To answer this question satisfactorily we must view it from the perspective of long years of Christian thought as well as the rather short years of modern scientific investigation. Evolutionists, who began to be heard in the latter half of the nineteenth century, were not the first to raise the question, though they asked it in a new context, with new and explosive results.

There were many theologians through the years who asked the question "How old is the earth?" Most of them answered it by replying that the earth was created about 4000 BC, or as we today would say, about six thousand years ago, for they believed that the earth was created as the first event of Creation week. But some theologians thought that the earth itself dated back much farther than Creation week. The reason was that they thought God created the physical orb called Earth at some distant but unknown point in time, described in Genesis 1:1 as "In the beginning." They noted that after Moses wrote "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" he immediately added "And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep." They speculated that at some distant moment in the

GOD AND EVOLUTION

past God did indeed create a perfect world, but that for some reason not disclosed, the perfect world came to ruin, so that the earth was without form and void and darkness rested over it; then that God set His hand, about six thousand years ago, to restore this sphere to perfection, and that He populated it with living creatures, as described by Moses in the events of Creation week.

This is known as the “ruin and restoration” theory of the origin of the earth, which has been believed by certain theologians through long years—and is today believed by some. However, it is hard to see how any theologian, even with twenty-twenty vision, could read so much between the lines of the first and second verses of Genesis 1. Conservative Christians have consistently declared that this theory has no foundation in Scripture. If the Christian religion is a revealed religion, where is there anything revealed that supports the “ruin and restoration” theory?

Though only a limited number of theologians believe this theory, many hold that the phrase in Genesis 1:1, “In the beginning,” describes a moment far earlier than the six-day period of Creation week. They feel that in this phrase Moses is telling us the simple, broad truth that at a moment in the far past God created the “heaven and the earth.” Then, having done this, He at His good pleasure later changed inert masses of matter—whirling spheres—into organized masses, giving to them form and light and living things, and that our earth was one of these spheres. In other words, according to this view the record of Creation week gives us the de-tailed story of how our erstwhile formless, dark earth took on form, was bathed in light, and was filled with living creatures. But this two-section view of Creation makes no attempt to inject a perfectly created, then ruined, world between the first and second verses of Genesis.

Many conservative Christians will consider as rather academic the idea that at some moment much earlier than Creation week God created this orb called Earth and then at Creation week gave to it form and shape and placed upon it living creatures.

However, in fairness to those who hold this view, it must be said that such persons give no aid or comfort to the evolution theory. Instead, they believe that God, by a creative act, brought our earth into existence. They would agree that “in the formation of our world, God was not indebted to preexisting matter.”—Ellen G. White, Testimonies, Volume 8, Page 258.

(We are deeply indebted to a number of ministers and science professors for their careful reading of a part of the manuscript of this book, and would especially mention P. E. Hare, Ph.D., research staff member in Geo-Chemistry of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, D.C., whose scientific aid and corrections have proved invaluable. Francis D. Nichol.)

In passing it should be stated that new light is thrown on the meaning of the opening verse of Genesis by the latest, most scholarly Jewish translation of the Pentateuch, which opens thus: “When God began to create the heaven and the earth—the earth being unformed and void.” [1] This turns the whole emphasis from when God created to what God did when He began to exercise His power to bring order to an inchoate earth. This translation exposes the ruin and restoration theory as scripturally groundless and wholly speculative. However, the translation does not rule out anyone’s entertaining the view that at some moment earlier than Creation week our earth, as simply a lifeless orb, was created. But obviously such a lifeless, unorganized sphere lacks meaning for us. We must look to a day when the earth was made habitable and life was placed upon it.

Creation Week Six Thousand Years Ago

The truly relevant religious question is, What does the Genesis record of Creation week actually teach us? Conservative Christians hold that it is a literal, historical record as to events and days, and that the events took place about six thousand years ago. And this is the heart of their controversy with evolutionists. Perhaps the prime point in their view is that Creation week occurred about six thousand years ago.

The reason for their thus believing, some onlooker might remark, is that seventeenth-century Archbishop Ussher devised a chronology of the Old Testament and that they have accepted the date he computed for Creation—4004 BC. No, the real reason they hold that Creation week occurred about six thousand years ago is that (1) they believe the Bible record is a historical record, and hence the patriarchs and the antediluvians were not mythical, legendary creatures, as modernists declare, but literal, living human beings. (2) They believe that since the Bible provides a historical record, the life-span given for each of those who lived from Adam to Christ is to be taken literally.

GOD AND EVOLUTION

1. The Torah, on Gen. 1:1 (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1962). Essentially the same translation is given in the Anchor Bible. Only Genesis, by E. A. Speiser, has thus far been published. General editors are William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman. Publisher, Doubleday & Company, Incorporated, New York, 1964.

Thus believing, they do not find it difficult to determine the approximate date of Creation week. I say “approximate” because the Bible writers have not seen fit to fill in every detail—sometimes condensing genealogies—and have apparently, in some instances, used different methods of chronological reckoning. A good illustration is their reckoning of the reigns of the kings of Israel and Judah, as Dr. Edwin R. Thiele has so clearly revealed. [2]

Christendom rather generally held to a 4004 BC. Creation week until at least the mid-nineteenth century. Then came Darwin with his theory of evolution. True, he was not the originator of this theory. There were many before him who held the philosophical speculation that there is a cosmic law carrying the universe ever onward and upward. It was a beautiful theory and not hard to accept, even in the absence of any proof. Darwin offered what seemed to many a laboratory proof that this earth has been gradually evolving from the lowest forms of life up through to man.

But even as Darwin presented his arguments for the evolution of plant and animal life, other men were giving special study to the fields of geology and paleontology. This latter fearsome-looking word means simply the study of ancient things, particularly the study of ancient life. It has long been evident that in many areas of the world different strata of earth lie one upon the other. The strata and other physical aspects of the world seem to give clear evidence that at some time or times in the long past, water, to say nothing of wind and other forces, had been active in determining the shape of things on earth. This evidence first suggested to most minds the Flood story of Genesis.

It would carry us too far afield into technical areas to try to out-line all the steps by which men changed from a belief in one great flood to the now-dominant evolutionist view. This view is that there have been endless subsidence and lifting of the earth in past ages. In other words, great areas have been alternately under water and above water, with different forms of flora and fauna—sometimes land forms, sometimes marine—flourishing in different ages. The change from belief in the Flood only hastened acceptance of Darwin’s over-all theory of evolution.

2. Edwin R. Thiele, The Mysterious Numbers of The Hebrew Kings (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951).

For many decades after scientists began to endorse evolution, liberal-minded theologians endeavored to harmonize the Genesis creation record—for the controversy turns on that—with the theory of evolution. One of the harmonizing endeavors was to invoke with new vigor the speculative ruin and restoration theory, mentioned earlier. Another and more popular way to attempt a harmony was to accept the idea, set forth by a few speculative though conservative theologians, that the seven days of Creation week represented long periods of time. Liberal theologians reasoned that if only enough time could be allowed, there would be room for both the Creation story of Genesis and the evolution theory.

A Great Revolution

The result has been the most overwhelming revolution in Christian thinking in the two thousand years since Christ. The evolution theory, of course, allows for no perfect man named Adam at the beginning of the way, and no perfect earth. Hence there is no place for Moses’ account of the fall of man or for the promise of One who would come to lift man from his fallen state. Nor is there any place for the prophecy of John the revelator that God will finally destroy this evil world and create a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwells righteousness. In fact, there is no place for the word sin as the Bible defines it from Genesis to Revelation, nor for the earlier Biblical ages of earth’s history. Amoeba do not sin, nor do frogs, fishes, monkeys, or any other segment of what evolution describes as man’s ancestors. Nor does evolution even suggest as to when man began to sin as he slowly struggled upward. Though theologians of our day still use Biblical terms, those terms do not have the same meaning they had in all past time.

Little did theologians realize that by interpreting the days of Creation as long periods of time they

GOD AND EVOLUTION

were playing right into the hands of the evolutionists, who think of time as a substitute for the miraculous. Given enough time, plus a dash of imagination and speculation, almost anything can happen. The ultimate exhibit of faith in what time can do is the current mood of many scientists who feel that despite the enormous elements of chance involved, there finally occurred after endless ages a certain combination of inert factors and forces and elements that produced the simplest forms of life from inanimate matter. And, of course, if life did thus begin, materialists finally can argue impressively that the only thing eternal is matter, that a living God does not figure in the picture. Thus the strict logic of evolution is materialistic.

Not all evolutionists are materialists. Some are theistic evolutionists; that is, they believe that evolution is God's way of working. I have never been impressed with their attempts to harmonize Darwin's prime concept of the survival of the fittest—which shows "nature red in tooth and claw"—with the Bible picture of a loving God. When God began creating, did He have no better techniques than those of a jungle struggle? I shall discuss this point later.

Churchmen Accept Evolution Theory

More and more as the evolution theory has become law and gospel in the scientific world most of the leading Protestant bodies have largely accepted it. In many instances they have quite surrendered any real attempt to find a harmony with Genesis. Even the Catholic Church has accepted it, seeking only to exempt one small area of man. If we understand aright the thinking of most Catholic theologians, they hold that evolution has been the active force operating on all forms of life, even on man, except that God in a supernatural way places within him a soul.

There are many of us who can still remember the day some forty years ago when the conflict between modernism and fundamentalism was at its height, and the first chapter of Genesis was the focal point. At that time fundamentalists denounced modernism lock, stock, and barrel, declaring that to make any compromise with the evolution theory was to reject the Bible. But what they did not realize was that belief in the ruin and restoration theory or in the allegedly long days of Genesis was already breaking down the defense that should have protected them against the doctrine of evolution. Though they would deny this fiercely, we would quietly remind them that if they will look back a half century and more they will discover that liberals broke down their defenses against evolution by calmly insisting that they had not rejected the Scriptures but were simply seeking to harmonize them with science.

We believe that even as modernists finally abandoned their attempts at harmonization and disposed of Genesis as folklore, so will fundamentalists be driven to do. But what happens to fundamentalism when they take this view of the opening chapters of the Bible? I shall refer again to the story of harmonization in a later chapter.

All the while, skeptics, some of them within theological seminaries, have been making high sport of what they describe as the intellectual gymnastics and elastic exegesis that permit Christian ministers to find within the Bible an endorsement for that basic concept of evolution—namely, long periods of time for evolving life.

Now, while all this has been going on, what have we who hold the classic belief in the Genesis creation week been doing? Have we shut our eyes and closed our ears to any evidence that evolutionists might present? The answer is No, emphatically No. We refuse to plead guilty to the charge that we shut our eyes to evidence.

Evidence in Nature

Nevertheless, we have not been willing to capitulate to the evolution theory, as most religious people have done. We agree with other churchmen that God has given us two revelations—the Bible and nature. But we do not agree that we should look to the Bible simply for knowledge about salvation and to the book of nature for knowledge of the natural world, and that we should keep the two books completely separate. To say that God has given us two revelations but that these two may conflict sorely is to state an impossible condition and reveal muddled thinking. It is one thing to say that nature supplements the Bible; it is another thing to say that it conflicts with the Bible.

We are not forgetful of the fact that many modernists and evolutionists tell us that the way out of our dilemma is to realize that we may be wrongly reading God's revelation in the Scriptures. We think that this revelation as it applies to Creation is plain and evident, and that if we cannot give to the words in

GOD AND EVOLUTION

Genesis their ordinary, plain meaning, what justification do we have for giving a plain meaning to the words of any other part of Scripture? Hence, why take seriously the Book of God?

Might it not be that evolutionists have wrongly read God's revelation in the book of nature? Why not? Is that an unreasonable position to take? I think not. Our goal is to show that a different but wholly reasonable interpretation from that of the evolutionists may be given to certain parts of the book of nature. To illustrate:

When Darwin took his famous trip on the *Beagle* along the coast of South America he noted that species of animal life on certain of the Galapagos Islands were a little different from the species on other islands. That started the thought in his mind that given enough time and enough geographical separation, plus other factors, entirely different species would be developed, then different genera, different families, and so on. Without our becoming involved in the endless intricacies of his theory, we may say that Darwin needed only to add the factors of favorable variation and the survival of the fittest in order to account not only for different kinds of life but for rising levels of life, even up to man.

Darwin Jumped to Conclusions

Now, conservative Christians can agree that Darwin dealt with a fact of nature when he declared that species often varied. What we question is the enormous superstructure of conclusions that he felt he was warranted in building on this simple fact. Let us never forget that there is a world of difference between observing certain facts and drawing conclusions from those facts. There was a day when men could prove to their complete satisfaction, and to the confusion and rout of their few opponents, that if the world is round, the sailor foolhardy enough to sail endlessly westward would ultimately slip over the side and fall off. Probably no argument could be more easily proved than that. We can visualize their "proof" even today by holding up a ball and watching what finally happens to an object on its surface as it moves in any direction from what we call the top side. It falls off. Q.E.D. How simple! At least, so the medievalists thought.

There was only one thing lacking in their simple demonstration and in their logic, and that was a knowledge of the law of gravitation. They thought they understood nature. They did—in part. They thought their conclusion unassailable. But we only smile as we look back on the matter and muse on the fact that an apparently unanswerable argument can suddenly become pointless by the addition of a lone new fact—in this case the fact of gravitation.

Darwin and Mendel

Return, now, to the point of the variations in species, on which Darwin began to build such far-sweeping conclusions. That there are variations is freely admitted, but to declare that the variations will go on endlessly and in a favorable direction until entirely different forms of life are produced is another matter altogether. The first is a fact, the latter a speculation. Gregor Mendel's nineteenth-century study of common garden peas helps us to understand, in part, the workings of nature in the matter of variation. But Mendel's work leads to the conclusion that variations seem to be within a charmed circle.

Unfortunately, Darwin's theory had gained much momentum before Gregor Mendel's work was rediscovered at the turn of the century and the modern science of genetics was born. Indeed, Darwin's theory had gained such momentum down the highway of human thought that it seemed to be overriding genetics, or at least requiring of it a great measure of flexibility. Evolutionists hotly contest this charge, for it implies that something besides cool logic and evidence controls them. But after all, they should remember that they are but human and that a deeply entrenched theory can produce blinding effects. On this point I shall speak more fully later.

No, there is no difficulty with the fact of variations in species. Open to challenge, however, is the assumption that variations can go on and on, producing at last truly different basic types of life. An attempt to provide scientific proof that variations can thus go on is one of the major tasks of evolutionists today in their attempt to establish the evolution theory. Indeed, some very learned students in that field have become so restive over their slow progress in explaining evolution by endlessly slow microscopic changes that they have boldly taken the position that somewhere in the dim past certain great changes—mutations—occurred. That is delightful as a theory, but beyond that, little can be said in its favor, and its scientific opponents can say much against it. Let us leave them to their controversy on mutations, large or small.

GOD AND EVOLUTION

Take another fact in nature on which evolutionists rely as they seek to marshal support for evolution. They point to the fact that all living things can be arranged on an ascending scale anatomically, and to a degree physiologically. Doubtless our readers have seen evolutionary sketches that show a line gradually ascending through different forms of life to apelike creatures, and then to man. The picture is persuasive, but second thought prevents considering it any sure argument for evolution.

Accounting for Similarities

There are certain similarities in the structure of different animals, and the so-called higher forms of life may have close similarities. For example, the skeletal structure of a monkey is very much like that of a human being. And there is nothing in the Creation story that clashes with this fact. Genesis informs us that God created all the original types of life. Very well. We may properly conclude, therefore, that He made some forms relatively simple, others more complex, but in making ever-more complex forms why should He not employ certain rules of structure for all of them, for example, a backbone for a whole category of animals? If the backbone is good for one, why is it not good for another? Inevitably, therefore, as we put the different forms along in a row, from the simple to the most complex, we will find similarities. Even the most complex machinery that man makes today still employs the principle of the wheel, a principle that in its simplest form is illustrated by the wheelbarrow.

Of course there are structural and functional similarities between man and animals. But it is amazing that evolutionists seem unable to give proper weight to the dissimilarities between man and animals. There is nothing in the Genesis record that demands that man should be wholly distinct from the animal world as to flesh and blood and bones. The distinction is found in the fact that man alone is made in the “image of God.” Neither Christians nor evolutionists can comprehend fully the import of the words “the image of God.” But that the Bible writer is clearly seeking to create a distinction between animals and man—a distinction vast as to kind rather than degree is hardly open to debate. And that distinction is startlingly plain for all to see. Nor can any theory offered by evolutionists really explain it.

Do the Rocks Prove Evolution True?

IT IS an evident fact of nature—a fact that evolutionists ought to be able to see as well as the rest of us—that there is a vast difference between man and animals. This great difference was a creative act of God, set up at the beginning of the world. Let the evolutionist sweat his way through, if he can, to a reasonable explanation of how a tail-swinging, apelike creature, playing and gibbering in the treetops in past ages, could evolve into that marvelous being called man. It might be proper to ask of those evolutionists who declare themselves Christians, When was the “image of God” stamped upon this allegedly evolving being? I have heard the explanations; I have read them time and again. Each time I wonder anew: Do the evolutionists themselves quite believe their own explanations?

Talk about certain Bible-believing Christians being blind to certain evidences of nature! What about those who are unable to see the force of that most evident fact of nature—that there is a great gulf fixed between man and the beasts, a gulf so great as to be impassable by even the most plausible logic that has ever been presented by an evolutionist. Let me state it even more forcefully: When we consider man’s spiritual nature, we find between man and the highest animals a gulf a thousand fold wider and deeper than anyone has ever found between any of the classifications of animals who stand below man. To the force of this fact evolutionists seem to be quite blind.

That they are blind to it is most clearly evident by the fact that while in their evolutionary chronology they allow uncounted millions of years for the evolution of life from the slimy algae in the pond to the swinging simian in the treetops, they allow a relatively short space of time for the highest forms of four-footed animal life to span the vast and impressive gulf between them and man. There is only one of two conclusions we can reach—evolutionists either vastly overestimate the simians or they distressingly underestimate man.

To say the least, I think their timing is implausible. I simply am not credulous enough to be a good evolutionist and thus to believe that a time so relatively short is sufficient to explain the vast differences between man and any other living creature. Let us never forget that time is of the essence in the evolution explanation for all the facts and phenomena of nature. Time is the substitute for the miraculous. It is much

GOD AND EVOLUTION

easier to believe the miracles of the Bible than to believe the kind of “miracles” that the evolution theory demands.

Crowning Proof of Evolution

Without making any pretense of presenting a reply to all the standard arguments for evolution (that would make this little book far too long) I come to the argument that is considered the crowning proof in behalf of evolution. Remember, the essence of the evolutionist position is that first there were very simple forms of life on the earth, and then, in higher strata, forms a little more complex, and so on, up to the highest forms of mammals, with millions of years separating the different categories and strata. The so-called crowning proof, evolutionists declare, is found in geology and paleontology; that is, the study of life on this earth long ago.

It is obvious that the lower strata were laid down before the upper ones, but whether a year or a million years before is not evident from the mere fact of the sequence. It is true that the fossil remains of different creatures are embedded in the strata, and that fossils of the higher forms of life appear to be restricted to the upper strata. But must we conclude that different forms of life lived at different periods of the past, millions of years apart? That might be one explanation of the facts, but it is certainly not the only one that might reasonably be given.

In proof that a certain stratum is many ages older than the stratum above it, evolutionists state that the so-called index fossils in that stratum belong to a much earlier age of the world—they are less complex. When asked why it is necessary to conclude that those less complex forms flourished millions of years earlier, in contrast to the creatures whose fossil remains are in the stratum above, evolutionists say that less complex forms lived long before more complex forms, or words to that effect. Able evolutionists have labored hard to prove that this is not an exhibit of circular reasoning—that is, assuming as true what is to be proved. But I have never been persuaded by their arguments. A person who looks at the strata without having any previous prejudice of mind in favor of the evolution theory would safely reach only two conclusions. (1) That the lower strata were laid down first, and (2) that in many instances the higher forms of life are absent from these strata. How much earlier were the lower strata laid? This is a question that at once introduces certain presuppositions.

If we are already sure that evolution is true, that the lower forms of life come first and that it takes millions of years to move from a lower form to a higher form, then the case is clear. But if we are sure of that already, why trouble to go to the rocks to prove the case?

A Counter Explanation

But let us look again. Even though we should find strata piled one upon another to a very great depth, with sequence rather steadily from lower forms up to the great mammals, does that necessarily prove that this is the time order in which they lived on the earth? I think not. There are other explanations just as plausible—I think even more so. Assuming a great flood, as Genesis declares, is it unreasonable to think that the lower forms of life, particularly marine forms, would most quickly be covered with sediment, and that higher forms of life, fleeing disaster, would be inundated at higher water levels? Why not?

Alternate sequences of marine and land fossil-bearing deposits pose a problem for both evolutionists and creationists. These sequences may be the result of volcanic action along with wind and water—it is an interesting fact that the Genesis flood record specifically speaks of the action of wind.

But that is not all. Perhaps the greatest weakness in the argument for evolution in the area of geology is one that challenged and perplexed its earliest champions. If the evolution theory is true, that there is a steady progression upward, then we ought to find in the fossil remains the various transitional forms from one well-defined kind of life to another. Even the evolutionists admit that they can find few so-called transitional forms. As we move up-ward in the order of life—from species to phyla—evolutionists admit that the presumed transitional forms rapidly, and soon completely, disappear. The earlier leaders in the evolution fight softened the force of this blow against the theory by arguing that much of the earth was still unexplored and that such transitional forms would yet be found in other groups of strata.

By the early decades of the twentieth century the earth had been rather well surveyed by geologists, yet the transitional forms were still missing. This fact constitutes, I believe, one of the heaviest indictments of the evolution theory. There are some evolutionists who admit as much, though they would

GOD AND EVOLUTION

not for a moment admit that the evolution theory is not true.

This briefly illustrates the conservative Christian's response to the argument that the book of nature proves conclusively that evolution is true. The evolution argument is full of dilemmas and unanswered questions. It is far from persuasive. It is simply one explanation of the phenomena of the natural world. We who are conservative Christians think that another explanation, that of Creation, is a better one—in fact, the correct one.

We readily confess that the believer in the literal record of Genesis does not have ready answers for all the phenomena of nature. Far from it. There are some facts of nature that will never quite be fitted into the limited revelation given us. The Bible prophets did not give us a book on geology, though we firmly believe that what they did give us in the record is not bad geology.

A Frank Confession

If the evidence for evolution is as equivocal as I contend, someone may ask: Why have not some honest, forthright evolutionists admitted it? The answer is that some of them have. True, not too many have. After all, they have a scientific reputation to maintain with their colleagues. Take the following sweeping statement that was made by a high-grade scientist in 1925. And re-member, by that year all the best proofs for evolution had been marshaled, and according to the evolutionists in general the case for the evolution theory was firmly established. I know of no primary discovery made since then that materially changes the picture unless it be in the highly experimental area of radioactive time clocks, of which I shall speak later. In 1925 Louis Trenchard More, dean of the Graduate School, University of Cincinnati, delivered a series of lectures at Princeton University. The lectures were shortly published. [1] He comes to this general conclusion as to the weight of the evidence for evolution:

The more one studies palaeontology, the more certain one becomes that evolution is based on faith alone; exactly the same sort of faith which it is necessary to have when one encounters the great mysteries of religion. The changes that are noted as time progresses show no orderly and no consecutive evolutionary chain and, above all, they give us no clue whatever as to the cause of variations. Evolutionists would have us believe that they have photographed the succession of fauna and flora, and have arranged them on a vast moving picture film. Its slow unrolling takes millions of years. A few pictures, mostly vague, defaced and tattered, occasionally attract our attention. Between these memorials of the past are enormous lengths of films containing no pictures at all. And we cannot tell whether these parts are blanks or whether the impression has faded from sight. Is the scenario a continuous changing show or is it a succession of static events? The evidence from palaeontology is for discontinuity; only by faith and imagination is there continuity of variation."—The Dogma of Evolution, pp. 160, 161.

I do not believe that if More were alive today he would have any occasion to change that withering comment. However, I recall that when I interviewed him in Cincinnati in 1925 he very firmly told me that he could not accept creationism. In his lectures he made the declaration: "I accept the general doctrine of the evolution of organisms as a deductive theory."—Ibid., p. 163. Quite evidently he did not lack faith, on which, he confessed, "evolution is based." He simply exercised his faith in behalf of that theory instead of creationism.

1. Louis Trenchard More, The Dogma of Evolution (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1925). [NOTE: In the interests of brevity and simplicity I have confined myself to the main outline of facts regarding the age and dating of strata. For example, I have not commented on a tendency in some geological quarters to determine strata relationships and identities by rock formations (Ethology) rather than by index fossils—a trend deplored by other geologists.]

Is The Evolution Theory Credible?

RECENTLY a professor of physiology and biochemistry at the University of Southampton, England, wrote a book on evolution. [1] Much of it is technical, but the preface is highly readable. Here is a brief quotation: "I think that the attempt to explain all living forms in terms of an evolution from a unique source, though a brave and valid attempt, is one that is premature and not satisfactorily supported by present-day evidence. It may in fact be shown ultimately to be the correct explanation, but the supporting

GOD AND EVOLUTION

evidence remains to be discovered. We can, if we like, believe that such an evolutionary system has taken place, but I for one do not think that ‘it has been proven beyond all reasonable doubt.’ In the pages of the book that follow I shall present evidence for the point of view that there are many discrete groups of animals and that we do not know how they have evolved nor how they are interrelated.”—Pages vii, viii.

Some time ago (1941) Oxford University Press brought forth a book entitled *A Short History of Science to the Nineteenth Century*, by Charles Singer. Singer frankly confesses to his faith in the evolution theory. Despite this, he declares:

“Evolution is perhaps unique among major scientific theories in that the appeal for its acceptance is not that there is evidence for it, but that any other proposed interpretation of the data is wholly incredible.”—Page 387 (1946 ed.). There is this much certainly to be said in favor of Singer—he is embarrassingly frank in his admissions.

1. G. A. Kerkut, Implications of Evolution (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960). Title page contains this: “International Series of Monographs on Pure and Applied Biology. Division: Zoology. General Editor: G. A. Kerkut.”

But why need it be said: “Any other proposed interpretation of the data is wholly incredible”? What constitutes credibility? The answer depends very much on the background, the presuppositions, yes, even the prejudices of the person evaluating a theory. Most scientists, awed throughout their lives by the inflexible order of nature, automatically rule out miracles as incredible—and Creation is the greatest of all miracles. In other words, we must first rule out the possibility of miracles before the Creation explanation of the origin of our world becomes “wholly incredible.”

An Orderly World and Miracles

Our creationist position is this: We believe in an orderly God, who makes the sun rise and set unfaillingly every day and causes the endless laws of nature to operate inflexibly. We also believe that the great God, who is the final explanation of all things, does at times intervene in a special way to produce a special result. It does not disturb our belief in an orderly universe to conceive that God should at times do something out of the routine, orderly processes we are acquainted with. To believe thus we do not have to exercise any more faith or imagination than does the evolutionist when he tries to explain all the perplexing problems that reside in his evolution theory. Indeed, we think that divine miracles are about the only rational explanation for some of the phenomena of nature.

Let us consider one exhibit. Evolutionists, with their concept of endlessly slow development of various parts of the human anatomy, must hold that the different delicate parts of the eye, for example—all of which parts are necessary to produce sight—developed slowly over long ages into a functioning eye. At a great and ecstatic moment all the parts, without any intelligent relationship between them to determine the relative rate of development, finally converged and, behold, a creature that through so many generations had been developing an eye finally saw! Frankly, I would describe such a procedure, to borrow Singer’s comment on creationism, as “wholly incredible.” I repeat, in certain situations belief in a miracle is the only credible belief. Actually, we are not credulous enough to be evolutionists.

Never forget that when we begin to talk about “credibility” we are no longer in the field of purely objective data, evidence, laboratory exhibits, and the like. We have moved into the deepest processes of the mind, where judgments are made, where evidence is weighed, and where an appraisal is decided upon. And in those inner recesses of the mind lurk the presumptions and often the prejudices inherited from a hundred generations. Also, we need only to read the long record of the history of human thought to know how strange conclusions can be reached from available data, and how a “credible” conclusion might have seemed much less credible if only a little more data had been available.

Paul’s Comment on Worldly Wisdom

The apostle Paul takes note of this in his remark that “the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God” (1 Corinthians 3:19). He could have been looking ahead to the time of the flat-world argument we now ridicule. He could even have been thinking of the impressive contention of the Greek philosophers that the circle is the most perfect figure, therefore the stars in their course must go in circles. How simple. But

GOD AND EVOLUTION

the facts were that it was the Greeks who were “going in circles.” The planets go in an elliptical orbit.

Before me is a book entitled *Relativity* [2] by none other than Albert Einstein. This is the simplified form of his larger work. He explains in the preface that anyone reaching college years ought to be able to understand it. Frankly, I confess that even his simplified book is far from easy reading and some parts are beyond my understanding. This ought to keep me close to many of my readers. However, there is much in the book that is understandable.

2. Albert Einstein, Relativity, The Special & the General Theory, 14th edition. (London: Methuen & Company Limited, 1946).

Now, it is a fact that Einstein on more than one occasion expressed ideas hostile to the concept of a personal God who directs the affairs of the universe. Lay alongside this the classic concept of the believers in a sovereign God whose heavenly abode is the center of the universe. With these two points before us, let us turn to Einstein’s book. The closing section is entitled “Considerations on the Universe as a Whole.” He sums up his views of the universe in words a little difficult but understandable, and certainly significant:

“As regards space (and time) the universe is infinite. There are stars everywhere, so that the density of matter, although very variable in detail, is nevertheless on the average everywhere the same. In other words: However far we might travel through space, we should find everywhere an attenuated swarm of fixed stars of approximately the same kind and density.

“This view is not in harmony with the theory of [Sir Isaac] Newton. The latter theory rather requires that the universe should have a kind of center in which the density of the stars is a maximum, and that as we proceed outwards from this center the group-density of the stars should diminish, until finally, at great distances, it is succeeded by an infinite region of emptiness. The stellar universe ought to be a finite island in the infinite ocean of space.”—Pages 105, 106.

Einstein takes issue with the classical view set down by Newton, borrowing the thoughts of the astronomer Seeliger:

“Seeliger suggested a modification of Newton’s law, in which he assumes that for great distances the force of attraction between two masses diminishes more rapidly than would result from the inverse square law. In this way it is possible for the mean density of matter to be constant everywhere, even to infinity, without infinitely large gravitational fields being produced. We thus free ourselves from the distasteful conception that the material universe ought to possess something of the nature of a center. Of course we purchase our emancipation from the fundamental difficulties mentioned, at the cost of a modification and complication of Newton’s law which has neither empirical nor theoretical foundation. We can imagine innumerable laws which would serve the same purpose, without our being able to state a reason why one of them is to be preferred to the others. For any one of these laws would be founded just as little on more general theoretical principles as is the law of Newton.”—Pages 106, 107.

A “Distasteful” Idea

This quotation, while not simple, is not obscure. Einstein says that by adopting a contrary view from Isaac Newton’s, “we thus free ourselves from the distasteful conception that the material universe ought to possess something of the nature of a center.” Now the word distasteful belongs, not to the scientific vocabulary but to the language of the emotions, the moods, the antipathies, and all the other strange forces that often play havoc with human minds. Why is it “distasteful” to entertain the “conception that the material universe ought to possess something of the nature of a center”? I see nothing distasteful in it. In fact, to me it seems a rather orderly concept. Why not a center to the universe?

Is it possible that Einstein’s mind tied together the idea of a personal, omnipotent God with the related idea of a center to the universe? He does not trouble to tell us. He simply disposes of the whole matter with a sigh of relief that a “distasteful conception” is removed. But he does frankly admit that any theory he might entertain that would free him from the “distasteful conception” would have “neither empirical nor theoretical foundation.” I would ask, remembering that all men are human beings even before they are great scientists, which view on a subject would a man hold when one view would confront him with a “distasteful conception” and the other view would relieve him of it, even though he must admit that there is no demonstrable scientific proof to support it? The question answers itself.

GOD AND EVOLUTION

Paul, in the first chapter of his letter to the Romans, speaks of the strange attitude of men who would not “retain God in their knowledge” (verse 1:28). May we not find here the explanation of the mystery of why some great men—great so far as intellects are measured—have no place in their thinking for God or for miracles while some other great men have beautifully fitted into their thinking both God and miracles?

But let us take one more look at the quotation from Einstein. He says that the astronomer Seeliger “suggested a modification of Newton’s law, in which he assumes that for great distances the force of attraction between two masses diminishes more rapidly than would result from the inverse square law.” Here is an eminent astronomer, quoted approvingly by the even more eminent Einstein, assuming that a law which presumably should operate to infinity really might not thus work, that there might be a change in its operation as greater distances are reached. Whether this is true is beside the point here. We present the exhibit simply to show that learned men do not hesitate to invoke the assumption of changes in what seem from our limited knowledge to be unalterable laws. I ask you to hold this point in mind as we move into the last section of our study of the question “How old is the earth?”

Radioactive Time Clocks and Evolution

THUS far we have been considering the question of the age of the earth in terms of the alleged evidence for evolution. This evidence, if accepted, demands an age to our inhabited earth of countless millions of years, with all life on the earth explainable in terms of slow evolutionary changes, which is another way of saying that the Creation story in Genesis is but a myth. We have seen how most of Christendom has capitulated to the evolution argument—and with disastrous results to Christian doctrines.

But I believe it is possible to be open-minded and intellectually honest and still hold to the Genesis story of creation, which story is the historical introduction to an inspired Book that is our sure guide for life. It so happens, if Genesis is considered a historical work, that the events of Creation week occurred about six thousand years ago. We thus conclude, as I would remind the reader, not because an Anglican churchman, Archbishop Ussher, added up the figures that way but because the historical record evidently seems to call for approximately six thousand years. To surrender that approximate figure is to surrender, at least in part, the concept of the validity of the whole historical record of the early Old Testament times.

I repeat here a thought expressed earlier on the word approximately. It is one thing to hold that the scriptural record is historical—which I do. It is another thing to hold that the historical record provides precise details—which it often does not. For example, genealogical tables in the Bible are sometimes elided, as illustrated by the genealogies of Christ. To concede this, however, in no way weakens the creationist position; it only admits that in some details we cannot hope for absolute exactitude on chronology. But our controversy with evolutionists concerns alleged millions, yea billions, of years.

It is a sobering fact that when churchmen began to accept evolution they likewise began to doubt the historicity of the Mosaic account of ancient men. It is impossible to dissociate belief in the historical reality of the first chapter of Genesis from the chronology of the Creation, though I frankly admit that God has not seen fit to give us all the details of the chronology, nor is that necessary.

I mentioned at the outset that some theologians of an earlier time held as a speculative view that the physical orb called Earth might have been created at a moment in history earlier than Creation week, a moment that corresponded with the opening phrase of Scripture, “In the beginning.” Their thinking may have been controlled by the fanciful ruin and restoration theory or simply by a speculative mood, but it was not controlled by evolutionary premises. Those theologians were creationists.

But today when churchmen say they believe that the earth is very old they almost inevitably blur together in one unbroken sequence the concept of a physical orb and a slowly organized world of living creatures, which is simply another way of saying that behind virtually all current discussions of the earth’s age lie millions, or billions, of years of evolutionary activity.

In rather recent years a new kind of evidence has been introduced which evolutionists believe clearly supports their contention that the earth is of vast age, with all the implications that evolutionists believe reside in this great age. In fact, they believe that this new evidence finally settles the question of how old is the earth.

The Area of Radioactivity

GOD AND EVOLUTION

I now come to the scientific work in the field of radioactivity. Out of the work done in this and closely related fields have come some of the most revolutionary developments of our present generation, most notable example of which is the work in nuclear fission that has brought forth atomic bombs. Certain substances—for example, uranium—have what are called radioactive qualities. Radioactivity is the spontaneous disintegration or breakdown of atoms, operating at a different but apparently constant rate for each radioactive substance.

Scientists believe that these known rates of radioactive disintegration provide them with a kind of clock to measure time in the past. Carbon 14, a radioactive form of carbon, is perhaps the best-known illustration. It has been used to estimate the age of the Dead Sea scrolls, for example. And the estimate agrees closely with that reached by other means. But scientists generally admit that the time-measuring quality of Carbon 14 seems to have validity only in a limited time span—a relatively few thousand years, not millions. It was only in the late 1940's that this first widely publicized time clock was discovered.

An exhibit of a time clock presumed to have value in terms of millions of years is the potassium-argon time clock.

In the interest of brevity and simplicity it may be said that these two—Carbon 14 and potassium-argon—illustrate what the scientific world means when it speaks of radioactive time clocks and the potential resident in all such “clocks.”

Now at certain places over the earth igneous—that is, formerly molten—rock is found on the surface. Such rock is considered by geologists to have come from deep within the earth in contrast to the stratified shell. The theory is that such rock, while molten, has come up through a fissure in the stratified rock, or has been spewed out by volcanoes in the form of lava and ash, and has hardened. Scientists tell us that when measured by the potassium-argon or some similar time clock, this igneous rock must be considered of vast age. Geologists then make certain deductions as to the age of the various fossil-bearing strata in relation to the age assigned to the igneous rock, and conclude that the age of these strata is also very great. Now, the stratified cover, or shell, of the earth contains fossils. In that fact lies a problem for creationists, who believe that only a relatively short time has elapsed since God created living things, and an even shorter time since a universal flood destroyed all life except Noah and his family.

Some creationists might be willing to accept the radioactive time-clock reading for the great age of the igneous rock on the assumption that the physical earth was created at some time earlier than Creation week, but what of the fossil-filled strata? That is the question before us. Shall we shut our eyes and close our ears to the radioactive-time-clock deduction that the fossiliferous strata are of vast age, with some strata millions of years older than others? Or, on the other hand, shall we accept the claim that these strata are indeed of vast age? To do this, of course, would be to concede the validity of the most important argument for evolution. Which shall we do? We think we need not do either. We need not follow the first course in order to remain loyal creationists, nor the second course in order to remain scientifically open-minded.

Uncertainties in Dating

It is difficult to pursue very far this whole matter of dating by radioactive time clocks. The subject quickly moves outside the world of all but a few scientific men who specialize in that particular field. I have already noted that deductive procedures are involved in the dating of the strata. But that is not all. Certain assumptions are involved. Assumptions are proper working tools, but we should never forget that they are assumptions. One of these is that when the molten rock cools, the radioactive time clock is set back to zero and so must start all over again.

Then, as mentioned earlier, there is the assumption that the rate of atomic disintegration through all the presumed ages that the radioactive igneous substance lay below has been constant from the very beginning. This, of course, is simply restating the uniformitarian postulate on which much scientific reasoning rests—indeed, must rest if there are to be any foundations on which to build working theories in the realm of nature. But I have already provided some evidence to suggest that uniformitarianism may properly be challenged in various situations. Really, is not even the most brilliant scientist more than audacious to speak with calm assurance about the uniform action of nature over a period of billions of years, which is the range of scientific thinking in regard to the earth?

Again, the present sedimentary strata that constitute the outer crust of the earth were formed from already existing matter—matter that had radioactive material. We have only the occasional intrusions and extrusions from below to give us our basis for deductions. We know practically nothing of the earth below

GOD AND EVOLUTION

the strata.

As a current illustration of how uncertain and tentative are our conclusions regarding radioactivity, and how even small additions to our knowledge demand new concepts, take the work recently done at the Westinghouse Research Laboratories. I quote from a news release sent out by Westinghouse, dated June 9, 1964:

“Westinghouse research scientists have found a way to prolong the lives of atoms.”

“The atoms involved are radioactive. That is, sooner or later they decay, or die, releasing some form of radiation and changing their mass or charge. This self-destruction always occurs in the same way and in an exact, predictable period of time.”

“This so-called half-life of an atom’s nucleus can range from billionths of a second up to many millions of years.”

“Traditionally, these atomic lifetimes have been beyond man’s control—unaffected by heat, pressure, or other changes in environment. Like the speed of light or the acceleration of gravity, they were generally regarded as fixed constants of Nature.”

“Only one atom, beryllium-7, has ever been known to disobey this orderly scheme of things. In 1947, Emilio Segre, Nobel laureate of the University of California, altered its nuclear lifetime by less than one tenth of one per cent through chemical changes in the environment of the nucleus.”

“Now, using purely physical means and a new principle of modern physics, scientists at the Westinghouse Research Laboratories have discovered how to extend the lifetimes of certain atomic nuclei by more significant amounts.”

How much change these scientists have been able to produce in their initial work, or whether they prolonged or shortened atomic lifetimes, is not the real point. Their work is “significant,” if for no other reason than that the change produced calls into question the assumption on which radioactive-time-clock reckoning has been built. If we are not justified in assuming that “atomic lifetimes” are “fixed constants of nature,” then what happens to the uniformitarian assumption that underlies the whole age-dating procedures?

A Warning

I must not press the matter beyond reason, though it is hard to overestimate the significance of this current research work. Nor would I hasten to sweeping conclusions. But I believe that all workers in the field of radioactive time clocks should find here a warning against the kind of dogmatic conclusions that have marked their labors at times. Let us not forget that the whole field of radioactivity is very new—in fact, work with the potassium-argon “clock,” for example, has taken place only in the past decade, and with Carbon 14, only since World War II. But in this brief time certain scientists are beginning to revise their thinking in a way that may vitiate some of the most primary assumptions underlying earlier conclusions. [1]

I would not discount scientific theories; far from it. But I plead for a sharper realization of their great limitations, and even more so, of assumptions. There is much more research needed before we are justified in dogmatizing in this whole area of time clocks. I cannot believe that any Bible-believing Christian is ready to discount the ordinary meaning of the Creation record in favor of largely unverified, and perhaps in part unverifiable, assumptions on radioactivity.

No scholar, creationist or otherwise, is called upon to bow in deep obeisance because great names can be cited in behalf of a new scientific view. The proper mood in the scientific realm is to view every new theory and idea with a rather critical eye. Furthermore, it is not unscientific to entertain grave doubts about the validity of even the most plausible theory if it conflicts with conclusions which a person feels the long years have justified his holding. Unless a person keeps this guiding principle in mind he will be tossed about by any and every new theory that has any plausibility whatever. The history of science presents a picture of many plausible theories that have had a vogue for a time and then later have been discredited, despite the evidence that had apparently supported them.

Note this: Scientists affirm that a radioactive time clock gives direct testimony to the age of the igneous rocks, but they admit that it gives only indirect testimony to the age of the stratified rocks. In other words, the age of the latter is determined by a process of deduction. This is no quibble. Deductions are not objective data, but conclusions reached by certain logical processes. Here, too often in the past, logical fallacies have crept in, as the history of science reveals. If we allow that the inert physical earth existed before Creation week, then the age of the igneous rocks may reveal the great age of this inert earth—but

GOD AND EVOLUTION

nothing more.

Again, we can all agree that these time clocks may have a real validity if conditions in our earth have always been as we see them now. But what proof is there that vast cataclysmic events of the long past might not have altered the pattern of radioactivity? Vast changes may have occurred in our earth at the time of the Flood, that worldwide catastrophe described in Genesis, so that “the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished” (2 Peter 3:6). These changes may have involved the distribution of the families of radioactive elements and thereby given a false appearance of age. There are those who feel that the Flood also involved changes in the atmospheric heavens immediately above us, perhaps as to their density and as to their moisture content. This cosmic catastrophe, with its possibly vast climatic changes, might have changed the force and concentration of the various rays that beat down upon our earth from interstellar space. This might conceivably affect, for example, the validity of the Carbon 14 method of dating.

1. Those who wish to examine further this piece of research should write to Westinghouse Research and Development Center, Pittsburgh 35, Pennsylvania, and request a copy of Scientific Paper 64-8c2-115-P1, September 1, 1964, by S. L. Ruby and R. R. Ferber. See also Chemical and Engineering News, June 22, 1964, page 43.

I frankly confess that I do not know all that happened in the past in fact, I know very little—and that I must therefore content myself with a little speculation. But it is a kind of speculation that within limits is justified. Scientists routinely employ this technique. Now to one who believes the Biblical record of the Flood, is it unreasonable to hold that various laws we now see operating at a certain rate in our earth might have operated at a vastly different rate in “the world that then was”? I simply raise the question. It is one that can never be surely answered in this present world. But I think the question relevant to the subject under discussion—namely, the scientists’ projection into the dim past of laws that presently operate in the field of radioactivity.

Others Make Assumptions

Here is the place to recall the statement earlier quoted from Einstein to the effect that a certain problem in astronomy could be solved by assuming that the law of gravitation changes when great distances are involved. Whether this is so is beside the point in this context and really irrelevant to us poor earth dwellers. But what is highly relevant is the unblushing admission of learned scientists that it is reasonable to create an assumption that the operation of laws may differ under differing conditions—in the case of gravity, a difference in distance.

Let us never forget that one of the prime assumptions underlying evolution, particularly in the realm of geology, is an assumption known as uniformitarianism. Namely, that the operations of nature are uniform and have always been uniform, and that therefore the present is the measure of the past—and of all the past. This obviously must be an assumption, since it is not subject to demonstration or proof. As we noted, Einstein calmly sets forth as scientifically plausible that the operation of the law of gravity might change with great distance in space. Why might not some other laws change with great distance in time, or with great changes in the earth, as at the Flood? What is equally important, perhaps even more important—might not the assumptions of scientists as to how certain laws of nature operate, change with the addition of new discoveries in the realm of science? Until the day that we have learned all there is to learn about nature, that possibility always lurks in the background.

Age of Deep Sea Sediment

In the setting of these facts and assumptions on age and radioactive substances we can properly add this relevant item about the deep sea and the age of the earth. Scientists have bored down into the sea bottom and tested the samples they have found at varying depths. What they have brought up is sediment deposited over an unknown period of time. Mixed with the clay are fossilized remains of certain small marine creatures. These remains have been tested for age by Carbon 14. By this method of measuring age the top (most recent) few centimeters would be two or three thousand years old. The “age” appears to increase steadily as deeper samples are taken until too little Carbon 14 remains for dating. But at this depth

the “age” is given as from fifty to seventy thousand years.

Now, obviously we have here simply one more exhibit of radioactive-time-clock measurements. Does the law of uniformity hold for the long past of the watery deeps? Also what about the rate of reproduction and death of microscopic sea animals whose shells constitute a major part of the deep-sea sediments? As an exhibit of unpredictable aspects of this matter, take this rather startling fact: Animals living at great depths in the oceans grow shells low in Carbon 14 and actually give a radioactive dating of more than a thousand years old, though they are still living. This almost calls for a reference to Mark Twain’s comment on the story that he had died. Said he: “The story is greatly exaggerated.”

Energy Into Matter

THE field of radioactivity is new, very new. Can anyone say that we know enough in this field to reach dogmatic, ultimate conclusions? But on this field evolutionists heavily rely. Before me is a book titled *Atomic Energy for Military Purposes*, [1] and subtitled: “The Official Report on the Development of the Atomic Bomb Under the Auspices of the United States Government, 1940-1945.” The author is Henry DeWolf Smyth. [2] We wish to quote two paragraphs from the opening page of his book:

“There are two principles that have been cornerstones of the structure of modern science. The first—that matter can be neither created nor destroyed but only altered in form—was enunciated in the eighteenth century and is familiar to every student of chemistry; it has led to the principle known as the law of conservation of mass. The second—that energy can be neither created nor destroyed but only altered in form—emerged in the nineteenth century and has ever since been the plague of inventors of perpetual-motion machines; it is known as the law of conservation of energy.

1. Henry DeWolf Smyth, Atomic Energy for Military Purpose’ (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1945).

2. At the time he wrote in 1945 Smyth was chairman of the department of physics at Princeton University, and consultant for the Manhattan District, U.S. Engineers. The “Manhattan District” concerned itself, first and before all else, with the then very new world of nuclear science, which was erelong to have such vast and ever-increasing effects upon the study of the nature of matter itself, and the production of the atomic bomb.

“These two principles have constantly guided and disciplined the development and application of science. For all practical purposes they were unaltered and separate until some five years ago. For most practical purposes they still are so, but it is now known that they are, in fact, two phases of a single principle, for we have discovered that energy may sometimes be converted into matter and matter into energy.”—Page 1.

Here is one of the most amazing developments and, in a limited sense, reversals of scientific thought that has ever occurred. And to think that it occurred so completely in the incredibly short time of about five years—1940 to 1945. If anyone previous to 1940 had challenged the “two principles that have been corner-stones of the structure of modern science” he would, most certainly, have failed in his course in physics, to say nothing of being viewed as hopelessly irrational. But suddenly a few more of the mysteries of nature were unearthed, very specifically “the phenomenon of nuclear fission of uranium,” and the two “cornerstones of the structure of modern science” had to be realigned.

Dr. Smyth reveals how rapidly expanding scientific discoveries can alter and revise the most rigidly established of all scientific axioms. So long as scientists held as axioms that neither matter nor energy could be destroyed, but only changed, there was always a problem for scientifically-minded Christians as to Creation. The two axioms that Dr. Smyth mentions were the scientific under girding for the heresy of materialism, for if “matter can be neither created nor destroyed but only altered in form,” then the matter that constitutes our earth today always existed. But with the suddenly added nuclear knowledge that the two axioms are really one, “that energy may sometimes be converted into matter and matter into energy,” we find that this new axiom becomes not only good science but also good religion. Without facing a scientific hurdle we may now entertain the belief that an omnipotent God converted some of His immeasurable energy into matter.

GOD AND EVOLUTION

Thus at one stroke, and as the result of five short years of re-search, the most rigidly scientific man is freed from the bondage of a concept of the eternity of matter from all past time to all future time, and permitted to entertain that which is of the essence of the Creation concept—namely, that energy, omnipotent energy, was “converted into matter.”

In the light of all this, any argument that Christians should suddenly abandon the Genesis creation doctrine because science has discovered time yardsticks that “demand” great ages for the series of strata seems both unimpressive and precipitate. However, we must wait for the future to reveal what flaws exist in the deductions drawn from the data on radioactivity.

In Conclusion

In these chapters I have explored the possibilities of a true harmony between science and religion. I appeal to others better qualified to explore more fully. But right here a strong word of caution and warning—let no scientist, or theologian for that matter, try to find that harmony by attempting to discover a parallel between the Genesis record and the evolution theory. That was what leaders in certain religious bodies sought to do years ago, and they quite uniformly ended up by accepting evolution lock, stock, and barrel, and relegating the Genesis story to the realm of myth.

In 1928 a theologian at the University of Chicago, G. B. Smith, wrote a book [3] that touched on this very point of the attempts made to harmonize science and revelation. He tells of the “harmonizing” endeavors made a half century before to equate the days of Creation week with the long periods of geological time, and then to show that the developing picture presented in Creation week corresponded to that revealed in the vast geological epochs. Smith comments:

“By the exercise of sufficient ingenuity, an apparently striking parallel could be drawn between the scriptural account and the process of evolution hypothetically set forth by geologists.”—Page 179. He goes on to observe that the apparent agreements between Genesis and evolution “are secured only by considerable juggling of the text of Scripture.”—Page 180.

He then adds, as an almost inevitable conclusion: “The harmonizing position, therefore, is being rapidly abandoned today [1928].”—Ibid.

Why, then, should conservative Christians, either theologians or scientists, seek to revive a long-abandoned and bankrupt kind of scriptural exegesis that failed in its attempts at harmonization? We can gain neither scientific prestige nor spiritual satisfaction by rearranging the bones of a very dead piece of Biblical interpretation.

Again, in any attempt to find points of agreement with geologists—who offer the allegedly prime proofs for evolution—a conservative Christian must be on guard lest he agree too much. Many of us may agree that the order of the strata as given in geology textbooks is essentially correct, and yet hold our creationist position—and this despite the fact that the lower strata contain predominantly marine fossils while higher strata contain fossil remains of much higher forms of life, including man. But we surrender to the evolutionists when we take a second step and agree that the laying down of these different strata took many millions, perhaps billions, of years.

3. *Gerald Birney Smith, Current Christian Thinking (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1928).*

The very essence of evolution is that slowly over millions of years the forms of life evolved from the simplest to the most complex. In the evolution theory, time—a vast period of time—is a substitute for the miraculous. And if natural processes over vast ages can explain all the various forms of life, including man, why hold to the miraculous story of Genesis? Thus the Genesis creation record disappears. And what happens to the Flood? At best it becomes simply the last of a long, dreary succession of deluges that have swept the earth, each carrying to their death increasingly complex varieties of animals and plants.

In the name of calm reason I appeal to conservative Christian scientists to exercise in the best sense of the word the faculty of critical analysis—calmly critical of any and every new view. A critical attitude is needed to protect us against the onrush of new ideas that may seem plausible but which may prove to have fallacies in them. There is wisdom as well as wit in the remark that if we don’t stand for something we’ll fall for everything. This is particularly true of those scientifically sponsored ideas that impinge on religious thought.

GOD AND EVOLUTION

And while they are exercising this critical faculty, I appeal to these Christian scientists to remember always that allegedly cool, dispassionate scientists in the great universities are as subject to passions and prejudices as the rest of us. What's more, they are as subject to prevailing moods of thought as are other men. Note these lines from a philosophical work [4] by T. E. Hulme:

“There are certain doctrines which for a particular period [of history] seem not doctrines, but inevitable categories of the human mind. Men do not look on them merely as correct opinion, for they have become so much a part of the mind, and lie so far back, that they are never really conscious of them at all. They do not see them, but other things through them. It is these abstract ideas at the center, the things which they take for granted, that characterize a period. There are in each period certain doctrines, a denial of which is looked on by the men of that period just as we might look on the assertion that two and two make five. It is these abstract things at the center, these doctrines felt as facts, which are the source of all the other material characteristics of a period.”—*Speculations*, pages 50, 51.

4. T. E. Hulme, Speculations (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1936).

In other words, scientists, along with other learned men, may often unconsciously incorporate into their thinking, and ultimately into their conclusions, some ideas they have mistakenly assumed are facts. There is no such thing, really, as complete objectivity, an attitude of mind described by some airy nineteenth-century scholars as not only a goal we should seek to reach but a goal we can fully reach. It was none other than a great psychiatrist, Karl Menninger, who, in addressing a learned assembly of theologians and psychiatrists a few years ago, referred to “the myth of objectivity.” His words were more true than most learned men would like to admit.

Prevailing Moods of Thought

Earlier I quoted briefly from Dr. G. A. Kerkut, of the University of Southampton, who challenged the view that the case for evolution has been proved. That was from the preface to his work *Implications of Evolution*. I wish now to quote further from his preface:

“There is, however, a second point that I should like to make, and this concerns not factual material but an attitude of mind. It is very depressing to find that many subjects are becoming en-cased in scientific dogmatism. The basic information is frequently overlooked or ignored, and opinions become repeated so often and so loudly that they take on the tone of Laws. Although it does take a considerable amount of time, it is essential that the basic information is frequently re-examined and the conclusions analyzed. From time to time one must stop and attempt to think things out for oneself instead of just accepting the most widely quoted view-point. I have dealt with this attitude in the introductory chapter of this book, though I hope that the moral does not end there but instead runs through the rest of the book as well.”—Page viii.

Probably there is no more treacherous area in which to move than the area of the mind. That is why the facts of science are one thing and the conclusions of scientists may be something else. Facts don't carry with them their own explanations, which is another way of saying that though many scientists may claim that the facts lead only to one conclusion—evolution—the facts really may not. Indeed, I believe they do not.

Let me sum up this section on the age of the earth. The submerged premise on which the whole argument for evolution rests is the theory of uniformitarianism. In other words, that the present is the measure of the past—all the past. Fully believing this theory, a scientist is prepared to dogmatize on the nature and activities of our earth billions of years ago. In fact, he must invoke billions of years in order to explain, on a naturalistic basis, all the facts and phenomena of the world we now inhabit. In the very nature of the case this theory can neither be proved nor disproved. But it seems a most useful theory in scientific study, and so holds sway—one might almost say unchallenged. But not quite so. Listen to these words from James B. Conant, former president of Harvard University:

“One can question whether the principles of physics and chemistry can be applied to the extremely distant past. More than one physicist has expressed grave doubts as to whether over such enormous intervals of time one can assume uniformity as to the behavior of matter. What does the concept of time mean when we speak of thousands of millions of years? Just as the physicist found it necessary to rewrite some ideas about space and time when very high velocities and very small distances came in view, so it is

possible that common-sense notions of time cannot be carried over into cosmology. As the data increase which must be fitted into a conceptual scheme with thousands of millions of years as one component, inconsistencies may arise. Such doubts and queries, it will be noted, are quite apart from the question of the validity of the principle of uniformitarianism. This principle is one of those first approximations so often required in the first stages of science; all geological theories agree today in assuming revolutionary, mountain-building periods in which the forces of nature were of a different order of magnitude, at least from those now seen on every hand.”—*Science and Common Sense*, p. 282.

Comment on Dr. Conant’s words seems superfluous. I turn now to a discussion of a related subject, the origin of life.

Changing Ideas on the Origin of Life

UNTIL a century ago learned as well as untutored men believed that life can begin spontaneously. This view is known technically as the theory of spontaneous generation. Perhaps no view has ever been considered more self-evident and thus more safely beyond debate. Did not worms spring from mud, maggots from rotting flesh, to cite only two illustrations of many?

Then came the great scientist Louis Pasteur, who performed a series of experiments. These were rather simple, as we view the matter now, and largely involved a procedure of sterilization. In other words, when any substance was adequately sterilized, or at least kept free from infection or contamination, the anticipated creatures, such as maggots from decaying meat, failed to develop. From Pasteur’s day virtually to the present moment no educated man has given credence to the idea of spontaneous generation.

Pasteur’s work was a triumph of scientific experimentation. From his work and that of learned experimenters before him grew the dictum that living things come only from preceding living things. For a hundred years that dictum has held unquestioned sway. There was only one thing the matter with it—it banned any explanation of the origin of life in our world on a naturalistic, or evolutionary, basis. The evolution theory as Darwin set it forth in 1859 assumed the presence in our world of living creatures—very small, to be sure, and living in such abominable places as swamps and mud holes, but living creatures nevertheless.

Given the living creatures, evolutionists, armed with their theory and an uninhibited imagination, proceeded to tell us how these most simple forms of life slowly but steadily became more complex, with certain of them later losing their love for mud holes and swamps and taking to the dry land. Then, as evolution proceeded, some creatures took to tall trees and others to the airy skies. It has been a dazzling, even if bewildering and incredible, story that evolutionists have told to us.

If we are willing to start, with the secular evolutionists, in the swamp, and grant that already there are simple forms of life stirring in the mud. If we further grant that there is inherent in these simplest forms the capacity to become more complex. And finally if we grant all the millions, or billions, of years needed, we can ultimately come to the full conclusions of the evolutionists—that man is the end result of such a long-drawn-out process.

Variant in Evolution Theory

Of course I mentioned earlier that there is a variant to the evolution theory that must be allowed for. Some who accepted the theory still wanted to hold on to their belief in a God who directed all things. Hence, instead of taking the general position that there is an innate, blind wisdom in all creation that leads it on and on to ever more complex forms, they declared that in His grand plan for the universe, God designed to place these simplest forms first in the swamp, and then to let them slowly develop under a super-intending providence until man ultimately evolved many ages later. However, for the creationist this variant of the evolution theory is really no more acceptable than the baldly secular view, and for three reasons:

First, although God is alleged to be directing the evolving process, there is, by the admission of evolutionists themselves, a vast amount of blind trial and error. Such a conception of God’s planning and working is wholly unacceptable to the mind of one who believes in a God who does all things well, and thus whose grand design cannot conceivably have in it the trial and error, the prodigal dissipation of life, that are inherent in any form of the evolution theory.

GOD AND EVOLUTION

Second, if evolution is God's way of working, then we must conceive of God as basically a Being who is interested, not in moral values but rather in the survival of the fittest, which often means the victory of might over right.

Third, if man is simply the end product of the whole evolution process, he is the inheritor of an appalling array of animal like propensities. Indeed, most evolutionists frankly admit this inheritance, explaining man's frequent terrible behavior on this basis. For a secular evolutionist such an admission creates no embarrassment, but for the one who declares that evolution is God's way of working, such an admission is naught but a dreadful indictment of God as the author of man's evil propensities. I am aware that some evolutionists, with the aid of literary phrases and many adjectives, have tried to blur this point; but it cannot be blurred.

A Troublesome Question

However, at this moment I am not concerned with the ultimate implications of the evolution theory, significant as they may be. I wish only to address myself to the point of beginning. To repeat: For a century evolutionists have begun their beautiful theory by assuming that in some dismal swampy state of our earth in a far-past day certain simple forms of life began to bestir themselves. But through the years certain restless scientists have kept asking: Where did these first simple forms of life come from? The endeavor to answer this question has produced a vast scientific literature on the subject of the nature and origin of life.

Because since Pasteur's day scientists have held themselves within the framework of the dictum that life comes only from preceding life, the best answer they have been able to provide is that life must have reached our planet from some other world, perhaps via a meteorite or similar object. In the last analysis this was not a very satisfactory answer. Meteorites have a way of becoming incandescent through friction as they strike our atmosphere. Such heat may reasonably be presumed to destroy any life on the meteorite. Even if we grant that life could have been brought here from another planet, we have not solved the problem of the origin of life; we have simply transferred the problem to another world. Thus though the problem is moved a very great distance away, it nevertheless is still wholly unsolved.

Those who are creationists have not been slow to remind evolutionists that the ultimate logic of the view that life comes only from preceding life demands an ever living being. In other words, there never could have been a time when life did not exist. But to most evolutionists, to accept this view would be to move over into the realms of philosophy and religion. And they frankly confess they do not wish to enter those realms, for then they could no longer function as scientists. For all who are creationists, the problem of the origin of life finds a satisfactory solution in the belief that an ever living God is the source of all life. But the evolutionists have not been willing to accept the creationist view. They have kept searching for other ways to solve the problem of the origin of life.

Two Horns of a Dilemma

In attempting to discover how the earliest forms of life came to be, evolutionists have been confronted with two horns of a dilemma. To admit to its fullest extent the dictum that life comes only from preceding life is an admission that the evolution theory is inadequate as a full explanation of the universe. Furthermore, if there is an ever living being able to produce the first forms of simple life, who will say even in the framework of science that He might not also have created much more complex forms of life and started them instantly on their way? And that, of course, is simply another way of saying that there was a creation.

The only alternative for evolutionists is to challenge the century-old dictum that life always comes from preceding life, and revive some modified form of the theory of spontaneous generation; that is, the theory that nonliving matter could evolve into living forms. Indeed, only by turning in this direction can evolutionists present their theory as an explanation of life, without a break, back to nonliving matter—for the idea of breaks in the theory is anathema. They believe they need not attempt to explain the origin of matter, for they have always felt that they could assume, unchallenged, that matter is eternal.

I need not tarry to stress the fact that their taking for granted that matter is eternal is the choicest exhibit of all assumptions. And we should never forget that assumptions are views held for which no proof can presently be given, views that owe whatever plausibility they possess to the fact that they seem

reasonable to those who set them forth. I agree that they have a proper place in scientific study, but that fact does not alter my description of them.

Spontaneous Generation Versus Creation

A Harvard Professor Speaks

SOME time ago, at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, one section of this great meeting devoted a full day to discussing the subject of spontaneous generation. Dr. George Wald, a biology professor of Harvard, observed: "Five years ago no responsible scientist would have talked about spontaneous generation." But the essence of the discussion in that section was this: Given a former watery state to large parts of our world, plus heat and electricity, certain chemical changes would ultimately take place that would produce the simplest forms of life. This kind of thinking was later set forth at length by Dr. Wald in an article in the *Scientific American*. There he traces first the history of the collapse of the old idea of spontaneous generation as a result of Pasteur's experiments, then adds immediately:

"We tell this story [of Pasteur's work] to beginning students of biology as though it represents a triumph of reason over mysticism. In fact it is very nearly the opposite. The reasonable view was to believe in spontaneous generation; the only alternative, to believe in a single, primary act of supernatural creation. There is no third position. For this reason many scientists a century ago chose to regard the belief in spontaneous generation as a 'philosophical necessity.' It is a symptom of the philosophical poverty of our time that this necessity is no longer appreciated. Most modern biologists, having reviewed with satisfaction the downfall of the spontaneous generation hypothesis, yet unwilling to accept the alternative belief in special creation, are left with nothing."—*Scientific American*, August, 1954.

Dr. Wald is refreshing in his frankness. But why is it the "reasonable view" to believe in spontaneous generation? His answer is that otherwise we are left with only the belief that life resulted from a "single, primary act of supernatural creation." To the scientific thought, it is, we might say, almost anathema, for it involves the operation of forces that cannot be measured scientifically. Indeed, to the man whose mind operates wholly within the controlled scientific frame of reference, a supernatural act is of the essence of the incredible, the unbelievable. This leads Dr. Wald immediately to add:

"I think a scientist has no choice but to approach the origin of life through a hypothesis of spontaneous generation. What the controversy reviewed above showed to be untenable is only the belief that living organisms arise spontaneously under present conditions. We have now to face a somewhat different problem: how organisms may have arisen spontaneously under different conditions in some former period, granted that they do so no longer."—*Ibid*.

In other words, while he is ready to admit that it is not scientific to believe that a living creature, not even the simplest form of life, could now arise spontaneously, he thinks it quite scientific to hold that living organisms—indefinitely small, of course—might have been spontaneously generated in a former age by a combination of forces then operating in our world.

The Theory of Uniformity

But to the extent that evolutionists attempt to solve their di-lemma about the origin of life by holding that certain things might have happened long ago that cannot happen today, to that extent they depart from the most primary governing theory that gives plausibility to their whole evolutionary position. We refer to the theory of uniformity. This uniformitarian theory, generally credited to Sir Charles Lyell, an English geologist, may be simply stated thus: The present is the measure of the past and all the past. That is, we can determine what has happened in the past by watching what is happening today. In other words, if hills are being eroded away by the action of water and swampy places are being raised above the level of the water by the deposit of silt, there is, says the uniformitarian geologist, a small-scale exhibit of what has happened in the dim past in the changing of great masses of the earth and the depositing of various strata.

By holding rigidly to this theory, and allowing endless time, it is possible, within limits, to find

GOD AND EVOLUTION

some measure of explanation for many of the phenomena of geology. But what is more important, by holding rigidly to this theory they rule out any great super-natural acts in the past that might suddenly have accounted for mighty geological changes. Charles Darwin, who transferred the discussion of evolution from the realm of philosophy to that of science by his *The Origin of Species*, in 1859, is reputed to have declared that he never would have attempted to formulate his wide-sweeping, and at that time daring, theory of evolution if he had not first read and accepted Lyell's theory of uniformity.

Or, to state the matter in reverse, if scientists once grant that the present may not be the measure of all the past, that some force or factor may have entered in suddenly and sweepingly to produce certain great results not now understandable or measurable, they admit a weakness in the whole theory and leave open the door for the creationists to discuss an alternate explanation—the super-natural acts of God in the long ago.

Now Dr. Wald is troubled when he confronts this rigid theory of uniformity. Strictly speaking, that theory forbids departure from the dictum that life comes only from that which is already living. He must therefore assert an exception to the theory, picturing a day long ago when certain special conditions existed that no longer exist, conditions that made possible the spontaneous generation of life. Here is his explanation for thinking it reason-able to believe that life sprang from nonliving matter:

“To understand how organisms originated we must first of all explain how such complicated molecules could come into being. And that is only the beginning. To make an organism requires not only a tremendous variety of substances, in adequate amounts and proper proportions, but also just the right arrangement of them. Structure here is as important as composition—and what a complication of structure! The most complex machine man has devised—say an electronic brain—is child's play compared with the simplest of living organisms. The especially trying thing is that complexity here involves such small dimensions. It is on the molecular level; it consists of a detailed fitting of molecule to molecule such as no chemist can attempt.”—*Scientific American*, August, 1954.

With refreshing frankness he follows immediately with this admission: One has only to contemplate the magnitude of this task to concede that the spontaneous generation of a living organism is impossible.”—*Ibid.*

But does this deter him in any way from his resolute belief that the presence of life in this world is the result of spontaneous generation, that is, of living matter coming from nonliving matter? Listen to his words that follow at once:

“Yet here we are—as a result, I believe, of spontaneous generation. It will help to digress for a moment to ask what one means by ‘impossible.’”—*Ibid.*

The Law of Probability

He launches, then, into an extended discussion of what might be described technically as the law of probability. He takes the simple illustration of a coin flipped in the air. With one toss of the coin there is a fifty-fifty chance that the coin will land “heads up.” The greater number of times the coin is flipped, the greater the certainty that if it has not already landed “heads up,” it certainly will ere long. This leads him to observe: “However improbable the event in a single trial, it becomes increasingly probable as the trials are multiplied. Eventually the event becomes virtually inevitable.”—*Ibid.*

He believes, therefore, that all that is needed in order to perform the incredible feat of the proper combining of elements to produce the first spark of life is that there shall be sufficient time. If a million years is not sufficient, then take two million, and if they be inadequate, then double the number again. And if we are still unable to see how such a bewilderingly complex array of elements could be brought together, then go on increasing the time by a billion or two years. Ultimately, either the event happens or we are sufficiently hypnotized by the ceaseless drone of the centuries, millenniums, and eons of time that we lose our incredulous mood and accept the theory. Note the learned doctor's words:

“Time is in fact the hero of the plot. The time with which we have to deal is of the order of two billion years. What we regard as impossible on the basis of human experience is meaningless here. Given so much time, the ‘impossible’ becomes possible, the possible probable, and the probable virtually certain. One has only to wait: time itself performs the miracles.”—*Ibid.*

All in the Name of Reason

Remember, all this is being said in the name of reason, for Dr. Wald holds that the “reasonable view” as to the origin of life is that of spontaneous generation. Now we grant that to a certain type of mind it may seem entirely “reasonable” to deify time, as though the mere passage of it could ultimately produce great and complex wonders. But time is nothing more than the medium in which events take place; time has no power in itself. In other words, the mere passage of time cannot bring to completion some-thing which, in the very nature of the elements involved, could never occur.

That brings before us a hidden assumption in the scientist’s allegedly “reasonable view.” In his whole argument about how time can finally produce a living organism from nonliving matter he is proceeding on the assumption that the mere combining of all the physical elements that go into such an organism will produce life. He flies in the face of observable scientific evidence when he assumes this.

At the moment before life departs from an organism, all the physical elements are still present. A moment later a dead body begins to undergo disintegration. The mere fact that the parts of the organism were all together did not in itself guarantee life. Why, then, must we conclude that merely by bringing together these physical elements, inert and lifeless, we would suddenly produce from the aggregation and coordination of them a living organism?

This question brings us face to face with the whole mystery of life, which has baffled biologists through all the years, and must still baffle them. What is life? No one has the answer in terms of physical phenomena.

We who believe the Bible do not say that life is unrelated to physical phenomena; we say only that a physical organism in itself does not provide the explanation of the mystery of life. More than that we need not say. The Christian is not required to explain the mystery of life in order to defend his belief in Creation. He needs only to remind the unbeliever that there is nothing scientifically established that makes unreasonable the Christian position with regard to the beginnings of life in the universe.

Changing Air Could Reverse Theory

Let us look a little further into this allegedly “reasonable view” of spontaneous generation. We have found it thus far resting on assumptions. Here is a further one: Most scientists presently hold a theory of the origin of our world that includes the idea that the early atmosphere of our planet was “virtually oxygen free.” Dr. Wald notes this with some satisfaction, declaring that this absence of oxygen would have made possible very stable “organic compounds” over long periods of time. But he well knows that theories as to the origin of the world have changed through the years. And as the theories have changed, the quality of the atmosphere also has changed. The breath of a new theory of origins might contain a liberal amount of oxygen, which would prove chilling or perhaps even lethal to this “reasonable view” of spontaneous generation, which suggests the question: How “reasonable” is a view that requires only a little oxygen to take the wind out of it?

An Act of Philosophical Faith

JUST how incredible is Dr. Wald’s allegedly “reasonable view” I will let him confess. Note his words:

“We must still reckon, however, with another destructive force which is disposed of less easily. This can be called spontaneous dissolution—the counterpart of spontaneous generation. In the vast majority of the processes in which we are interested the point of equilibrium lies far over toward the side of dissolution. That is to say, spontaneous dissolution is much more probable, and hence proceeds much more rapidly, than spontaneous synthesis. ... The situation we must face is that of patient Penelope waiting for Odysseus, yet much worse: each night she undid the weaving of the preceding day, but here a night could readily undo the work of a year or a century.”—Scientific American, August, 1954.

He states immediately that in our present day living organisms are able to “synthesize organic compounds against the forces of dissolution.” Thus they are able to live and grow. He observes that “a living organism is an intricate machine for performing exactly this function” of synthesizing organic compounds against the forces of dissolution. This leads him to confess:

GOD AND EVOLUTION

“What we ask here is to synthesize organic molecules without such a machine. I believe this to be the most stubborn problem that confronts us—the weakest link at present in our argument.”

Abject Devotion to a Theory

How devoted to a theory can a man become! Dr. Wald is sure, despite the enormous complexity of even a simple organism and the constant forces of dissolution, that given enough time life would spring from the nonliving.

Here is a simple illustration to highlight the hopelessly unreasonable character of this “reasonable view.” Let us imagine that all the type—as hand-set type needed to produce an unabridged dictionary were thrown down on a type room floor. Would the letters arrange themselves so as to produce, on the floor, the same order that they had when the typesetters earlier selected them for printing the dictionary? No. Now imagine that we could pick up all the pieces of type so that they maintained the same relationships they had on the floor, and then threw them down a second time. Imagine our doing this unendingly for a lifetime. Does anyone think that even then the letters would have begun to arrange themselves more definitely in the form of words and sentences, and in alphabetical sequence, as the dictionary reads? No.

But that is not all. Let us imagine that owing to some kind of forces at work on the floor—a kind of “spontaneous dissolution” - any possible tendency of the separate type to hold a word combination was counteracted. What reason have we to believe that what had failed to give evidence of beginning after an age of tossing the type around would, after endless ages, not only begin to be but gradually become more and more like the original combination of letters in the dictionary pages? That question answers itself. Is it reasonable to believe, in the credulous words of the scientist, that time is the “hero of the plot” and “performs the miracles”? The question again answers itself. We feel tempted to ask the reader’s pardon for solemnly setting before him such utterly fantastic notions as the doctor has regaled us with.

A Choice Exhibit of Faith

It is neither science nor reason that causes Dr. Wald to argue so ardently for the idea of spontaneous generation. Rather, it is faith. He has unquestioning faith in the theory of evolution; the theory logically calls for life to spring from nonliving matter, therefore life must have thus begun on our earth.

In the early days of the controversy over evolution lived Thomas Huxley, a militant, incisive, and withal very frank scientist. So vigorous was his defense of evolution that Darwin called him his bulldog. In his presidential address to the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1870, Huxley discussed the question of the origin of life. I quote from that address:

“Looking back through the prodigious vista of the past, I find no record of the commencement of life, and therefore I am devoid of any means of forming a definite conclusion as to the conditions of its appearance. Belief, in the scientific sense of the word, is a serious matter, and needs strong foundations. To say, therefore, in the admitted absence of evidence, that I have any belief as to the mode in which the existing forms of life have originated would be using words in a wrong sense. But expectation is permissible where belief is not. And if it were given me to look beyond the abyss of geologically recorded time to the still more remote period when the earth was passing through physical and chemical conditions, which it can no more see again than a man can recall his infancy, I should expect to be a witness of the evolution of living protoplasm from not living matter. I should expect to see it appear under forms of great simplicity, endowed, like existing fungi, with the power of determining the formation of new protoplasm from such matters as ammonium carbonates, oxalates and tartrates, alkaline and earthy phosphates, and water, without the aid of light. That is the expectation to which analogical reasoning leads me; but I beg you once more to recollect that I have no right to call my opinion anything but an act of philosophical faith.” THOMAS H. HUXLEY, *Discourses Biological and Geological* (ed. 1896), pages 256, 257.

Perhaps our modern scientist might plead that he has more evidence to support him than had Huxley. I hardly think so. I have already quoted Dr. Wald as saying: “Five years ago no responsible scientist would have talked about spontaneous generation.” The reason the scientists did not talk about it was that though nearly a century had passed since Huxley wrote, there was no scientific evidence that justified anyone’s talking about it. Incidentally, the law of probability, on which the present advocates of spontaneous generation rely so heavily, was known in Huxley’s day. If some great scientific discoveries bearing on this problem have been made in the past five years, Dr. Wald has not cited them. He argues for

GOD AND EVOLUTION

spontaneous generation frankly on the basis that it is the only “reasonable view.” But that is not a scientist speaking; rather, it is a special pleader for a cause, one who is displaying a will to believe.

We come to the close of our examination of the claims made by an eminent biologist, Dr. George Wald of Harvard, that spontaneous generation is the explanation for the origin of life on our planet. His article is learned and long. He ends it on a note that reveals the real driving force behind his extended argument:

“This is really the end of our story. Yet not quite the end. Our entire concern in this argument has been to bring the origin of life within the compass of natural phenomena. It is of the essence of such phenomena to be repetitive, and hence, given time, to be inevitable.

“This is by far our most significant conclusion—that life, as an orderly, natural event on such a planet as ours, was inevitable. The same can be said of the whole of organic evolution. All of it lies within the order of nature, and apart from details all of it was inevitable.”- Scientific American, August, 1954.

This eminent biologist, with good logic, places the matter of the spontaneous generation of life as the first link in the chain of evolution. Obviously, if that link cannot be forged, the whole theory of evolution is hopelessly weakened. There must be life before there can be diversity of life. If it cannot be established as a scientifically reasonable proposition that life began spontaneously, we are thrown back on the only alternative-belief in a supernatural act by which life began.

But if it is once admitted that a supernatural act occurred, why may we not reasonably hold that this act involved not only the bringing into existence of one very simple form of life but rather many and complex forms? We may! If there be a power so great as to be able to bring life into existence, why limit the manifestation of that power to one small, simple form of life? But such reasoning brings us straight to the first chapter of Genesis and to Creation.

Issue Clearly Drawn

The issue is here clearly drawn, at the very beginning of time, we might say, between the evolution theory and the creation doctrine. Did life begin spontaneously or was it a supernatural act of a Being capable of producing life? The scientist, by the very rules that govern him in his study, feels that he must confine himself to observable data, to things that can be measured and weighed and comprehended by the senses, to events that have been observed and verified and can serve as a yardstick by which to measure the character of other events in the long ago or in the days to come. Plausibly, the scientist can declare that the supernatural is beyond the range of his study. With like plausibility he contends that inasmuch as supernatural events are not happening about us today, there is no yardstick by which to measure the claim that supernatural events occurred in the ages past. Hence he declares that he cannot even entertain the idea of a supernatural act, which fact means that he must continue to explore the possibilities of spontaneous generation.

I am well aware that the supernatural cannot be put in a test tube, nor measured by a yardstick. I am also aware that supernatural events, such as various of the miracles of the Bible and the great miracle of Creation, are not happening today, and hence we do not have any observable data on supernatural happenings that can aid us in evaluating the claim that certain great supernatural events occurred ages ago. The basis for our belief that life began by a creative act of God is this: The Bible, our source for the record of Creation, is a book which, independently of the Creation record has provided us adequate reason for confidence in its veracity. Therefore, though we did not witness the creation of the world, we can nevertheless believe the account given of it in the Bible

The Matter Summed Up

Let us in conclusion sum up the whole matter: The scientific view before us as to the beginnings of the evolutionary cycle of life on our planet—the view that life began spontaneously—rests on certain unprovable assumptions, combined with the bemusing claim that given sufficient time the most complex of all molecular combinations conceivable would finally occur and produce the spark of life. This theory of the origin of life calls for vast, immeasurable faith, or rather, plain credulity. Yet the eminent Dr. Wald, who is typical of certain scientists today, feels that this theory is so much to be preferred to a “belief in special creation” that he declares: “A scientist has no choice but to approach the origin of life through a hypothesis of spontaneous generation.”

GOD AND EVOLUTION

Now I would not wish to deny him his right to feel that a hypothesis of spontaneous generation is a view more reasonable to hold than that of special creation. I simply say, and I need not say more, that my faith, which enables me to believe in special creation, is altogether too weak to permit me to believe in spontaneous generation. I hold my head high, my reason clear, and my willingness to accept scientific data unimpaired, and yet still believe the doctrine of special creation. Indeed, I think that I am more scientific than are the believers in spontaneous generation-when did it become scientific to believe the incredible?

The First Great Cause

There is nothing observable by any of our senses, nothing coming from the laboratory, that warrants our discarding that basic dictum in biology that all living things are explainable in terms of previously living things. Standing on this scientific dictum, we can reach up and grasp that awesome prime truth that an ever living Being is the first great cause. All else in the universe is simply effect. Obviously all life wherever manifested must be an effect produced by the fact that this ever living Being willed to impart some of His life to these other beings in the universe. Paul well declared that the one true God “gives to all life, and breath, and all things,” and that “in him we live, and move, and have our being” (Acts 17:25, 28).

Thus viewing the origin of all living things, we can find great satisfaction; for us the universe takes on order and form and purpose. We do not have to conclude, as does Dr. Wald in his article on spontaneous generation, that the transition from nonliving matter into living organisms, and from that on into ever more complex forms of life “was inevitable.” We who hold to the belief in an ever living God are free from the fatalistic idea of the inevitability of anything. Rather, we see in the orderliness of the great universe the calm planning and wisdom of an omnipotent God who does all things according to His good pleasure and whose hand is not forced by the inevitability of inarticulate and irresistible laws of nature.

It is because we see in the magnitude and complexity of the universe the product of a divine and orderly Mind that we can find comfort, even in the midst of the disorder that our sinful wills have produced in this world. Indeed, we find in the fact of a great God who ultimately overrules all things the assurance that at last there will come order out of our disorder, and life out of the dread cycle of death that our evil conduct in this world has produced.

Does Time Perform Miracles?

OUR discussion up to this point has been largely confined to questions of fact and evidence. I think that the case in behalf of the great age of the earth and the spontaneous origin of life is far from proved. In view of this we might let the matter rest were it not for the fact that these questions have far more than scientific interest-they directly affect our view of God and of the Bible. It is true that I have already made some general references to the religious aspects. I wish now to focus on them.

For the past one hundred years, and very particularly the past fifty, the history of the Christian church has been a history of the attempts of liberal theologians to accommodate the Bible and Christian thought to the evolution theory. The result of that accommodation has been the acceptance of the evolution theory by most Christian churches. This seems more than strange in view of the fact that a number of the early proponents of this theory quite discounted the Bible and had little place for God in their thinking. In fact, some of these proponents boasted that the theory of evolution made God quite unnecessary.

Then how is it that so many Christian people today who profess faith both in God and in the Bible believe the evolution theory? There are two main parts to the answer.

First, such people have come to view the Bible as inspired only in part. Further, they have come to view portions of it, particularly the early historical sections, as not being true history but only folklore and fable. It is evident that when the Scriptures are viewed in this way, they can be adjusted to almost any theory.

A second and equally important reason is that people have changed their belief in God. They declare that evolution is God’s way of working, His way of creating the earth and all upon it. Who first proposed this idea, I know not, but I do know that it sounds so simple and plausible as to seem an adequate explanation -that is, until we look at it a bit more closely.

The question is not whether God could use the processes of evolution as a means of creating a world and its inhabitants but whether the God portrayed in the Bible, the Christian God, would employ the

GOD AND EVOLUTION

processes of evolution in creating the earth. The God of the Bible, the God of the Hebrew prophets, the God revealed through Jesus Christ, is a God all-powerful, all-wise, all-compassionate to His children, a God who can speak and cause a world to come forth, a God who does all things well, a God who created our earth and declared that it was -very good." That, we say, is the Bible picture of God.

Bible Picture of God Forgotten

If we reject that Bible picture, then, of course, we are free to move in any direction. We may even take the pagan view that God is a revengeful creature of hideous qualities and sometimes of limited power. But we cannot conceive that any Christian would permit himself to entertain any of the variant ideas of God that the pagans have held. Surely it is reasonable to declare that a person who holds to any semblance of Christianity holds at least to the Bible picture of God, or at least that he wishes to do so. The trouble, I believe, with many Christians who have accepted the evolution theory is that they have forgotten the Bible picture of God.

Those churchmen who believe in God and also in evolution call themselves theistic evolutionists—the word theistic comes from a Greek root meaning “God.” Now what does the theistic evolutionist really believe, inasmuch as his thinking is a blend of belief in God and a belief in evolution? Well, here are some of his beliefs:

1. He believes that the great God, presumably infinite in power and wisdom, saw fit to employ the stumbling method of trial and error in creating our world. In other words, God tried one procedure, and if it did not work, He tried another. And so, zigzagging, as it were, through long ages God finally found a procedure that worked and carried the world a certain distance upward. Then, after more ages, He discovered further procedures that carried the world a little higher still. And so on, finally, up to man.

2. All during this long period of trial and error there were, as Darwin described it, endless exhibits of “the survival of the fittest.” For example, an animal with a little longer neck could eat a little higher of the green leaves on the trees and so would have a better chance of survival when food was short. Hence the world would be favored with taller species. Or, a certain strain of animal might be fleet of foot and thus escape the clutches of predatory animals. The net result would be a species of animal with perhaps longer legs or stronger muscles, or possibly both.

This picture of the evolving of the earth led one poet to speak of “nature, red in tooth and claw.” Darwin’s theory calls for a fierce, never-ceasing, bloody battle for survival. We have in the evolution theory essentially an endorsement of the pagan philosophy that might makes right, a philosophy abhorrent to the Scriptures, and particularly to the Christian religion.

3. According to the evolution theory man is the end product of the whole evolution chain that began with microscopic creatures in the swamps. He inherits all the past. That means that there run in his blood and dictate to his nervous system endless urges of the animal kingdom. In other words, it has been hard for man suddenly to break away from all the evil past. The very first man thus starts out under a heavy handicap.

But need we go further in our description? The god of the evolutionist might have used the evolution method, but not the God of the Bible, not the God to whom we would pray in every hour of need as to an all-wise, compassionate Father.

Some theological evolutionists have written that the fight for survival in “nature, red in tooth and claw” was really not so bad after all, that probably most animals through the ages suffered little in being torn to pieces. In rereading such books we have failed to discover that the writers were whimsical. Rather, they intended us to take them seriously. How far can the benumbing influence of a false theory carry a man? Are such writers trying to make us believe that as animals were torn limb from limb in the fight for survival, and screamed in pain and terror, they were simply putting on an act to amuse friend and foe? To think that theistic evolution has been put forth by learned churchmen as the reasonable way to harmonize religion and science! I grant that the evolution theory may indeed permit belief in a god, but what a god!

A Greater Indictment

But there is an even greater indictment that we can bring against theistic evolution. Learned churchmen started out to examine, and finally accepted, the evolution theory because they wanted to be in harmony with the scientific age. Now, it is laudable to seek to find harmony between all the aspects of

GOD AND EVOLUTION

truth. But we need to be very sure that in our search for truth we do not follow a wrong path and end up by letting go of truths we earlier learned. We think that is what theistic evolutionists have done.

In their quest for scientific truths they have forgotten that scientific men frankly confess that their theories, hypotheses, and speculations on any subject have to be kept within the framework of those explanations of the phenomena of nature that are called natural. The supernatural cannot be put in the test tube or measured by a yardstick.

This is no indictment of the scientific mind. Actually, this scientific mood may be nothing more than a frank and humble admission of the limitations of the knowledge and ability of the scientists. But this limiting mood is a very important point to have in mind when we are speaking about theistic evolution.

One of the very reasons why scientists have tended through the years to give a longer and still longer span to the history of our world is that a longer period is needed in order to explain the origin and development of the world and all its inhabitants on a natural basis. That is, without the aid of the supernatural. Scientists can never be quite sure, even in their own minds, that the approximately four billion years that they now give as the age of the earth is adequate, but at least it presently seems to provide enough time for the interaction of various natural forces and phenomena to produce the changes in the world necessary to provide us the kind of world we now have.

Now, the theistic evolutionists, having committed themselves to harmonizing their theology with scientific beliefs, have trustingly gone along with the scientists-back, back, back through the rolling years-and accepted the present four-billion-year estimate for the age of the world. But what such churchmen evidently forget is that the scientists have rolled time back into the oblivion of the past in order to find what they feel is a rational, non supernatural explanation for the world; that is,-an explanation that calls for no action by God in the process of the making of the earth and its inhabitants. The churchman's dilemma is this: How can he insist that he is keeping God squarely in the picture through the four billion years when scientists have set up those years in order to keep everything exclusively within the framework of natural phenomena, which means that God is not in the picture?

Nor has the churchman any way of escape from the dilemma. For him to attempt to inject any evidence of God's taking any part in the making of the earth, on the assumption that natural processes cannot account for all, is to part company with the scientists, who insist that all we need to do is to add a billion or so more years in order to compass everything within the natural framework.

Time, the Hero

I earlier quoted a scientist, George Wald, of Harvard, who sought to explain the origin of life in terms of natural phenomena by a proper combining of certain minerals and gases. He confessed it was most difficult to visualize how this combining could occur and thus set in motion for all time the action of that mysterious phenomenon known as life. He is to be commended for his frankness in confessing the enormous odds against there ever having occurred the proper combination. But he transcends all the difficulties, all the impossibilities, all the incredibilities, by simply lengthening the time involved, which, as the reader will recall, brings him to the lyrical outburst that "time is in fact the hero of the plot. One has only to wait: time itself performs the miracles." The reader will also recall that Dr. Wald declared that we must either believe in spontaneous generation or "accept the alternative belief in special creation," because there is no other alternative.

It is not necessary to bring an indictment against Dr. Wald. He is working within the framework and limits of the scientific world. If we should interview him and suggest that he accept the alternative of special creation, he would almost certainly reply that the supernatural belongs to the realm of religion, and that he is not competent to speak in that realm. And there the matter would rest. He would continue to believe in spontaneous generation. After all, he is a scientist and not a theologian.

But what shall we say of the theologian who calls himself a theistic evolutionist? Only this: Every stride he takes back through the ages in an endeavor to walk in step with the scientists is a stride away from a truly theistic explanation of our earth. If the scientists, with whom he wishes to agree, have finally carried him back with them to the point where they say it is possible to explain all the phenomena without bringing God into the picture, why not agree with them there also? There seems something a little tragic in the idea of a religious man's traveling back trustingly for billions of years because he thinks the scientists have the truth, and that he is watching his great God at work, only to discover in the infinity of the past that the scientists took him back that far in order to explain everything without God!

GOD AND EVOLUTION

Let modernist theologians protest, and they most certainly will, that they still believe in God. I ask again, What kind of God? Surely not a God who is very important to all the processes of the world. And if God is so unnecessary and everything can be explained on a naturalistic basis if enough time is allowed, why be concerned about promoting belief in God or giving obedience to His will, or indeed doing anything about God? The answer to that question is painfully evident. And in that answer, I believe, is found the chief explanation for our present secular age. By the very logic of the evolution-believing theologians, God has become so secondary, even so incidental, as to seem a wholly unimportant force in the universe. Why not let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die? Surely a God so unimportant to our lives will not bring us into judgment, nor can He be expected to provide for us a life in a world beyond. Obviously, the classic idea of God--a Being all wise and powerful, personally concerned about our lives, One who stands above and beyond all the processes of nature--simply cannot be harmonized with the whole evolution philosophy.

A Sure Protection Against Evolution

THEOLOGIANS during the past two or three generations have come to accept the evolution theory, they have gradually changed their whole conception of God. They speak now of an immanent God. By this they mean the opposite of a God who stands apart from and above His created universe. If you should read a definition of an immanent God, you would find great difficulty in seeing how it really differs from that of the pagan pantheistic God. And a pantheistic God is one who is everywhere in general but nowhere in particular. He is in the tree, in the mountain, in the valley, in the cloud--a pervasive something, strangely different from the classic Biblical picture of God. We ask, How did men come to believe in a vaporous, amorphous God, which is the only way we can describe an immanent God? The answer is ready: The idea of a personal God, a transcendent God, is an embarrassment to all Christians who accept evolution in its full logical implications.

Now, if God is one who can be toppled from His throne by "time," as the Harvard professor says, so that "time itself performs the miracles" and God is but an immanent, pervasive something, then there is double reason for discounting God on every side. If time itself performs the miracles, why not a clock on the mantel as the new and true object of our adoration?

Some would say that this pushes the matter too far, quite beyond the logical implications of the belief that many modern theologians hold regarding God. Please remember that only a few decades ago an impressive number of theologians and philosophers, who frankly confessed that the logical end of the road was the disappearance of an unnecessary God, set out to promote what is known as humanism. For all practical purposes, this word describes the idea that man by his own efforts, particularly his scientific efforts, must shape his destiny and determine his future. True, the great majority of theologians were frightened by the thought of the destination to which humanism would carry them. And so they stopped dead in their tracks. Though refusing to turn back on their modernist premises, they fervently affirmed their belief in a God and in a divinely directed destiny. But they inconsistently held to their immanent God, and to the necessity of going along with scientific premises to the last extreme. The result could only be confusion, but the kind of confusion, however, that so befogged the road that most men refused to follow on into humanism. That is about where the religious world stands today.

Perhaps we should add one more important fact to give the full picture of bewildered modern man. He has increasingly placed his faith in scientists, which is another way of saying that he has placed his faith in what he believes scientific discoveries can do to provide him an ever-better world in which to live. Thus, even if he is uncertain about a world beyond and mansions in the sky, he can at least be reasonably sure, in time, of a kind of heaven on earth. Have not scientific discoveries made life much more livable for him? With many diseases conquered, he can hope to live with a minimum of pain, with added years to each generation. Why not look upon scientists and their discoveries as the saviors of mankind? In fact, some years ago a book was written entitled *Science, the New Messiah*. The reasoning has seemed to be that if we can no longer be sure of a world beyond, let us make this world the best one possible. How important, then, all scientific advance!

The End of the Cycle

Then came the atomic bomb, and soon the hydrogen bomb. All this was accompanied by the

GOD AND EVOLUTION

terrified cry of the nuclear scientists that it is “minutes to midnight.” And from that day onward they have carried on the title page of their official organ, *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, a picture of a clock with the hands a few minutes before twelve. If we believe the scientists’ doleful words, we must conclude that soon we may reach the end of the evolution cycle, and that this end will be explosion, incineration, oblivion for all.

Is it possible that the theistic evolutionists declare this to be God’s way of working? I would not charge them with such blasphemy. I think they are honest but deluded. They have now come to the worst of all dilemmas—the dilemma of either resigning themselves to possible extinction or turning back to the view of the universe that places a personal, omnipotent God on the throne again, a God whose plans and purposes will ultimately be carried out, a God who will not abdicate to sinful men, a God who will finally destroy willful sinners, but who will also save His children and create for them a new heavens and a new earth wherein dwells righteousness. I believe that the only hope of our world is a return to this true concept of God and His plan for this world. The whole Bible rests on the foundational record of Creation, which pictures a very real and a very personal God, interested in His creatures, One who created a world for them and pronounced it “very good.” All that follows in the Holy Record can be rightly understood only against the backdrop of Creation.

Confirmed evolutionists will laugh at the idea of a return to a belief in Creation. But what is there laughable about it? The Creation record pictures no childish activity, but the majestic movements of a great God. Perhaps it seems irrational to them to believe that one short literal week can suffice to bring a world into existence, but let them remember that only a few short years ago before we had discovered certain amazing facts about nuclear power, no one thought it reasonable to believe that one bomb could destroy a city in a moment. If science teaches us anything today, it teaches us that formerly undreamed-of forces can be set in motion instantly to do vast things. Incidentally, why should a great God—and why believe in any but a great God—who has an incredibly large universe to govern take more than one week to create one little world? Men need to be careful lest their laughter be the result of the littleness of their understanding and the littleness of their comprehension of God.

There is in the world today a rapidly growing religious movement, the Seventh-day Adventist Church, that is definitely distinguished by its belief in a literal Creation as set forth in the opening chapters of the Bible. The adherents of this movement believe that only by thus believing can a true view of God and His purposes for man be achieved. They have held from the beginning not only the belief that God created this world but that He will recreate it ere long, after destroying all wickedness in the earth at the time of the return of Jesus Christ. The two beliefs go together—Creation and Christ’s second advent—they are two parts of one whole. We in this movement are not overawed by the forecasts that it is “minutes to midnight.” Why should we be? Believing as we do in a God who speaks and a world is brought forth, we are not troubled by the wailing words of scientists who declare that forces beyond our control are driving us on to oblivion. Yes, we believe that there are forces beyond our control, but not beyond the control of the personal, omnipotent God in whom we believe.

A Sure Protection

We who are Adventists believe that because of our belief in Creation we have been protected from succumbing to the bewitching arguments in behalf of evolution. To make sure that we shall never forget Creation, we keep holy unto God as a memorial of Creation the seventh day of each week, the Sabbath of the Lord. And why have we followed this plan to keep Creation clearly in mind? The answer is ready and obvious—because God gave the Sabbath to man for this very purpose. In the record of Creation in Genesis is found the declaration: “And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made” (Genesis 2:2, 3).

Later, when God proclaimed His moral code, the Ten Commandments, which all the great Christian bodies believe is still in force, He included in the heart of the Ten Commandments this commandment: “Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shall thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shall not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it” (Exodus 20:8-11).

GOD AND EVOLUTION

Before some reader might wish to dismiss the matter right here with the summary comment that - Adventists are just trying to revive the old Jewish Sabbath,” I would ask: What is there Jewish about the creation of the world? How many Jews were present at the end of Creation week when God set an example for us by resting on the Sabbath day and blessing it? Long before Adventists were well known, a theologian who, so far as we know, worshiped always on Sunday, offered these thoughts on the Sabbath commandment in his commentary on the book of Exodus:

“The observance of the Sabbath connects man with the origin of his race, with the six days’ creation, and with the Creator Himself. The connection is manifestly a historical one. He that observes the Sabbath aright holds the history of that which it celebrates to be authentic, and therefore believes in the creation of the first man, in the creation of a fair abode for man in the space of six days, in the primeval and absolute creation of the heavens and the earth, and, as a necessary antecedent to all this, in the Creator, who at the close of His latest creative effort rested on the seventh day. The Sabbath thus becomes a sign by which the believers in a historical revelation are distinguished from those who have allowed these great facts to fade from their remembrance (Exodus 31:15).”

“The observance of the Sabbath, then, becomes the characteristic of those who cherish the recollections of the origin of their race, and who worship God, not merely as Elohim, the Everlasting Almighty, but as Jehovah, the historical God, the Creator, who has revealed Himself to man from the dawn of his existence as the God of love, and afterward of mercy and grace, of promise and performance.”- JAMES G. MURPHY, Comments on Exodus 20:8-11.

Creation, the Foundation Truth

The fact that this theologian kept the first day, Sunday, does not alter in any way the force of his statement. But when the question of the keeping of the Sabbath instead of Sunday is before them, many of these devout ministers declare that keeping in memory the resurrection of our Lord is more important even than keeping in memory the creation of the world. I do not believe that they would say this if they saw the whole subject in its larger perspective and realized that it was the modernist rejection of Creation, and with it the doctrine of the fall of man, that took the vitality and meaning out of the great truth of the death and resurrection of our Lord.

I repeat, the whole historical record of the Bible rests upon the opening chapters of Genesis. We must ever keep this fact bright in our minds, or the remainder of the Bible becomes in many respects pointless. Indeed, when we see the Creation account in the light of what has happened to Christendom in the past fifty and more years, we can truly appreciate the meaning of the Sabbath command, God’s command for His followers to “remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy.” Strange it is, if the remembering of the Sabbath is so minor a point as some present-day theologians would say, that God saw fit to place in the heart of the Ten Commandments this command to “remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy” and to remind us in that commandment that He created the heavens and the earth in six days and rested the seventh day.

Seventh-day Adventists began to emphasize the keeping of the Sabbath day before Charles Darwin wrote his book on evolution. We could not then possibly see the whole force of the divine command, but we did know it was written in the timeless Ten Commandments. Now we can see more fully the force of the command, and so we seek to proclaim the Sabbath more fully. We see in our keeping of the Sabbath an assurance that we will not forget the God who created the world. We also believe that it is a witness we bear to the world that we have no part in the modern apostasy that has engulfed so many Christian people, and which is robbing them of their quiet confidence in a transcendent, omnipotent God. The God of the Sabbath is the One who gave us a perfect earth at the beginning and who has promised us a new heaven and a new earth at the last. Our doctrine of the seventh-day Sabbath, coupled with our doctrine of the soon coming of Jesus Christ, gives to us before and behind the protecting assurance of our great God. We invite others to join with us in keeping holy the Sabbath day. We invite them to join with us, not simply in keeping it but in proclaiming it. We invite them, in truth, to join with us in believing and proclaiming the related truths for which the Seventh-day Adventist Movement stands.

We can humbly but joyously say that we do not fear the future. Scientists may declare that it is “minutes to midnight.” Perhaps it is for those who have no hope in an omnipotent God, who does all things well. We say it is minutes to morning, the grand morning of the return of Jesus Christ to re-create this earth in righteousness.

Creationism On The Internet

The Origin Of Life

Roadblocks to prove evolutionary origins	www.christiananswers.net/q-abr/abr-c004.html
Where did life come from?	www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/origin-of-life.html
Can evolution be the source of life	www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/life-complexity.html
Why is abiogenesis impossible?	www.christiananswers.net/q-crs/abiogenesis.html
What if the cosmos is all that there is?	www.christiananswers.net/q-aiia/cosmosallthereis.html
Second Law of Thermodynamics	www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-thermodynamics.html
Are we made of stardust?	www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/made-of-stardust.html
How can we know there's a God?	www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c038.html
If God made everything, who made God?	www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c039.html
Does Scripture refer to life in space?	www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/space-life.html

The Origin Of Species

What are the Genesis "kinds"?	www.christiananswers.net/q-crs/baraminology.html
Can genetic mutations produce evolution?	www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/genetic-mutations.html
Where did cancer come from?	www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/cancer.html
Kangaroos	www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-kangaroos.html
Did horses evolve from a small animal?	www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c016.html
Why do flightless birds have wings?	www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c035.html
CHARLES DARWIN - Was he a Christian?	www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/darwin.html

The Fossil Record

Does the fossil record teach us evolution?	www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-c006.html
What happened to the horse?	www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c016.html
New fossil "dinosaur-bird" discovery?	www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c032.html
Blood cells in dinosaur fossils?	www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c026.html
The world of "missing" links?	www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-c008.html
Did humans live millions of years ago?	www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c029.html
Where are all the human fossils?	www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c014.html
CARBON-14 DATING	www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c007.html
Are dinosaurs mentioned in the Bible?	www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-c004.html
What about continental drift?	www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c001.html

The Origin Of Humans

Similarity between chimps and humans	www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c018.html
The world of "missing" links?	www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-c008.html
'Missing links' between humans and apes?	www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c029.html
Where are all the human fossils?	www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c014.html
Human fetus and evolution	www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-c024.html
Human gills?	www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c031.html
Adam the first man	www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-adamforkids.html
About Racism and Christianity	www.christiananswers.net/race.html
Cloning: Right or Wrong?	www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/cloning.html

GOD AND EVOLUTION

Did Adam have a belly button? www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/bellybutton.html
Where did Cain get his wife? www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c004.html
How did bad things come about? www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c008.html

Education System

Why scientists endorse Evolution? www.christiananswers.net/q-aiia/aiia-scientists.html
Evolutionism and Creationism? www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-sciencebias.html
Do real scientists believe in Creation? www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-scientists.html
CREATION-SCIENTISTS www.christiananswers.net/creation/people/home.html
Creationist colleges and seminaries www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/creationist-schools.html
when your teacher is an evolutionist? www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-c010.html
Teach kids about Creation and dinosaurs? www.christiananswers.net/dinosaurs/teachers.html
Religion of Secular Humanism www.christiananswers.net/q-sum/sum-g002.html
Are we living in a moral Stone Age? www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-g007.html
What difference does it make? www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-c003.html

Dinosaurs

Discovery Trail www.christiananswers.net/dinosaurs/journey0.html
Answers www.christiananswers.net/dinosaurs/questions.html
Fun And Games www.christiananswers.net/dinosaurs/games.html
Exploring www.christiananswers.net/dinosaurs/exploring.html
Resources www.christiananswers.net/dinosaurs/coolstuff.html
Teachers Aids www.christiananswers.net/dinosaurs/teachers.html

Catastrophe

Is the Black Sea the flood of Genesis? www.christiananswers.net/q-crs/crs-blacksea.html
Flood of Noah covered the entire Earth? www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-c005.html
Has the Garden of Eden ever been found? www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/garden-of-eden-loc.html
Could Noah's Ark really hold the animals? www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-c013.html
How did animals get to Australia? www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c006.html
How did FISH survive the Flood? www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c037.html
How did PLANTS survive the Flood? www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c019.html
Where did the flood water come from? www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c010.html
Where did the flood water go afterwards? www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c010.html
Did Noah need oxygen tanks? www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/noah-above-mts.html
What is "Gopher Wood"? www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/gopherwood.html
Near Eastern stories of Creation and Flood www.christiananswers.net/q-abr/abr-c001.html

Astronomy

The origin of the solar system? www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/solar-system-origin.html
Was there a big bang? www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/big-bang.html
How are star distances measured? www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/star-distance.html
Do stars evolve? www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/star-evolve.html
Do new stars form today? www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/star-formation.html
Evolution of the moon's origin? www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/moon-origin.html
Distant Starlight www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c005.html
Is every star different? www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/star-differences.html
How many stars are known to exist? www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/star-number.html
What is the Death Star? www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/death-star.html
Is heaven located in the northern sky? www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/heaven-location.html

GOD AND EVOLUTION

Is the gospel spelled out in the stars? www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-c019.html
What's wrong with studying astrology? www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/astrology.html

Dating Methods

Evolutionist age estimates www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-earthage.html
Old age arguments www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-oldagemethods.html
Young age arguments www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c012.html
Radioactive Dating Methods www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-radioactive.html
Carbon 14 Dating www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c007.html
Age of the Earth www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-c002.html
Distant Star Light www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c005.html
Day 4 of Creation Week www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-c020.html
Day 6 of Creation Week www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-c001.html
24 Hour Days www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c011.html
The Age of the Earth www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-c026.html
Progressive Creationism www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-c009.html
Theistic Evolution www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c015.html
Teachings Of Hugh Ross www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-c014.html
The Gap Theory www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c003.html
Big Bang Theory www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/big-bang.html

The Bible

Does God Exist? www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c038.html
Bible and Archeology www.christiananswers.net/q-aiia/aiia-arch1.html
Origin of Sin and Death www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c008.html
Pain and Suffering www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-t023.html
Origin of the Races www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/race-definition.html
The Garden of Eden www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/garden-of-eden-loc.html
Miracles of Jesus www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/rfsm-miracles.html
Is Genesis Literal? www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c020.html
Who wrote Genesis www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c021.html
Genesis Chapters 1 to 11 www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c022.html
Genesis Chapters 1 to 2 www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c023.html
Fact or Mythology? www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c024.html
Pope and Evolution www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c017.html
Charles Darwin www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/darwin.html
The Gap Theory www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c003.html
The Gap Theory Examined www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-gaptheory-problems.html
Progressive Creationism www.christiananswers.net/q-eden/edn-c009.html

Answers In Genesis

Alien And UFOs www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/alien.asp
Anthropology www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/Anthropology.asp
Apologetics www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/apologetics.asp
Archaeology www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/archaeology.asp
Wrong Arguments www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/dont_use.asp
Astronomy www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/astronomy.asp
Bible www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/bible.asp
Cloning www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/cloning.asp
Communism and Nazism www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/communism.asp
Countering the Critics www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/critics.asp

GOD AND EVOLUTION

Creation Compromises	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/compromise.asp
Creation Scientists	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/bios/default.asp
Creation: Why It Matters	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/creation-matters.asp
Darwin, Charles	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/darwin.asp
Design Features	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/design.asp
Dinosaurs	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/dinosaurs.asp
Education	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/education.asp
Embryonic Recapitulation	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/embryonic.asp
Environmentalism	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/environmentalism.asp
Family And Marriage	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/family.asp
Flood	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/flood.asp
Fossils	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/fossils.asp
Galileo, Geocentrism	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/geocentrism.asp
Genesis	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/genesis.asp
Genetics	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/genetics.asp
Geology	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/geology.asp
God	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/God.asp
History	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/history.asp
Human Life	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/humanlife.asp
Ice Age	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/iceage.asp
Information Theory	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/infotheory.asp
Jesus Christ	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/Jesuschrist.asp
Linguistics	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/linguistics.asp
Mammoths	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/mammoth.asp
Morality and Ethics	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/morality.asp
Mutations	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/mutations.asp
Natural Selection	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/selection.asp
Noah's Ark	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/noah.asp
Origin of Life	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/origin.asp
Philosophy	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/philosophy.asp
Plate Tectonics	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/tectonics.asp
Probabilities	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/probabilities.asp
Racism	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/racism.asp
Radiometric Dating	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/dating.asp
Religion, Humanism, etc.	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/religion.asp
Scopes Trial	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/scopes.asp
Speciation	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/speciation.asp
Thermodynamics	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/thermodynamics.asp
'Vestigial' Organs	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/vestigialorgans.asp
Young Age Evidence	www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/young.asp

Back To Genesis

The Anti-Creationists	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-186a.htm
The City With Foundations	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-185a.htm
The Lake of Fire	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-184a.htm
Strange Strings	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-183a.htm
My Dream	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-182a.htm
On the Vital Ministry of Teaching	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-181a.htm
Willingly Ignorant	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-180a.htm
The Mathematical Impossibility of Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-179a.htm
The Evolving Humanist Manifestos	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-178a.htm
The ICR Graduates	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-177a.htm
Evolutionists and the Moth Myth	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-176a.htm
The Bounds of the Dominion Mandate	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-175a.htm

GOD AND EVOLUTION

The Uncertain Speed of Light	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-174a.htm
Memories of ICR Colleagues Now in Heaven	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-173a.htm
The “I Am”s of Christ	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-172a.htm
God’s Dominion Mandate and the Nations Today	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-171a.htm
Evolutionary Arrogance	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-170a.htm
Let the Word of God Be True	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-169a.htm
What Are They Afraid Of?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-168a.htm
The Staff of Life	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-167a.htm
All Nations Under God	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-166a.htm
The Light of the World	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-165a.htm
The Dean of Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-164a.htm
What Astronomers Don’t Know	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-163a.htm
Inquiring Skeptics Want to Know	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-162a.htm
Evolution Versus The People	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-161a.htm
“Things You May Not Know About Evolution”	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-160a.htm
Religion and Resurrection	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-159a.htm
An Open Letter to American Muslims	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-158a.htm
The Mystery of Complexity	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-157a.htm
Curiously Wrought	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-156a.htm
Acceptable Words in Such a Time	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-155a.htm
The Outer Darkness	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-154a.htm
How Not to Defend Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-153a.htm
The Microwave of Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-152a.htm
The Dangers of Compromise	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-151a.htm
The Cosmic Bubbleland	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-150a.htm
Why?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-149a.htm
Entropy and the Resurrection	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-148a.htm
The Mystery of Human Language	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-147a.htm
Just How Simple Are Bacteria?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-146a.htm
Cancer and the Curse	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-145a.htm
Evolution: Real Science or Nonsense?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-144a.htm
The Profusion of Living Fossils	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-143a.htm
Finding an Evolutionist’s God	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-142a.htm
How Buildings Grow	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-141a.htm
Evil-Ution	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-140a.htm
Running with Birds and Butterflies	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-139a.htm
The Vital Importance of Believing in Creation	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-138a.htm
Cosmology on Trial	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-137a.htm
The Finished Works of God	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-136a.htm
Scientific Irrationality	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-135a.htm
A House Divided	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-134a.htm
Strong Delusion	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-133a.htm
The Year 2000 and Bible Prophecy	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-132a.htm
Behind the Dark Curtain	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-131a.htm
Creation Evangelism	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-130a.htm
Creation by Inflation and Quantum Fluctuation	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-129a.htm
Biblical Uniformitarianism	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-128a.htm
Design is not Enough!	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-127a.htm
Fish That Talk	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-126a.htm
The Bible and Jesus Christ	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-125a.htm
The Deity of the Risen Christ	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-124a.htm
What They Say	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-123a.htm
All Spaced Out	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-122a.htm
The Stardust Trail	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-121a.htm
Creation, Christmas, and the Qur’an	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-120a.htm
An Urgent Appeal to Pastors	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-119a.htm

GOD AND EVOLUTION

The Tree of Life	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-118a.htm
Grazing the Mailing Lists	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-117a.htm
Why Christians Should Believe in a Global Flood	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-116a.htm
The Postmodern Agnostic	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-115a.htm
Bigotry In Science	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-114a.htm
The Literal Week of Creation	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-113a.htm
The Fall, the Curse, and Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-112a.htm
God's Library	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-111a.htm
Inspired Guesses, Creative Imagination, and Science	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-110a.htm
Evolutionary Paranoia	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-109a.htm
God's Only Begotten Son	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-108a.htm
Why The Gap Theory Won't Work	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-107a.htm
Bring The Books	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-106a.htm
"Human Evolution" An Update	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-105a.htm
Radiometric Dating And The Bible	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-104a.htm
The Creationism Of America's Founding Fathers	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-103a.htm
Can Order Come Out Of Chaos?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-102a.htm
The Coming Big Bang	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-101a.htm
Old-Earth Creationism	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-100a.htm
Prophecies Of The Resurrection	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-099a.htm
Creation On Campus	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-098a.htm
Defending The Faith	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-097a.htm
Evolution And The Pope	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-096a.htm
Reason or Rhetoric	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-095a.htm
Back to the Mythical Genesis	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-094a.htm
The World And The Word (Psalm 19)	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-093a.htm
Of Making Many Books	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-092a.htm
Sweet Land Of Liberty	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-091a.htm
Should Creationists Abandon The KJV?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-090a.htm
Communicating Truth	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-089a.htm
Discovering Truth	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-088a.htm
ICR And The Future	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-087a.htm
The First Twenty-Five Years	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-086a.htm
ICR And The Future	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-085a.htm
ICR and the Word of God	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-084a.htm
A Unique Creationist School of Science	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-083a.htm
The ICR Outreach Ministries	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-082a.htm
The Battle for True Education	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-081a.htm
The Revival of Modern Creationism	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-080a.htm
Reflections on Fifty Years in Creation Evangelism	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-079a.htm
Let the Redeemed of the Lord Say So	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-078a.htm
The Urge to Submerge	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-077a.htm
Genesis and the Resurrection	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-076a.htm
In the Beginning, Hydrogen	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-075a.htm
Cosmology's Holy Grail	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-074a.htm
Nor Any Nod to God	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-073a.htm
Theophany	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-072a.htm
Blessings from the Old Files	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-071a.htm
Christ and the Time of Creation	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-070a.htm
The Wolf and the Lamb	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-069a.htm
Naive Literalism	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-068a.htm
Birthrights and Pottage	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-067a.htm
Testimonies From Creation Evangelism	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-066a.htm
The Big Bust	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-065a.htm
The Hyper-Environmentalists	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-064a.htm
Games Some People Play	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-063a.htm

GOD AND EVOLUTION

Beginning At Genesis	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-062a.htm
The Most Expensive Christmas Gift of All	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-060a.htm
Cain's Wife: It Really Does Matter!	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-059a.htm
Know The Enemy!	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-058a.htm
Coming Back to Genesis?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-056a.htm
Dinosaurmania Strikes Again	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-055a.htm
The Ultimate End	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-054a.htm
Back to Genesis and Creation Shock in the UK	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-053a.htm
Why Are Some Churches Producing Atheists?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-052a.htm
"Back to Genesis" The Hope for America?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-051a.htm
The Chasm is Widening	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-050a.htm
Monkey Ears and Wasted Years	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-049a.htm
The Smartest Man in America	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-048a.htm
Calling Little Green Men	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-047a.htm
Without Excuse	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-046a.htm
Creation Ministry in the United Kingdom	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-044a.htm
Be A Berean	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-043a.htm
Asimov Meets His Creator	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-042a.htm
Battles Behind the Scenes	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-041a.htm
Always Be Ready!	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-040a.htm
Revelation: Key to the Past	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-039a.htm
The Seed Snatchers	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-038a.htm
Who is the Real Hero?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-037a.htm
Are Creationists Divisive?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-036a.htm
Creation Evangelism Works	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-035a.htm
Thinking God 's Thoughts After Him	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-034a.htm
Adam and Ants	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-033a.htm
Choosing a Christian College—Part II	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-032a.htm
Choosing a Christian College—Part I	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-031a.htm
What is a Creationist?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-030a.htm
Billions, Millions, or Thousands—Does it Matter?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-029a.htm
Needed: Pioneer Evangelists	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-028a.htm
Wars and Rumors of Wars	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-027a.htm
Make Museums Count for Creation	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-026a.htm
And How Shall They Hear Without a Preacher?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-025a.htm
God of Creation or god of Christmas?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-024a.htm
Children and Creation	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-023a.htm
Is America Committing Suicide?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-022a.htm
Do the Days Really Matter?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-021a.htm
It 's Not a Matter of Your Opinion	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-020a.htm
What Mean These Stones?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-019a.htm
The Big Bang is Coming	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-018a.htm
Why Does the Carrot Move?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-017a.htm
Creation and Conservation	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-016a.htm
Watches and Wombats	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-015a.htm
Closing the Gap	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-014a.htm
America Needs Salting	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-013a.htm
Where Are All the Godly Offspring?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-012a.htm
Temples of Evolution—Temples of Doom	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-011a.htm
Were You There?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-010a.htm
We've Forgotten	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-009a.htm
Our Bodies—Our Rights?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-008a.htm
Needed—More Watchmen!	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-007a.htm
Don't be Afraid of Giants	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-006a.htm
Five Vital Questions to Ask Your Church	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-005a.htm
Is God Being Outlawed in California?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-004a.htm

GOD AND EVOLUTION

Is God an Evolutionist?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-003a.htm
A Modern Babel? Confusion in America	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-002a.htm
Bishop or Bible: A Question of Authority	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-a/btg-001a.htm

Creation Questions And Answers

When a Tadpole Turns Into a Frog	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-186b.htm
Were the Huge Columbia River Basalts Formed in the Flood?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-185b.htm
Do the Doctrines of Creation and Resurrection Reinforce Each Other?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-184b.htm
Is Believing in Evolution the Same Kind of Thing As Believing in Gravity?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-183b.htm
Does the Similarity of Human Blood to Sea Water Prove Life Arose in the Ocean?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-182b.htm
How Long Will the Sun Last?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-181b.htm
Can the Ussher Chronology Be Trusted?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-180b.htm
How Did the Vertical Columns at Devil's Tower Form?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-179b.htm
What Happened at the Tower of Babel?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-178b.htm
Did Noah's Flood Cover the Himalayan Mountains?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-177b.htm
Did Modern Coal Seams Form in a Peat Swamp?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-176b.htm
Is Man a "Higher" Animal?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-175b.htm
How Long is a Billion Years?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-174b.htm
Does the Bible Contain a Mathematically Incorrect Value for "Pi"?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-173b.htm
Don't the Fossils Prove Evolution?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-172b.htm
Do Creationists Really Believe in Evolution?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-171b.htm
Who Cares About Creation Anyway?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-170b.htm
Do Millions of Laminae Document Millions of Years?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-169b.htm
Has Archaeological Evidence for Jesus Been Discovered?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-168b.htm
Does Salt Come from Evaporated Sea Water?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-167b.htm
Who Could Argue with Teaching Good Science?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-166b.htm
Did God Lie to Us?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-165b.htm
If an Idea Agrees with Scripture, Does that Make it Unscientific?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-164b.htm
Why did God Create Us?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-163b.htm
Can the Small Changes We See Add Up to Evolution?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-161b.htm
Is Lack of Room for Wisdom Teeth Proof of Evolution?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-159b.htm
Who were the "Giants" in the Days of Noah?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-158b.htm
When did "Sue", the huge T-Rex, live and Die?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-157b.htm
How Long Does It Take for A Canyon to Form?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-156b.htm
What About Stem Cell Research?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-155b.htm
Are Human Artifacts Ever Petrified?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-154b.htm
Why Does Nearly Every Culture Have a Tradition of a Global Flood?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-153b.htm
Hasn't Life Been Created in the Laboratory?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-152b.htm
Does the Bible Really Claim that Insects Have Only Four Legs?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-151b.htm
What Grows on Evolution's Tree of Life?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-150b.htm
Do We Now Have a New Monkey for an Uncle?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-149b.htm
Can Children Benefit from Creation Thinking?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-148b.htm
Does Genesis Address the "Time" of Creation or Just the "Fact" of Creation?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-147b.htm
How Can the Chinese Dynasties Extend Back Many Thousands of Years?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-146b.htm
What Could The God of Scripture Call "Very Good"?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-145b.htm
Can Raw Energy Create Order?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-144b.htm
In What Ways Has God Blessed America?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-143b.htm
Why Can't Geneticists See the Obvious Evidence for Creation in the Genetic Code?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-142b.htm
Can we see Evolution around us?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-141a.htm
Can Research be Done from a Creation Base?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-140b.htm
Did Dinosaurs Hunt in Packs?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-139b.htm
Does the Creation Worldview Help in Time of Grief?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-138b.htm
What do Americans Believe about Origins, According to the Polls?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-137b.htm
How Could Noah Have Built the Ark All by Himself?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-136b.htm
What Would Need to Change for a Dinosaur to Evolve into a Bird?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-135b.htm
Has Evidence for the Flood Been Found in the Black Sea?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-134b.htm
Is Evolution a Unifying Principle in Science?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-133b.htm
Where Was the Garden of Eden Located?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-132b.htm
What Really Happened on the Kansas School Board?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-131b.htm
What Happened to Land Plants During the Flood?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-130b.htm
Why Is Creation Politically Incorrect?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-129b.htm
Does Convincing Evidence for Evolution Exist?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-128b.htm
Should Apes Be Given Human Rights?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-127b.htm
Could Evolution and Creation Be Telling the Same Story in Different ways?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-126b.htm
What Can Be Done to Help Endangered Species?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-125b.htm
What About the Peppered Moth?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-124b.htm
Why Do Seminary Professors Entertain Old Earth Ideas?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-123b.htm

GOD AND EVOLUTION

Can Science Prove the Bible?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-122b.htm
Is There a Need for Creationist Research?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-121b.htm
Do Back Problems in Humans Prove Evolution from the Animals?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-120b.htm
Whose Values Are Family Values?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-119b.htm
Do Bacteria “Evolve” Resistance to Antibiotics?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-118b.htm
Do Creationists Believe in Natural Law?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-117b.htm
How Does “Old Earth” Thinking Affect One’s View of Scripture’s Reliability?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-116b.htm
Doesn’t Carbon Dating Prove the Earth Is Old?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-115b.htm
Are Schools Teaching Evolution Well Enough?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-114b.htm
Did God Create the Earth in its Present Condition?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-113b.htm
What Part Does the Flood of Noah’s Day Play in Creation Thinking?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-112b.htm
Is the God of Theistic Evolution the Same as the God of the Bible?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-111b.htm
How Did Creation Fare on PBS’ “Firing Line”?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-110b.htm
Do People Really Believe in Evolution?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-109b.htm
Where Is Cloning Taking Us?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-108b.htm
Does Science Conflict With the Bible?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-107b.htm
Did The “African Eve” Leave Footprints?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-106b.htm
Is Neanderthal In Our Family Tree?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-105b.htm
Can Radioisotope Dating Be Trusted?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-104b.htm
Will “The Lost World” Ever Be Found?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-103b.htm
Is The Big Bang Biblical?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-101b.htm
If All Animals Were Created As Plant Eaters, Why Do Some Have Sharp Teeth?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-100b.htm
Is It Scientifically Impossible For Miracles To Occur?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-099b.htm
Who Or What Made The Laetoli Footprints?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-098b.htm
Is There Water On The Moon?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-097b.htm
Does It Help To Compromise With Evolution?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-096b.htm
Will Infanticide Follow Abortion As “Acceptable Behavior?”	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-095b.htm
What is the Difference Between Macroevolution and Microevolution?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-094b.htm
Did NASA Find Life in Martian Rocks?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-093b.htm
How Did Life Originate?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-092b.htm
Did Lungfish Evolve Into Amphibians?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-091b.htm
Do Evolutionists And Creationists View The Family Differently?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-090b.htm
The Remarkable Word Patterns in the Book of Genesis	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-089b.htm
The One True God	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-088b.htm
Should We Expect To Find Transitional Forms In The Fossil Record?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-087b.htm
Is There Such A Thing As Creationist Counseling?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-085b.htm
Who or What Was Australopithecus Ananensis?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-084b.htm
What Distinguishes Man From Ape?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-083b.htm
How Long Does It Take For Wood To Petrify?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-082b.htm
What are “Polystrate” Fossils?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-081b.htm
Did the Evolutionists Present a Good Case at the Scopes Trial?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-080b.htm
Is Creation Treated Fairly in the Media?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-079b.htm
What is the Purpose of Creation Ministry?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-078b.htm
Does Nature Reveal Truth as Clearly as Does the Bible?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-077b.htm
Is Creation or Evolution More Empirical?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-076b.htm
Is Belief in the Young Earth Necessary to be a Christian?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-075b.htm
How Old is the Earth According to the Bible?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-074b.htm
If it’s in the Museum, Doesn’t that Mean it’s Right?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-073b.htm
Does “The Beak of the Finch” Prove Darwin Was Right?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-072b.htm
Has the “Missing Link” Been Found?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-071b.htm
Are Things Getting Better or Are They Running Down?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-070b.htm
Does the Law Require Public Schools to Teach Evolution as Fact?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-069b.htm
Can Christian High-School Students Survive Public School?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-068b.htm
Does the Geologic Column Prove Evolution?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-067b.htm
Grand Canyon: Is it Really “ Exhibit A” for Evolution and the Old Earth?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-066b.htm
Is the Death Penalty Appropriate Since Man is Made in “God’s Image”?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-065b.htm
Do Peppered Moths Prove Evolution?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-064b.htm
What About the Horse Series?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-063b.htm
Do Museums Portray Truth?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-062b.htm
Did Jonah Really Get Swallowed by a Whale?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-060b.htm
Did the Frozen Mammoths Die in the Flood or in the Ice Age?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-059b.htm
What Happened in the “Days of Peleg”?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-058b.htm
Was There Really An Ice Age?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-056b.htm
Could Dinosaurs Be Cloned?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-055b.htm
Do Park Rangers Tell A Credible Story?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-054b.htm
Did Dinosaurs Survive The Flood?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-053b.htm
Is Creation Thinking Useful?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-052b.htm
Can Science Go “Back to Genesis”?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-051b.htm
Would the Discovery of Noah’s Ark do any Good?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-050b.htm
Why Do Some Babies Show “Animal” Characteristics?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-049b.htm

GOD AND EVOLUTION

Do Muslims Believe in Creation?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-048b.htm
Does SETI Have a Chance? Is it Science?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-047b.htm
Is Creation One of the Traditional Values?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-046b.htm
Can Scientists Study the Past?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-044b.htm
Has the Big Bang Been Saved?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-042b.htm
Should a Church Take a Stand On Creation?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-041b.htm
Testimonies in “Letters to the President”	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-040b.htm
How Could all the Animals Get On Board Noah’s Ark?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-039b.htm
Do Americans Believe in Creation?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-038b.htm
Why Don’t We Find More Human Fossils?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-037b.htm
Is Creationist Ministry Effective?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-036b.htm
Is There Geological Evidence for the Young Earth?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-035b.htm
Was Mankind Created to do Work?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-034b.htm
Are Plants Alive?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-033b.htm
Does Scripture Require a Global Flood??	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-032b.htm
Why Should a Christian Believe in Creation?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-031b.htm
How Do Creation/Evolution Debates Affect People?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-030b.htm
How Can a Geology Professor Believe that the Earth Is Young?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-029b.htm
Should the Public Schools Teach Creation?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-028b.htm
Did Jesus Believe in Creation?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-027b.htm
Can Scientists Study the Past?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-026b.htm
Is Creationism a Missionary Effort?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-025b.htm
Who Was the Babe in the Manager?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-024b.htm
What Can We Do About the Public Schools?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-023b.htm
Did God Create with Appearance of Age?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-021b.htm
Why Do We Marry?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-020b.htm
How Could Fish Survive Noah’s Flood?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-019b.htm
Is There A Conspiracy Against Creationism?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-018b.htm
What is the Connection Between Homosexuality and Evolution?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-017b.htm
Evolution, the New Age, and Your Child’s Education	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-016b.htm
Did a Watchmaker Make the Watch?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-015b.htm
Does Scripture Allow a Gap?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-014b.htm
Are We Being Salt?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-013b.htm
Was Lucy An Ape-man?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-011b.htm
When Did the Fossils Die?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-010b.htm
Do The Difficult Questions Have Answers?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-009b.htm
Does The Human Embryo Go Through Animal Stages?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-008b.htm
Has Noah’s Ark Been Discovered?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-007b.htm
Is There Evidence Against Evolution?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-006b.htm
How Do The Dinosaurs Fit In?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-005b.htm
Where Do The Anti-Creationists Come From?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-004b.htm
Did Noah’s Flood Cover the Whole Earth?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-003b.htm
Where Did The Races Come From?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-002b.htm
How Do I Know There Really Is A God?	www.icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-001b.htm

Creationist Impact Articles

Evolution Hopes You Don’t Know Chemistry	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-371.htm
Jurassic Park or Jurassic Jumble?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-370.htm
The Cosmological Genesis of the Indians	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-369.htm
Biology Confronts Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-368.htm
Was Charles Darwin Psychotic?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-367.htm
New RATE Data Support a Young World	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-366.htm
Creationist Colleges	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-365.htm
Carbon Dating Undercuts Evolution’s Long Ages	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-364.htm
Mediated Design	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-363.htm
Sea Dragons	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-362.htm
Are Polar Ice Sheets Only 4500 Years Old?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-361.htm
Progressive Creationism	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-360.htm
Dating Niagara Falls	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-359.htm
The Voyage of the Beagle - In the Creator’s Service	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-358.htm
Fellowship, Creation, and Schistosomes	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-357.htm
Benjamin Spock, on Darwin and Morality	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-356.htm
Glimpses of Christ the Creator	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-355.htm
Numbers, and the Divine Proportion in God’s Creation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-354.htm
Radiohalos - Significant and Exciting Research Results	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-353.htm
Nuclear Decay: Evidence for a Young World	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-352.htm
Evolution: The Secret Behind the Propaganda	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-351.htm
The Battle for the Cosmic Center	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-350.htm

GOD AND EVOLUTION

In Search of the Congo Dinosaur	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-349.htm
Water, Water Everywhere . . . and not a Drop to Drink?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-348.htm
High School Students' Attitude Towards Creation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-347.htm
The ICR Scientists	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-346.htm
The Terror of Anthrax in a Degrading Creation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-345.htm
Ten Problems with Embryonic Stem Cell Research	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-344.htm
Creation in the Natural History Museum of Great Britain	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-343.htm
A Review of the PBS Video "Evolution" Series	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-342.htm
Death of Darwinism and the Rise of Intelligent Design	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-341.htm
Genome Decay in the Mycoplasmas	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-340.htm
Earth's Climate Thermostat	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-339.htm
Seven Years of Starlight and Time	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-338.htm
Why ICR—and Why Now?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-337.htm
The Effect of Darwinism on Morality and Christianity	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-336.htm
The Human Genome: A Creationist Overview	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-335.htm
Chicxulub and the Demise of the Dinosaurs	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-334.htm
Darwin's Influence on Ruthless LaissezFaire Capitalism	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-333.htm
Evolution is Religion—Not Science	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-332.htm
The Scientific Case Against Evolution: (Part 2)	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-331.htm
The Scientific Case Against Evolution: (Part 1)	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-330.htm
Fossil Insect Bed Resulting from Cataclysmic Destruction	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-329.htm
Experiments in Stratification	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-328.htm
Einstein's Gulf: Can Evolution Cross It?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-327.htm
Polonium Radiohalos: Still "A Very Tiny Mystery"	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-326.htm
The Unselfish Green Gene	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-325.htm
Basic Chemistry: A Testament of Creation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-324.htm
Neanderthals Are Still Human!	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-323.htm
A Visual Presentation of Creation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-322.htm
Feathered Dinosaur from National Geographic Doesn't Fly	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-321.htm
Jerusalem's Unique Climate	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-320.htm
Pb Behavior Places U-Th-Pb Mineral Dating in Doubt	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-319.htm
The Gospel of Creation in a Moslem Land	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-318.htm
Evolution Is Biologically Impossible	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-317.htm
Coal Seams of Joggins Fossil Cliffs	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-316.htm
The Search for New Planets	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-315.htm
RATE Group Prepares Status Report	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-314.htm
The Myth of Chemical Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-313.htm
The Bible and/or Biology	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-312.htm
The Global Flood of Noah's Day	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-311.htm
Cloning: Redefining When Life Begins	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-310.htm
Potassium-Argon and Argon-Argon Dating	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-309.htm
The Blind Gunman	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-308.htm
The "Achilles' Heel" of Potassium-Argon "Dating"	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-307.htm
A Call to Arms for Conservative Christian Educators	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-306.htm
Creation and Quantum Mechanics	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-305.htm
Scientific Roadblocks to Whale Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-304.htm
Do Laws and Standards Evolve?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-303.htm
The Declining Power of Post-Flood Volcanoes	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-302.htm
Radioisotopes and the Age of the Earth	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-301.htm
The Age of the Solar System	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-300.htm
Therapeutic Proteins by Genetic Engineering	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-299.htm
Christianity: A Cause of Modern Science?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-298.htm
Cloning—What Is It And Where Is It Taking Us?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-297.htm
Neocreationism	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-296.htm
Twentieth-Century Earthquakes: An Urban Legend	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-295.htm
Global Warming and the Flood	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-294.htm
Scientific Naturalism as Science	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-293.htm
Origins Beliefs Among American Science Teachers	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-292.htm
Where Has All The Water Gone?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-291.htm
The First Young-Earth Conference on Radioisotopes	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-290.htm
Reticulate Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-289.htm
Creationism in Russia	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-288.htm
The Mere Consistency of Signs and Creation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-287.htm
Alleged Evolutionary Ancestors Coexisted With Humans	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-286.htm
The Flood of Noah & the Flood of Gilgamesh	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-285.htm
The Power of the Creation Message	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-284.htm
Natural Selection--A Creationist's Idea	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-283.htm
Should Evolution Be Immune From Critical Analysis?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-282.htm
Planning a Creationist-Based Field Trip	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-281.htm
The Creation Science Movement in Korea	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-280.htm

GOD AND EVOLUTION

Teaching The Bible In Public Schools?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-279.htm
Biology Textbooks Worldview Development	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-278.htm
Cooling of the Ocean After the Flood	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-277.htm
Evidence for a Young Sun	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-276.htm
The Gish-Max Amarillo Debate	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-275.htm
New Stars, New Planets?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-274.htm
A Resource For Answering the Critics of Noah's Ark Creation and the Curse	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-273.htm
Wise and Learned Men Who Believed in a Creator	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-272.htm
An Educational Step in the Right Direction	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-271.htm
A Young-Earth Creationist Bibliography	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-270.htm
The Yellowstone Petrified Forests	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-269.htm
Female Monarch Butterfly's Designed for its Survival	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-268.htm
Microgeometric Design of Diatoms: Jewels of the Sea	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-267.htm
Could Adam Really Name All Those Animals?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-266.htm
Carl Sagan's Pale Blue Dot	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-265.htm
The Greater Light to Rule the Day!	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-264.htm
The Nature of Science and of Theories on Origins	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-263.htm
A Faulty Climate Trigger	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-262.htm
Science and the Bible	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-261.htm
Design in Infant Nutrition	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-260.htm
Man's Visit to the Moon and God's Visit to Earth	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-259.htm
The New State Religion: Atheism	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-258.htm
Gravity	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-257.htm
A Practical Model for Integrating Science and Faith	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-256.htm
Out of Whose Womb Came the Ice?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-255.htm
Geocentricity and Creation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-254.htm
Tree Rings and Biblical Chronology	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-253.htm
Star Formation and Genesis 1	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-252.htm
When is a Whale a Whale?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-251.htm
Darwin's Teaching of Women's Inferiority	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-250.htm
Would China Benefit From Christianity?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-249.htm
Compromises and Consequences:	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-248.htm
When God Became Man	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-247.htm
Christianity and Technological Advance	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-246.htm
The Dating Gap	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-245.htm
The Principle of Preformism as a Creationist Approach	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-244.htm
The Earth's Magnetic Field is Young	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-243.htm
Dragons in Paradise	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-242.htm
Creation Evangelism Cross Culturally	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-241.htm
The Greenhouse Effect and Pre-Flood Days	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-240.htm
Studies in Creationism and Flood Geology	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-239.htm
Design Features of the Monarch Butterfly Life Cycle	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-238.htm
Creeds and the Six Creation Days	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-237.htm
Pantheistic Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-236.htm
Bumps in the Big Bang	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-235.htm
The New Age and Global Education	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-234.htm
The Search for Noah's Ark: Status 1992	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-233.htm
ICR Museum of Creation and Earth History	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-232.htm
The Apple (Computer) Bites African Eve	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-231.htm
The Plasma Universe	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-230.htm
Evolution and the American Abortion Mentality	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-229.htm
Ice Cores and the Age of the Earth	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-228.htm
Creationist Schools (list of), Revised 6/82	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-227.htm
Excessively Old "Ages" For Grand Canyon Lava Flows	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-226.htm
Natural Selection Versus "Supernatural" Design	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-225.htm
How Could Fish Survive the Genesis Flood?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-224.htm
The Bible, Creation, and Ecology	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-223.htm
Columbus and His Creator	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-222.htm
Modern Scientific Discoveries Verify the Scriptures	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-221.htm
Hugh Ross, ICR, and Facts of Science	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-220.htm
Hugh Ross, ICR, and the Bible	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-219.htm
Big Bang Theory Collapses	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-218.htm
Patterns of Speciation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-217.htm
Genesis According to the Miao People	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-216.htm
Mr. Bryan on Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-215.htm
Adam and the Animals	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-214.htm
On the Changing Definition of the Term "Species"	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-213.htm
Were Grand Canyon Limestones Deposited by Calm Seas?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-212.htm
Evolution and the Wages of Sin	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-211.htm
	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-210.htm
	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-209.htm

GOD AND EVOLUTION

I Think; Therefore There is a Supreme Thinker	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-208.htm
A Failed Attempt at Student Brainwashing	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-207.htm
ICR President Defends Quality of ICR Graduate School	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-206.htm
The Logic of Biblical Creation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-205.htm
The Christian and the Greenhouse Effect	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-204.htm
Beyond Neptune: Voyager II Supports Creation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-203.htm
Testimony of a Former Skeptic	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-202.htm
Daniel and the Classical Experimental Design	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-201.htm
Thinking About the Brain	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-200.htm
ICR, Creationism, and the 1990's	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-199.htm
Earthquakes in These Last Days	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-198.htm
How Long Was the Seventh Day?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-197.htm
Teachers Can Teach Creation Science in the Classroom	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-196.htm
As a Transitional Form Archaeopteryx Won't Fly	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-195.htm
Evolution-A House Divided	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-194.htm
How a Christian Dies	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-193.htm
Worldwide Traditions of a Primordial Paradise	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-192.htm
Death Before Sin?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-191.htm
Science Education-Its Methods and Purpose	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-190.htm
Myths Regarding Radiocarbon Dating	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-189.htm
The Mystery of the Earth's Magnetic Field	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-188.htm
Writing Off Creationism	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-187.htm
Proposed California Science Framework	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-186.htm
A Path for Excellence in K-6 Science	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-185.htm
The Meaning of "Day" in Genesis	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-184.htm
The Heritage of the Recapitulation Theory	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-183.htm
Good Science-A K-6 Plan for Excellence	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-182.htm
Hitler's Evolution Versus Christian Resistance	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-181.htm
A Theory in Crisis	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-180.htm
Has the Speed of Light Decayed?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-179.htm
A Survey of Isotope Dating Methods	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-178.htm
The Compromise Road	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-177.htm
More on the Anti-Darwinian Scientists	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-176.htm
A Report on the ICR Ararat Exploration, 1987	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-175.htm
Frontiers of Physics	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-174.htm
The Anti-Darwinian Scientists	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-173.htm
Stalin's Brutal Faith	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-172.htm
Startling Discoveries Support Creation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-171.htm
The Supreme Court Decision and Its Meaning	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-170.htm
The Chinese Language and the Creative Hands of God	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-169.htm
The Ice Age and The Genesis Flood	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-168.htm
Dinosaur Mania and Our Children	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-167.htm
Mutation Fixation: A Dead End for Macro-Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-166.htm
Evolution and the New Age	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-165.htm
The Ascent of Racism	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-164.htm
Creation Evangelism	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-163.htm
Evolution and the Snowflake	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-162.htm
The Christian World View of Science and Technology	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-161.htm
Early Church Defended Creation Science	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-160.htm
Flight of Migratory Birds	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-159.htm
Importance of Creationism in Foreign Missions	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-158.htm
Mt. St. Helens & Catastrophism	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-157.htm
The Vanishing Case for Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-156.htm
The Chemistry of Oil Explained by Flood Geology	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-155.htm
The I.C.R. Building Dedication	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-154.htm
The Resting Ark, The Grounded Fish, Jesus' Tomb	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-153.htm
Creation Science in Korea	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-152.htm
The Paluxy River Mystery	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-151.htm
Star Witness	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-150.htm
Design in Nature: The Anthropic Principle	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-149.htm
Evolution-Useful or Useless?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-148.htm
I.C.R. Fifteen Years in a Unique Mission 1970-1985	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-147.htm
Virgin's Aeneid, By Chance Alone?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-146.htm
The German Creationist Movement	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-145.htm
The Earth: Unique in All the Universe	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-144.htm
Up, Up, and Away! The Helium Escape Problem	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-143.htm
Oceans of Piffle in Evolutionary Indoctrination	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-142.htm
Does Entropy Contradict Evolution?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-141.htm
Scientific Integrity	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-140.htm
Removed From Circulation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-139.htm

GOD AND EVOLUTION

Not According to Hoyle	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-138.htm
Ten Misconceptions About the Geologic Column	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-137.htm
Evolution: The Changing Scene	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-136.htm
Evolution Ex Nihilo	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-135.htm
Can The Redwoods Date the Flood?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-134.htm
Mankind: The Pinnacle of God's Creation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-133.htm
Recent Creation is a Vital Doctrine	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-132.htm
Design in Ecology	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-131.htm
Creation and the Resurrection	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-130.htm
C. S. Peirce's "Neglected Argument"	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-129.htm
The Sky Has Fallen	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-128.htm
Removed From Circulation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-127.htm
Creation is the Foundation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-126.htm
The Search for Noah's Ark: 1983	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-125.htm
Removed From Circulation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-124.htm
Creating a Missing Link	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-123.htm
Earth's Magnetic Age: The Achilles Heel of Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-122.htm
Starlight and the Age of the Universe	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-121.htm
Evolutionary Indoctrination in Schools	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-120.htm
Those Remarkable Floating Rock Formations	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-119.htm
Did Landscapes Evolve?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-118.htm
Evolution and the Human Tail	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-117.htm
Noah's Ark: The Search Goes On	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-116.htm
Removed From Circulation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-115.htm
Molecular Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-114.htm
Radiometric Dating Using Isochrons	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-113.htm
Learning and Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-112.htm
The Splendid Faith of the Evolutionist	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-111.htm
Young Age for the Moon and Earth	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-110.htm
Did the Early Earth Have a Reducing Atmosphere	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-109.htm
Evolution? Prominent Scientist Reconsiders	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-108.htm
Evolution is Religion, Not Science	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-107.htm
Consequences of Time Dependent Nuclear Decay	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-106.htm
The Arkansas Decision on Creation Science	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-105.htm
1981 and the Battle for Creation I.C.R. Annual Report	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-104.htm
Bible Believing Scientists of the Past	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-103.htm
The Mammal-Like Reptiles	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-102.htm
Origin of Mankind	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-101.htm
Depletion of the Earth's Magnetic Field	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-100.htm
An Answer for Asimov	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-099.htm
Springs of the Ocean	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-098.htm
The Anti-Creationists	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-097.htm
Summary of Scientific Evidence for Creation (Part II)	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-096.htm
Summary of Scientific Evidence for Creation (Part I)	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-095.htm
Materialism, Animism, and Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-094.htm
Origins in Public Education	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-093.htm
Words: Genetic and Linguistic Problems for Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-092.htm
Two Decades of Creation: Past and Future	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-091.htm
Glycolysis and Alcoholic Fermentation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-090.htm
Creation, Mutation, and Variation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-089.htm
Creation, Selection, and Variation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-088.htm
The Origin of Mammals	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-087.htm
The I.C.R. Scientists	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-086.htm
The Tenets of Creationism	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-085.htm
Extinction	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-084.htm
Noah & Human Etymology	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-083.htm
The Sun is Shrinking	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-082.htm
Theistic Evolution & the Day-Age Theory	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-081.htm
Does Academic Freedom Apply to Christians?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-080.htm
Origin of Limestone Caves	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-079.htm
Evolution at the Smithsonian	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-078.htm
Revolutionary Evolutionism	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-077.htm
Evolution of Living Organisms by Pierre-Paul Grassé	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-076.htm
Creation and the Seven-Day Week	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-075.htm
The Delayed Fate of the Dade Debate	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-074.htm
Probability and Order Versus Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-073.htm
Defects in the Jupiter Effect	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-072.htm
Presentation of Evolution and Scientific Creationism	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-071.htm
Evolution in Public Schools B	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-070.htm
Evolution in Public Schools A	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-069.htm

GOD AND EVOLUTION

The Moon: A Faithful Witness in the Sky	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-068.htm
Creation Science and the Local School District	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-067.htm
Does Scripture Require a Recent Creation? (Part II)	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-066.htm
Does Scripture Require a Recent Creation? (Part I)	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-065.htm
Nature's Challenges to Evolutionary Theory	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-064.htm
Remarkable Rebirth of Planet Earth	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-063.htm
Things That are Made	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-062.htm
Racine Debate	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-061.htm
A Comparison of Students Studying the Origin of Life	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-060.htm
Bone Disease Simulating Ancient Age in Fossils	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-059.htm
Thermodynamics and Origin of Life (Part II)	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-058.htm
Thermodynamics and Origin of Life (Part I)	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-057.htm
Creationism in the Netherlands	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-056.htm
Day-Age Theory Revisited	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-055.htm
A. Szent-Gyorgyi's Theory of Syntropy and Creationism	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-054.htm
Impact of Evolution on Humanities and Science	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-053.htm
Impact of Evolution on Social Sciences	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-052.htm
Religion of Evolutionary Humanism and Public Schools	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-051.htm
Considerations Regarding Model for Psychology	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-050.htm
Evolution to Creation: A Personal Testimony	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-049.htm
Circular Reasoning in Evolutionary Geology	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-048.htm
Noah's Ark Goes to Hollywood	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-047.htm
Ebla: Its Impact on Bible Records	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-046.htm
Can You Recognize Bias in History Content?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-045.htm
On the Origin of Language	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-044.htm
Cracks in Neo-Darwinian Jericho (Part II)	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-043.htm
Cracks in Neo-Darwinian Jericho (Part I)	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-042.htm
Origin of Coal	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-041.htm
Entropy and Open Systems	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-040.htm
Spiritual Impact of Creationism	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-039.htm
Up With Catastrophism	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-038.htm
Origin of Life: Theories on Origin of Biological Order	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-037.htm
A Two Model Approach to Origins	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-036.htm
Paluxy River Tracks	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-035.htm
Creation and the Cross	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-034.htm
Origin of Life: Fox Thermal Model	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-033.htm
Continental Drift, Plate Tectonics, and the Bible	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-032.htm
Critique of Early Stage Chemical Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-031.htm
Creation and the Virgin Birth	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-030.htm
Man, Apes, and Australopithecines	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-029.htm
Language, Creation, and the Inner Man	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-028.htm
Some Recent Development with Time	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-027.htm
Treatment of Creation and Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-026.htm
Gospel of Creation-Anti-Gospel of Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-025.htm
Debates Generate Vigorous Response	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-024.htm
Amino Acid Racemization Dating Method	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-023.htm
Noah's Ark: Status 1975	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-022.htm
Evolution and the Population Problem	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-021.htm
Introducing Creationism into Public Schools	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-020.htm
Removed From Circulation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-019.htm
Mimicry	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-018.htm
Young Earth	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-017.htm
Physics: Challenge to "Geologic Time"	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-016.htm
Solar System/New Discoveries Produce Mysteries	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-015.htm
Planet Earth: Plan or Accident?	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-014.htm
Creation and the Environment	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-013.htm
Interpreting Earth History	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-012.htm
Richard Leakey's Skull 1470	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-011.htm
Stars of Heaven	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-010.htm
Removed From Circulation	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-009.htm
Evolution: Oceans Say No!	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-008.htm
Evolution and Modern Racism	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-007.htm
Geology and the Flood	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-006.htm
Evolution and the Bible	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-005.htm
Creation/Evolution	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-004.htm
Evolution, Thermodynamics, & Entropy	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-003.htm
Center of the Earth	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-002.htm
Evolution, Creation, and the Public Schools	www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-001.htm

Bible Study Web Sites

AMAZING FACTS

www.AmazingFacts.org

IT IS WRITTEN

www.iiw.org

VOICE OF PROPHECY

www.vop.com

MARANATHA MEDIA

www.MaranathaMedia.com.au

ANSWERS IN GENESIS

www.AnswersInGenesis.org

CHRISTIAN ANSWERS NETWORK

www.ChristianAnswers.net

INSTITUTE FOR CREATION RESEARCH

www.icr.org

REVELATION OF HOPE

www.RevelationOfHope.org

ELLEN WHITE ESTATE

www.WhiteEstate.org

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

www.SignsTimes.com

ADVENTIST BOOK CENTRE

www.AdventistBookCenter.com

DISCOVERY BIBLE GUIDES

www.DiscoverOnline.org

MC-DONALD SDA CHURCH

www.McDonald.Southern.edu

TRUTH LEFT BEHIND

www.TruthLeftBehind.com

PROPHECY MADE EASY

www.ProphecyMadeEasy.com