

GOD OF THE UNIVERSE WATCHING OVER THE EARTH

DR. OSCAR L. BRAUER

364 South 16th Street, San Jose, California, 95112

The Theory of Evolution was tolerated by most people as long as it was taught as a theory. Now that evolution is taught as fact, as is the case in so many high schools and colleges today, it is a source of downgrading of God and denial of evidences of His existence. Fulfilled prophecy, dimensions of the universe, the very existence of matter, changing theories of cosmology, orderliness and design, and the impossibility of chance as an explanation are all reviewed. Those who would interpret the Bible liberally are saying that, if God's word does not agree with current scientific theories, they will have to make it fit the theories. Why not change the theories to fit God's Word?

Introduction

The purpose of this article is to counteract the modern tendency to downgrade God and his Holy Word. In this century there has been a trend among biologists, geologists, paleontologists, and in a few cases among chemists to go far beyond observed facts into speculations of various kinds.

The keystone of all these Godless imaginings is the Theory of Evolution. Its influence has had the tendency to downgrade God. Now many of those in the forefront are trying to do away with God entirely, not so many by direct statement, but by giving God the "silent treatment" and teaching things that are inconsistent with his Word.

This point of view has infected the speakers and writers of this generation so that they think that in order to be intellectually modern in style they must say something that at least appears to contradict the Bible, such as saying something happened sixty million years ago.

The Theory of Evolution was tolerated by most people so long as it was taught as a theory. Now, however, it is taught as fact in many high school texts where it can do the most harm. This has alarmed the religionists. From what one reads in the newspapers civilization seems to be losing its moorings and many think this Godless teaching is the main cause.

God's Existence Answers Our Problems

No philosophy of scientist, philosopher, religionist, educator, or lay citizen is satisfying unless it accounts for the beginning of things. The average child may, and usually does, ask his parent who made the world. The parent usually replies that God made it. Then the child may ask who made God. The parent's reply now is that God was always in existence.

This answer is meaningless to the child. It is also without meaning to the parent, and even meaningless to all the wise men that ever lived. Neither Aristotle, nor Newton, nor Einstein, nor anyone else can comprehend how God could have always been in existence. One may imagine

he understands the forward end of eternity; that is, endless time from the present on, but an eternity projected backward endlessly is incomprehensible to every finite human mind.

The only logical attitude for us to take, and the only one giving intellectual satisfaction, is that there has to be an infinite mind who understands what the human mind can never hope to understand. That infinite mind is the mind of God.

If an all-knowing God put man on this bewildering, complex, puzzling, and frustrating world, it is logical that he would have given man some instructions to guide preparations for the eternal life that God had planned for him. These instructions millions of people believe God has given them in the form of the Holy Bible. These millions of people also believe that the Bible contains all the instruction man needs for forming a correct philosophy of life, and all the general understanding of the universe that the limited finite human mind can take.

If the Bible is the word of God, it should be unique, unusual, wonderful, challenging, comforting, inspiring, ennobling, encouraging, in a class by itself, and outstanding in every respect. The Bible is all of these things and more. No other book can come anywhere near it in importance.

Several volumes would be required to describe all the ways in which the Bible is important. It is significant that all other books come and go in a very short time, but the Bible increases its sales from year to year and from century to century.

Besides this we shall direct attention only to fulfilled prophecy. Of the hundreds of prophecies already fulfilled, and the scores more that are in the process of being fulfilled now, and the many to be fulfilled in the future, we shall select only two relative to Christ's first appearance, given in the Old Testament and fulfilled in the New. The fulfillment of these two prophecies cannot be attributed to chance or coincidence.

Prophecy

“Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.”¹

Fulfillment

“But while (Joseph) thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary, thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost.

“And she shall bring forth a son and thou shalt call his name, JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins.

“Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying:

“Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us.”²

Second Prophecy

“They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture.”³

Fulfillment

“Then the soldiers when they had crucified Jesus, took his garments, and made four parts, to every soldier a part; and also his coat; now the coat was without seam, woven from the top throughout.

“They said therefore among themselves, Let us not rend it, but cast lots for it, whose it shall be: that the scripture might be fulfilled, which saith, they parted my raiment among them, and for my vesture did they cast lots. These things therefore the soldiers did.”⁴

Does the Bible Claim to Be Inspired of God?

“All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.”⁵

“For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye witnesses of his majesty.

“For he received from God, the Father, honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

“And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount.

“We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts:

“Knowing this first that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation.

“For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.”⁶

What Does the Scripture Say About God Being Eternal?

“The eternal God is thy refuge and underneath are the everlasting arms—.”⁷

“Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting thou are God.”⁸

“For thus saith the high and lofty one that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is holy; I dwell in the high and lofty place.”⁹

“Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory forever and ever.”¹⁰

“But Thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end.”¹¹

What Does the Bible Say About the Wisdom and Understanding of God?

“Great is our Lord, and of great power, his understanding is in finite.”¹²

“For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts higher than your thoughts.”¹³

The Dimensions of the Universe Indicate There Is a God

Says the critic: “No one can prove there is a God.” The rule works the other way too: no one can prove there isn’t a God. In truth, there are infinitely more facts pointing to the existence of God than any which might be interpreted as against his existence.

The statement that “no one can prove there is a God” is startling to the Christian. To one who has had God answer his prayers many times, to one who has read of scores of miracles in this day and age where God has rescued his servants from immanent danger, the foregoing statement seems like blasphemy. Could it be that in the last analysis the statement is quibbling about the meaning of the word “prove”? Perhaps those who use “prove” in this connection are thinking too much of the rigid formality of geometry.

Let us consider the dimensions of the sidereal universe. The dimensions are so great that astronomers use the light-year as a measuring unit. Light travels 186,000 miles per second. So in one year light would travel 5.8 trillion miles.

The 200-inch telescope on Mount Palomar and the electronic telescopes can see galaxies (clusters of stars) at distances of practically one billion light-years. Thus the part of the sidereal universe now visible is a sphere with a diameter

of two billion light-years, and a volume of 4.2 times 10^{27} cubic light years, a volume many times anything the human mind can comprehend.

Is this the full extent of our universe? If we could make an 800-inch telescope, we would probably be able to see twice as far. Who is it that would dare to say we would not be seeing more galaxies? In other words, is the universe infinite in diameter or is it finite?

The human mind cannot comprehend infinite distance. On the other hand, if the diameter of the universe is finite, what exists two times as far out, or three times as far out? To the limited human mind neither possibility offers a satisfactory answer. Neither possibility is intellectually satisfying.

To our God-given intuition, man will never be satisfied with either concept. The only satisfactory picture is that there is an infinite God, who understands and has made all.

Let us emphasize the phrase "God-given intuition" used in the next to the last sentence. Isn't it reasonable to assume that an omniscient (all wise) God would have given his creatures some inborn mechanism by which they could distinguish the real from the imaginary?

Suppose you told a normal child that the house in which he lives is not there but exists only in his mind. To him this statement would be foolishness. In other words, God has given him an intuition that tells him the house is real. This child as yet is not confused by the imaginings of certain philosophers.

Mankind has not given God all the credit due him. Psychologists probably would not give much weight to "God-given intuition." At least they would not dignify it as being unerringly able to judge reality. But really isn't it logical? If you as God were putting man into a very confusing world in which you could foresee confusing philosophies, wouldn't you give him some way of distinguishing between the real and the imaginary?

Some philosophers use esoteric (understood by only a few) words behind which to hide their peculiar philosophies. Two of these words are "idealism" and "existentialism." The two words mean much the same; that is, the external world is not real but exists only as ideas in the human mind. Is there any need for us to argue this point? Really isn't this absurd to your own God-given intuition?

The Existence of Matter Indicates There Is a God

There are billions of questions about our world, and the rest of the universe, still unanswered. A relatively small number of them will in time be answered by the research of men,

but the largest percentage of them will always be beyond man's reach and comprehension. One topic that will always be beyond the limited capacity of the human mind is the origin of the stupendous quantity of matter in the universe.

One of our most dependable laws of nature is the *Law of conservation of mass and energy*, which states that the sum of the mass and energy of the universe is constant. Some mass may be changed into energy and some energy to mass, but the sum total cannot be increased or diminished. It would be impossible to create any definite quantity of mass, even as small as one gram, out of absolutely nothing.

Yet we are confronted with an almost infinite mass in the visible part of our universe. Our sun has a mass of 2.2 times 10^{27} tons. It is about an average sized sun among the other suns or stars. There are about one billion stars in the one galaxy in which we live. In the visible part of the sidereal universe there are from five hundred million to one billion similar galaxies.

From whence came all this mass? Axiomatically, it was either always in existence, or it was created. To have been always in existence doesn't make sense to our God-given understanding. But if you are more scientifically minded, let's look at it in terms of a scientific law.

The German scientist, Clausius, formulated a law that has been practically universally accepted by all scientists. Although Clausius applied the law only to the world, it has since been extended to the whole universe; in this form the law is: *The entropy of the universe goes to a maximum.*

Entropy means the run-down condition of the universe. When entropy should get to a maximum the entire universe will be as dead as the proverbial "door nail." Our earth and everything on it will have been frozen stiff. Any form of life would be impossible.

Let us illustrate the change of entropy by a study of light and heat. For instance, the earth is receiving fabulous quantities of heat from the sun especially, energy in the form of light which changes into heat as soon as it is absorbed by the surface of the earth. Yet the earth intercepts only a very, very, very small part of the total energy perpetually going away from all sides of the sun.

Where does the rest of the energy go? Most of it is presumably lost in the outer bounds of space. In other words, the entropy of the sun is on its way to a maximum, when it will be dead and cold. The earth is also radiating heat at a rapid rate. When its heat is not renewed by the sun, earth's energy will run down rapidly. Its entropy will increase to a maximum and it will freeze up.

To further illustrate the tendency of entropy to increase on the surface of the earth let us note how it increases in the natural and man-made processes here. The only way we can use heat in a heat-engine for work in running machinery is to begin by using a heated gas or liquid at high temperatures and discharging it at the resulting low temperature when it has done its work. The natural tendency of heat is to flow from high temperatures to low temperatures. When it all gets to a uniformly low temperature its entropy will be at a maximum and it will be unavailable for any more work.

Another illustration of entropy going to a maximum is in the case of water and water power here on earth. Water naturally flows down hill. If there should be no more heat from the sun to evaporate the ocean and cause winds to carry the moisture up to the mountain tops, all of the water will soon have run down to sea level where it will be at its maximum entropy, and there could be no more water power. Energy can be useful only when it is not at maximum entropy. These few samples illustrate the general tendency for all things to go to the state of maximum entropy.

The reality of the situation as of now is that the sun and the other stars have not run down. The earth, fortunately for us, has not frozen up. *Hence the universe has not always been in existence.* If it had been in existence since eternity, its entropy would have had time to reach a maximum, and the universe would now be dead.

The only other possibility is for the universe to have been created. Creation of a universe out of nothing is infinitely beyond anything and everything but an omniscient and omnipotent God. There can be no other theory and no other explanation.

Here is another situation that *demand*s that there be an all-wise and all-powerful God. We have nothing to fear for the future of the universe. our God will sustain it for the forward end of eternity.

Biblical Sayings About Creation

“I have made the earth, and created man upon it: I, *even* my hands, have stretched out the heavens, and all their host have I commanded.”¹⁴

“Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their host by number: he calleth them all by names, by the greatness of his might, for that he is strong in power: not one faileth.”¹⁵

God knows all of the untold billions of stars by their individual names. How many stars do you know?

“By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth.

“For he spake and it was done; he commanded and it stood fast.”¹⁶

There are 71 verses in the Bible that say or imply that God created the heavens and the earth.¹⁷ From the large number of verses in the Bible where the same facts are stated, God must have seen that at sometime this fact would have to be emphasized. Haven't we reached that time now?

The governments controlling over half of the peoples of the earth are self-pronounced atheists. Not believing in the existence of God, naturally they cannot believe he created anything. The rest of the peoples of the world are divided into raw heathen, who are devil appeasing; God-centered, but not Christ-centered religions such as Jews, Mohammedans, Hindus, Buddhists, Shintoists, and Confucianists; and the Christ-centered Christians.

Even the intelligentsia of the nominal Christian nations are largely evolutionary atheists. And the result is that, although the nations are said to be Christian nations, so many people are not even approximately living up to the teachings of Christ that many of the heathen peoples think Christianity is a joke. If there ever was a time when belief in God, the creator, was needed now is the time.

Modern Theories of Cosmology

To illustrate the confusion in the minds of a great many modern intellectuals, let us review what is being written about modern theories of cosmology.

“Cosmology is defined as that branch of philosophy that concerns itself with the origin and general structure of the universe; its parts, elements, and laws, especially with such characteristics as space, time, causality, and freedom.”¹⁸

Doctor Thomas H. Leith in an article entitled “Modern Scientific Cosmogonies” has summarized the writings of cosmologists beginning with Einstein.¹⁹

Leith commented on twenty two cosmologists and their theories. In order to get some idea as to what they are saying we must go back to elementary physics.

In sound there is a principle called Doppler's Principle. If a sounding body emitting a definite pitch and a listener were both stationary, the listener would hear the correct pitch. If the sounding body were moving away from the stationary listener, or if the listener were moving away from the stationary sounding body, or if they were both moving away from each other,

the listener would hear a lower pitch from what he heard when they were both stationary.

On the other hand, if the sounding body were moving toward the stationary listener, or if the listener were moving toward the stationary source of sound, or if they were both moving toward each other, the listener would hear a higher pitch than when they were both stationary.

Astronomers have applied Doppler's Principle to light. Light given off by any of the chemical elements when heated to incandescence, when passed through a spectroscope, appears as colored lines at definite places on the scale of the instrument. These lines are characteristic of the element being heated. No other element can produce these characteristic lines.

Now if we choose a definite line to study and point a telescope-spectroscope combination to one side of the sun's disc, the line will be shifted toward the violet or high frequency end of the spectrum. Yet if we point the instruments toward the other side of the sun's disc, this line will be shifted toward the red or low frequency end of the spectrum. Applying Doppler's Principle to the situation the astronomer takes this to mean that the sun is rotating on its axis (i.e., one side is approaching and the other receding).

When the telescope-spectroscope combination is directed toward different stars, in some cases the line is shifted one way and in other cases it is shifted in the opposite direction. This is taken to mean that some stars are approaching us and some going away.

When pointed at some stars the lines appear to be shifted both ways at the same time. This is interpreted to mean that we are looking at a spectroscopic double star in which two stars are rotating about a common center. The amounts of the shifts are changing all the time; and, when the two stars are moving at right angles to the line of sight in passing each other, there is no shift.

When the spectra of a large number of stars is studied critically there is a residue of "red shift" on all the stars. This is interpreted to mean that the universe is expanding. The great mystery in this situation is that the farther away a galaxy is the faster it seems to be receding. Thus the most distant galaxies are receding at enormous velocities. This red shift is one of the most difficult phenomena for cosmologists to explain.

Einstein and his followers built their universe on the general theory of relativity. In order to keep his theory mathematically consistent, Einstein introduced what he called a "cosmic constant." Since there was no way of determining the value of the cosmic constant, which could be

positive, zero, or negative, the theory was not complete.

Einstein's universe was static and made up of curved space. It took no note of the "red shift" so it didn't have to explain what happens when the retreating galaxies reach the outer boundaries of space. Our question might be, Will the receding galaxies spend the rest of eternity running around the boundary fence like pigs trying to get out of a field?

Following Einstein and his immediate successors was a group who advocated the "Big Bang" theory. They postulated the universe as beginning with a gob of energy, which exploded as soon as formed and then progressed to the present situation. They have no explanation of how the gob of energy happened to be, and what would be the final outcome. Their theory accounted for the "red shift," but not what would become of the billions of expanding galaxies. Their picture was ragged at both ends.

Then there was a group who postulated a pulsating universe. In this view, when the expanding galaxies get to the outer bounds of space they "reverse their field" and start back to the beginning gob of energy from which they started. This process would be the end of any life on the planets. From the starting point the process was supposed to repeat the explosion or "Big Bang."

These theorists have few explanations based on accepted scientific laws, especially as to what "shoed" the galaxies back from outer space, wherever that may be. This theory violates Newton's Second Law. The galaxies are thought of as accelerating without an applied force; and then, they are assumed to be stopped and turned back without any opposing force. Such speculations forget reality entirely.

The last the most modern of the mental cosmologists is represented by Bondi, Gold, and Hoyle. They postulate what is known as the "steady state" theory. This theory assumes that matter is created near the center of the universe and destroyed at the outer bounds of space. (Editor's Note: Hoyle has recently abandoned the steady state theory.)

Such a scheme violates the law of conservation of mass and energy at both ends of the route. If it could work at all God would have to be on the job at each end of this one way traffic to create and destroy mass and in the middle to speed up the galaxies. However, the proponents seem to ignore God.

Dr. Leith points out that these men are in some difficulty. Naturally, to most scientists their theory doesn't make sense. Dr. Leith also says the Einstein-deSitter, Lemaître, Dirac, and

Milne models seem rather untenable, This is a great understatement.

This discussion of man's cosmogonies reminds us of a Biblical verse:

"Then I beheld all the work of God, that a man cannot find out the work that is done under the sun: because though a man labour to seek it out, yet he shall not find it." (Eccl. 8:17).

None of these cosmologists ever mention God or God's word. It is a reasonable assumption that they have no place for God in their thinking; or that they do not believe in God. In God's word there is a verse especially for these men: "The fool bath said in his heart: There is no God—"

Orderliness and Design in the Universe Indicates the Existence of God

Another host of facts that point to an infinitely intelligent and powerful God is the orderliness of the universe, its governing laws, and the design in his creations.

If I showed an atheist or most evolutionists my watch, and told him that it just evolved, that it was formed by no greater intelligence than the laws of chance guiding the evident forces of nature such as gravity, lightning, wind, erosion, sound, light, electricity, and chemical reaction he would reply: "Impossible, unthinkable, preposterous." He would be absolutely correct.

Yet most evolutionists seems to think that "living machines," which are infinitely more complex than a watch, evolved under the guidance of chance working on these same natural influences.

When the wheel of a watch wears out the watch is useless unless an intelligent being replaces the worn out wheel. Chance couldn't do it. A similar situation exists with any other man-made machine. For instance, if a TV tube burns out, the machine is useless until an intelligent person puts in a new tube. These two examples illustrate a universal rule with man-made machines.

On the other hand, the God-made "living machines" can renew parts within the limits that God has set. If a starfish loses an arm, it can grow another. If lightning breaks the top off a fir tree, it can grow a new top.

Furthermore God-planned and designed living things can even adjust themselves to an unfavorable environment, which a man-made watch cannot do. Animals grow longer fur in a colder climate. Birds migrate when it begins to get colder in the Arctic. The Arctic hare and the ptarmigan change their coats to the protective white to match the snow. Deer also change their coats to match the different environments of

summer and winter. These are just a few of hundreds of similar adjustments.

An honest consideration of the laws of chemistry, physics, and biology all point to the existence of God. There is no other sensible way to account for these laws. A superintelligence had to make the universe and the forces and laws that run it.

Is Time of the Essence?

Sometimes a lawyer in making a contract uses the expression: "Time is of the essence." This expression represents the predicament of the evolutionist. For him: Time is of the essence.

All of the many processes postulated by the evolutionary theory that do not take place to a noticeable extent in historical time are assumed to take place in millions or billions of years. A great deal of time and effort has been expended by many scientists on determining the age of the earth. Why is the age of the earth so important to them? The answer to this question is that evolutionists want more time.

When first the geologists began to date the earth by such methods as the rate that sediment is being carried to the Gulf of Mexico by the Mississippi River, or the time it took the salt to accumulate in the ocean to its present concentration, and a number of similar methods, the results came out in the order of magnitude of a few hundred thousand years. This wasn't nearly enough time for the evolutionists. But when the radioactive dating came out with results of two or three billion years they rejoiced.

Now the evolutionary claim is clear: governed by the laws of chance, life began in a primordial slime two to four billion years ago and evolved to man as its crowning achievement. Theistic evolutionists use God to guide the process, but the extremists try to do away with God, or at least to ignore him completely. Let us consider a simpler situation than living animals and check the logic of the Evolutionary Theory. Let us describe the following to an evolutionist.

A Chance for Chance

There is a dump outside a modern large city. Scattered around this dump are steel, aluminum, glass, plastic, and other materials needed to make an automobile. The laws of chance and time are fully working there. Gravity still functions. Perhaps lightning strikes once in a while; at least there is a little static electricity around. Cohesion, adhesion, and surface tension are available, Newton's three laws of motion still operate here. The laws of macro-physics (dealing with visible things) all apply. The laws of micro-physics and the laws of chemistry still work.

If we allow one hundred years, a thousand years, or one hundred thousand years an automobile will not be formed on this city dump. Would you say that if we allow two billion years, a brand new automobile would come rolling out of that city dump? I think not. Unguided by intelligent planning, time is destructive and not constructive.

Evolution theorists may argue that automobile analogies do not apply to the origin of living things. Yet ultimately the evolutionary theory must start with non-living matter, so the analogy is quite valid.

Even today we cannot make living organisms from non-living matter in spite of great advances in chemistry, physics, and biology. This is true even with help from the most highly educated and trained scientists. Without God, it is unthinkable two billion years ago. It would have to have been "spontaneous generation." Spallanzani, Pasteur, and others long ago proved that macro- and micro-spontaneous generation are impossible. Now, however, God-less evolutionists want us to believe in ultramicro-spontaneous generation.

About four decades ago Dr. Jacques Loeb of the University of California discovered a way to force development of a certain animal ovum without a male sperm. This was heralded with great acclaim by some popular scientific writers, who like to proclaim the unbelievable as fact so as to have the appeal of science fiction. They hinted most strongly that this was almost the synthesis of life, which was just around the corner. However, the furor was short lived and soon "blew over."

And Now the DNA Code

Now has come the cracking of the DNA code meaning that biochemists have discovered compounds which influence inheritance of characteristics. Once again some popularizing semi-fiction journalists of science are suggesting, or at least hinting, that we are on the verge of choosing the inheritance characteristics we want in animals and plants and even man; that just around the corner will come the production of "Super-Man." Real scientists know such wishful thinking is foolishness and always will be foolishness,

True, synthesis of an amino acid that can reproduce itself has been hinted as one of the first steps in the evolutionary sequence. But every sensible biologist knows that a self-reproducing molecule is not a living cell. The living cell is infinitely more complex than a self-producing amino acid. Even if the self-producing molecule should have happened in some highly improbable way, two billion years ago, it would have required many miracles to get it to the stage of the first biological cell.

A more extensive discussion of the problem of man trying to create life was given by Dr. Paul A. Zimmerman in the 1964 *Annual* of the Creation Research Society, page 13.

If the chemist should synthesize the first self-producing cell from the inorganic elements, he would have to use a large number of reactions carried out under carefully thought-out and carefully controlled conditions; most of such conditions could not be produced in unguided nature, especially in the sequence that they would have to have.

Although not very vocal on the subject, many of the extreme evolutionists are undoubtedly atheists. One reason for dating the earth is that all their dates are inconsistent with the Bible. Then they reason that, if the Bible does not support their interpretation of science, the Bible is not true. In turn if the Bible is not true, it is not the inspired word of God, hence there is no God. We would remind such persons to read again Psalms 14:1.

Position of Theistic Evolutionists

The theistic evolutionists' position is very little better than that of avowed atheists. They have to take a stand inconsistent with some of the main teachings of the Bible; such as:

(1) Bible: God created a perfect man and woman in one day. Theistic Evolutionist: God created a protein molecule two billion years ago which eventually evolved into modern man.

(2) Bible: Man sinned and fell from his perfect estate. Theistic Evolutionist: Man always evolved upward, and never fell.

(3) Bible: Christ, the Son of God, died to redeem man. Theistic Evolutionist: Man, having never fallen, didn't need redemption, so there was no need for Christ.

(4) Bible: Unregenerate man is getting more sinful. Theistic Evolutionist: Man is getting better and better.

Does history show that man is getting better and better? Few men have been worse than Hitler. This man attempted a cold-blooded extermination of the Jews. This took place not in the Dark Ages, but in the highly civilized twentieth century by the leader of one of the most highly civilized countries.

Was there ever anybody in the past who equaled Stalin and other communists, who murdered millions of their fellow citizens simply because they differed politically from his own? Or has anything in previous history of mankind ever been worse than in the Belgian Congo where modern savages killed innocent whites, who had come there to help the natives, and ate their benefactors? This happened in the year 1964. Such atrocities were done by beings representing some of the latest models of the assumed long evolutionary line.

Of course better examples of men can be found than we have just cited, but they are better due to the Christian influence of God's instructions in the Bible. If all men kept the ten commandments of God's eternal law and lived by the Golden Rule what a different world this would be!

Theistic evolutionists are trying to make the modern interpretations of some scientific observations compatible with the Bible by interpreting the latter so liberally that anything is permissible. To use an old cliché, they are putting the cart before the horse. Practically, they are saying that if God's word does not agree with current scientific theories they will have to make it fit the theories. Why not change the theories to fit God's word? Do these persons have more faith in man than they have in God?

A Question to Ponder

This leaves us with a question to ponder. Why do the interpretations of some scientific observations appear to be so far apart from some of the most obvious interpretations of scripture? This is not a question that can be satisfactorily answered in anything short of a book-length manuscript.

Any short answer of this question might imply dishonesty on the part of many scientists. This is not necessarily the case. When a person gets started on any line of belief it is very hard to change him.

If a person is born into a family of Democrats, politically he is most likely to be a Democrat, not because he has studied all political philosophies, and concluded on the evidence that the Democrats had the correct politics, but because he got started that way.

If one is born into a Catholic family he is likely to be a Catholic, not because he has studied all of the religions critically, and concluded the Catholic religion is the best, but just because his parents thought so. As a child he felt that what his parent did was right.

Likewise, if a student in college, or even in the high school, studies under an instructor who *believes* in evolution, he is most likely to interpret every scientific observation to agree with the evolutionary philosophy.

To illustrate what we mean, in Monument Valley there is a track in the sandstone that looks exactly like a bear track. A friend showed the track to a man of the U. S. Geological Survey, and asked him what kind of a track it was. His reply was: "It looks like a bear track, but knowing that there were no bears in existence when that strata was laid down, I know it cannot be a bear track. It must be the track of a sloth."

This man was no doubt honest in his conclusions, but his testimony may be hiding a key fact that disputes that geological sequence and ages of the strata.

We realize that we have not met all of the stock arguments of the evolutionists directly. Space does not permit. However, your attention is directed to continuing publications of the Creation Research Society where this is being done.

References

- ¹Isaiah 7:14.
²Matthew 1:20-24.
³Psalms 22:18.
⁴John 19:23,24.
⁵II Timothy 3:16.
⁶II Peter 1:16-21.
⁷Deuteronomy 33:27.
⁸Psalms 90:2.
⁹Isaiah 57:15.
¹⁰I Timothy 1:17.
¹¹Psalms 102:27.
¹²Psalms 147:5.
¹³Isaiah 55:9.
¹⁴Isaiah 45:12.
¹⁵Isaiah 40:26.
¹⁶Psalms 33:6,9.
¹⁷Genesis 1:1; 1:7; 2:1; Exodus 20:11; 31:17; I Samuel 2:8; II Kings 19:15; I Chronicles 16:26; II Chronicles 2:12; Nehemiah 9:6; Job 9:5-9; 26:7; 38:4; 38:6; Psalms 8:3,4; 19:1; 33:9; 89:11; 90:2; 95:5; 96:5; 102:25; 104:5; 105:5; 121:2; 124:8; 134:3; 136:5; 136:6,7; 146:6; 148:5; Proverbs 3:19; 16:4; Isaiah 40:26; 40:28; 42:5; 43:20; 45:12; 45:18; Jeremiah 4:23; 10:12; 27:5; 32:17; 33:2; 51:15; Amos 4:13; 5:8; 9:6; Jonah 1:9; Zechariah 12:1; Mark 13:19; John 1:3; 1:10; Acts 14:15; 17:24; Romans 1:20; I Corinthians 2:7; 8:6; Ephesians 3:9; Colossians 1:16; Hebrews 1:2; 1:10; 2:10; 11:3; II Peter 3:5; Rev. 4:11; 10:6; 14:7.
¹⁸*The American College Dictionary*.
¹⁹*Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation*, September 1964, p. 73.
²⁰Psalms 14:1.

ERRATA

Corrections in the previous October, 1966, Quarterly are stated below. The editors regret any inconvenience.

(a) On page 7, substitute "n" for the number, 77, in the second line of the article abstract in italics.

(b) On page 11, substitute "appears" for word "appear" in the sixth line of the fourth full paragraph in the left column.

(c) On page 12, add this line: "spiny cactus." to the second full paragraph in the right column.

(d) On page 16, substitute "sound" for "round" in the top line in the left column.

(e) On page 17, in the last paragraph before the "Summary," insert: "during digestion are driven into the mid-gut by" after the second line of that paragraph.