

SCIENCE IS NOW PROVING THE GENESIS CREATION ACCOUNT IS CORRECT

By JOHN J. GREBE, *Physical Chemist*
Midland, Michigan

The person who feel the need of remaining a child of God often faces the incompatible viewpoints of the evolutionists and creationists. In this age it is difficult for one to question an almost universally held theory like evolution when it is purported to come from the Book of Science, even if it does conflict with the Book of God. It is not surprising that many, including theologians who know little about natural science, find it expedient to attempt to resolve these contradictions by putting God into the picture through various interpretations using the term theistic evolution. To me this compromise fails. Man is still sinful and in need of grace. The closer one lives with Christ, the more thankful one is for grace. Surely it is not the fault of God's incomplete "evolution" that pride and depravity are rampant. The evidence of God's Law written in the conscience of each person, both before and after Moses, is clearer than we want to admit.

It is the thesis of this short paper that Christians need no longer make peace with science in regard to the Genesis story of God's creation; that, indeed, science is now proving the ancient account to be right. In support of this we offer some recent developments and are willing to predict that many more will come as soon as it is no longer nonsense to point out the impossible odds against chance evolution.

During the Twenty's, when the impact of the principle of indeterminism in physics became evident, when the great difference between our understanding of the action of the laws of chance variations and the survival of the fittest and what must be the Great Cause of the immensity of the creation task became clearer, the evolutionary view became more untenable by anyone who tried to be "scientific." This is well-developed by Dr. Pollard in his book *Chance and Providence*. Recent DNA studies show a factor of 10^{14} against it. Dr. J. T. Jukes (p. 227, June 1963, *American Scientist*) points out, "There can exist about 4×10^{87} different nucleic acids." The admission of this fact has become quite common in recent years, even among those who take the materialistic point of view.

The materialists feel safe in their position because they "know" that the age of the earth and the six days of creation are not likely to be the six thousand years, and the six- twenty-four-hour days that some people have ascribed to statements about the Bible. However, science does not "know" the age of the earth. This can be estimated only if one assumes a uniform rate of change of all the factors involved, which is now known to be a most unlikely situation. God specifically defined the period of

light as day, and the dark as night while darkness was on the face of the deep before the sun was evident. This was during the first night of any suitable length of time. Currently both the untenability of the idea of uniform rates of geologic changes and the impossible odds against chance evolution of the DNA code are becoming matters of known fact.

Conditions of cosmic radiation alone are constantly changing. Even man has been able to affect the earth's magnetic, electrostatic, and radioactive surroundings with high altitude H bombs. So much so that evolutionistic scientists around the world are advocating stopping all tests in and above the atmosphere. *Their fear of increased mutation due to radioactivity belies their faith in evolution by mutation better than any other argument.*

In the days when the single cell of protoplasm was considered as the elementary item, evolution might conceivably have occurred in the two billion years postulated as the age of the earth, granting the assumption that adaptive mutations can be accumulated by natural selection. Now the cell has been found to be so complex that the longest time that anybody wants to ascribe to the age of the universe or the Earth is just plain trivial compared to the time that it would take to make one living cell from exactly the right raw materials under the most ideal conditions and with a frequency of, say, one per second for assembly and test and evaluation by the survival of the fittest.

If somebody thinks that evolution worked that fast, I would say "fine." "Now how far do you think you might get by that process?" He could not even show the most trivial chance of producing one single DNA molecule with 10^{87} varieties possible that would be able to match the RNA at the same time by any kind of a process even conceding stable planes as proven substratas assumed to be available at all times. After all, 10^{17} second is all that the maximum age of the earth provides and what is that against 10^{87} ?

Nothing could show and ridicule present advanced concepts of evolution any better than an article by George Gaylord Simpson, February 21, 1964, in *Science*. It honestly presents the problems of life on other planets even though Calvin and others have agreed there could well be one hundred million planets with exactly the right conditions such as found on our earth for such evolution to occur. The last column on page 771 starts pointing out the improbabilities in a qualitative way. Anyone willing to put even the most benign and condescending quantities into the picture and still insisting on evolution would merely have to infer

as Simpson does, that somehow the impossible must have occurred on earth because we're here.

All this neglects the many additional facts and details such as the replacement of 37 of the amino acids in our DNA with others after birth being built into the "memory" of the original DNA; nor, does it in any way even infer a mechanism by which the feedback on page 773 at the bottom of the middle column can possibly occur the first time when there is nothing to do the feeding into the new animate matter at the correct composition.

The Mossbauer effect, electron spin resonance, and the nuclear magnetic resonance phenomena all show that living organisms are not only a grand organ with billions of stops, but that organ is playing new and original music continually in the form of detectable electromagnetic waves. When I say original music, it is like no other music as generated anywhere else before; not even in your parents. It is very distinct and different.

One can ask any evolutionist to specify his time interval for evolutionary production and elimination by the process of the survival of the fittest, multiply by all the carbon on the earth available to the biosphere and divided into the greatest age that they're willing to stretch their imagination to, and reach the non-sensical result that so-called scientists accept. All of their thinking was based on single cells being a unit. Going back beyond this one point changes all concepts of complexity as pointed out by inference (not by numbers) in the Simpson article. Combining this with the relatively short-sighted article on the 28th of February, 1962, *Science* article by Gordon McDonald on the Deep Structure of Continents, from a uniformitarian point of view leaves one with even more confidence.

However, the H bombs are trivial in proportion to natural energy sources. Even the increase in the combustion of fossil fuels makes the carbon dioxide in the air a major influence for nonuniformity. Well' reasoned arguments indicate enough warming up due to the greenhouse effect to melt the polar ice caps and flood the earth 250 feet above sea level. The photosynthetic processes of plant growth were optimized at seven times the present CO₂ concentration. What would a still bigger change in the amount of water vapor in the air, or ice in orbit do to all this?

Man's lack of knowledge of the natural sciences has kept him from being able to comprehend the

meaning of much of what was written in the Bible, particularly the difficult passages in the Revelations of St. John. Successive new scientific facts are still refuting the so-called proofs of errors in the Bible based on evolutionary science. Even the *fall of man*, the *most crucial point at issue*, can now be understood as a purely physical phenomena exactly as recounted. Since Adam and Eve were "one flesh" in the fullest sense of the word, having exactly identical chromosomes, they felt and thought "at one" with one another," possibly until chemically "poisoned" by the forbidden fruit. The delicate balance of sensory structure that makes possible the mutual sharing of one another's senses, feelings, and emotions, known to exist between identical twins, might be diminished or destroyed by many naturally grown poisons. Perhaps this is why Adam and Eve felt separate, naked, and different from one another after eating the forbidden fruit. No wonder we find it hard to grasp the significance of and the awesome loneliness experienced by Christ on the cross, saying: "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken me?"

Since then only the most fortunate and unusual circumstances have produced genetically optimum progeny at any one place or time by normal processes. Virgin birth, with its attendant perfection of structure, perfect coordination and elimination of inner stresses, observed repeatedly under positive control during the breeding of laboratory animals, must have occurred also for humans. Why should God not have granted this help to Christ to help Him bear the enormous grief of our blindness?

The lack of scales for weighing spiritual force does not leave the spiritual life out as a fact of nature. The most potent evidences, however, are the fruits of the spirit. The unselfish love for God and all His creation by redeemed sinners, who have been privileged to serve Him throughout human history, have left a heritage impressive to all who want to study history. Is there a compromise that does not deny human experience and the facts of history? Can faith in God the Creator prevail? Could it all have been a mistake, and should we be reduced to living with and on the level of achievements of the materialists? Could the evolutionists be so right that we may look forward to the survival of the strongest, fittest, and most cunning materialists?