



**SIX DAYS,
DARWIN
OR BOTH?**

**THE
ORIGINS DEBATE
WHY, WHAT
AND SO WHAT**

Oliver Bayley

SIX DAYS, DARWIN, OR BOTH?

**THE ORIGINS DEBATE
WHY, WHAT
AND SO WHAT**

Oliver Bayley

**© Faithful Sheep Ministries
www.fsmins.org**

info@fsmins.org

**ISBN 978-1-905308-27-2
Digital Download Edition**

**(HOME PRINTING IS PERMITTED
FOR INDIVIDUAL OR HOME GROUP USE.
Otherwise no part of this Publication may be copied, stored, retrieved etc
without the prior written permission of the Publisher)**

CONTENTS

Introduction	Page 4
Chapter One - Words, Meanings and Definitions	6
Chapter Two - Belief System One Concerning Our Origins: Early Genesis	10
Chapter Three - Belief System Two Concerning Our Origins: (a) The Big Bang (b) Darwinian Macro-Evolution	12
Chapter Four - The Clashes of the Titans	15
Chapter Five - Two Attempts at Compromise: (a) The Gap Theory (b) Theistic Evolution	23
Chapter Six - The Clashes of the Titans - Progress Report	29
Chapter Seven - A Wake-Up Call	33
Chapter Eight - The Big Bang - <i>Scientifically</i> Impossible	36
Chapter Nine - Darwinian Macro-Evolution - <i>Scientifically</i> Impossible	42
Chapter Ten - Evidence for Old or Young, Slow or Quick	51
Chapter Eleven - The "Missing Link" and Ape-Man Fossils	68
Chapter Twelve - The Genesis Flood	72
Chapter Thirteen - The Closing Headlines	92
To Take You Further	94
Appendix 1 Graph of Patriarch's Ages	96
Appendix 2 Some Questions for use in the Debate	98
Index	101

INTRODUCTION

Welcome to "Six Days, Darwin or Both?". This book is one of the titles produced by Faithful Sheep Ministries.

The aim of Faithful Sheep Ministries is to strengthen and encourage our fellow Christians in this age of challenge and confusion. We particularly have in mind those Christians who lack Bible teaching on a regular basis, but who love the Lord and His Word, and who seek to serve Him as His "faithful sheep" in this needy world.

We aim to offer timely Bible teaching and reflection through a variety of ministries. Our theological stance is one of biblical orthodoxy, centred on the Historic Christian Creeds and the 39 Articles of the Church of England.

The Director of Faithful Sheep Ministries is the Rev. Oliver Bayley, a retired Anglican minister with extensive teaching and pastoral experience. Oliver and his wife Judith have a grown-up family, and live, work and worship in Southampton, England.

Our hope is that the Lord will graciously use this book to bless and encourage you in His service.

-----.

Slightly over two hundred years ago, in the month of May 1809, a child was born who in his adult life was to exert profound, long-lasting influence on scientific thought and method around the world.

The boy was Charles Darwin. His ideas were expressed in his seminal work "On the Origin of Species", published in 1859, and our views of the world and our origins have never been the same since.

In this particular book, "Six Days, Darwin or Both?", we examine the nature and claims of two Belief Systems that are set before us all concerning our origins. The first Belief System is that given in the

early chapters of the Book of Genesis; the second Belief System is Darwinian Evolution, with its fellow-traveller, the "Big Bang".

Please note that "Six Days, Darwin or Both?" is not primarily a technical book, and is not written by a technical author but by a minister of the Gospel, whose main concern is to "feed the people with knowledge and understanding" (Jeremiah 3.15).

The author does not therefore give individual sources for each point made. That being said, the various facts and figures within these pages can be easily followed up via the websites and books shown in the "To Take You Further" section at the end of this book.

The very existence of such facts and figures demonstrates that what we can call "the Genesis / Evolution debate" remains "a live issue", much to the surprise of many within the Church and beyond. Not surprisingly, the implications of this debate are far-reaching.

At the very least we trust that this book will serve as an "eye-opener" for those Christians who have never really considered the implications of this debate before.

A further practical point is relevant here. There is often some overlap between the various theories, viewpoints and pieces of evidence when considering the Genesis / Evolution debate. This has led at times in this book to some repetition of the most significant points. I have left this repetition in the text to preserve the logical flow of the chapters, and in the hope that having the main points mentioned more than once as the arguments unfold will help with remembering just what those main points are.

Many seem to assume that the case for Darwinian evolution is now so strong that there is no point in trying to uphold the Genesis creation account as being historical, because that is what we have been told at school, university, church and in the media.

As we shall see in these pages, the grounds for that widespread assumption are not nearly as solid as many people think.

Oliver Bayley,
Southampton, England.

Chapter One

Words, Meanings and Definitions

A few basic definitions and distinctions are necessary before we get properly started.

We will normally refer to the basic debate as the Genesis / Evolution debate. By that we are meaning the early chapters of Genesis (Chapters 1 - 11) on the one hand, and Darwinian "macro-evolution", which will be defined in a moment, on the other.

Those supporting the Genesis message, of a Creator and a recent 6-day God-achieved creation, are referred to as "creationists". Those supporting Darwin's Theory of Evolution (also referred to perhaps as Darwinism or Darwinianism) are referred to as "evolutionists".

Darwin's Theory of Evolution does not attempt to explain the origins of life itself, but concerns only the *development* of life after life had first arisen. We therefore also include on the Darwinian side of the debate "the Big Bang theory", which attempts to tell us how everything started off, including life itself.

For ease of reference we will abbreviate the early chapters of Genesis to GEN, the Big Bang to BB and Darwinian macro-evolution to DME from now on, with BBDME referring to them both.

When we come on to consider the Genesis Flood, we will use "flood" for any flood, and "Flood" for the Genesis Flood.

"Micro-Evolution" and "Macro-Evolution"

We must also clearly define at this point a vitally important distinction, between what is termed "**micro-evolution**" and "**macro-evolution**",

There is no doubt or debate about the existence of micro-evolution – for it is plain for all to see.

Micro-evolution refers to changes, adaptations and variations *within species*.

Micro-evolution is in the true sense of the word "scientific", for it is observable and repeatable, and this is what Darwin saw on the Galapagos Islands during his famous world voyage on HMS Beagle.

The various finches really had developed different beaks and diets and so on, because of the particular environments in which they lived. Darwin noted these differences, and drew correct scientific conclusions from them.

Here before his eyes, and ours, is "micro-evolution" in action. We see that it is all about **adaptation and variation** of life-forms in the light of the environments in which they live.

Creationists have no problem at all with micro-evolution, because micro-evolution *can be seen to be true*.

But Darwin then took ***a huge leap of faith!*** On the basis of what he had *seen*, he reached out far beyond science, into the realm of theory, into the realm of *belief*.

For Darwin proposed that because we see ***small changes within species*** – **micro-evolution** – these changes must be a tiny part of a much greater, longer process involving ***massive changes across species, that is, macro-evolution***.

Now nobody has ever *seen* macro-evolution – its pace is simply far too slow to be observed. Nor can anybody *repeat* macro-evolution, for the same reason.

Thus macro-evolution remains pure theory. It is outside the realm of science, for it cannot be seen, and it cannot be repeated. As such, macro-evolution is *not* science; *it is BELIEF*.

This point is utterly crucial for Christian people to understand.

Macro-evolution may be a very well-founded belief, and to discover whether or not that is the case we would have to examine the

evidence carefully. But it is vital that we realise that macro-evolution will always remain in the realm of **belief** rather than in the realm of **science**.

Now see where this gets us to. **In terms of origins, we are all in the realm of belief!** Darwinian macro-evolution (DME) is one Belief System; Genesis (GEN) is another Belief System.

None of us was there, so we can never know with scientific certainty what actually happened at the very dawn of our origins.

We can selectively breed dogs till we are blue in the face (that is, speeding up micro-evolution for our own purposes), but that will never move us an inch closer to establishing that macro-evolution is a scientific fact. All we can do is weigh up the evidence before our eyes and come to conclusions as to which is the most likely Belief System to be true.

When we realise that **all** sides of this debate are in the realm of belief, suddenly the playing field is seen to be rather more level than the evolutionists like us to think.

Men like Sir David Attenborough, Professor Richard Dawkins and the author Philip Pullmann are so used to loftily dismissing any talk of a Creator God, and any adherents of "creationism" as being nutcases, that their own **beliefs** in BBDME are just assumed to be scientifically proven as true. But they are not, and they never can be so proved, or will be so proved.

"We must only teach Evolution in school Science lessons" so the argument goes, "any mention of Creationism is infantile". Do you see the sheer arrogance, and the blatant smoke-and-mirrors, of such talk? What such a person is arguing for is, "Yes to my Belief System during Science lessons – macro-evolution – but No to the other side's Belief System - creationism"!

This is not Science at all. For in Science's quest for "the Truth", all the evidence has to be weighed in the light of the various possibilities before us, as objectively as possible.

The fact is, and it is just that, a fact, micro-evolution IS Science, for it is observable and repeatable, but macro-evolution is NOT Science, and never can be or will be Science, for it is not observable or repeatable.

The Big Bang and Darwinian macro-evolution (BBDME) is a Belief System. Genesis (GEN) is another Belief System. The Genesis / Evolution debate is thus all about two competing Belief Systems, which stand or fall *on the weight of the observable evidence around us*.

Chapter Two

Belief System One Concerning Our Origins:

Early Genesis

The word "Genesis" means "beginning". In the early chapters of this book, we are given a full description of what happened in the way of "beginnings" concerning God and us, and this planet and the universe.

Here are some key points from Genesis Chapters 1 - 11:

- "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth"
- This act of creation took place by the word of God - "And God said"
- This act of creation took place over 6 days, and the clear intention of the writer is to emphasise that these were normal 24-hour days
- This act of creation took place recently, only a few thousand years ago
- This act of creation was completed and finished
- God saw all that He had made, and it was "very good"
- Man was placed at the head of this creation, entrusted with the stewardship of it
- Woman was taken from the rib of the Man, to act as "help-meet" and companion
- All living creatures were vegetarian
- Man was given freedom, but with two prohibitions to remind him of his subservience to God the Creator

- Man sinned in disobedience
- God cursed the ground, punished Adam, promised redemption through the seed of the woman, and drove Adam and Eve from Eden

- Suffering, disease, toil and death thus entered creation as a result of Man's sin
- Wickedness spread, culminating in the judgement of God on creation with the catastrophic global flood of Chapters 6 - 8, while Noah and his family and the animals in the ark were saved
- Man was told to fill the earth after the flood
- Rebellion spread once again, leading to the city and tower being built at Babel God's confusion of language, and the scattering of the peoples
- Three detailed genealogies are given, listing all the generations from Adam through to Noah and his descendants.

We see from this brief survey that these early chapters of Genesis are filled with vital information. This information simply could not be known in any other way unless it was included in this ancient book.

The message of these Genesis chapters is perfectly clear: there really is a God, and He is our Creator. He is holy and righteous, and we are all accountable to Him. Creation has been spoiled by human sin, leading to the present state we see of suffering, bloodshed and death. God in His mercy promised to Adam and Eve that He would set things right once more.

The remainder of Scripture tells how He has done just that.

Genesis 1 - 11 is the foundation on which the rest of Scripture has been built, and on which the rest of Scripture depends. It is the contention of "Six Days, Darwin or Both?" that we tinker with these foundational chapters at our peril.

Chapter Three

Belief System Two Concerning Our Origins:

- (a) The Big Bang (BB)
- (b) Darwinian Macro- Evolution (DME)

Let us now briefly remind ourselves just what Darwin's Theory of Evolution (by that we always mean macro-evolution) involves. (To explore these theories in greater technical detail, please see the end of this book for a list of resources).

Now those who believe in the linked Belief Systems of the Big Bang and macro-evolution (BBDME) fall into two broad camps.

The first camp consists of atheists, that is, **people who believe that there is no God**. Notice that an atheist is just as much a believer as someone who **does** believe in God. Atheists love to denigrate "believers" (by which they mean believers in a God) as being half-wits, while ignoring the fact that they too are believers. We all are. We have to be in such matters, because the answers to these questions will never be in the realm of proof.

So as you read further in these pages, you might like to ask yourself which belief about the origins of this earth and universe is *more likely to be true* - that the whole thing got here by itself, from Nothing (which atheists believe), or that the whole thing got here by the activity of a Creator God (which God-believers believe).

The second camp amongst the BBDME supporters consists of **believers in God AND in BBDME**. It is fair to say that this approach has become by far the most prevalent amongst western Christians these days. This Belief System says - "God exists, but He used evolution".

Hence, so this line of argument goes, there is no problem at all between what GEN tells us - that God is Creator - and what BBDME tells us - that He used a Big Bang and macro-evolution as His *method* of creation.

So in answer to the question posed in the title of this book, "Six days, Darwin or both?", the answer is a cheerful "Both!".

Problem solved eh?! Stay with it, we shall see.

We shall come to this second camp in Chapter Five. For now we shall concentrate on the first camp, whose members, as a result of these beliefs, are comfortable in their atheism.

A "Big Bang" (BB)

Though not directly a part of Darwin's thinking, the whole process starts with the origin of this universe in what can loosely be termed a "Big Bang".

This Belief System tells us that this Big Bang brought into being a mass of matter which then spread out into space from that central point of explosion, in time coming to form stars, planets and galaxies. Gradually as conditions allowed, the most basic forms of life started to evolve through natural chemical processes.

Notice that there is no mention of, or need for, a Creator God in this Belief System. We will return to consider the feasibility of the Big Bang in a later chapter.

The Evolution of Life by Darwinian Macro-Evolution (DME)

Once "life" had somehow come into being, through various chance concoctions of chemicals, the process of "natural selection" then came into play.

This meant that life forms which, by chance, had inherited features which turned out to be beneficial, survived and prospered, at the expense of weaker life forms which were not able to cope so well.

Then, by these twin processes of "natural selection" followed by the "survival of the fittest", the stronger went on from strength to strength, and the weaker died out.

Over billions of years, life-forms steadily evolved, culminating in homo sapiens.

Thus we have the diagrams, well-known in the textbooks, showing the "evolutionary tree", with its various branches – plants, fish, birds, mammals and so on - spreading forth from the main trunk and the original root. Our ultimate ancestors therefore were not the apes, but simple single-celled "things" in some sort of sea or "primordial soup".

We mentioned earlier that Darwin developed these ideas after his observations of the natural world, notably on his voyage around the world on the *Beagle* (1831-1836), which included his visit to the Galapagos Islands off the coast of Ecuador.

On those islands he observed that similar species of birds had developed particular characteristics depending on their habitat, to allow them to prosper in terms of their local environment and the food resources which they depended upon.

From these observations he proposed that all life-forms have evolved from a single source, over a very long period of time. This involved that huge leap of faith, from observation of *micro*-evolution, into the massive assumption of *macro*-evolution. He *saw* the first before his eyes, as we all do, but the second he never did see or could see.

Notice that once again, there is no mention of, or need for, a Creator God in this Belief System.

There in the proverbial nutshell is an introduction to the Big Bang theory and Darwin's Theory of Evolution (BBDME). We will return to these theories shortly.

Chapter Four

The Clashes of the Titans

Having briefly reminded ourselves of the claims made in GEN on the one hand and BBDME on the other, we now come to "the clashes of the titans".

For clearly, the Belief Systems on each side of the debate cannot both be true. Or perhaps - as many Christians believe - they can.

(If you are a Christian in that second camp we mentioned earlier, who believes that actually both systems CAN be true, by your believing in either the "Gap Theory" or "Theistic Evolution", please bear with us. We shall consider in the next chapter each of these responses to the clashes we now cover in this chapter).

Clash Number 1

We are confronted fair and square with the opening words of the Bible, Genesis 1.1 – "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth".

There is no debate within Scripture concerning these two facts – that God exists, and that He created the universe. Straightaway then, we have a clash with Darwinism in its rendering of God as superfluous in the creative process.

In GEN God is central. In BBDME, God is no longer necessary! One of the great attractions of BBDME is that it answers the age-old questions about our origins by being able to dispense with God entirely. If somebody is keen to explain how we all got here without having to allow for a Creator God, then BBDME fits the bill just perfectly.

The fact is that BBDME, to succeed, needs no God.

Clash Number 2

If there is a Creator God as the Bible bluntly informs us, then there *are* Rules – *His* Rules, whether those rules suit us or not!

Unfettered macro-evolution (DME) actually allows us to do whatever we like to further our own interests. That allowance clashes head-on with our obligations, to God our Creator, to one another, and to the other aspects of God's wonderful creation.

Is the social chaos we are seeing all around us not just one symptom of the deeply-entrenched evolutionary assumptions in our society? – that life is merely about **Me** and **Mine**, and never mind anyone else?

If there is no God, then there are **no Rules!** Macro-evolution is entirely a-moral, un-moral. With macro-evolution such concepts as Good and Bad, Right or Wrong simply do not exist. How ever could they exist? – for who is to say what is good or bad, or right or wrong?

Successful DME is not about Right, but about Might. What DME gives us is a blind, relentless process where the strong overcome the weak, and become stronger, bigger, better, brighter, and more dominant.

Clash Number 3

The processes of chance and randomness are simply not "of God" – they are not the way in which He operates or has set up His creation to operate. Instead, wherever we look, we see design, plan, beauty.

BBDME tells us there is no Mind behind all this, but it is merely the result of chance processes, some of which happened to be beneficial. GEN tells us it is the Mind of the Infinite God behind all this.

BBDME is all about **chance and randomness**. After a Big Bang, of itself, from nothing at all, some early, simple, single-celled creatures somehow developed; they happened to strike it lucky with a few advantageous genes, so they could swim faster or bite more effectively. Their dominance spread, and they passed on to their offspring these developing strengths. There is no plan here, just chance, followed by a perpetual struggle for dominance.

DME thus involves, in its very essence and from the very start, **struggle, bloodshed and death**. Going on from that, it means that ultimately all creatures that exist, including human beings, are here because of victorious struggle by those of our species who have gone before us. Today we stand on a pile of defeated corpses! – and they were defeated because of the superiority of our own species.

Now few of these implications are ever clearly spelt out, but here they all are! I trust that as Christians we are beginning to shuffle rather uncomfortably in our seats at this stage! – for we can now consider how both the *methods* and the *implications* of DME sit very awkwardly alongside scriptural statements concerning our origins.

Clash Number 4

GEN tells us that God made all living creatures "after their kind" – that is, they were all in specific groups of their own from the start.

At what level these first "kinds" existed is a matter for debate (for example, were there many types of dog at the start or just one basic pair?), but we are told quite clearly that particular *types* of living creature are ingrained within God's creation.

DME denies this, arguing that all forms of life that we see have originated from one basic single source.

Clash Number 5

The order of evolution and Genesis 1 differ significantly, posing another difficulty for those who regard the Genesis account as a theological description of evolution.

The sequence of creation in GEN is:

- The creation of light, and, by implication, the rotation of the earth on its own axis;

- then waters above and below "the firmament", that is the creation of the atmosphere and sky above the sea covering the earth itself;
- then dry land and vegetation;
- then the sun, moon and stars;
- then marine and bird life;
- then mammals, including human beings.

We note that according to this passage, Light existed before the sun, the earth is special, and human beings are special.

The sequence for DME is different:

- A Big Bang and the emergence of the features of the universe;
- then the existence of suitable gases and chemicals allowing the existence of water and the beginnings of simple life forms within the water;
- then the gradual emergence of the various branches of life – vegetation, marine creatures, amphibians, reptiles, birds and finally mammals.

Notably in BBDME, this earth is nothing special, but merely a chance speck within the vastness, where conditions just happened to allow for life to occur; and nor are human beings special, but are merely the current "top dog" amongst the pack.

Clash Number 6

Time after time we read in GEN that creation was *good*, that it was *very good*.

Did God really use evolution as His creative method, involving violence, struggle, bloodshed and death from the start? Would He

really look on His creation and pronounce all that He saw as "good"? What sort of God would that make Him? Does He delight in the horrors and cruelties of "nature" which we see all around us today?

Surely not! The Bible tells us that truly it *was* very good. It was a shalom-filled creation, at peace with God, and within itself. Something happened to change all that: that something was *human sin*.

Bloodshed and death have entered God's creation as a result of human sin – see Genesis 3. It is because of *us* that creation now finds itself in such an unhappy, twisted, violent mess.

Sir David Attenborough, in his beautifully presented programmes, is confronted in nature with its apparently-inexplicable horrors in the midst of such awe-inspiring beauty. As a result he recoils from any notion that a loving, designing God could be responsible for all this, and no doubt the great majority of people agree with him. He flatly ignores Genesis 1 and 2, which explain the beauty of God's creation, and Genesis 3 which explains its present horrors.

He takes the classic evolutionary line – which millions accept without a murmur as a result – that the way things are is the way things have always been, (a belief known as "**uniformitarianism**", which we will come to later on).

But God's Word tells us quite simply and clearly that things have *not* always been like this; and it also makes it perfectly clear that they will not always be like this.

God in His mercy in Christ is restoring His creation. He has broken the grip of sin and death at terrible cost to Himself, and is putting creation back into its original, perfect, shalom-filled state.

Clash Number 7

As part of that original state of creation which God saw as "very good" was the fact that all creatures, including human beings, were *vegetarian* (see Genesis 1. 29-30).

DME depends on a life-and-death, eat-my-neighbour-before-he-eats-me struggle from the time of the first living blob in the ocean.

But God tells us in His Word that it was only *after the Fall* of Genesis 3 that blood was shed, and that shedding of blood was done initially by God Himself. In His giving of "coats of skins" to Adam and Eve (Genesis 3. 21) we come across, by implication, the first shedding of blood as a covering for sin.

Such shedding of blood remains a crucial element within God's creation to this day. How are we redeemed? – by our accepting on our own behalf the shed blood of Jesus; it is still as simple as that.

We come across this principle after the Flood (Genesis 9.1-7), where God gave "every moving thing" to mankind for food. Hence the principle of our survival being dependent on the shedding of blood on our behalf is played out at every table where a life of a creature has been given that we might live.

Then we see it in vivid form at the time of the first Passover in Egypt, where the people of Israel were "passed over" by the avenging Lord because of blood that had been shed on their behalf (Exodus 12). This is followed by the elaborate system of sacrifice within the rituals of the Mosaic Law, and then ultimately at Calvary itself.

It is ironic that DME does get this principle of the shedding of blood on our behalf quite right, but the motives are very different.

In DME blood is shed by violence, as part of the blind struggle for dominance and survival, whereas under the Lord, blood is shed for the remission of the sins of an unholy people by the holy and perfect Creator God. Is this not another example of Satan taking a precious divine principle and twisting it for his own ends, as he so loves to do?

Clash Number 8

GEN tells us that God created the heaven and the earth in "six days", but DME needs billions of years for its evolutionary processes to function.

Much debate focuses on the Hebrew word for "day" used in Genesis 1 – "yom". When "yom" is used with a number, as it is repeatedly here, the writer is describing a 24-hour period involving one rotation of the earth on its axis.

If "Theistic Evolution" (the belief that macro-evolution has taken place, but as God's chosen method of creation - we will cover this shortly) is still to have a chance, the meaning of "yom" has to be changed to that of "vast periods". But that would involve our having to ignore the repeated usage of "yom" with a number as it occurs each time in Genesis 1 and elsewhere in Scripture.

We also have to get round the problem of the "seventh day", if "yom" represents millions of years. God rested on this seventh day – and hallowed it; here is the origin of the "sabbath" with all that it involves in the weekly rhythms of God's people. Furthermore, Adam lived through this seventh day himself, but he was only 930 years old when he died. That seventh day has to be just that – a normal day: taking it as a period of million of years simply makes no sense.

Like it or not, it is clear that the writer of this passage was meaning six literal days of 24 hours each. That may not be the end of the story, but that at least is what the writer was meaning.

Clash Number 9

The implication of Genesis 1 and 2 is that this earth was created *recently*. This is based on the creation of Adam and Eve on Day 6 of the Creation Week, and their succeeding generations which are described in minute detail in such passages as Genesis 5 and 10, and Luke 3. Do we find detailed genealogies such as these *in poems?*

DME depends on very ancient dates, for by its very nature, evolution takes billions of years to occur.

Is the earth young or old? If it is young, then DME simply cannot have happened, for there has not been the time which it requires. If it is very old, DME, in terms of the necessary timescale, is still a possibility.

Clash Number 10

The heavens and the earth were *finished* (Genesis 2.1). DME has it that evolution is still going on – this blind, inexorable, wonderful progress to Bigger and Brighter and Better – for the winners!

But in GEN we are told that all within creation was finished: that therefore nothing new is being created, it is merely being re-worked.

A baby for example is a wonderful new being, but the baby is only made of existing "stuff", a re-working of what was already present in God's creation. That is not to take anything away from the wonders of conception and childbirth, but rather to observe this is not a new "creation" in the literal sense of the word.

We see from these ten "clashes of the titans" that there is indeed a deep chasm between the two Belief Systems, of GEN and BBDME.

Before we consider the many significant consequences of this clash, we are going to deal with two popular "compromise solutions" adopted by many Christians, in a bid to overcome the chasm.

Chapter Five

Two Attempts at Compromise: The Gap Theory and Theistic Evolution

Many Christians have long sensed just what a challenge to orthodox biblical belief is posed by DME.

But probably some of us reading these words are thinking "Big deal! Why on earth do we Christians have to get involved with all this stuff? There is no clash at all between GEN and BBDME. The solution is perfectly simple, and perfectly obvious".

That is a common Christian reaction when confronted with BBDME today. Even if you are not thinking along such lines yourself at this stage, you probably know many Christians who do take this line.

Christians who believe there is no clash between the two Belief Systems before us usually base their belief on either of two explanations, namely what are termed "the Gap Theory" (we will abbreviate to GT) and "Theistic Evolution" (abbreviated to TE).

Each of these explanations seems to offer an attractive solution to the clash between Genesis and Evolution. They apparently offer a reasonable compromise, allowing Christians to have both their scientific cake (the acceptance of BBDME) and their theological eating of it (that GEN upholds the belief that God is the Creator, but that He obviously used evolution as His *method* of creation).

We will now briefly consider each of these compromise positions. If the evidence in support of either the Gap Theory (GT) or Theistic Evolution (TE) is convincing, then we really can all calm down and take the view that there is no significant clash between GEN and BBDME.

The Gap Theory (GT)

The "Gap Theory" was first publicised in 1817 by Thomas Chalmers, an evangelical theologian who was sincerely trying to "square the circle" between what Genesis 1 and 2 tell us on the one hand, and what geologists and palaeontologists were saying on the other.

(We note that the Gap Theory precedes Darwin's book "On the Origin of Species" by more than forty years, showing that Darwin was in no way "brand new" in his thinking. His particular contribution was to pull together, at a timely moment, the various strands of scientific thinking concerning evolution, by providing a coherent *mechanism* for evolution, based on "natural selection" and the "survival of the fittest". Darwin was the first man to come up with convincing-looking answers as to the "How?" of evolution).

GT argues as follows:

- Genesis 1.1 affirms the basic central truth, that in the beginning, God indeed create the heavens and the earth.
- Between the words of Genesis 1.1 and 1.2 there then comes a vast, unmentioned gap of time, perhaps lasting billions of years.
- During that gap all sorts of events occurred on the earth and beyond, such as long geological ages, perhaps great floods producing many fossils, the age of the dinosaurs, the fall of Lucifer, and so on. The gap can be as long as required, so as to include everything which does not seem to fit into the Genesis timescale.
- From Genesis 1.2 onwards, our attention is then focussed on the latest phase of creation, that is a *fresh* creation, of the earth, in which God as Creator brings into being the earth within a recent, genuine 6-day timescale.
- The Gap Theory thus looks very neat. It apparently gets round all the difficulties by inserting the long ages, so essential to

BBDME, into the unseen gap of time between Genesis 1.1 and 1.2, while still retaining a recent 6-day creation by God.

Whether or not GT stands up to scrutiny, we shall examine shortly.

"Theistic Evolution" (TE)

Now we turn to the second attempt by Christians to reconcile early Genesis with Darwinian evolution, namely "Theistic Evolution" (TE).

TE goes like this:

- Yes, the earth and universe are very old, and BBDME is true, because that is what we are constantly told by the people - the scientists - who seem to know about these things;
- so clearly this must have been the *method* God used to create the universe;
- so we must understand the Genesis account of our origins in an allegorical sense, realising that it is not trying to give us a scientific, historical account of creation, but a *theological* account.

Thus, so the argument goes, BBDME looks at things from the scientific angle, and GEN looks at them from the theological angle, so whatever is all the fuss about? A TE supporter argues that there is no controversy once we understand we are being confronted with two different angles on the same thing, both of which have valid things to tell us about our origins.

In this way TE apparently solves any problems. Any perceived clash between GEN and BBDME is removed, and we can all carry on happily with our lives, accepting the findings of "Science" without a murmur, while contentedly reading our Bibles.

But there are distinct problems with both GT and TE. On closer examination neither of them is credible in the light of both scientific and scriptural evidence.

We will now examine various flaws, each of which sinks either one or both of these compromise theories. For each flaw, GT (for Gap Theory), or TE (for Theistic Evolution) shows to which theory this flaw particularly relates.

- (GT) One flaw that we see straightaway is that there is no gap of any sort in the text between the two key verses of Genesis 1.1 and 1.2.

If the Bible really is God's revealed Word to us, is it likely that God would conceal from us, right at the very start of His revelation, this highly significant and vast period of time? Surely if that period of time exists, He would draw clear attention to it, for its definite existence would certainly solve a lot of subsequent problems, for both Him and us! The fact is that there is no hint in the biblical text of such a gap.

- (GT TE) GT assumes that pain, suffering, violence and death **preceded** Genesis 1.2 and following, and TE assumes that pain, suffering, violence and death were an integral part of the six "days" (millions of years) of creation. Thus both GT and TE have to accept that pain, suffering, violence and death **preceded** the Fall in Genesis 3.

But Scripture makes it abundantly clear that this pain, suffering, violence and death which we now experience in creation only came into the world ***AFTER the Fall of Genesis 3, as a direct result of man's sin.***

A totally central foundation of biblical truth is that before the Fall, creation was sinless, peaceful and "very good". Creation is none of those things now - because of human sin. And that central fact paves the way for the Gospel of grace in our Lord Jesus Christ.

- (GT TE) The beautiful creation of Genesis 1 and 2 is repeatedly described as being "very good". But if that creation was only a *re-creation*, resting as it did on millions of years of evolutionary struggle, death and extinction that had preceded it, it clearly could not be described as "very good". The earth was

unfortunately already a very full graveyard, and was already no stranger to death, thus hardly fitting the description of "very good".

- (GT TE) Is it in God's nature, a nature we know so much about from His self-revelation in the rest of Scripture, to bring His creation into being by using the wholly inefficient and highly cruel method of DME? Is He a Creator God who takes delight in watching small, weak creatures being caught and eaten by larger stronger creatures? - which is the very essence of DME.

That is what He has to observe at present in His creation, as a result of Man's sin and His current curse on creation. But the idea that this is the way He likes things to be simply does not square up with what we know of God from the rest of Scripture

- If there had already been one or more major floods either before Genesis 1.2 (GT) or during the TE 6-day / millions of years creation, producing millions of fossils on the earth, then the Flood of Genesis 6 – 9 must have been "nothing special" in the overall picture: only a localised flood, producing only a small proportion of all the fossils we see in the rocks around us today.

Is that how the Genesis text describes "Noah's Flood"? Not a bit of it! The text makes it perfectly clear that it was indeed a terrifying, massive global flood, covering the whole earth with water for over a year. If it was only a local flood, no ark was even necessary.

Another key point about the Genesis Flood is that the Lord Jesus accepted its literal truth (eg., Matthew 24.37-39). Are we really now all so clever that we know more than did the Son of God on such matters?

- (GT TE) Exodus 20.11 alone sinks both GT and TE , leaving no room for any gap: "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea *and all that in them is ...*".

There is nothing in these words suggesting that there was anything *before* those 6 days, and there is nothing in these words suggesting that those 6 days were not precisely as stated - 6 days.

So both GT and TE leave us with a stark choice. For GT, we must go along with the notion of millions of years, involving pain, bloodshed, suffering and death, followed by a *fresh* creation in Genesis 1.2 and following. This belief contradicts both the text and the rest of Scripture.

For TE, we must argue that each "day" stands for a great period of time, and then again go along with the notion of millions of years, involving pain, bloodshed, suffering and death. This belief contradicts both the text and the rest of Scripture.

In both GT and TE, the pain, bloodshed, suffering and death *precede the Fall of Man as described in Genesis Chapter 3. This precedence is in direct contradiction to the Fall of Genesis Chapter 3, and all that follows from it.*

All in all, the Gap Theory and Theistic Evolution are firmly in the realm of Bad News.

For sound scriptural, textual and even scientific reasons (which we asre coming to), we can stay with the plain biblical account, of a 6-day recent, complete and perfect creation, the fall of Adam through sin, the entrance of bloodshed and death as a result of that sin, and the redemption of creation through the death of the Lord Jesus Christ.

That is what the Bible tells us, and that is the foundation on which the Christian Gospel is built. To place sin and death before the Fall, in any shape or form, and on any timescale - as BBDME, GT and TE all oblige us to do - is to change the foundation of the Gospel from solid rock to sinking sand.

Unfortunately that is precisely what has been happening in western churches and western society for the past two hundred years. The consequences are plain to see.

Chapter Six
The Clashes of the Titans
Progress Report

The two compromise solutions of GT and TE simply do not work.

Like it or not, and unfortunately many Christians will not like it, trying to hold on to both a 6-day creation and Darwin's macro-evolution is just not a valid response in the Genesis / Evolution debate.

The fact remains that BBDME does indeed pose a very serious challenge to orthodox biblical belief, concerning both early Genesis and the rest of Scripture. It always has done. This challenge is far more central to the Gospel than many people seem to realise.

Let us pause and remind ourselves just why this challenge does matter so much.

Poem, myth, legend or fairy tale

First, the notion has developed that early Genesis is not to be taken literally, because those chapters have turned out to be, in the light of supposed "scientific discovery", only a poem or myth after all.

If Genesis Chapters 1-11 really have no factual basis, but are merely a collection of ancient origin-stories cobbled together from around and about by a Jewish writer, as many liberals would have us believe, then Genesis itself, the foundational book of the entire Bible, is gravely damaged.

Going on from there, if in the popular mind GEN has now been exposed as being little more than a fairy tale, when for eighteen centuries people were told it was stone-cold historical fact, then it is easy to see why that same popular mind questions the trustworthiness of the rest of the Bible too.

We need not be surprised therefore when we find all too often that many people who reject the Christian Faith do so on the grounds that "Science has disproved the Bible". That is their *perception*, giving them the freedom, as far as they are concerned, to set aside the Bible, and with it, any meaningful, personal obligation that they might have had under Almighty God.

Result? - the removal of the Bible from all debate and decision-making.

This dismissive approach to the Bible has become widespread, within the Church as well as beyond it, and is due in no small part to the creeping prevalence of belief in BBDME, GT or TE.

This is another reason why the GEN / BBDME debate remains of critical importance, for at stake is the authority of the Bible itself, and of the Gospel truths it contains.

Evolutionary thinking takes over

Second, not only has the Bible's authority been deeply damaged, but BBDME has in turn been handed a deep-seated respectability within wider society - a respectability that it simply does not deserve. But we now find that evolutionary assumptions dominate in the media, politics, education, and social behaviour.

In our generation we are literally swamped with BBDME on all sides and from all directions. From their earliest years at school our children are taught how all life-forms have gradually evolved over millions of years from "blobs in the sea" into today's wonderful array of living things. Man is at the "top of the tree" because he has evolved more than anything else, and Man is therefore related, to a greater or lesser extent, to all other living beings.

This same theme, with its smooth-voiced assumptions, pours forth from every "nature programme" on the television, as we gaze in awe at the marvels of creation that are portrayed to us by the stupendous photography we have all become used to. But there is never the slightest mention of the true God of creation. The only "god" that is

ever mentioned when this amazing creation is being considered is none other than DME.

Not surprisingly the effects of this steady diet of evolution over the years, from whichever source it happens to come, have been widespread. Ask the average man or woman in the street, and even the average man or woman in the pew, whether we humans have evolved from the apes, and the overwhelming response will be "Yes, of course we have". And why do they say that? Because we have all been told that that is the case for as long as we can remember.

The result yet again? - the removal of the Bible from all debate and decision-making.

There is no denying that the steady spread of DME across western thought and practice has had untold effects which are deeply detrimental to the Gospel and to society at large.

We need to mention again why DME has taken such a hold on western society. What is it about this theory that makes it so attractive to western thought, and renders it now so deeply embedded within that western thought?

The answer is simple: the central fact about BBDME is that *it renders God unnecessary*. If Darwin is correct in his thinking, humanity can now explain its existence without recourse to a Creator.

BBDME gives us apparently respectable scientific grounds for assuming that we got here by natural processes. We are here on our own, and because we are here on our own, *there are no ultimate rules, we find ourselves as the masters of our own fate, and we can do whatever we want*.

Taken to its logical conclusion, BBDME gets rid of any troublesome ideas about a Creator God who is "the Boss" and to whom we are all accountable. No wonder this theory is so appealing to natural man.

Needless retreat into two compromise solutions that do not work

Third, by GT and TE becoming the "default refuge" for so many Christians, a great deal of damage has already been done.

This adoption of GT and TE means we have yielded ground in the very areas where no ground at all needs to be yielded - including the grounds of *stone-cold, observable, measurable, scientific FACTS*.

As we shall now demonstrate, it is on such grounds that, against all the odds and against all the ceaseless barrage of BBDME propaganda, GEN comes out strongly, while BBDME, GT and TE are seen to be riddled with holes - many of them scientific holes.

The clear conclusions are -

- that we *do not need* to reach for either GT or TE on scientific grounds;
- that if we do reach for them, we find that they do not actually stack up scientifically or scripturally;
- and yet because so many Christians have reached for them, a great deal of damage has been done, and needlessly so.

Chapter Seven

A Wake-Up Call

So when Christians say that there is simply not a problem between GEN and BBDME - perhaps spoken out of ignorance, fear or apathy - it turns out to be a classic case of putting their heads in the sand.

Is it any wonder that with the Word of God being thrown aside and replaced with BBDME, that our society is in such a bad way, that godlessness is so rampant, and that outright hostility to the Christian Faith is gathering momentum?

It is high time that Christians woke up to what is going on, recognised why this is going on, and then did something about it, prayerfully, humbly, urgently, and with deep repentance.

A Four-Fold Job

In the light of the current serious situation, Gospel-concerned Christians have a four-fold job to do:

- To be aware of the basic questions and issues which are involved in this clash of Belief Systems about our origins, for let there be no doubt about it, BBDME has become far and away the major block to Christian belief in society at large.
- To demonstrate that GT and TE simply do not work in washing away any problems between GEN and BBDME (as will be demonstrated shortly).
- To expose the scientific flaws in BB and DME.
- To draw attention to the scientific reasonableness of GEN concerning our origins.

This book has been written to make us aware of these tasks and to assist us in carrying them out.

Puncturing Tyres

Carrying out this four-fold job will not in itself bring thousands of converts to faith in Jesus Christ. But it will serve to puncture a few tyres on the great evolutionary juggernaut as it grinds slowly along.

For, once it can be established in people's minds that, on every ground of logic and science that exists, there simply *has* to be an Intelligent Mind behind this universe, then the soil is prepared, with minds, many currently closed tight shut, being obliged to give Genesis and the rest of the Bible a mature hearing once more.

We are culpably foolish to turn aside and say nothing, for at stake are the most crucial issues of human existence – the accountability of all human beings to Almighty God our Creator, and the Solution He has mercifully provided.

So let us have no more talk claiming that the Genesis / Evolution debate does not matter! Clearly, for Christians to pretend that this debate is just a sideshow for a few fundamentalist freaks is the height of irresponsibility, especially as such a dismissive attitude nearly always arises from outright ignorance of the facts.

Two Mindsets

Now let us move on to consider some of the relevant evidence concerning the two Belief Systems of GEN and BBDME.

As we do this, we do well to bear in mind that BBDME is not science but belief. As such, at the very least, it is entirely legitimate that sensible debate takes place, based on the evidence before us.

Both sides in the debate are confronted with exactly the same evidence, but they come to wildly different conclusions. It all depends upon which mindset you adopt as you set out to examine the evidence.

The evolutionist approaches the evidence from a Darwinian point of view, while the creationist comes at it from a Genesis point of view. As Ken Ham, a well-known creationist speaker, once described it – "We are all biased, so it comes down to which bias is the best bias to be biased with". Exactly.

The Evidence

So we come to BBDME.

Inevitably these matters become a little technical at times. If it all gets rather too much, just hang on to the main points, that BBDME is *not* science, it is *not* scientifically possible, and, despite what everyone is told to think, it has not landed even one good punch on the jaw of Genesis. BBDME has "swept the board" under wholly false pretences.

As we examine these matters, we need to remember the basic ground rules –

- We need to be courteous to those who hold different views, be they atheists or other Christians. Ill-tempered shouting of favourite texts at opponents will get no-one anywhere, and fast.
- We do well to remain cautious, avoiding the two extremes of over-certainty, (our crashing about with our own opinions which the biblical text may not actually support), and over-*uncertainty*, (our withholding submissive belief from accepting the clear statements of Scripture).

We are all ultimately in the realm of *belief* in these matters, and are concerned to find the truth – which may well turn out to be not quite matching our own preconceived ideas.

When all is said and done, we are trying to be faithful children of the living God, and to give Him the glory that is His due.

Chapter Eight

The Big Bang – *Scientifically Impossible*

Contrary to popular opinion, Darwin did not seriously tackle the question of how life actually *began*. His "Origin of Species" only takes up the story when there already existed so-called "primitive" forms of life.

So to explain the ultimate origins of life itself, we have to turn to the "Big Bang Theory" (BB), on which Darwin's Theory of Macro-Evolution (DME) actually depends. The two theories are wholly separate, but have to hang together if a convincing no-God explanation is to be found to explain the universe and the life within it.

What is the scientific evidence in support of this Big Bang?

BB involves the belief that in the beginning, "Nothing" exploded, from nothing and nowhere, into a vast "Something", which now comprises this amazing universe.

We are obviously in the realm of "Alice in Wonderland" here, ***if we are relying solely on natural scientific processes***, but this theory has been accepted by many scientists for many years. Why? Because, as with DME, it explains our origins in a natural way, without recourse to there having to be a God, and because it is the necessary foundation on which the God-excluding theory of DME can subsequently be constructed.

There are over 100 *billion* galaxies, and our galaxy alone has over 100 *billion* stars. Yet we are told, by people who somehow keep a straight face, that all this vastness came from an explosion - an explosion from Nothing!

Now please note that Nothing in this case means - Nothing: no space, no gas, no atoms, no elements, no vacuum, no void, no anything at all.

From this state of Nothing, Nothing, all by itself, exploded into Everything.

Sir Fred Hoyle, one of the world's most eminent astronomers, stated that for BB to have occurred producing the universe as a result, we must imagine the universe being full of blind men, each with a Rubik Cube, and each coming up with exactly the right answer to their cube at exactly the same time as everyone else.

That is the likelihood of the *naturalistic* Big Bang explanation for the origin of the universe. There may well have been a Big Bang wrought by Almighty God the Creator, but a no-God Big Bang, of Nothing at all into Everything that now is, all by itself, is utter nonsense.

The First Law of Thermodynamics

The First Law of Thermodynamics (which, as with all scientific laws, has been found to exist because of repeated scientific observation), states that Matter and Energy cannot be created or destroyed. The Matter and Energy within the universe are thus a Constant, neither increasing or decreasing, they just "are".

Because of this state of permanent constancy, it is obvious on pure scientific grounds that they could not have come into being from tiny beginnings, from which they have steadily developed into their present state.

We are thus confronted with an awkward fact from an evolutionary point of view. We observe a very big "Something" – the Matter and Energy within the universe in a permanently constant state – which simply cannot have become what it is now from being originally a "Nothing"! - ***if we are relying solely on natural scientific processes.***

Scientifically, to get a Something from a Nothing is a straight impossibility. We are therefore compelled to the conclusion that the Something which we all observe can only have come into being from Nothingness by a Force greater than itself, and greater than scientific law and thereby also above and beyond scientific law.

It means that there is nothing *within* the universe that is capable of creating it. This means in turn that the universe must either be eternal, or it was made by a Force, a Something or a Someone *outside* itself and *greater* than itself.

The Second Law of Thermodynamics

Perhaps this problem for the twin theories of BBDME can easily be solved by the universe simply being eternal?

This means that Matter and Energy would have always been a "Something" in an eternal state of Constancy, so the problems posed by the First Law of Thermodynamics are removed. We no longer would have to try to explain how a Something in a Constant state could have reached this Constant state in direct contradiction of the basic scientific laws which we know exist.

An eternal universe would also conveniently provide endless ages in which DME could occur.

But, surprise, surprise, we now hit another snag, in the form of the *Second* Law of Thermodynamics!

This Second Law states, in layman's terms, that everything over time just "runs down". They go from Order to Chaos, and Energy itself is dissipated, becoming less and less "available".

So, if the universe was eternal, infinitely old, we should now see complete disorder all around us; indeed we and the universe would not be here at all because the whole thing would have just decayed into chaos long ago. Yet instead, we see order all around us, albeit running steadily down.

Hence the universe has to have had a Beginning: it *cannot be* eternal or infinitely old. That leaves only one logical explanation for its origin.

We see that there has to be a time when the universe was "not" - it did not exist. But now it does exist, and there is only one way that that change from non-existence into existence can be explained. It is by that Force, that Something or Someone we have just come across

under the First Law of Thermodynamics, which, or who, is outside the universe and greater than the universe.

On the one hand, a Big Bang from **Nothing** to **Something** is a scientific impossibility. If there was really Nothing before the Big Bang, we simply have to have a greater Force to create the Something from Nothing (even assuming this Force used a Big Bang).

On the other hand, if there was already a Something before the Big Bang, such as gases and elements, amongst which the Big Bang operated, then the Big Bang is not at the beginning! - leaving us with the old questions about when and how the beginning itself actually occurred.

The more we ponder this one, the more it shouts at us that there has to have been a Something or a Someone to produce a Something from a Nothing at the very start – whenever that start happened to be; there is simply no logical alternative.

Now so far we have only identified this Force as a Force - recognising that such a Force, greater than the universe and outside it, is the only explanation to account for the origins of what we see around us. We have not yet begun to consider the nature of that Force – whether it is in any sense a living and benign Creator – which would bring us back to Genesis and the rest of the Holy Bible.

Genesis calmly tells us who that Force, that Something or Someone, is: that in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth, and that He finished them. The First and Second Laws of Thermodynamics are entirely in accord with these statements, but those two Laws expose a self-starting Big Bang as nonsense.

There are various other scientific torpedoes which also sink the good ship "Big Bang", which are too complicated for us to tackle here. Suffice it to say that it is now acknowledged in mainstream scientific thought that *the Big Bang theory is wholly discredited*.

That means there is no longer any *scientific* refuge for those who seek to explain this universe in natural, God-omitting, atheistic terms.

Let this last point sink in. There is simply no scientifically-plausible, Force-omitting explanation for the origin of this universe:

- *scientifically* you cannot get a Something from a Nothing;
- we observe a Something, which cannot be eternal, so there has to have been a time when it was a Nothing;
- so the change from a Nothing to a Something that has occurred must have occurred *by processes outside conventional scientific laws*;
- this brings us to the essential existence of a Force outside, and greater than, the Something that is the universe.

The Law of Cause and Effect

We can also briefly mention at this point the "Law of Cause and Effect", which simply states that *nothing happens on its own*. Everything has a Cause, and the Effect can never be greater than the Cause.

Thus, because the universe is an Effect, it must have been brought into being by a greater Cause.

So, the Creator of time has to be greater than time – so the Creator *does not need time* in which to create a universe. The Creator of knowledge and power and space, (each of which is an "Effect"), must be greater than these, hence omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent. The Creator of our wills, emotions and personalities must possess these characteristics too, but on a greater scale.

This Law of Cause and Effect again points us logically away from any notion of origins-by-chance, towards the necessity for an infinitely powerful Creator, the ultimate Cause who has brought into being all the Effects we observe around us.

I hope that the various arguments we have examined in this chapter, all based on scientific observation and logic, are an encouragement to all who *want* there to be a divine Creator.

Such a Being simply must exist: the origins of what we see around us cannot be explained in any other way.

Chapter Nine

Darwinian Macro-Evolution - *Scientifically Impossible*

In our previous chapter we have seen how the ultimate foundation on which DME is built – a Big Bang - turns out to be scientifically impossible without specific creative input from a superior Source.

We can now move on to consider some of the serious problems facing DME itself. This theory is of course a *naturalistic* explanation about the evolution of all forms of life on this planet, by which is meant that no superior Source is required for these forms to exist.

a) Information and Energy

For anything to be created, we need two things in existence beforehand – information, and energy.

There are an estimated 3 billion letters of DNA information required to change, as someone has put it, "a microbe into a micro-biologist". Where did any such information and energy come from at the start of the evolutionary process? Remember that true supporters of Darwin cannot just reach for a convenient God to provide these; information and energy have to be present already, from natural causes.

Evolutionists have no explanation for the origin of the information and energy necessary for evolution to begin.

Genesis gives the explanation – "In the beginning God"; He was, and is, the source of infinite information and energy.

b) The Origins of Life Itself

Arising from the problem of information and energy is the question of how life itself actually began.

Darwin did not try to explain this, and nobody has succeeded in doing so since. Evolutionists make no secret of the fact that we still have no idea how life originated of itself, *if* we are still insisting on excluding any God.

But the whole BBDME bandwagon glides majestically on as if the answers to such basic questions were all established generations ago. They weren't. They haven't been, and if the grounds of explanation are to be limited to the purely "scientific", then they never will be.

Why are "Joe Public" never told this sort of thing?

c) Utter Complexity

The notion that a living cell could put itself together is simply non-science. Hoyle had another picture to help us understand the absurdity of this notion: imagine a tornado in a junkyard producing a Boeing 747 – that is the chance of a living cell producing itself.

We have 30 million million cells in our bodies, and 12,000 million such cells in our brains alone, with over 100 million connections between those brain cells.

Man's finest megachip can hold a few million pieces of information, yet the cells within a human body can hold 4.5×10^{13} pieces of information, that is, about 40 million million times more!

It has been estimated that if all the information in all the libraries of the world – an estimated 10^{18} pieces of information - were put on to megachips, the pile of chips would reach from the earth to beyond the moon. But if all this information was put on to one molecule of DNA, it would take up *1% of the volume of a pinhead*.

We get the message – we are incredibly, mind-bogglingly complex.

"Isn't evolution wonderful!" is the common reaction to facts such as these, but Romans 1.20 puts it far more truthfully – "For the invisible things of him (God) from the creation of the world are clearly seen..."

Are we not dealing here with deliberate and wilful blindness by sinful man towards the glories of God and His creation?

d) "Irreducible complexity"

We are surrounded by wonderfully complex mechanisms, at all levels of scale, the parts of which *all had to be present together at the start before the entire mechanism could function.*

In the development of a single cell for example, we need both DNA and enzymes. But you cannot have DNA without enzymes, and you cannot have enzymes without DNA. Which came first? The answer is neither, for we need both, at the same time; it is the classic "chicken and egg" situation. How could this dilemma be solved in natural terms? Only a Designer could do this.

A similar example concerns how proteins within a cell are destroyed by the presence of oxygen. But at the same time there has to be oxygen present - to allow for the presence of ozone which in turn protects the proteins from destruction by ultra-violet radiation.

We thus somehow have to have proteins, oxygen and ozone, all in correct relationship to one another, from the very start. Again this simply cannot have occurred through a long process of evolution – it had to be complete right away.

Think of the eye as a well-known example of "irreducible complexity". A half-formed eye would be a liability, which natural selection would eradicate. Similarly the ear is beautifully intricate: is it really feasible to imagine that such a tiny, precise mechanism of interlocking bones and membranes developed only by chance, and over a long period of time? It shouts at us "design", a design which had to be complete in its entirety before any part of it could work.

A half-grown wing on a reptile would be ruled out by natural selection, for until it was fully formed and functional, its owner would be at a great disadvantage, being able neither to fly, nor to run as fast as its adversaries. The wing is just another example of the need for such features to be fully functional from the start.

A woodpecker has a tough bill, an extra strong skull and a long sticky tongue which he keeps in a groove round the skull! When he hits the tree with his bill the force is up to *one thousand times gravity*. Each one of these particular features had to be present in the first place, or else the woodpecker would simply crush his skull when hitting the tree, and that would be the end of him.

DME cannot explain how such mechanisms, which can only function properly when all their components are in place, could have evolved. Each one of these mechanisms is an "all or nothing": with even one component missing, the whole system is fatally flawed.

e) "Natural Selection"

Imagine that DME is like a car moving slowly along, with an engine driving it, and petrol driving the engine.

There are two types of "petrol" driving the engine, namely natural selection and random mutations. The "engine" itself of DME is the process that Darwin termed the "survival of the fittest".

"Natural selection" is the belief that beneficial characteristics within a creature, inherited by chance, enable it to thrive in a particular environment. These characteristics are then passed on to the creature's offspring. In this way the beneficial characteristics become more established with each generation, conferring a yet greater advantage on the creatures which happen to possess these.

This in turn means that the best-adapted, the "naturally-selected", by chance, become stronger, and gradually overcome the weaker who are "weeded out" in the process. In this way the petrol that is "natural selection" is claimed to drive the engine of the "survival of the fittest".

Notice that any change of environment, such as greater warmth or greater cold, will alter the whole balance between those who have been, up until then, the victors and the vanquished. Perhaps now a thicker fur coat becomes the key to survival, whereas previously thick fur had been a hindrance in the struggle for survival.

Now we need to understand that natural selection cannot *change* any form of life. It provides no new information into the system, but just sifts the information that is already there, and indeed over time, leads to a loss of information.

But DME depends on *new* information being supplied at every step of the way, be it by natural selection or by some other "petrol", so that the life-forms of succeeding generations can become "bigger and better".

Where and how does this new information come from? Natural selection gives no answer.

f) Random Mutations

When the problems besetting natural selection were realised in the 1930s, the emphasis in terms of the "petrol" driving the engine gradually switched from natural selection to beneficial **random mutations** as the mechanism to explain better the "survival of the fittest".

But these random mutations also face two serious problems. First, by definition they depend only on random chance, and second, they are nearly all either harmful or meaningless.

What we actually observe is that mutations do indeed occur across the generations, but, just as with natural selection, these mutations involve at each stage a *loss* of genetic information rather than a gain. This is in line with the Second Law of Thermodynamics (that everything runs down), but flies in the face of DME (which insists that everything is moving up).

Random mutations such as these come nowhere near explaining the amazing profusion of life all around us.

So DME fails to explain the very thing it claims to explain - the origin of species. The fittest may indeed be the ones who survive, but how they came to be the fittest remains a mystery. Neither natural selection nor genetic mutations answers the question of how new genetic information, essential for the evolution of more complex life

forms, enters the system. Instead, both processes involve the loss of information at each step of the way.

g) Apparent design

Wherever we look, we see evidence of apparent design. But BBDME supporters insist that **nothing** has been designed.

On what possible grounds do they feel entitled to say that? They don't know that, and they can never finally establish that. Yet the barrage of design-denial continues, misleading millions and millions of people, with such damaging consequences in so many aspects of human existence.

h) The DNA Code

The DNA code, discovered and explored in only the last 60 years, is an incredibly sophisticated language system. We are told for example that the meanings of its words are not related to the chemical properties of the letters of those words.

DME depends on this whole amazing code reaching its present mind-boggling state completely by chance, by trial and error, over billions of years. But the whole thing shouts INCREDIBLE DESIGN - but BBDME supporters shuffle steadily on, ignoring the blindingly obvious.

Which party is having to use more faith here - the GEN supporters or the BBDME supporters?

Some Conclusions

This can all get rather confusing – but it remains important that we as Christians know our way around some of the basic issues of this vital debate.

BBDME is in trouble because on so many fronts it is now recognised as being simply scientifically impossible.

Dr Colin Paterson has written, "I have been duped into taking evolution as revealed truth". Sir Fred Hoyle and his colleague Dr Wickramasinghe reject DME on scientific grounds, because the life we see all around us is too complex to have got here by chance processes. H S Lipson, FRS, has written "In fact evolution became in a sense a scientific religion; almost all scientists have accepted it and many are prepared to 'bend' their observations to fit in with it".

Yet we still see this love-affair with DME continuing in much of the scientific establishment, as well as in education, political debate and the media. Why? Because DME is so attractive to man's natural mind – for it so neatly disposes of a Creator God to whom we are all accountable.

There is also the pressure on scientists to conform to the accepted norms over BBDME: to question these theories, let alone to reject them in favour of "creation from nothing" by a divine Creator, is to invite derision, ostracism and a rapid drying-up of research funding. Such a stance takes rare courage and conviction.

We read in II Peter 3.3-6 that in the last days there will be scoffers, "willingly ignorant", who deny the second coming of Christ and the Flood of Genesis. It took over 1800 years for that prophecy to be fulfilled, but it is surely being fulfilled right now. And the great justification for those denials of scriptural statements is none other than DME, Darwin's theory of macro-evolution.

True science is a God-ordained activity, and as such will gradually expose more and more of the glories of our Creator – as surely happens whenever this ugly cloak of evolution is thrown back.

The fact is that the weaknesses of both BB and DME put the existence of a divine Creator beyond any doubt whatever; what we see around us can simply be not explained in any other way.

This in turn leads us back to the biblical account of our origins, which we shall now move on to consider in more detail.

At the very least we can say at this stage that the notion that this universe was created by a Creator is already seen to be true; no

other explanation is plausible. Equally true is that the universe and the life within it could not have come into being "on its own" by a self-generating Big Bang followed by Darwinian macro-evolution.

So we see that, contrary to all the received wisdom of the age in which we live, the Genesis creation account is still "in the ring".

But it turns out to be far more than merely still in the ring, as we are about to see. Suffice it to say for now that we can trust the Lord God as much as ever, and we can trust His Word as much as ever, for it remains "a lamp to our feet and a light for our path".

A Confusion-Buster

Meanwhile, let us have a brief "Confusion-Buster", as we give a summary of our enquiries so far. For simplicity's sake at this stage, we will refer to the Outside Creative Source as "God" –

1) At the Start

- A **no-God BB**, involving Nothing to Something, is scientifically impossible: it did not happen.
- A **God-created Beginning**, creating Something from Nothing, has to have happened, somehow and at some time; quite apart from any other arguments, there are simply no logical alternatives.

2) After the Start

- A **no-God process** of DME is scientifically impossible: it did not happen.
- A **God-initiated process** of DME (ie., He started things off then walked away) is scientifically impossible: it did not happen.
- A **God-involved process** of DME (ie., He engineered things at each step of the way) is divinely possible, (for God could add the information and energy needed for DME to move on to the next step), but is theologically *impossible* because it contradicts His character and His written word:
 - (i) the recent 6-day creation;

- (ii) all was very good;
 - (iii) all was finished;
 - (iv) pain, struggle, bloodshed and death came only *after* human sin and *as a result of* human sin.
- Hence we can be sure that such a process did not happen.

We are thus left with a **God-created Beginning**, and a **God-involved creative process that did not involve macro-evolution**.

In our next chapter we shall examine evidence concerning the age of the earth, and the feasibility, or otherwise, of a rapid (6-day type) creation.

Chapter Ten

The Evidence for Old or Young, Slow or Quick

In this chapter we may become rather technical at times. But I hope we can be cheered by the very fact that there **are** technical details, for they demonstrate that an acceptance of the Genesis account of creation is entirely plausible *on scientific grounds*. We simply do not have to "leave our brains outside" if we wish to accept that what Genesis tells us is historically and scientifically accurate.

As we know, the Theory of Evolution, (by which we always mean Macro-Evolution), is based on there being tiny changes, from simple to complex, by natural selection and chance mutations, over millions of years.

Before we go further, let us remember the distinction between micro-evolution, and macro-evolution:

- Micro-evolution involves small changes within species. We observe these changes, so they are indeed "scientific" – that is, observable and repeatable. Creationists have no problem with micro-evolution, as it is merely adaptation and variation within species.
- Macro-evolution is where the problems come. Macro-evolution is the belief that because we observe small changes within species, then there must have been massive changes across species. Macro-evolution is pure belief, and pure **not**-science, because we cannot observe this process or repeat this process. It is this macro-evolution which is usually being referred to whenever "evolution" is mentioned in academic circles or in the media.

We have seen in previous pages that DME, Darwin's Theory of Macro-Evolution, has many problems, but there is one feature on which DME depends which, if proved to be missing, sinks DME "just like that", as Tommy Cooper would say.

This one feature is DME's need for millions of years. Darwin depends totally on a very long timescale. If those millions of years have never been, then DME is simply impossible.

So one key question in this whole matter comes down to just this: How old is the universe and this earth within it?

A Young Universe and Earth?

The notion of the universe and the earth being very young is preposterous at first sight these days.

We are discovering the sheer vastness of the universe, with untold distances involving millions of light years. When we remember that the speed of light is currently 186,000 miles a second, then clearly a star whose light has reached us after apparently millions of light years is hardly just round the corner!

We are told that BB – even though it is a *scientific* impossibility – occurred about 14 thousand million years ago, giving DME ample time to take place.

By contrast, GEN tells us that God created the heavens and the earth in six literal days. He "made the stars also" on Day 4, and Adam on Day 6. Adam lived through Day 7, which presents severe problems with the notion that the "days" spoken of are millions of years, and the generations of Adam are then listed in careful detail through to Noah and beyond.

The whole implication of GEN is thus that the earth and the universe were created **quickly and recently**. BBDME tell us that they came into being (that is, not "created") **slowly and anciently**. Once again we come across a blatant clash.

Let us now take a look at some of the evidence surrounding these issues, bearing in mind that, when all is said and done, both sides will still be in the realm of *faith*.

Our task is humbly to weigh up the evidence, and see where probability and likelihood are to be found. The Belief System, be it GEN or BBDME, which is best supported by the observable evidence and which therefore needs the least amount of "blind faith", is the one that is far more likely to be the true one.

Uniformitarianism

We begin with a very long word, "uniformitarianism"! This is the idea that whatever processes we see around us today have always been the case, that is constant, and "uniform".

Thus for example, we can measure that a cliff is currently being eroded by the sea at 2 feet per year. Using a uniformitarian approach, we can then draw a straight line back on a graph to discover how far out to sea that cliff used to be at whatever date we wish – because we assume that the rate of erosion has been constant.

The implication of uniformitarianism is therefore simple: the *present* is the key to the *past*. From whatever we find today we can extrapolate back into history to discover key dates and ages.

Let us now apply this principle of uniformitarianism to the speed of light. We know the speed of light today, and we think we know how far away the star is from us today, so we can work out how long it has taken for light to reach us from that star. From this we can *date when the light began to set out* on its long journey towards us from the star, and from that we can work out *the age of the star itself*.

Eureka! So we could come up with something like this - "Star X16 in Galaxy 509FR is 12 billion years old". Using that date, along with other dates calculated in a similar way, we can then start to construct dates for surrounding stars and galaxies, thus building up a fuller picture of how old different parts of the universe are.

We can also measure how fast the galaxies are moving away from each other at present, that is, how fast the universe is expanding. From these measurements we can extrapolate back to when the universe was that tiny blob milliseconds after the Big Bang - again assuming that the current rate of expansion has always been what it is today. That is how we can date the Big Bang.

It is all quite neat and straightforward – an array of ancient dates built up from one another, and ***all of them based on uniformitarian principles***. The whole edifice of dates and distances and ages is constructed on the assumption that the rates we can measure today have been constant over billions of years.

Let us now give a discreet "Ahem" – and ask a rather obvious question: "What happens to your dates if the rates you measure today have ***not*** been constant?"

Thus, coming back to our eroding cliff, what happens to various dates concerning that cliff if sometimes it was eroded at five miles a year, and at other times at one inch a year? We have no idea of any variables in the rate or erosion, and hence we have no idea at all of when and where that cliff may have been in times gone by.

We must recognise that assumptions are just that. But the whole edifice of uniformitarianism entirely depends on all these assumptions being correct – for none of us was there.

Let us also ask where the assumptions came from in the first place. The Big Daddy of all Assumptions is THE UNIVERSE IS VERY OLD! And where did that come from? Why, from none other than Mr Darwin and his long-ages evolutionist colleagues.

So we see once more the way in which BBDME is purely ***a belief system***. It gives rise to massive and untestable assumptions, which people then choose to adopt as they sally forth to examine the evidence.

"Catastrophism"

There happens to be a rival belief system when it comes to our origins – in the Book of Genesis. With this belief system too we are in the realm of assumption, in this case, that the earth and universe were created recently; and if they were created recently, then they have to have been created quickly. As we have seen, if this belief system is true, then DME is impossible.

The creationist takes the view that the key to the Past is not the Present (that is, uniformitarianism), but divine Revelation: that is, that in Genesis God has revealed to us what He wants us to know about the past.

GEN speaks not of uniformitarianism, but of its direct opposite – "**catastrophism**". Catastrophism is the view that what we see around us today is the result of various catastrophic events in times past, rather than a steady, lengthy, uniform process.

Thus both camps, the supporters of GEN and the supporters of BBDME, set forth with their particular sets of assumptions to examine the evidence around us. Notice it is ***the same evidence***, but each camp comes up with very different answers because of the difference between the two sets of prior assumptions.

Which of the two belief systems, with their respective sets of assumptions, better explains the evidence all around us?

The Speed of Light

We know the speed of light today, but how can we ever know, as opposed merely to assume, the speed of light in times past?

If we assume that the current speed of light has always been constant, then we can draw a straight line back on the time graph and it will go back a very long way indeed! - which suits BBDME "very nicely thank you".

But who on earth is to say that the speed of light has always been what it is today? – that is a massive and wholly untestable

assumption. On what possible grounds is it assumed that today's rates **have** been constant?".

What if, in recent times but beyond our reach to know for sure, the speed of light was close to infinity? That would make our neat straight lines on the time graphs a nonsense. Once we recognise that a superior Source, a Creator God, is essential in all these matters, then anything becomes possible in terms of speeds, distances and dates.

Some recent research for example, by Barry Setterfield and Trevor Norman, shows the probability that the speed of light has *not* been constant in times past, but that it is actually slowing down. If these two men are correct in their research and conclusions, then the date of creation is put at between 5300 and 5700 BC. If that is the case, DME is an impossibility through simple lack of time.

The fact is that ***all ancient dates are based on assumptions***. If those assumptions are correct, then presumably the dates are correct. But if those assumptions are false, then the dates upon which they are based are wholly unreliable.

"Apparent Age"

Let us now suspend all debate for just a moment and assume that the Genesis creation account is quite literally true - a recent, rapid, finished creation by Almighty God.

When Adam was five minutes old, how old did he look? - say, thirty yers old? When the trees in the Garden of Eden were ten minutes old, how old did they look? - say, fifty years or more? When the stars in the sky were just hours old, how old did they look? - say, millions of years?

We are so used to estimating correct age by the *appearance*, and by our *experience*, of everything around us, and in the normal run of things, we can be pretty accurate.

So for example, that old man looks about eighty years old. This oak tree looks "very old", and when it is felled we can count the rings

within its trunk, and by assuming that each ring represents one year's growth, we can judge its age in years.

But again we are in the realm of assumption. As soon as we try to assess the age of anything that pre-dates the truly verifiable historical era (which only stretches back a few thousand years), we unavoidably venture further and further into assumption. For we are obliged to assume that the rates of change we can measure now, in the present, have indeed remained constant right back into "the depths of time" - forcing us to rely therefore on "uniformitarianism" once again.

But God is God. He is omnipotent - that is, "omni-potent", all-powerful, capable therefore of doing anything at all in as short or as long a time as He might wish.

The statement that God made this amazing universe, in its entirety, a few thousand years ago, in the space of just six normal days, of course "blows our tiny minds" in the natural sense, especially because of the universe's size, complexity and "apparent age". But when we remember the ability of Almighty God, the whole thing becomes wholly feasible, and in one sense, not surprising at all. Indeed it gives rise to the question, "Why ever did He take so long?".

Just because something *looks* very old, on the basis of our present experience and assumptions, means very little where Almighty God is concerned. Apparent age is just that - apparent.

Dating Methods

"Radiometric dating" has become a widely used technique for the dating of the rocks around us today.

As various types of matter, such as uranium, zircon and potassium, cool and solidify, so the radio-active "isotopes" within them begin to decay. This process gradually changes the isotopes from their original form, known as the "parent", to the new, decayed form, the "daughter".

The rate of this decaying process can be measured today, and is termed the "half-life" for that particular type of rock; the half-life simply means the time taken for half of the parent isotope to decay into the daughter isotope.

By measuring how much daughter is present within the rock sample today, we can work out when the decay process began.

This method is also commonly used for the dating of organic substances, such as bone, wood, skin or cloth. With such materials, Carbon 14 is the preferred element used, as this has a very short half-life.

Dr Paul Garner, a Geology graduate and young-earth creationist, provides a useful analogy to help us understand radiometric dating more easily. Imagine we enter a room, we see a candle burning there, and we are asked to work out for how long the candle has been burning.

We need to know some background information to be able to work out the answer: How high was the candle when it was first lit? How high is the candle now? How fast is it burning down? Given those three pieces of information, we can work out when it was first lit.

But notice what we need to know, and what we have to assume, before we can come up with the answer. First, we need to know the candle's height at the start; unless someone trustworthy tells us its height, we can have no idea. Second, we have to assume that the rate of burning has been constant – no draughts to speed it up, no denser wax to slow it down, no other interference from any source.

The same assumptions apply to the radiometric dating of rocks.

- 1) We need to know the conditions at the start of the process, for example, how much parent material was present, and was there some daughter material already there, naturally, also? If there was, then the amount of daughter material we find today can give us no guide as to the age of the rock.

In a volcanic region of Hawaii, rocks of a known date of less than 200 years old were dated using the Potassium-Argon method. Out came the answer – "These rocks are 22 million years old" – an 11 million % error.

Near Auckland in New Zealand a similar experiment involved lava rocks of a known date of less than 300 years old. The Potassium-Argon method came up with an age of between 145,000 and 465,000 years old.

Using the Rubidium-Strontium method, a 3 billion year old date was produced for lava flows known to be very recent.

Such results show that radiometric dating ultimately depends entirely on "an educated guess". We do not know, we cannot know, what conditions were like at the start of the decay process. Scientists using radiometric dating approach the matter ***assuming vast ages***, and there are many examples of "wrong dates", (that is, young ones), being put into the waste paper basket if they do not fit what is expected or required.

2) There has to have been a "closed system" throughout the decay process – that is, no outside interference with the materials. But this earth is a shifting, changing place – plate tectonics, continental drift, volcanic explosions, groundwater flows, possible changes in the earth's axis, its speed of rotation, the speed of light, the content of the atmosphere, and so on.

There are any number of reasons why the relative amounts of parent and daughter material in a rock, and the rates of decay from one to the other, could have been altered, perhaps repeatedly. Again, we have no way of knowing this, and again these possibilities put the dates we are presented with into the realm of pure guesswork.

Indeed it is significant that "wrong dates", if published, are often explained away by the presence of all these unknown factors in an "open system", which have interfered with the decay process. So it seems that dates "officially approved" (because they fit into a long time-frame) are accepted, while awkward dates are set aside on the grounds of "outside interference".

A further problem arises in that different methods can come up with very different results. The origin date of volcanic lavas near the Grand Canyon came out as 17 million years old using the Potassium-Argon method, but 2 ½ billion years old using the Lead-Lead method.

"Lucy", a fossilised human-type ancestor, was dated using the Potassium-Argon method as 2.9 million years old, but a different method came up with 3.5 million years. As Dr David Rosevear of the Creation Science Movement puts it with a chuckle, "That's one of the problems with trying to date an older woman"!

It is no exaggeration to say that the entire system of radiometric dating of the rocks depends on a long list of assumptions. Those assumptions are slanted strongly towards the expectation of great ages, because of the pervasive presence of evolutionary thinking. If you expect to find great ages, and want to find great ages, then there are ways and means of getting what you want.

But the general public hears nothing of these assumptions, just the announcing of ancient dates by the presenters of the TV programmes.

W D Stansfield, an old-earth evolutionist, in his book "The Science of Evolution" has admitted, "There is no absolute reliable long-term 'radiological clock'".

We must conclude that the great ages which are delivered by radiometric dating methods are not reliable guides as to the age of the universe.

Polonium Haloes

Now we come to something very special.

Granite is an igneous rock, made originally from molten magma, which solidified deep below the earth's surface. As such, granite is believed to be very old, and to have cooled slowly over long periods of time.

One ingredient of granite is mica, and one ingredient of the mica is an element called Polonium 218.

Now this polonium has a very short half-life – a matter of seconds - before it decays into Polonium 214, Polonium 210, and onwards. So when we examine granite today, and the mica within it, there should be no evidence at all of any Polonium 218, 214 or 210 - for these will have "been and gone" in moments, during the supposedly long cooling process.

But an American geologist, Dr Robert Gentry, has found something rather different. Under the microscope, he has found concentric, locked-in "coloration spheres" of Polonium 218, 214, and 210. These should simply not be there.

A simple illustration will make this finding clearer. Imagine putting a soluble pill into a glass of water. It fizzes for a few seconds as it dissolves, and then all goes quiet, leaving no sign of the pill or of the bubbles. The only way you could halt and "lock in" the fizzing process is to freeze the water instantaneously. Then the bubbles would still be visible within the frozen water in the glass.

Now this is similar to what has happened with these tiny polonium haloes. Each element of polonium is like a soluble pill in that glass of water, whose "fizz" would last for just a matter of seconds before the element itself disappeared. But somehow the fizz process has been halted in mid-flow, so the fizz is now "locked into" the rock.

There is only one way in which that halting and locking-in could occur: *the rock suddenly cooled and solidified.*

The implications of this discovery are enormous. It means that the decay process of each type of polonium was halted and locked in because the granite *changed from a molten to a solid state within a matter of seconds.*

There are no ifs and buts about this; this has nothing to do with belief or viewpoint, but everything to do with stone-cold fact (pardon the pun) - the existence of those tiny polonium haloes.

Not only does granite not need millions of years to cool and form. It simply *cannot have had those millions of years* – for if it had, there would be no polonium haloes today.

These haloes have been found in granites throughout the world, including North America, Russia, Madagascar and Japan.

They have been termed "fingerprints of creation", for by their very existence they show that the granite rocks deep within the earth were formed and cooled within a matter of seconds. There is no known conventional scientific explanation for this occurrence and uniformitarianism is nowhere to be seen when faced with such a fact - the virtually instantaneous formation of granite, one of the deepest-lying igneous rocks that exist on the earth.

Now we still do not know from these little haloes *when* the granite was rapidly cooled and formed. It could still have been billions of years ago, in which case the great length of time since then gives DME a chance to occur (ignoring for the moment all the other problems with the theory).

But what the haloes do give us are three fascinating conclusions.

First, the transition from molten liquid magma to cooled, solid granite was practically instantaneous, for there is no other explanation for the "locking-in" of the haloes.

Second, arising from this, we see that "creation" can indeed be virtually instant - great ages are simply not necessary to explain what we see in the rocks around us.

Third, once we see the possibility of extremely rapid rock formation, then we can also see that a very young universe and/or earth, (that is, with an age of even only a few thousand years), becomes entirely plausible, despite all the evolutionary assumptions and ancient dates that are bandied about today.

And the wonder is that all these conclusions arise from those tiny polonium haloes.

Rapid Formation of Strata

Another assumption, which points to the need for a very old earth, is that it takes millions of years for thick beds of rocks to be laid down.

But once again when the evidence is examined, catastrophism comes up trumps.

In 1980 for example, the Mount Saint Helens volcano violently erupted in the north-west United States. A ½ cubic mile of rock disintegrated, with an explosive force 20 times that of the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima. This resulted in a mud flow which carved a canyon 125 feet deep, and a 600-foot bed of laminated strata that was laid down at a rate of 25 feet per day. Coarse and fine layers of sediment within these beds were laid down in less than four hours one afternoon.

A huge lake was formed, later named Spirit Lake, in which after only eight years over 19,000 trees had come to rest on its floor – in upright positions. This means that individual trees reached through many different layers of strata at the bottom of the lake. The traditional time-scale for the formation of such strata would be millions of years, but here they all are after just a few years.

"Polystrate fossils"

Related to the Mount Saint Helens events are what are termed "polystrate fossils". These are trees, now fossilised, which penetrate through different layers of rock strata. We have entire trees, from roots to top branches, stretching vertically through different strata of rock.

A classic case of these fossilised polystrate trees is found at The Joggins in Nova Scotia. Here the sedimentary rock layers are 2,500' thick, passing through twenty geological "horizons", with thousands of vertical polystrate trees throughout the sequence. The long-age geologists tell us that the layers at the top are millions of years younger than the layers at the bottom. This simply could not be – those rock layers had to be laid down rapidly, probably "in one fell swoop" in a matter of weeks or months.

Polystrate fossils such as these only exist because the trees *must* have been buried in those underwater sediments very quickly.

Now let us ask ourselves in what conditions vast numbers of trees might be buried in sediments, underwater, and very quickly?

Another geologist has concluded, "You can explain most of fossils and geology with very short time-spans". So yet again, the assumption that the earth and universe must inevitably be of great age is simply unfounded. From the evidence we are seeing around us, they need not be old at all.

Sea Salt

It is estimated that 450 million tons of salt enter the seas on the earth each year, but only 27% of this salt *leaves* the seas. This means that the sea should be getting more and more salty each year. Even if we assume that this process of saltiness began when there was no salt at all in the sea (unlikely), and measure how salty the sea is now, the greatest age for the process to have started is 42 million years ago.

Now that age is far greater than young-earth creationists would be happy with, but it is 90% younger than what the evolutionists tells us, for they believe the sea is over 500 million years old. On the basis of its saltiness today, the sea cannot be anything like that age.

Too Much Oil

We have far too much oil in the earth! Despite talk of dwindling global oil reserves these days, if the earth really is millions of years old then we should expect by now to have no oil at all remaining beneath our feet.

This is due to the tremendous pressure exerted on the oil-bearing strata below the earth's surface. That pressure, again using uniformitarian principles, should by now have crushed those strata and the oil within them, causing the oil itself to have leaked away long ago.

Not Enough Helium and Hydrogen

Here is another problem that points us away from an old earth and towards a young one: we have far less helium and hydrogen, the "daughters" of the decay process, around today than we should expect.

If the decay process involving these two elements began millions of years ago at a constant rate, then the "daughters" we see today should be a great deal bigger than they are. But they are still in their push-chairs!

This suggests that the decay process is far less advanced than is assumed, meaning it can only have begun recently.

Amber

The film "Jurassic Park" was based on the extraction of dinosaur DNA from insects trapped in amber, which had sucked dinosaur blood. That part is true – DNA can be extracted from insects trapped in amber.

But DNA is very unstable. After death, DNA simply starts to disintegrate, and after at most a few thousand years, it would no longer exist, even if the creature was trapped in amber.

Thus the DNA we find in insects-in-amber today cannot be more than a few thousand years' old, at most.

Yet evolutionists for example have dated by this method a particular beetle at over 130 million years old. That date is a nonsense, but it is used as a piece of the dating jigsaw puzzle, for on the basis of that date, the dates of surrounding creatures will be dated too. We see how the whole dating bandwagon rolls grandly on, each date being used to justify every other date.

The "Population Clock"

In 2000 AD the world population was approximately 7 billion. If we start the process with two human beings, and make the conservative

assumption that the population doubles every 150 years, we need 33 such doublings to reach 8.5 billion people. The date for the start of such a process comes out at 4,950 years ago.

On the other hand, if the earth is ten times older than that, at 50,000 years old (still far younger than evolutionists believe), then there would have been 330 doublings, making the population of the world today as 10 to the power of 100.

Suffice it to say that that is rather a large number! - and the human race would have long since destroyed itself by sheer weight of numbers.

Moon Dust

During the period of the various moon landings forty years ago, the NASA scientists were expecting there to be deep layers of fine dust on the surface of the moon, which would have accumulated since the "birth" of the moon. This dust could have proved fatal, by clogging the engines of the lunar module.

But there was hardly any lunar dust. Why not?

Some Conclusions

We have come across some quite technical information in this chapter, which can be rather confusing for our lay minds. But the mere fact that there is so much technical information is in itself an encouragement for us to take GEN seriously. We simply do not have to scurry off into the refuges of GT or TE - (which turn out to be not refuges at all) - "that God must have used evolution and that the Genesis creation account is just a myth".

The first conclusion we can draw from the evidence we have considered here is that the notion that the earth and the universe are very old is a **belief**, which has arisen from evolutionary assumptions.

We have seen that some of those assumptions are downright impossible – many of the things which we are told are very old simply cannot be very old.

Equally, much of the evidence around us is not only conducive to a young-earth view, but points strongly towards that view.

At the very least therefore, we see that GEN - telling us of a recent 6-day creation, wrought by God, is still "alive and kicking" **on scientific grounds**, quite apart from any other grounds in its support.

Let us remind ourselves why all this matters.

DME and its fellow-travellers on which it depends, Great Ages and Old Earth, have become far and away the greatest reasons why people dismiss the Bible and reject the God revealed within the Bible.

By demonstrating that DME is an impossibility, and that Great Ages and Old Earth are pure assumptions, GEN, the rest of Genesis, and the rest of the Bible thereafter, can be given the serious hearing they deserve once more.

The fact remains that there is no scientific reason, and no scientific evidence around us, why God could not have made this universe and the earth within it, recently and over a period of 6 normal days.

In our next chapter we shall consider some of the famous "ape-men" fossils which have been claimed as demonstrating the evolution of humans from the apes, and then we shall come on to consider the Genesis Flood.

Chapter Eleven

The "Missing Link" and Ape-Man Fossils

Since the publication of Darwin's book "On the Origin of Species" in 1859, there have been many attempts to find **"the missing link"** in the fossil record between apes and homo sapiens. The existence of such a fossil would give clear evidence that that transition from ape to human has truly occurred – a transition that is vital for DME's credentials.

But Gary Parker, a well-known creationist speaker based in Australia, starts one of his discussions about "ape-man fossils" rather well. He puts it like this:

"If you believe a frog turns instantly into a prince, that's a fairy tale; but if you believe it takes 300 million years to do so, that's evolution. Is it true that all we have to do is wait?"

Neanderthal Man

In the late nineteenth century, much attention was given to "Neanderthal Man" as providing the missing link. It was initially argued that the Neanderthals were indeed half-ape and half-human, mainly because of their hunched posture as they walked along.

However, it subsequently became clear that the Neanderthals were entirely human after all. For example they apparently had a larger brain volume than we do today; they practised quite sophisticated cave art; and they held a belief in an after-life – three characteristics clearly not shared by the apes. Their hunched posture has been explained by their suffering from various bone diseases, brought on probably by a meagre and limited diet.

So it turns out that the Neanderthals are simply ordinary people, our human forebears with particular problems of their own. Now

"science", which was originally very keen on them serving as the "missing link", has caught up with the actual facts.

Some Hoaxes and Frauds

In 1912 at last the missing link was found – or so it was claimed.

"Piltdown Man" consisted of a skull and jaw, from which it was concluded that here was a creature in transition between being an ape and being a human.

It did not take long to establish that the Piltdown Man find was a deliberate hoax. It was in fact an ape jaw set into a human skull, both stained so as to look old. We have to ask why someone would perpetrate such a fraud.

Yet Piltdown Man was still put forward as one of the missing links until the 1950s.

"Java Man" consisted officially of an upper leg and skull fragment, and yet again, great conclusions were drawn from the significance of this find.

However, the discoverer of these fragments also found with them *an ordinary human skull* which he did not mention for thirty years.

"Peking Man" was the name given to a collection of ape-like skulls found in China in the 1930s, each skull of which was crushed at the back.

What was exciting about this find was the presence of some primitive tools with the skulls, the inference being that these creatures had had the ability to construct and use tools.

But closer examination showed that the tools had been used *on* the skulls, not by the owners of the skulls. It turns out they were ordinary ape-skulls, which had been broken open to extract the brain tissue within – ape-brain being still a delicacy in China today apparently.

So Peking Man was nothing more than a meal for humans rather than an ancestor of humans.

"Nebraska Man" caused further excitement later on, especially in the now-famous Scopes Trial of 1925 in the United States, where a teacher was accused of teaching evolution to his pupils. The Nebraska Man tooth was used as evidence in support of DME.

Two years later, a similar tooth was found, attached to a pig's skull.

There are many other fossil finds, including for example Ramopithecus and Australopithecus, which, at least according to their discoverers, provide further evidence of our being descended from the apes. But time and again the initial results of each find are either corrected on further examination, or are rejected out of hand in the case of frauds.

The fact is that still no conclusive link between the apes and homo sapiens has been found within the fossil record, this despite 150 years of active searching since the time of Darwin's book.

The fossil record continues to give its silent testimony, that apes are apes and human are humans.

Pure Make-Believe

Before we move on from these fossil claims, we should note in passing how amazing it is that detailed pictures of long-gone creatures could be produced and widely published, all drawn from such slender evidence. Such pictures are nothing more than pure make-believe, deriving from the imaginations, *and the expectations*, of the artists.

The artists themselves have been taught by DME that our forebears are all hunched, hairy, ape-like creatures.

Thus when they are presented with a piece of skull or jawbone and a commission to "draw for us what this creature would have looked like", they do just that! No wonder they come up with the usual picture of ape-like beings sitting outside their caves in the midst of the

swamps, perhaps with a few mammoths passing by in the background.

Try it yourself. Take a piece of any bone from an animal you do not know, and then draw the creature from whence that bone came, set in the environment in which the animal lives or lived. You will quickly learn about imagination and make-believe.

Yet our textbooks are filled with such pictures, each one playing its part in convincing the public that human evolution from the apes is a proven scientific fact based on proven scientific evidence.

What the fossil record actually shows is that nothing could be further from the truth.

Chapter Twelve

The Genesis Flood

The Genesis / Evolution debate remains crucially important. Far from this subject being a sideshow, time and again Darwin's Theory of Evolution is given as the reason why people reject the Bible and all that is within it.

For if the Bible has got it so wrong in Genesis regarding our origins, by telling us that God made everything in six days when in fact the universe has just evolved naturally over millions of years, why ever should we bother with anything else that the Bible says?

We have been seeing that despite the constant pro-BB and pro-DME assumptions in the media, both these beliefs face severe scientific problems.

What is more, a great deal of the evidence around us points not only away from long-age, slow macro-evolution, but strongly towards a young-age, and hence rapid, creation.

Genesis 6 - 8

In this chapter we shall consider "Noah's Flood" of Genesis Chapters 6 – 8. You might like to read those famous old words in your Bible before going further into this chapter.

We must ask ourselves at the outset: Does this read like a legend? Does this story really come over as some hotted-up myth from Babylon or somewhere else?

For that is how a liberal approach chooses to handle this story, telling us that Genesis 6-8 is merely a concocted account of some local flood of years before, drawn from various unknown sources.

The Hebrew compilers of this story, we are told, were keen to use it to show that if the people disobeyed the "powers-that-be", then God would get angry and punish everyone.

Is that really all there is to it? Let us take a closer look.

The Fossil Record

We start with the fossils.

A fossil is an exact copy in rock of a formerly-living organism, such as a bird, mammal, reptile, insect, fish or plant. For such an organism to become fossilised, four conditions must be met:

1 Water – the organism must be under water at, or soon after, the time of death.

2 Sediment – the organism must be buried in sediment to preserve it.

3 Speed – the burying must be rapid before the organism decays.

4 Dead things!

In sedimentary rocks around the world, (that is rocks, which are in layers, and which were originally laid down underwater), we find literally millions of fossils.

Using these fossils and the rocks in which they were found, the early geologists began to construct the "geologic column". This was an attempt to show a complete sequence of rocks on the earth, from the oldest at the bottom, to the youngest at the top.

So as to date these rocks, the geologists used the fossils within them, and then, to date fossils elsewhere, they would use the dates of the rocks in which the fossils were found.

Thus for example, Fossil A is found in Rock Type 1 in Arizona. It has been established from South Africa that Rock Type 1 is 200 million years old, because of the fossils within it, so Fossil A in Arizona must be 200 million years old as well. Then we can go on to Bolivia, where we find Fossil A again, but in Rock Type 8! So we know that Rock Types 1 and 8 must be roughly the same age, because they both contain Fossil A.

And so the process goes on, with the gradual construction of dates of both fossils and rocks. There are two end results: first, the geologic column, and second, the "evolutionary tree", apparently showing how ancient, simple life forms have steadily evolved into the complex life forms of today.

Patchwork Quilts

But notice that both the column and the tree are pure "patchwork quilts". There is no place anywhere at all on the earth where there is anything like a full sequence of rocks as shown in the geologic column. Nor is there anything like a full array of fossils, from the simple at the bottom to the complex near the top, in any one place.

Instead, there are bits and pieces of rock sequences and fossil sequences all over the world, from which have been developed a supposedly full geologic column and a supposedly full evolutionary tree.

Whatever else is going to be said, it is abundantly clear that once again we are in the realm of *total theory*. The theories might be right, or they might not be right. The key point is that they are theories, only theories, and they are very far from being proven facts. But try telling that to Sir David Attenborough and his colleagues.

Thus it can be seen that the fossils and the rocks in which they are found played a significant part in the development of evolutionary ideas (bearing in mind that Darwin was by no means the first to think along these lines).

The fossils are the closest we can ever come to real historical evidence, but of course they do not come with a date label. Darwin ended his book by admitting that the fossil record was "the worst evidence for my theory", because no "transitional fossils" had yet been found (that is, fossils of creatures halfway between one species and another). He also spoke of the origin of plants as "an abominable mystery".

But he argued that, with further exploration in the future, many of the questions still posed by the fossils would be clearly answered – in favour of Darwin himself and his theory.

Sure enough, the fossils have been used over the years as the main evidence for DME. "Just look in the rocks!" they say. "You see simple creatures near the bottom, in the older layers of rock, and the more complex creatures in the younger rocks near the top, so there you see it – macro-evolution in action before your very eyes!".

At first sight this looks convincing, even though we might have to go to fifty places around the world to find the different layers in the supposed sequence. But there are rather more sights than just this first sight.

"Mini-Catastrophism"

Before we come on to consider Noah's Flood as such, let us remember that an evolutionist has to accept that all the fossils were indeed covered rapidly, in sediment and underwater.

But because of "uniformitarianism" (everything has happened gradually at rates we see today), an evolutionist has to believe that there must have been innumerable small and local floods during the earth's millions of years of history, enabling the billions of fossils we see to have been formed; that is, many tiny catastrophes within the main uniformitarian processes.

Discrepancies

Despite these many little catastrophes, the great evolutionary goal that has to be achieved is an orderly sequence of rocks and fossils across the earth, from the old at the bottom to the new at the top.

Any discrepancy, anywhere in the world, such as a fossil type being "in the wrong position" in the rock layers, or a specific rock type containing the "wrong" fossils, poses real problems for the evolutionist, for such a discrepancy is a threat to the whole edifice of DME and the geologic column.

However, discrepancies are fine as far as a Noah's-Flood-creationist is concerned. Indeed they are not seen as discrepancies at all. The whole notion of discrepancy only arises when you are obliged, from the beliefs you hold to, to force the evidence you see before you into a specific time-frame and sequence.

Three Massive Fossil Problems

Let us now consider three more massive problems confronting DME that are posed by the fossils.

Problem Number One: No Pre-Cambrian Fossils

The oldest rocks on earth come under the general heading of "Pre-Cambrian" in the geologic column.

Despite great thicknesses of apparently suitable sedimentary rocks of this age in different parts of the world, *the first three-quarters* of our supposed evolutionary history are not supported by any fossil evidence at all.

Instead, at the start of the Cambrian period, (that is, supposedly younger rocks sitting on top of the pre-Cambrian rocks), a whole host of fossils suddenly appears, displaying a wide range of fully-developed species, many of which are still recognisable with those existing today.

This means that only the supposed final quarter of the evolutionary tree has any fossils, and these are all fully-formed anyway.

From a Genesis Flood perspective, this lack of fossils in the pre-Cambrian rocks is not critical; it can be reasonably explained by the simple absence of creatures in such areas, perhaps due to great tidal currents or whirlpools and the like.

But this absence of pre-Cambrian fossils leaves DME supporters with a great deal of explaining to do. Apart from anything else it obliges them to admit that the first three-quarters of the vital fossil evidence on which the "evolutionary tree" depends is simply not there. Why not?

Problem Number Two: No "Transitional" Fossils

If DME is correct, we should expect the fossil record to be teeming with "halfway house" creatures, that is, those which are *between* species. These are known as transitional or intermediate fossils.

Darwin depends on these transitional fossils, for his whole theory is based on the notion of a sort of inexorable escalator of life, leading from the ancient and simple to the new and complex. In such a process, "species" hardly matter at all, for by definition, every creature is always changing from one thing into something bigger and better. Hence most fossils we find should display features of more than one species.

Darwin acknowledged that in his day no convincing examples of transitional fossils had been found, but they would be, he said, given further exploration. One hundred and fifty years of such exploration have now passed, with still no joy. 99.999999% of all fossils are clearly within distinct species, reminding us of the phrase in Genesis 1, "God brought them forth after their own kind". Even the 0.000001% of fossils keenly put forward as being transitional turn out not to be.

All fossils appear in the record fully-formed, with minor variations (micro-evolution) due to local conditions, as we should expect and still observe today. We see nothing within the fossil record of any new species *being* formed.

For example we come across little creatures called trilobites, rather like wood lice of today. In evolutionary terms they are deemed to be early and primitive, but the trilobites suddenly appear in the fossil record, in great numbers and with awesome complexity, and then suddenly disappear from it. Their eyes had a double lens, giving perfect and undistorted sight – but they did not even need eyes for the lifestyles they lived! Why, and how, did such perfect eyes evolve for them? "Isn't it wonderful what evolution can do?" is the stock response.

A few years after Darwin's book was published, a fossil of Archaeopteryx was found amidst great excitement in Germany; he

was nicknamed Archie. This was a bird-like creature with a bony, feathered tail, and was proclaimed as "pro-avis", a first bird that had evolved from a reptile – a transitional fossil at last!

But this fossil has features still found in creatures today, for example claws on its wing just like ostriches of today. It had a furcular (a wishbone), which marks it out as a strong, flying bird. Later on, two definite bird fossils were found in Texas, which were dated as 75 million years *older* than Archaeopteryx. So Archie turned out to be not a transitional fossil at all.

Sometimes we are told that the development of the horse is a clear example of macro-evolution through various transitional phases, from "eohippus" to "equus". But even New Scientist magazine has acknowledged that such an example has been "oversimplified and misleading", causing researchers to waste time and money on a project that leads nowhere.

We also have significant gaps in the fossil sequence. For example in both the fossil record and the living world we have only single-celled and multi-celled organisms – no 2- or 3-celled creatures. But such creatures must have existed if Darwin's theory is true. But where are they? They exist only in theory.

Mr Colin Patterson of the British Museum published a book entitled simply "Evolution". He was asked why there were no illustrations of transitional fossils in his book, to which he simply replied, "There are no such illustrations, because there are no such known fossils".

Professor Barnes of the School of Botany in Cambridge has cheerfully admitted, "Textbooks hoodwink!" when it comes to the evolution of plants. Here again we have no transitional fossils.

For Darwin the evolution of plants was "an abominable mystery". It still is.

Problem Number Three: Fossils and Rocks in the Wrong Order

Nowhere on the earth's surface is there anything like a complete fossil sequence in one location from a simple organism at the bottom

through to a human being at the top. We have seen how each new date, for a fossil or a rock layer, depends for its accuracy upon the many previous dates upon which it is based.

In some cases the fossil sequence is in the wrong order. For example, mammals appear lower down, that is therefore earlier, than birds, and primates appear in the Eocene earlier than some of the orders of lower mammals.

Elsewhere even the rock beds are upside down. The Matterhorn for example is made of rocks said to be older than the rocks it is sitting on. This little mystery is solved by arguing that the older rocks have been slid into place over the young rocks upon which the mountain now sits.

But this solution poses more problems than it solves. What possible force could have done the pushing? And why is the plane of friction (that is, the junction between the bottom of the older rocks comprising the mountain, and the top of the younger rocks on which it now sits) an entirely normal joint with no sign of friction or metamorphosis at all? We should expect that plane of friction to be buckled and burned, but it isn't.

The jumble of rocks and fossils which we find throughout the world is exactly what we should expect from a Flood, and the lack of transitional fossil forms only testifies to the truth of Genesis 1, where we are told that God brought forth each form of creation "according to its kind".

Once again, the facts beneath our feet and before our eyes point strongly towards the veracity of the Genesis creation account.

"Living Fossils"

But the problems posed by fossils regarding macro-evolution continue.

Why do we have many fossils which are exactly the same as living forms today? Surely evolution should have done its work, meaning that life forms today should be significantly different from their

fossilised antecedents? But clams are still clams, snails are still snails; sea lilies, frogs, sea urchins – all are the same today. We have algae today which are exactly the same as fossilised algae with a supposed date of 1,000 million years ago.

The most famous example of "a living fossil" is the coelecanth, a large fish with bony fins. These fins were thought to be the beginning of flippers, and hence perhaps the coelecanth was evolving into an amphibian? But then a coelecanth was caught off South Africa in the 1930s. So many have been caught since that, as one creationist has put it with a smile, coelecanths are in danger of becoming extinct.

Examples such as these pose problems for long-age geologists and evolutionists. While DME has depended from the start on the fossil record, this is no longer the case. For instance Mark Ridley, an evolutionist at Oxford cheerfully admits that "no evolutionist uses the fossil record now" – the emphasis having moved to genetics.

There has also been a swing in favour of accepting sudden evolution, known as "punctuated equilibrium", to explain the lack of transitional fossils. This involves the belief that for most of the time uniformitarianism ruled, but occasionally there were brief, rapid bursts of evolution that happened too fast to leave any evidence in the fossils.

We can only wonder at how the mind of a typical evolutionist seems to work! "DME is King! DME is True! – and we will do whatever it takes to keep DME on its throne". Whatever else we can say about such an approach, it certainly isn't science.

But for a GEN-creationist, there is no problem at all. This Flood-creationist simply says that the features that we see around us today in the rocks, fossils, oceans and continents, testify clearly to a horrendous, global flood, just as the Bible describes.

Of the two Belief Systems we are dealing with, DME with its long ages or GEN with its recent-creation-and-flood, the evidence before our eyes fits the latter model far more than the former one.

Now that *is* science.

Chaos

If Noah's Flood happened as described in Genesis 6-8, utter chaos would have reigned across the earth, both during and after the Flood.

We are told of the collapse of waters "above the firmament" causing torrential and prolonged rain, plus the bursting-forth of the "fountains of the deep", meaning presumably more water and volcanic eruptions, both lasting 40 days.

Such events would cause tremendous erosion, rising floodwaters, sediment and corpses. Millions and millions of creatures would have drowned, their corpses swirling in the floodwaters, and then sinking and being buried by all the sediments. The remains would then become fossilised as the sediments dried out and became "lithified" (turned into rock).

The post-Flood landscape would thus consist of extensive areas of sedimentary rocks with embedded fossils, but there would be no universal sequence of layers of either rocks or fossils. After such a flood it would be fanciful for us to look today for neat layers of rocks, and fossils within those rocks, across the world, and then to try to fit what we see into a time-frame of millions of years.

What we could expect to find is the more complex creatures being generally nearer the top of the sediments, simply because they could escape death for a longer period, while the simpler creatures would be lower down for they had perished first. Overall however, "higgledy-piggledy" is what we should expect, and, surprise, surprise, that is exactly what we do find.

Notice that in the above scenario, we have all the basic requirements for fossil formation: water, sediment, speed - and millions of dead things.

Peaceful Co-Existence?

Notice also that if the fossils we see around us today were all laid down in the Genesis Flood, the creatures which make up those fossils would have all perished within weeks of each other.

And that simple fact in turn means that before the Flood *all those creatures had been living on the earth together at the same time.*

That last point needs to sink in.

It means that dinosaurs and human beings co-existed on the earth before the Flood (for example fossilised footprints of men *inside* dinosaur footprints) - and perhaps we still do co-exist! Nessie?

Yet again, the notion that dinosaurs died out millions of years before man ever evolved is seen to be pure make-believe, arising from this desperate clinging to DME in the face of the evidence around us.

Fossil Graveyards

Massive fossil graveyards are found in different parts of the world. There are great shoals of fossilised fish in rocks which are now near the top of the Alps.

In the Karoo in South Africa, there is a vast fossil graveyard with an estimated 800 *billion* vertebrate skeletons; that is rather a lot of dead things.

There are an estimated 1 billion fossilised fish in 4 square miles of Miocene shales in California, and millions more in the Devonian Old Red Sandstones in eastern Scotland. In Australia there are millions of fossilised jellyfish, and Colorado and the Antarctic contain huge dinosaur graveyards.

What does all this evidence point to? It is evidence that is entirely in line with what we should expect from a global flood of enormous intensity and destructive power - the ultimate example of "catastrophism".

What about the Water?

In Genesis we are told that the Flood was global, and was caused by the release of water from above and beneath the earth. If so, critics ask, where is all the water now?

The answer is rather simple: right here.

70% of the earth's surface today is underwater, and it is estimated that the sea has an *average* depth of 13,000 feet (that is, approximately 2½ miles). The average height of the land above the sea on the other hand is only 2,500 feet (about ½ mile).

So if all the land on the earth, both below the sea today and above it, was flattened out into a perfect sphere, with the surface-smoothness of a ping-pong ball for example, clearly the whole earth would be covered by sea water to a great depth.

Since the Flood, the surface of the ping-pong ball has become "crinkly": the sea floors have dropped and the continents have risen, causing the flood waters to drain into the ocean basins, and exposing 30% of the earth's surface as "dry land" above current sea level.

In Bolivia for example, there are the remains of a vast salt-water sea that was originally 400 miles long by 100 miles wide. This sea is now 12,500 feet above sea level (that is nearly 2½ miles), but there are no salt-bearing rocks in the area. This lake is a classic example of the post-Flood rise of land masses - the surface of the ping-pong ball becoming crinkly.

There is no problem at all concerning the water of the Flood. It is all still here.

Cave Evidence

There is significant cave evidence supporting a massive flood that is found in different parts of the world, such as France, California, Australia, Sicily, South America and England.

In the Victoria Cave in Yorkshire for example, when it was excavated in the 1870s, bones were found of grizzly bear, bison, fox, reindeer, mammoth, hyena, hare and hippo.

What could have driven this strange collection of animals, all at the same time, firstly *up* a hillside and then *into* a cave?

Rapidity

DME needs great spans of time, but we have already seen ample evidence that things can happen very, very quickly (as we saw in a previous chapter with those tiny polonium haloes and with the strata at Mount Saint Helens).

Sea lilies for example disintegrate quickly after death, but perfect fossilised sea lilies have been found. They must have been buried almost instantly. Clams normally come open about an hour after death, but fossilised clams are still shut – they must have been buried alive.

Even the processes of fossilisation and lithification (the turning of the soft sediments into rock) need not take long. A teddy bear in Yorkshire became lithified in just three months. A ship's bell, from a ship that sank in 1852, was found to be entirely cased in real sandstone only 120 years later.

So here are further examples of how processes involving sediment, fossilising and lithifying can all be surprisingly quick. Millions of years are not only not needed, they would actually prevent from happening what we see before our eyes *has* happened in many parts of the world.

A Genetic Bottle-Neck

In recent decades a switch in evolutionary research has occurred away from the fossils to genetics - the fossil record has turned out to be a "non-starter" for DME, so perhaps genetics will fare better.

But even here there is rather a large problem. If any two men are taken from anywhere in the world, say from Australia and northern Canada, their genes will be closer than the genes of any two apes *taken from the same African rain forest*.

Researchers, no friends of creationism, have concluded from this that there "must have been a bottleneck in human history".

Well, what a mystery! It might just be solved by a reading of Genesis Chapters 1 - 11.

Global Flood Stories

Anthropologists have discovered stories based on early Genesis in indigenous peoples literally throughout the world – such as the American Indians, the Babylonians, the Maoris, the Egyptians, the Eskimos, the Fijians, the Chinese, the Mexicans and the Hawaiians.

The details inevitably vary with the passing of the years and the spreading-out of the peoples, but the stories contain recurring themes. For Flood stories we hear of a terrible flood, a single family, animals in a great boat, and often a name such as Nuh or Noh.

For example the aborigines have stories concerning an original man and woman, a time of no death, then a curse, then a flood. Where did all that come from? There is a Babylonian legend concerning "the lady of the rib".

Early Christian missionaries in China were astonished to find in the characters used in Chinese writing numerous references to Genesis. A few examples will have to suffice here, but fuller details can be found in a book listed at the end of this book.

For example:

- a) The verb "create" in Chinese is made up of symbols meaning: dust / life or motion / mouth or person / speak / walk.
- b) "Devil" is made up of: garden / man / secret / life or motion.
- c) "Tempter" is made up of: cover / tree / devil.
- d) "Covet" is made up of: woman / two trees.
- e) "Boat" is made up of: vessel / eight / mouth or person.
- f) "To judge" is made up: mouth / words / lamb.

Deeply embedded within Chinese tradition and language, pre-dating Moses and the written Genesis accounts by centuries, we have numerous references to the events described in Genesis. How could this be?

The only answer is for us to accept the words and implications of Genesis for the post-Flood era: the people gradually multiplied, and, after Babel, spread out across the earth, taking with them the knowledge of creation, the Fall and the Flood.

Hence it is no surprise that we find the Genesis events embedded within ancient Chinese, and Flood accounts from all over the world.

Jesus and Genesis

The Bible tells us that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of God. Many people choose to believe this, and worship Jesus Christ as Lord. Equally, we are told that "all things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made" (John 1.3). It is only reasonable therefore for us to pay attention to Jesus' own beliefs and utterances about the early chapters of Genesis.

Jesus believed in a literal Adam and Eve (eg Matthew 19.4), and in the worldwide Flood of Genesis 6-8 (eg Matthew 24. 36-39), which "took them all away".

He speaks of the great tribulation that is yet to come (eg Mark 13.19) as being more terrible than anything there has ever been since "the beginning of the creation which God created" – worse therefore even than the Flood.

Some Other Scriptures and Genesis

The Book of Job is reckoned to be the oldest book in the Bible, pre-dating the written version of the first five books of the Bible.

In Job 22.15-17 we read of "the old way which wicked men have trodden", who were "cut down out of time, whose foundation was overthrown with a flood". There is the Flood once again, mentioned almost in passing, in the midst of the oldest written book of the Bible.

In II Peter 2 the Holy Spirit tells us through Peter how God "spared not the old world, but saved Noah the eighth person, a preacher of

righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly" (v.5).

In II Peter 3.3-7, we are told that "in the last days" scoffers will come, "walking after their own lusts". Notice what we are told about these people:

- a) They will dismiss the promised coming of the Lord (v.4).
- b) They will be "uniformitarians" – "all things continue as from the beginning of the creation" (v.4); that is, there never was a worldwide flood.
- c) They will be willingly ignorant of the flood, in which "the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished" (v.6).

We only need to look around us today to see that those promised scoffers have been "ruling the roost" in terms of western thought for a good many years now, with BBDME at the heart of their rule.

In Jude 14-15 we read of "Enoch, the seventh from Adam" prophesying of the Lord's Second Coming in judgement

There is no denying that the early chapters of Genesis, including the Creation, the Fall, the Flood and Babel, are accepted as factual throughout the rest of Scripture without a second thought, and notably by the Lord Himself.

If that is the approach of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ to Genesis (and indeed to the rest of the Old Testament), should that not be good enough for us?

The only alternative is to say that nowadays we know more than the Son of God did then, who is the Agent of creation in the first place. Is any Bible-believing Christian going to be comfortable in claiming that he or she knows more than the Lord Jesus? Or in claiming that some of the things the Lord Jesus believes and tells us we now know to be ***untrue?***

As one noted creationist speaker has put it – "It is serious not to believe the Bible In the Bible we are dealing with Almighty God".

The Ark Itself?

Let us finish with "Noah's ark".

In a book that has become the standard work on the subject, "The Genesis Flood", published in the early 1960s, John Whitcomb and Henry Morris closely examined the Flood account of Genesis Chapters 6 - 8 from a scientific point of view.

Their researches included the ark itself. They concluded that the dimensions of the ark as given in Genesis 6 are wholly credible. The length x width x height ratios of 10 x 6 x 1 (described in NIV as 450 feet x 75 feet x 45 feet), are still the norm for basic marine design. They estimated that the ark's capacity was ample for the number of creatures required to be loaded on board, a figure of approximately 35,000 animals, plus room for storage of fodder and water, and living space for Noah and his family. The timescale of construction of the ark, the workforce, the materials, the gathering of the animals - all "add up".

In Genesis 8.4 we are told that the ark landed on the mountains of Ararat, in what is now eastern Turkey.

This brings us to efforts by various groups to find the remains of the ark. We must now tread with particular caution, as the search for, and supposed discovery of, Noah's ark itself is clearly going to attract many fortune-seekers, attention-grabbers and downright hoaxers.

But let us be clear as to the enormous significance in the GEN - BBDME debate if the remains of the ark really were found, definitely and beyond all doubt, on Ararat.

The discovery of the remains of a great, ancient boat on a mountain, a mile or more above present sea level, would take some explaining. It would give DME even more problems than it is having already, and force people to give GEN a great deal of respect once again, for

those remains would be direct, beyond-debate evidence that the Genesis Flood *happened*.

You would think that these days finding an object such as a large old wooden boat on a mountain would be fairly straightforward, what with satellite photography and so on. But it seems it is not as easy as that.

There are various peaks of the Ararat range spread over a large area; there are ice and snow fields; there have been earthquakes over the centuries altering the landscape. Searchers, who tend to be well-funded, well-meaning American Christians, also speak of a curious sense of difficulty, foreboding, frustration and danger encountered by expeditions while on the mountains. It is as if there is something of a strong spiritually-negative nature that is present over the area and thwarting the explorations.

Even so, there is undoubtedly much evidence, in terms of stories, claims, historical records and possible photos, to suggest the remains of the ark may well still be up there somewhere.

One of the strongest pieces of evidence concerns various local place names of the area that are clearly based on the Genesis Flood account; even if the ark no longer exists, those place names quietly testify to those old words, "the ark came to rest on the mountains of Ararat" (Genesis 8.4). Their very antiquity makes it very unlikely they were all invented as a deliberate hoax.

Suffice it to say here that the finding of the remains of the ark remains a possibility, but it is not something deserving our obsessive attention.

Frustratingly, there is nothing definite in the search results so far, and we have seen that there is ample evidence for the truth of the global flood quite apart from the possible discovery of the ark itself.

Some Conclusions

In conclusion, let us see where all that we have come across in this chapter actually gets us to in the GEN / DME debate:

1 If the Flood happened as described in Genesis, we can safely assume that the fossils and sedimentary rocks on the earth today were laid down rapidly and recently during that Flood, and not gradually over millions of years.

2 Hence all the creatures now fossilised were alive together on the earth at the same time before the Flood.

3 Hence there is yet again not a shred of evidence in support of long-age macro-evolution, but instead:

- overwhelming evidence in favour of the Genesis account of the Flood;
- and, if Genesis gets it right about the Flood, in the face of all the ridicule heaped upon it by the well-oiled DME juggernaut, why ever should it not also get it right concerning a recent, 6-day creation by God?

We have seen how the dating methods that are used rely entirely on long-age assumptions, which in turn have been adopted simply because of a prior belief in long-age DME.

We have seen also that there is ample evidence in support of rapid and young-age creation.

Approaching the evidence around us with that Genesis-based mindset has nothing to do with being fundamentalist nut-cases, etc, etc, etc - the cheap accusation that is constantly made - but everything to do with a mature Christian response on both scriptural and scientific grounds.

In view of all the evidence we have come across in these pages, would an open-minded, neutral person, inspecting the evidence around us in the light of the two explanations put forward (long-age Darwinian macro-evolution or recent, rapid creation and a global flood) not be bound to opt for the Genesis account? - for it is that account that fits the facts far more closely than does the other one.

Derision

We must bear in mind that people who accept the first chapters of Genesis as literal truth, (and there are many more of them than we might expect), are usually met with howls of derision or worse.

An example of recent years concerns Sarah Palin, the Republican Vice-Presidential candidate in the US Presidential election of 2008. While many of the sniggers directed towards her may have been justified in the light of her apparent political ineptitude, she also took much vitriolic flak because of her creationist beliefs.

We can only assume that this viciousness arises because the powers-that-be who are opposed to God and desperate to uphold BBDME realise how *crucial* this subject is.

For if it is shown that we have **not** evolved by chance over millions of years, then the old question remains: just how did we get here? As we have seen, despite all the odds, Genesis comes up with highly convincing answers to that question.

Courtesy

Let us be courteous and reasonable if involved in discussions in such matters. Asking simple questions, using any one of the many pieces of evidence we have come across in this book, will serve to show that, at the very least, these issues are far from being "done and dusted" as BBDME believers would have us believe.

When all is said and done, God's Word simply states – "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. 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" (Genesis 2.1-2).

In Job 38.4 we read – "Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare, if thou hast understanding".

Quite so!

Chapter Thirteen

The Closing Headlines

In "Six Days, Darwin or Both?" we have covered a great deal of ground. The very existence of this ground demonstrates that the Genesis / Evolution debate remains a live issue of critical importance.

The worry is that within the Church the debate has been written off as a sideshow for well over a century. The thinking within the Church has been to accept the "findings of science", regarding a great age for the earth and universe, and the supposed established truth of Darwinian macro-evolution. Both of these "findings" fly straight in the face of Genesis and of the rest of Scripture.

In so doing, the Church has made a massive and needless retreat. The authority of both Genesis and the rest of the Bible has been gravely weakened; the Bible has been completely sidelined from the realms of debate and decision-making; and those realms have instead become dominated by leave-God-out-of-it evolutionist thinking.

The dismal consequences of this madness can be seen all around us in western society today.

As part of this process, those keeping to a literal, recent, finished 6-day creation, for very good reasons, are now written off as weirdoes, fruitcakes, fundamentalists, nutcases, geeks, etc, etc, from beyond and within the Church.

This makes no sense, for it isn't these GEN-upholders who have the explaining to do. Rather, the explaining needs to be done by those BBDME-upholders who seek to alter Scripture by downgrading early Genesis to the status of poetry and myth. As we have seen in these pages, trying to justify that downgrading is a great deal harder than it looks, when faced with the facts we have encountered in this book.

As we finish, to help you remember the main points of attack and defence in any discussion of these matters, here is a repeat of the Confusion-Buster (from page 49), with one or two final comments:

1) At the Start

- A **no-God BB**, involving Nothing to Something, is scientifically impossible: it did not happen.
- A **God-created Beginning**, creating Something from Nothing, has to have happened, somehow and at some time; quite apart from any other arguments, there are simply no logical alternatives.

Conclusions: Atheism is impossible; there has to be a Creator above, beyond and outside this creation to explain how everything started.

2) After the Start

- A **no-God process** of DME is scientifically impossible: it did not happen.
- A **God-initiated process** of DME (ie., He started things off then walked away) is scientifically impossible: it did not happen.
- A **God-involved process** of DME (ie., He engineered things at each step of the way) is divinely possible, (for God could add the information and energy needed for DME to move on to the next step), but is theologically *impossible* because it contradicts His character and His written word:
 - (i) the recent 6-day creation;
 - (ii) all was very good;
 - (iii) all was finished;
 - (iv) pain, struggle, bloodshed and death came only *after* human sin and *as a result of* human sin.
 Hence we can be sure that such a process did not happen.

Conclusions: We are left with a **God-created Beginning**, and a **God-involved creative process that did not involve macro-evolution**.

This is where Genesis Chapters 1 - 11 might just be able to help us!

<h2 style="margin: 0;">To Take You Further ...</h2>

Here are some sources of further information on this subject:

Contrary to expectation perhaps, the people involved in these creationist groups are not all "boneheaded fundamentalists".

Many of them are top-rank scientists who are creationists on pure scientific grounds quite apart from on any theological grounds.

1) Creation Science Movement, PO Box 888, Portsmouth PO6 2YD, UK. www.csm.org.uk. 02392 293988.

(Thorough, sensible, modest, long-standing, British).

Recent pamphlet titles include:

- Was there a Big Bang?
- Pi and the Earth's Orbit.
- Flight.
- Can "Yom" really mean one thousand years or even longer?
- Hitler's Debt to Darwin
- Can Life Arise Spontaneously?
- Hallmarks of Design
- He made the stars also
- Genome information – the Darwinian Dilemma
- Histones – The Controllers of DNA
- etc.

2) Answers in Genesis, PO Box 8078, Leicester LE21 9AJ. www.AnswersinGenesis.org. (Serious sums of American and Australian money ensure a stream of professionally-produced materials).

3) Creation Ministries International, 15 Station St, Whetstone, Leicestershire LE8 6JS, Phone: 0845-6800-264. (www.creation.com). (Recently set up after a break-away from AIG, see below).

4) "God's Promise to the Chinese" – by E R Nelson, R E Broadberry & G T Chock; published by Read Books Publisher, ISBN 0-937869-01-5

5) "The Genesis Flood" – Whitcomb & Morris; published by Presbyterian & Reformed (technical, exhaustive, the "grand-daddy" of Flood books).

6) "Many Infallible Proofs" – Henry Morris; published by Creation-Life Publishers, ISBN 0-89051-005-9 (a thorough, readable book about Christian "evidences", including evolution, creation and the Flood).

Appendix 1

Plotting on a Graph the Ages of the Patriarchs as listed in Genesis

This is a simple "back-to-school" exercise for a wet afternoon, but the results are fascinating.

1 Getting started

- a) Put your graph paper horizontally.
- b) Draw the vertical axis 10 cms long, starting at a point 4 cms in from the left margin, and 5 cms up from the bottom margin.
- c) Label this vertical axis 0 / 100 / 2001,000, and write "Age in Years" to the left of the axis.
- d) Draw the horizontal axis 19 cms long, starting from the bottom of the vertical axis.
- e) Write below the horizontal axis "Patriarchs".

2 The Ages

(These ages are found in Genesis Chapters 5 and 11)

For each Patriarch:

- a) mark on the Patriarch's age according to the vertical scale (1mm : 10 years); thus for example, 800 years = an 8cm-high block;
- b) draw a block for him 1 cm in width;
- c) write his name and age above the block.

Adam	930 years	(= 9.3 cms up the vertical axis)
Seth	912 years	
Enosh	905 years	
Kenan	910 years	
Mahalalel	895 years	
Jared	962 years	
Enoch	365 years	draw top of his block with dotted line only
Methuselah	969 years	

Lamech	777 years	
Noah	950 years	mark horizontal line at 600 years on Noah's block and label this FLOOD
Shem	600 years	mark horizontal line at 100 years on Shem's block and label this FLOOD
Arphaxad	438 years	write above his block "Born two years after Flood"
Shelah	433 years	
Ebor	464 years	
Peleg	239 years	
Reu	239 years	
Serug	230 years	
Nahor	148 years	
Terah	205 years	
Abram	175 years	
Isaac	180 years	

3 Colouring

Using a pencil crayon, you could colour all the blocks or parts of blocks before the Flood neatly in one colour, and all the blocks, or parts of blocks, after the Flood neatly in a different colour.

4 Finishing off

You will observe what happens to the ages of the Patriarchs after the Flood. Their earlier deaths are caused by the collapse of the vapour canopy during the Flood. This canopy had served to protect the earth from harmful rays of the sun before the Flood (thus explaining the long lifespans of the pre-Flood Patriarchs). Since the Flood, the earth is now more exposed to the sun, with various, usually harmful consequences, which are part of the curse placed by God on creation as a result of the Fall of Genesis 3.

You could check up on what happened to **Enoch** - Genesis 5.21-24.

You could note down the meaning of each of the names of the Patriarchs, using an exhaustive concordance such as Strong.

Appendix 2

Some Questions for use in the Genesis / Evolution Debate

Here are a few questions, selected from the many topics we have covered in "Six Days, Darwin or Both?", which you can put to believers in BBDME. Use courtesy and a smile, but also dogged persistence, for these questions are far harder to answer than most people realise.

You will find that dealing with atheists on this subject is usually easier than dealing with fellow Christian believers who have accepted GT or TE.

To atheists:

"On the purely scientific grounds which you limit these matters to, please tell me:

- how you can get Something from Nothing;
- how you can then get Everything from that tiny Something;
- how life began;
- where the necessary Information and Energy came from to drive DME at each step of the way;
- how you square DME with the First Law of Thermodynamics (that Matter and Energy are constant, not increasing, and therefore could not have developed from infinitely small beginnings);
- how you square DME with the Second Law of Thermodynamics (that everything runs down rather than hot up);
- how you tackle the problem of "irreducible complexity" (that all parts of an organism, such as an eye, ear or wing, must be fully present at the start for the organism to function properly);
- how you explain "polystrate fossils" (page 63ff);
- how you explain why the first three-quarters of the "evolutionary tree" are entirely missing from the fossil record;

- a follow-up question to the above: so you agree that that evolutionary tree, and even DME itself therefore, is pure belief and assumption, rather than proven science?
- a follow-up question to the two questions above: how do you therefore justify the teaching of Belief System BBDME in Science lessons because it is said to be Science, but the banning of the Belief System GEN because it is not Science".

To Jews or Christians believing in the Gap Theory (GT):

"Please tell me how you explain:

- the absence of any break in the text between Genesis Chapter 1 verses 1 and 2;
- God's silence about the gap (an apparent desire to conceal and confuse) with His desire to reveal to us about our origins in the rest of the early chapters of Genesis;
- that the "re-created" earth could be described as "very good" when it was actually already a massive global graveyard;
- the presence of suffering and death (from the previous creation) BEFORE Man's sin at the Fall, when God tells us in the rest of Scripture that suffering, death and God's curse on creation only came AFTER the Fall, and as a direct result of the Fall"

To Jews or Christians believing in Theistic Evolution (TE):

"Please tell me:

- how you explain that "yom" used with a numerical figure always refers to a 24-hour period elsewhere in Scripture;
- how you explain that Adam lived through Day 7 of creation;
- how you explain the presence of suffering and death (during the macro-evolution process) BEFORE Man's sin at the Fall, when God tells us in the rest of Scripture that suffering, death and God's curse on creation only came AFTER the Fall, and as a direct result of the Fall;
- how you explain that macro-evolution, being cruel and haphazard, does not tie in with the character of God as revealed in the rest of Scripture;
- how you explain God's silence about His use of macro-evolution over millions of years (an apparent desire to conceal

- and confuse) with His desire to reveal to us about our origins in the rest of the early chapters of Genesis;
- how you explain the statement that the creation was finished, but macro-evolution by definition never is finished;
 - how you explain the statement that the creation was "very good", when the earth was in fact filled with violence from the start of the creation process according to TE;
 - how you explain the presence of meticulous genealogy lists in Genesis Chapters 5, 10 and 11;
 - on what grounds you downgrade Noah's Flood to being merely a local flood;
 - on what grounds an ark was necessary if the flood was only local;
 - on what grounds you assume that the early chapters of Genesis are to be understood only as poetry or myth;
 - on what grounds you believe that the early chapters of Genesis are borrowed from older Babylonian legends;
 - how you explain the presence of Flood stories throughout the world;
 - how you explain the obvious knowledge of the Genesis creation account in the characters of the Chinese alphabet;
 - how you explain the decline in the lifespans of the Patriarchs after the Flood;
 - (to a Christian only) how you explain the acceptance by Jesus Christ of the Genesis accounts of creation and the flood".

Quite a list!

"..... For in six days the Lord made the heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day".

(Exodus 20.11)

In the light of the evidence we have considered in these pages, He seems to mean just that.

There is work to be done.

Index

(ff = and following pages)

- after their kind 17
- age, apparent 56
- ages, vast 59
- Alice in Wonderland 36
- amber 65
- atheists 12
- Answers in Genesis 92
- ape-man fossils 68
- Appendix - graph of ages 94ff
- Ararat 88ff
- ark, Noah's 88f
- archaeopteryx 77
- Attenborough Sir David 8 74

- beginning of universe 38
- Belief systems 9
- Bible, removal of 31
- BB 6 12ff 52
- BBDME 12 23
- Big Bang, impossible 36ff
- blobs in the sea 30
- blood, shedding of 20
- bottle-neck, genetic 84

- catastrophism 55
- cause and effect 40ff
- caution 35
- cave evidence 83
- chance and randomness 16
- chaos 81
- Chinese characters 85
- clashes of titans 15ff
- coelecanth 80
- complexity 43
- compromise solutions 23ff
- confusion-buster 49

- co-existence, peaceful 81
- courtesy 91
- creation, order of 17ff
- creationists 6
- Creation Ministries Int'l 92
- Creation Science Movt 92
- Creator 40 48

- Darwinian Macro-Evolution,
impossible 42ff
- dating methods 57ff
- Dawkins Richard 8 12
- default refuge 31ff
- derision 91
- design, apparent 47
- discrepancies, fossil 75
- DME 6 13ff 67 80
- DNA 44 47 65

- earth, the, young? 52
- Enoch 87 95
- enzymes 44
- eohippus 78
- evolutionists 6
- eye, half-formed 44
- Fall The 20
- finished 22
- flaws, GT and TE 26ff
- Flood 6
- Flood, conclusions 89ff
- flood stories 85
- fossil graveyards 82
- fossil record 73ff
- fossils, living 79
- fossils, requirements for 73
- fossils, wrong order 78
- four-fold job 33

- Gap Theory 23ff
- GEN 7 80

- Genesis 1-11 10ff
 Genesis 6-8 72
 "Genesis Flood, The", 88 93
 genetic bottle-neck 84
 global flood stories 85ff
 God as ruler 16
 God-ordained activity 48
 God unnecessary 31
 granite 60
 GT 23ff
- helium and hydrogen 65
 hoaxes and frauds 69
 Hoyle Sir Fred 47
 human sin 19
- Information and Energy 42
 irreducible complexity 44
- Java Man 69
 Jesus and Genesis 86ff
- light, speed of 55ff
 living fossils 79
 love affair with DME 48
- Macro-Evolution 6ff 51
 make-believe 70
 Matterhorn 79
 mica 61
 Micro-Evolution 6ff 51
 mindsets, two 34
 mini-catastrophism 75
 "missing link" 68
 moon dust 66
 Mount St Helens 63
 mutations, random 46
- natural selection 45
 Neanderthal Man 68
- Nebraska Man 70
 Noah's Ark 88ff
 nothing to something 39
 oil, too much 64
 order of creation 17ff
 order of DME 18
 order to chaos 38
 origins of life 42
- patchwork quilts 74
 patriarchs 94ff
 peaceful co-existence 81
 Peking Man 69
 Peter 2 3.3-6 48
 Piltdown Man 69
 place names, Ararat 89
 poems 21
 polonium haloes 60ff
 polystrate fossils 63ff
 population clock 65
 Pre-Cambrian fossils 76
 Pullmann Philip 8
 "punctuated equilibrium" 80
- radiometric dating 58
 rapidity 84
 recently 21
- Science lessons 7
 Scriptures and Genesis 86
 sea salt 64
 sin 19
 strata, formation of 63
 struggle and death 17
 survival of the fittest 45
- Take you further 92ff
 TE 23ff
 theistic evolution 21 23ff
 thermodynamics 1st 37ff

thermodynamics, 2nd 38ff

Titans, clashes of 15ff

transitional fossils 77ff

trilobites 77

tyres, puncturing 34

ultimate Cause 40

"uniformitarianism" 19 53 87

universe young? 52

vegetarianism 19

"very good" 18

wake-up call 33ff

water, Flood 82ff

Whitcomb and Morris 88

wing, half-grown 44

woodpecker 45

"wrong dates" 59

yom 21

young or old 21

SIX DAYS, DARWIN, OR BOTH?

**THE ORIGINS DEBATE
WHY, WHAT
AND SO WHAT**

Oliver Bayley

**ISBN 978-1-905308-27-2
Digital Download Edition**

We hope this book has been a blessing for you.

**For details of our other titles and ministries,
please visit our website at
www.fsmins.org
info@fsmins.org**