

The "evening and the morning" defines a literal day upon this earth and try as one may to remove the words "very good," or explain them away, they always refute the theistic evolutionists who say that God started it but chose evolution to carry it on. God did not create and make man, or any other creature or living system, in a death struggle of the survival of the fittest. Death was not present when God looked upon His work and proclaimed that it was "very good." Survival of the fittest is the result of man's sin and the curse it brought, not God's direct design.

"Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned:" (Rom 5:12).

"For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but... The creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption... For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now" (Rom 8:20-22).

Dear Reader,

You do not have to worry about what so-called scientific or religious leaders say about origins. After all, scientific laws are simply formulations of what already exists. It was created so and true science finds it so. You can read the truth about the origin of the universe and much more in the world's most comprehensive and absolutely accurate Book, the Holy Bible. The Author tells us much about earth's history, including how it all began. He tells us that He spoke and the worlds came into being:

"...the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear" (Heb 11:3).

He even tells us how its going to end.

"...the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat?" (2 Peter 3:10-12).

What shall be after this ending? He tells us that also.

"Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Peter 3:13).

"And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away..." (Rev 21:1).

"And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away" (Rev 21:4).

"But the...unbelieving...shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death" (Rev 21:8).

Your eternal abiding place depends upon whether or not you believe God; not with just a head belief but within the deepest recesses of the inner man. The belief that will save you from the "second death" is a belief which comes from God. It is a belief that will give you a broken and contrite heart because of sin and drive you to your knees before the Creator. It is a belief that will cause you to cry out to the Lord Jesus Christ from a heart of repentance. It will make you cast off all hope in self or any mere man and exercise faith in the Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. It will cause you to open your heart to Jesus Christ, the sin bearer and Lord of all who do so. While the question of which model of origins is the most scientific is an important one, the true believer knows the answer, thus the most important question is:

Where will you spend eternity? With God in the bliss of the "new heaven and new earth" or separated eternally from Him by the "second death"? Only those who have eternal life will escape that "lake of fire." And who is it that has eternal life? Answer: He that hath the Son.

"And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life" (1 John 5:11-12).

Who hath the Son of God? Answer: Those who have received Him.

"He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (John 1:10-13).

The belief that truly opens the heart to receive the Lord Jesus also imparts a new birth which changes and directs our lives into the path of righteousness. David of Israel asked the question:

"LORD, who shall abide in thy tabernacle? Who shall dwell in thy holy hill?" (Psa 15:1).

David received the answer:

"He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart. He that backbiteth not with his tongue, nor doeth evil to

his neighbour, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbour. In whose eyes a vile person is contemned; but he honoureth them that fear the LORD. He that sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not. He that putteth not out his money to usury, nor taketh reward against the innocent. He that doeth these things shall never be moved" (Psa 15:2-5).

No! Salvation is not earned or obtained by living a righteous life. It comes from God "by grace...through faith"; however, once received it produces changes in a person's life. Everyone who Jesus Christ saves will strive to live a righteous life. The major thirsts of a saved soul will be to know Him and be like Him.

"As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God" (Psa 42:1).

Dear Reader, have you been saved? If not, believe on the Son of God and you will not experience the "second death." God tells us that He became a man that He might destroy the Satanic power of Death, the enemy of mankind, and give eternal life to all who will believe.

"For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16).

God also tells us:

"That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the hart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. For the scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed. For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Rom 10:9-13).

Gerald J. Counts

The author, a retired Electronics Engineer, is a student of science, not a scientist. Most of the thoughts on the models of origins in this booklet are based upon the works of scientists who are associated with the Institute of Creation Research (ICR).



CHAPEL LIBRARY

2603 W. Wright St. • Pensacola, FL 32505

Phone: (850) 438-6666 • Fax: (850) 438-0227

email: chapel@mountzion.org • web: www.mountzion.org

A Ministry of Mt. Zion Bible Church

Creation or Evolution?

These two theories of the origin of the universe are mutually exclusive. Of the two scientific models constructed around these theories, one is correct and the other incorrect. One is true and the other false. Either the universe, with life on earth included, had a beginning or it did not. Either there is a Creator who is eternal, or the universe has existed eternally in one form or another. Since man was not present in eternity or at the beginning, scientifically he can only postulate (to assume or assert something as a basis of argument), hypothesize, and theorize about origins and then test by observation and analysis of present data. This must be done with presuppositions about and extrapolation into the past based on or derived from that data. In the final analysis both scientific models, creation or evolution, lead to a matter of faith. Scientifically, the model that is most likely correct is the one which the data best fits. Therefore, let's take a simplistic look at these two models in the light of some of the data.

1. The two foremost scientific laws concerning the universe are the 1st and 2nd laws of thermodynamics. Simply stated, these laws say that nothing is now being created or annihilated and that all systems (living or otherwise), unless otherwise designed or without intelligence maintaining them, become less complex and eventually run down and wear out. What does the data reveal? Answer: Nothing is now being created or annihilated in the universe and it is running down and wearing out. This is what the creation model postulates. The evolution model postulates that the universe, as we know it, started from dead and less complex matter and became more and more complex even to the production of all living systems, including man. With the associated scientific facts, the 1st and 2nd laws fit the creation model best, making it the most scientific of the two models. This is the case even after taking into account that these laws are based on closed systems.

2. There is another law known as the law of "cause and effect." Every event is the result of a cause

or causes. Thus there must be an event causer. The cause of an event may have been a previous event which had a causer. Scientifically, one must conclude there is a first cause for the complex and well organized universe (though it is wearing out). Since the Causer must be capable of producing the event, the "first cause" of the universe, with all that it contains, must be greater than the universe. Anything less than that could not cause it. The "first cause" of time must be beyond "time." The "first cause" of life must be "living." Of course we could logically go on and on. Obviously, when all the data is analyzed the "First Cause" of this universe must be at least infinite, eternal, all powerful, everywhere present, all knowing, personal, and free to do as He pleases. The creation model postulates such a "First Cause." What about the evolution model? Some scientists think the cause of the universe, as we know it today, was a Big Bang.

That's a long way from scientific fact but even if such were the case, what caused it and what caused the cause that caused the Big Bang? The evolution model must conclude that energy and/or mass are eternal. Thus there is no first cause of this universe. This universe, in one form or another, is eternally self-existent. This ignores any logical reasoning as to the scientific law of Cause and Effect. To assume no first cause of the universe by-passes this law. So, which model does this scientific law fit best? Answer: The creation model.

3. What about the fossil record? Much data concerning fossils have been collected from the earth's shell. What does this data tell us about creation and evolution? First, the evolution model postulates that dinosaurs and man did not live on the earth at the same time. Does the data support this? No! Footprints of man and dinosaurs have been unearthed side by side in the same geological deposit. The prints of both species give every evidence of being authentic. They prove that dinosaurs and man lived on earth at the same time. Of course those who religiously hold to the evolution model will not accept the clear evidence even though man and dinosaur still live together on the earth. Crocodiles are dinosaurs (great lizards) that have survived extinction. When one evolutionist looked at human footprints beside dinosaur footprints, he said of the human prints, in essence: *These prints must have been made by some human-like animal because humans and dinosaurs did not exist on the earth at the same time.* That's the typical "scientific" logic of an evolutionist. Secondly, if the evolution model is correct there should be millions of fossils which show transitional forms of life between species. There is not one fossil in the

millions that can be scientifically identified as a transitional creature. Macro-evolution has no scientific basis in the fossil record. On the other hand, the creation model postulates that man and dinosaurs lived on earth at the same time and that the fossil record will show all species of creatures fully formed with no transitional fossils. These are exactly what the fossil record reveals. So, which is the most scientific model according to the fossil record? Answer: The creation model.

4. What about the age of the earth? The evolution model postulates that the earth is very old. The creation model postulates a young earth though age is not a factor. Which model does the data most fully support? Because the statistical probability of evolution is zero without a very old earth, the evolution model requires an earth that is millions of years old. The evolutionary thesis is that given enough time anything can happen, even evolution. The crocodile may one day sprout wings and fly. So according to the evolution model, how old is the earth? Answer: As old as the rocks. But how old are the rocks? Answer: As old as the fossils. Well, how old are the fossils? Answer: As old as the rocks. Conclusion from the evolution model: the earth is old enough to raise above zero the probability that evolution occurred. What does the data really show? Estimates, based on uniformity, range from 1,750 years to 500,000,000+ years. Which is the best estimate? Of course the earth is older than 1,750 years but otherwise take your pick. You will still come up with a zero probability of evolution for all practical purposes. The fact is that the age of the universe or its earth cannot be determined by scientists. The creation model postulates that the earth systems may be young. The earth was created with an apparent age. For instance, the first man was made a fully grown and mature adult. After he was one day old, any scientist would have concluded that he was approximately 30 years old. Are there any data that supports a young age for the earth? Yes. The rate of decrease in the earth's magnetic field produces an estimate of 10,000 years or less. Radiocarbon entering the earth system gives 10,000 years; growth of the oldest living part of our biosphere indicates the earth's age to be 5000 years; development of human population gives about 4000 years. These younger estimates are as close to the true age as those that give older ages and probably closer since they are smaller. If we trust the younger ages to be the best scientific estimates, then the creation model is the most tenable.

5. Which model, creation or evolution, does the earth's geological structure best support? Simply put, the evolution model postulates that the so-called

geological column was laid down per the uniformity theory over millions of years. The fossils in the lower part of the column would be of the simplest life-forms and thus the first order of evolution. The next highest level in the column would contain more complex life-forms and thus a higher order in evolution. The idea is, that as the life-forms evolved and died, they were covered by the erosion of the surrounding terrain. Apart from the fact that fossils of different complexity are sometimes found in the same level of the column, another problem with this process is that it does not lend itself to fossil formation. Dead creatures seem to rot, turn to dust and their bones get scattered, there's not much left to fossilize. Besides, even if fossils could be made by the millions this way, the question arises: What happened to the fossils of transitional life-forms? There should be millions, but there's not one. Well, what about the creation model? It postulates that the geological structure of the earth is mainly the result of a world-wide catastrophe (a flood-earthquake-volcanic combination) and its aftermath. Only those humans who were prepared, along with the air-breathing creatures (dinosaurs included) they prepared for, and the water dwelling creatures would have lived through it all. All others perished and many of those were buried in the resulting sludge and debris as it settled out of the agitated flood waters and was pressed down by the tremendous forces involved. Thus the geological column, with its millions of fossils, was formed. The pressure/temperature/time, operating on buried debris, produced the fossil fuels which we are using for an energy source today. The violent upheaval of the pre-catastrophe earth drastically changed its topography. The continents, now with mountain ranges and the associated ocean basins, then went through a short ice-age, leaving them much as they are today. So, which model does the geological data best fit? Answer: The creation model.

The above are only five examples, but it doesn't matter which data is analyzed. Scientifically it all comes out the same. The data always fits the creation model of origins better than or equally as well as the evolution model.

So which model of origins is the most scientific? While there are many unresolved scientific problems with both models of origins, the answer to this question must be the creation model. The data, when analyzed within the context of the scientific method, overwhelmingly supports the creation model over the evolution model. As someone said, "It takes more faith to believe in evolution than to believe in God."

While there are many scientists who reject the

evolution model in favor of the creation model, there are many more who hold to the evolution model. Why do they do so? Why is evolution treated as fact in our public education system, news media and some churches? Maybe it is as one scientist who held to evolution said, in essence: *To deny evolution is to acknowledge that there is a God and if there is a God who created then we must be accountable to Him.* This scientist did not hold to evolution based on his scientific analysis of the data, but because of his hatred of God. The Creator, who this man and so many others reject, has told us many times and in many ways that he created the heaven and earth and all that is in them. Simply stated, He created the universe. It's recorded in the Holy Bible:

"For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is..." (Exo 20:11).

"So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him..." (Gen 1:27).

"The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork" (Psa 19:1).

"Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things... To whom then will ye liken me, or shall I be equal? Saith the Holy One" (Isa 40:25-26).

"...God the LORD, he that created the heavens, and stretched them out; he that spread forth the earth, and that which cometh out of it; he that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein...I have made the earth, and created man upon it: I, even my hands, have stretched out the heavens, and all their host have I commanded" (Isa 45:5,12).

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made...the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth" (John 1:1-3,14).

"...who created heaven, and the things that therein are, and the earth, and the things that therein are, and the sea, and the things which are therein for his pleasure..." (Rev 4:11).

As we said in the beginning of this booklet, creation and evolution are mutually exclusive. To believe in macro-evolution is to reject God's word and thus to call him a liar. For instance, there are "Christians" who desire to hold a "theistic evolution" belief, even though this belief is contrary to the Bible. Note just one verse:

"And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day" (Gen 1:31).