

# THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION



A FAIRY TALE FOR ADULTS?

This booklet is a free educational service, provided by the "Church of God, a Christian Fellowship in Canada," in collaboration with the "Church of the Eternal God" in the United States of America. Printed in Canada in 2001. This booklet is not to be sold

Scriptures in this booklet are quoted from the New King James version (©1998 Thomas Nelson, Inc. Publishers) unless otherwise noted.

# **THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION**



A FAIRY TALE FOR ADULTS?

**BY NORBERT LINK**

# Contents

---

What is the Theory of Evolution?	1
Is the Theory Provable?	2
Some Scientists Register Skepticism	3
“Missing Links” are Still Missing	4
No Proof for the Basic Tenets of Evolution	6
Evolution—a Fairy Tale For Grownups?	9
Is “Theistic Evolution” the Answer?	11
The Proof of Creation	13
The Earth Became Void and Empty	14
Man Created in God’s Image	15
The Barrier Between the Mind of Man and Animals	17
The Spirit in Man	19
Why Does Man Have a Spirit?	22
Do Animals Have a Spirit?	24
Why Some Animals are Extinct	26
In the Beginning . . .	28
Punishment for Sin	31

**T**he theory of evolution, teaching that species developed gradually into other species, is widely expounded to be the most logical explanation for the origin of plants, animals, mankind, and in fact, the entire universe. It holds that animals have evolved over millions of years and that man is the latest product of this development—the top of the line, so to speak. Though Christianity was originally opposed to this concept, some groups gradually embraced it, with the proviso, however, that God directed the whole process. Other religious people—Christian and non-Christian alike—continue to reject evolution in its entirety, believing in Divine creation.

While theology is divided on the subject, many scientists no longer consider evolution merely a theory. Rather, they regard it as fact, as if science had actually proven its accuracy. It is not surprising then to find evolution being taught in our schools, thus creating a conflict of beliefs between evolution and creation. In our study of this subject, we will look closely at claims made to support this theory, as well as scientific concerns, and what the Bible teaches us about God's creation. The real facts will become quite apparent in this study, and may surprise you!

## **WHAT IS THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION?**

To start with, we need to understand what the theory of evolution professes, and how the theory itself began. In a nutshell, it states that, due to oxygen and other gases, all life on earth began in an organic "soup." Somehow, two cells developed in that "soup" and all life came into existence through these two cells—one for plants and one for animals. Mankind then is actually nothing more than, as Charles Darwin described it, "a descendant of a mollusk" or some other primordial life form.

This idea did not originate with Charles Darwin, although Darwin was the creator of the present-day theory of evolution. In ancient times it was believed that life was connected to the four elements—earth, fire, water and air. Some philosophers thought that all things came into existence through water. Others believed it was through air. The Greek philosopher Aristotle [384-322 B.C.] taught that life evolved from matter.

Science today teaches that our universe came into being through a "big bang," in which the universe began as an explosion of incredibly hot plasma from a very small point that then briefly expanded faster than the speed of light, and from

which the entire universe with all its matter and energy condensed. All of the planets, stars and galaxies supposedly came from this event.

### **IS THE THEORY PROVABLE?**

Now, if one were trying to prove the validity of statements made in a court of law, one should ask, “are these statements without contradiction?” and, “can they be proven to be accurate?” Answering these two key questions relative to the subject of evolution will help in our search of the truth of the matter.

So then, we must question the origin of this small nucleus of matter and energy. We must also ask about the origin of the laws of inertia and gravity that make planets rotate on an axis while orbiting the sun. What scientific facts prove this theory? A close examination reveals that this theory indeed has many contradictions, and in fact, the scientific community is divided on the subject.

In his book entitled “Starwatch,” author David Block, Ph.D., MSc., and Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society, writes on page 140, “The conventional big bang model of the universe is not the only possible universe model. Our universe contains galaxies and this is a serious problem in the standard big bang cosmology. Galaxies, and the nebulae inside them, should not have formed.” He essentially says that accepting the big bang theory only brings up additional perplexing questions.

Several years ago, Professor Robert Jastrow came to some remarkable conclusions and wrote a book entitled, “God and the As-

tronomers.” He stated, “The essence of the strange developments is that the universe had, in some sense, a beginning—that it began at a certain moment in time...Some scientists are unhappy with the idea that the world began in this way. Until recently, many of my colleagues preferred the ‘Steady State’ theory, which holds that the universe had no beginning and is eternal. Theologians generally are delighted with the proof that the universe had a beginning, but scientists are curiously upset. Their reactions provide an interesting demonstration of the response of the scientific mind—supposedly a very objective mind—when evidence uncovered by science itself leads to a conflict with the articles of faith in our profession (pp. 3-5).

“Now three lines of evidence—the motions of the galaxies, the laws of thermodynamics, and the life story of the stars—pointed to one conclusion; all indicated that the universe had a beginning... There is no ground for supposing that matter and energy existed before and was suddenly galvanized into action... It is simpler to postulate creation *ex nihilo*... Scientists cannot bear the thought of a natural phenomenon which cannot be explained, even with unlimited time and money. There is a kind of religion in science... This religious faith of the scientist is violated by the discovery that the world had a beginning... Science has proven that the universe exploded into being at a certain moment. It asks, what cause produced this effect? Who or what put matter and energy into the universe? Was the

Universe created out of nothing or was it gathered together out of pre-existing materials? And science cannot answer these questions...The scientist's pursuit of the past ends in the moment of creation. This is an exceedingly strange development, unexpected by all but the theologians. They have always accepted the word of the Bible: 'In the beginning God created heaven and earth (pp. 101-105).'" A profound admission indeed!

Is there scientific *proof* of the theory of evolution? Let's read some rather astonishing quotes from leading scientists making such a claim. Notice the arrogance and pride associated with these statements. Sir Julian Huxley wrote in "Evolution after Darwin", 1960, Vol. 3, p. 41, "The first point to make about Darwin's theory is that it is no longer a theory, but a fact. No serious scientist would deny the fact that evolution has occurred, just as he would not deny the fact that the earth goes around the sun." Richard Goldschmidt is quoted in "American Scientist," 1952, Vol. 40, p. 84, "Evolution of the animal and plant world is considered by all those entitled to judgment to be a fact for which no further proof is needed." Richard Swann Lull in "Organic Evolution," 1948, p. 15 says, "Since Darwin's day, evolution has been more and more generally accepted, until now in the minds of informed thinking men there is no doubt that it is the only logical way whereby the creation can be interpreted and understood."

## **SOME SCIENTISTS REGISTER SKEPTICISM**

Although many scientists, as well as most scientific and pseudo-scientific publications like to claim that evolution is a fact for which no further proof is needed, this does not mean that it is, in fact, a *fact*. Increasing numbers of scientists have uttered skepticism. Horatio Newman wrote in "Evolution, Genetics, and Eugenics," 1932, 3rd ed., p. 57, "Reluctant as he may be to admit it, honesty compels the evolutionist to admit that there is no absolute proof of organic evolution." Professor Ernst Mayr of Harvard wrote in 1963 in "Animals Species and Evolution," on pp. 7 and 8, "The fact that the synthetic [evolutionary] theory is now so universally accepted is not in itself proof of its correctness...the basic theory is in many instances hardly more than a postulate." Professor of Physiology and Biochemistry, G.A. Kerkut, wrote in 1960 in "Implications of Evolution," on p. 157, "The evidence that supports it [evolution] is not sufficiently strong to allow us to consider it as anything more than a working hypothesis."

In a German biology book written for high schools, an insightful statement is made on pages 309 and 310 (Schmeil, Allgemeine Biologie, 10th ed., 1965): "It is doubtful whether experiences which have been made at the outer fringes of evolution can be automatically applied to the entire concept...It is also totally unimaginable that designed organs such as the eye, the nervous system, the wonderful

harmony of an organism, or the surprisingly purposeful actions of instinct, just came into existence through accidents.”

It is interesting to note that even Darwin himself saw the insurmountable difficulties with his theory when considering, for example, the eye. Writing in his “On the Origin of Species” he says, “To suppose that the eye...could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree.” One of the leading modern evolutionists, Harvard Professor George G. Simpson, concurs, “The origin of such an organ as an eye, for example, entirely at random seems almost infinitely improbable” (“This View of Life,” 1964, p. 18).

“Time Magazine” reported in 1981 that former U.S. President Ronald Reagan remarked that evolution was only a scientific theory, which was no longer considered infallible as was once thought to be the case. He added that if schools wanted to continue teaching evolution, they should also teach creation at the same time.

In 1980, the late well-known scientist at the Max-Planck Institute, Professor Joachim Illis, wrote an article in a German magazine, the “P.M.” In it he made some astonishing admissions regarding the alleged evolution of man, saying, “No serious scientist dares to state today that we know anything certain about the evolution of man.”

In 1996 “P.M.” published a special edition entitled, “The Wonder of Evolution.” It quotes Professor Josef Reichhold on page 37, “Remember

the Neanderthal man? Originally, he was portrayed as a distorted, mean-looking individual. Today, we have uncovered more fossils, and the entire viewpoint has changed... When one day someone finds the remains of a tall Massai and of a little Pygmy, then perhaps some scientists will declare that they belonged to different species... We must remember that all designations are nothing else but hypotheses. The fossils that we find do not carry name tags.” This then, is the MAIN problem with the idea of evolution. Science uncovers fossils and designates them in accordance with already believed concepts. But if those concepts are inaccurate to begin with, the subsequent conclusions are also inaccurate.

Martin Tzschschel wrote in “P.M.,” “The picture of evolution consists of many little pieces and many big holes. A scientist found a good analogy when discussing the attempt to explain evolution based on fossils. That would be like trying to reconstruct Tolstoi’s six volumes of War and Peace out of only six unrelated single pages... This reconstruction does not sound very convincing in light of the many many holes. In addition...fossils had to be classified in such a way as to fit into the picture. When new fossils were found, the old picture became very often shaky.”

### **“MISSING LINKS” ARE STILL MISSING**

As “P.M.” pointed out in its article, “In Search of a New Darwin,” science has never found fossils that would prove the existence of



ANY evolution from one species into another species—say from a fish to a reptile. But without such a transition, the whole evolution theory has no merits.

On pages 61 and 62 of the article, we read, “Never within the last 125 years, has there been found a missing link between reptile and bird, between crocodile and eagle, between turtle and dove. Whatever one unearthed—they were either distinctively the bones of a reptile or the bones of a bird. With staged despair, the German scientist Otto Schindewolf remarked in 1950, ‘The original bird Archaeopteryx has jumped out of a reptile egg.’ In other words, there is no proof that nature bridged the gap between reptile and bird in many small steps, as Darwin’s teachings demand. To the contrary, all fossils show that there were in existence reptiles with scaly skin, and then, suddenly, there was the Archaeopteryx with fully developed feathers. And what was in between? In between, there was nothing... Darwin believed that, contrary to cattle breeding, changes or mutations between the species were possible. He thought that in principle, the bounds and limits, which the cattle breeder is subject to, could have been crossed over by nature.

“But...we modern men cannot rely on this anymore, because otherwise, missing links between two species should have been found. The problem with missing links is oftentimes mentioned in the context of the evolution from apes or monkeys to man. But the U.S. biologist George Simpson complains, ‘Missing

links are almost a universal phenomenon.’ And his colleague Rattrey Tayler explains more specifically, ‘The evolution of approximately 26 groups of mammals is totally unclear. So are the origins of insects. The ancestors of the fish are likewise unknown. The first fish eggs which were found were already totally developed, and the original insects captured in amber do not look much different than today’s specimen.’”

Darwin himself, the founder of the modern evolution theory, was not unaware of the difficulties just described. He thought, though, that, given enough time, missing links or, as he put it, “transitional forms,” would be found. Well, have they? Have recent news of so-called scientific discoveries in China, linking birds and dinosaurs, changed the picture? A popular television broadcast ran a program on this finding, trying to show how birds evolved from dinosaurs. They showed a dinosaur running and running, while magically losing its long tail and replacing it with wings. Then the dinosaur jumped and jumped until he took off from the ground like an airplane. The absurdity of this kind of thinking is laughable. Not all birds fly. The ostrich, for example, does not fly. What happened? Did the ostrich evolve back from a flying bird to a non-flying one? And so it goes with evolutionary reasoning.

There are scientists who found, or think they found, a skeleton that, as one magazine put it, “could prove to be the smallest known fossil of a dinosaur.” But was it? Here’s what a June 2000 article in “Der Spiegel,” a

very popular and widely respected weekly German magazine, has to say. It quotes an article from “Science” magazine as stating, “The oldest animal with feathers was not a dinosaur.” The article points out that animals with feathers existed prior to dinosaurs, and it concluded, “This fossil rules out the widely-held view that birds evolved from dinosaurs.” So you see, science itself is divided on these subjects and so-called *proofs*.

If there is such disunity among scientists as to the proof of their theories, then why has science trusted in Darwin’s teaching for decades? A good question, and the answer is shocking. “P.M.” magazine explains it well in its article, “In Search of a New Darwin,” “To explain, one must remember the ideology of the whole matter. Even today, scientists, if they want to depart from Darwin’s teaching of evolution, must be afraid to receive applause from the wrong side—from the side of Bible-believing individuals, who, even 125 years after Darwin, still claim the accuracy of the Biblical story of creation.”

And so science continues to teach Darwinism and evolution, knowing full well that those concepts are wrong. The “P.M.” article goes on to say, “Two years ago, [Professor] Illis showed that there is no known example of big mutations [developments from one species into another species]. But Illis also pointed out that we must not go back to the Bible. The animals were not created in six days, but in billions of years. And life does not exist on earth for only 6000 years, although that is

what the Anglican Archbishop James Usher had figured out in 1860 and disputed with Darwin.”

## **NO PROOF FOR THE BASIC TENETS OF EVOLUTION**

Other scientists concur regarding the total lack of proof of “big mutations.”

In 1903 Professor Thomas Hunt Morgan wrote in “Evolution and Adaptation,” “Within the period of human history we do not know of a single instance of the transmutation of one species into another one...therefore it may be claimed that the theory of descent is lacking in the most essential feature it needs to place the theory on a scientific basis. This must be admitted” (p. 43).

Professor Dobzhansky stated in 1941 in “Genetics and the Origin of the Species,” p. 80, “Systematic mutations [big mutations transforming one species into another] have never been observed, and it is extremely improbable that species are formed in so abrupt a manner.” Professor George Simpson wrote in 1961 in “Science Today,” on p. 36, “Obviously, such a process [of multiple mutations] has played no part whatever in evolution.” And Dr. Maurice Caullery wrote in 1964 in “Genetics and Heredity,” on p. 119, “It does not seem, therefore, that the central problem of evolution can be solved by mutations.”

Now these are astonishing admissions by scientists of basic flaws in their beloved theory. So it may not be so surprising then, that they become very aggressive toward those who dare to question their validity,

calling them “ignorant,” “unlearned,” “incompetent,” etc. As an old saying goes, “A good offense is the best defense.” But we know, of course, that attacking the truth does not make the error correct.

Since scientists admit that mutations can’t fill the holes in evolution, what can? Some say, “natural selection” or “survival of the fittest” gives the answer. Sir Julian Huxley claimed in 1953 that natural selection is the ONLY explanation of evolution. However, many scientists readily admit that this theory can NEVER explain evolution. George Simpson wrote in 1953 in “The Major Features of Evolution,” on pp. 118 and 119, “The theory [of natural selection] is quite unsubstantiated and has status only as a speculation.”

Gertrude Himmelfarb wrote in 1962 in “Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution,” on p. 445, “A growing number of scientists...have come to question the truth and adequacy of natural selection.” Why is that so? Because selection, whether natural or man-made, can create nothing new. It only makes more of a specific type already in existence. In other words, natural selection may explain the *survival* of the fittest, but it can never explain the *arrival* of the fittest. That’s why Professor E. W. Bride wrote in “Nature”: “Natural Selection’ affords no explanation...of any...form of evolution. It means nothing more than ‘the survivors survive.’ Why do certain individuals survive? Because they are the fittest. How do we know they are the fittest? Because they survive.”

Faced with these kinds of

unanswerable problems, some have proposed that evolution occurred through many small mutations that were passed on to the next generations, until the many small mutations had become big. This concept was originally taught by Jean Baptiste Lamarck and has become known as “Lamarckism.” However, science has since proven this concept to be wrong, acknowledging that characteristics acquired by an individual during his life may affect his body, but cannot bring about a corresponding change in his hereditary nature as carried by his reproductive cells. For example, if you lose a finger, your children will still be born with ten fingers.

Some scientists claim that “the fossil record is the strongest evidence of evolution” (Thomas Hunt Morgan, *A Critique of the Theory of Evolution*, 1916, p. 24) or even that it is “the only evidence available” (W.R. Thompson, *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation*, Vol. 12, March 1960, p. 6). But what about this evidence?

Professor West in “Compass,” May 1968, p. 216, writes, “Contrary to what most scientists write, the fossil record does not support the Darwinian theory of evolution because it is this theory...which we use to interpret the fossil record. By doing so we are guilty of circular reasoning if we say then the fossil record supports this theory.” What the author is saying is that scientists find fossils and classify them as belonging to a certain geological age. How and why? Because they “know” that evolution took place. Therefore,

the age of the rock is determined by the fossil. If it's a supposedly ancient fossil, the rocks are determined to be old – if it's a supposedly more recent fossil, the age of the rock is determined to be more recent as well. Can we see how deceptive this method is?

Quoting from Professor Henry Shaler Williams in “Geological Biology”, 1895, p. 38, “The character of the rocks themselves, their composition, or their mineral contents have nothing to do with settling the question as to their particular system to which the new rocks belong. The fossils alone are the means of correlation.” But you may wonder if in more recent years this reasoning has changed. No, it hasn't.

R. H. Rastall of Cambridge University also observed the circular reasoning of science. Quoting him from the 1956 edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, he said, “It cannot be denied that from a strictly philosophical standpoint geologists are here arguing in a circle. The succession of organisms has been determined by a study of their remains buried in the rocks, and the relative ages of the rocks are determined by the remains of organism that they contain.” We will later explain in detail the real story behind the fossil record. Fossils were formed in a sudden way, not by gradual changes. They do not support the evolution theory at all, but they do support several catastrophic events on this planet.

So what have we learned so far? We have learned that scientists are unable to provide any proof that evolution did happen, and that any

so-called proofs amount to no more than circular reasoning. Yet, science continues to teach evolution as fact, and people continue to believe it. WHY? It is because the alternative—the Biblical teaching of creation—is unacceptable to science. Such a statement may seem absurd, but is well supported by the scientists themselves. Consider carefully these additional quotes from scientists telling us to have faith in evolution, not in the Bible.

Dr. Louis T. More wrote in 1925 in “The Dogma of Evolution,” “The more one studies paleontology, the more certain one becomes that evolution is based on faith alone, exactly the same sort of faith which is necessary to have when one encounters the great mysteries of religion.”

Charles Singer wrote in 1946 in “A Short History of Science,” on p. 387, “Evolution is perhaps unique among major scientific theories in that the appeal for its acceptance is not that there is evidence for it, but that any other proposed interpretation is wholly incredible.”

Arthur Keith, an evolutionary scientist, admitted, “Evolution is unproved and unprovable. We believe it only because the only alternative is special creation which is unthinkable.” (B.G. Ranganathan “Origins?” 1988, p. 22)

Finally, a quote from scientist D.M.S. Watson, essentially denying Divine creation, “Evolution itself is accepted by zoologists, not because it has been observed to occur or can be proven by logical coherent evidence, but because the only alternative—special creation—is clearly incredible.”

(B.G. Ranganathan “Origins,” p. 22).

Attorney Philip Johnson wrote a book, entitled, “Darwin on Trial.” In it, he states on pages 59 and 56, “We paleontologists have said that the history of life supports [the story of gradual adaptive change], all the while really knowing that it does not... [The] sudden appearance and stasis [lack of change] of species in the fossil record is the opposite of what the Darwinian theory would predict.”

British Scientist Chandra Wickramasinghe summarized the problem this way, “The general scientific world has been bamboozled into believing that evolution has been proved. Nothing could be further from the truth... There is no evidence for any of the basic tenets of Darwinian evolution. I don’t believe there ever was any evidence for it. It was a social force that took over the world in 1860, and I think it has been a disaster for science ever since.” Did you get that? It was a *social force*, not scientific fact. People *chose* to believe a lie, and indeed, today they still cling to it. Louis Bounoure, a biologist and zoologist from France, put it this way: “Evolution is just a fairy tale for grownups.”

## **EVOLUTION—A FAIRY TALE FOR GROWNUPS?**

Some time ago, a program was shown on television entitled, “The Mysterious Origin of Man.” It was hosted by actor Charlton Heston, known from such movies as “The Ten Commandments” and “Ben Hur.” Mr. Heston stated the following in the program, “Sometimes artifacts are found that break

all the rules [of evolutionary time tables]... What happens when we find a modern human skull in rock strata far beneath the oldest of man’s ancestors?”

To answer this question, the program interviewed Dr. Richard Thompson and Michael Gremo, co-authors of the book, “Forbidden Archaeology,” in which they listed literally hundreds of so-called unexplainable artifacts. Michael Gremo stated that “we are talking about a massive cover-up.” Dr. Thompson elaborated, “What we find is a knowledge filter. People filter out things which don’t fit, which don’t make sense in terms of their paradigm. In science you find that evidence that does not fit the accepted paradigm tends to be eliminated. It’s not taught, it’s not discussed.”

Another person who was interviewed in the program was British author Richard Milton, who wrote a book entitled, “Shattering the Myths of Darwinism.” He stressed what we already know—“So far,” he said, “the missing link is still missing.” When asked why he criticized Darwinism without offering an alternative, he responded, “It seems to me that if Darwinism is wrong, somebody has got to point the finger.”

The program also discussed the so-called Java man, which, until 1984, was considered to be a link between man and ape. It was pointed out that today it is a scientific fact that the Java man was not a man at all, but rather an extinct ape. Another fossil, called Lucy, was claimed to be a link between ape and man. Michael

Gremo explained, "I was at a conference of paleontologists where many of them were making the case that she was hardly distinguishable from an ape or a monkey." Richard Milton concurred, "This is merely an interpretation—an interpretation of one group. These same bones can be, and they have been, taken by scientists to identify simply an extinct ape—they have nothing to do with us at all."

In light of those admissions and findings, Mr. Heston made the following remarks: "So far no missing links have been found at all. So what happens to the evolutionary model if the missing link does not exist at all? The model simply collapses." This indictment against the scientific method is repeated in a book entitled, "Apes, Man and Morons," written by evolutionary anthropologist Ernest Albert Hooton in 1970. He states on p. 107, "Heretical and non-conforming fossil men were banished to the limbo of dark museum cupboards, forgotten or even destroyed."

Here's a quote from another article published in the "P.M." magazine by Professor Joachim Illis, entitled, "What Do We Know About The Evolution Of Man?" It contains eye-opening admissions as to how science has invented, and keeps in operation, the fairy tale of evolution. Professor Illis writes, "Missing facts and gaps in the building of the theory are supplemented with theoretical missing links..., and in this way, the magician of biology presented a completed trunk of life-forms, which arises from the organic

soup...to its proud height, containing as branches all present and extinct animals and plants. Mere chance of correct mutations, as well as the concept of the survival of the fittest, according to Darwinism, were alone responsible for this trunk and its branches, which evolved all by themselves. Man has a similar fate as the ape, because he, too, is...the product of a material process without any purpose and design; he is the highest coincidental or accidental assembly of energy and matter, a product of chance.

"Darwinists think today as Haeckel did 100 years ago, but in the meantime, one should have learned that chance is not even a scientific explanation. Most biologists do not live comfortably any more in the shaky building of Darwinism. That is so, as we have never found any big mutations (that is, changes that would show that one species could develop into another species)...and we have never found any fossils that could qualify as a link between the species. Those missing links are absolutely necessary, as they alone can fasten the branches to the trunk and the tree, and they must therefore have existed.

"Pitecanthropos and the Neanderthal man are upon closer examination not apes at all, but real members of the species man. The famous original bird, Archaeopteryx, which was listed as a link between reptile and bird, has now been declared as a real reptile which caught, while running, butterflies with its feathered forelegs."

## **IS “THEISTIC EVOLUTION” THE ANSWER?**

A famous German TV moderator, Dr. Franz Alt, wrote a book several years ago entitled, “Love is Possible.” He pointed out, “We were at no time in our development mouse, ape or tadpole. We were, from the beginning, humans. Man did not evolve from animals. More and more scientists consider that the belief in a Creator is much less speculative than the belief in a big bang or an organic soup, out of which everything supposedly developed. The theory of accidental creation reminds me of a printer who threw all his letters out of the window, hoping to find later on the street, just by chance, Goethe’s Faust... The theory of chance is the mentally poorest of all explanations for the existence of the world. The atheism of modern materialism...do[es] not give us any answers to the...question as to what is the purpose of life.”

These are intriguing words. Can evolution tell us WHY we exist? Of course not! And neither does it even attempt to do so. In the P.M. magazine, “The Wonder of Evolution,” we are told, “At the beginning, chance reigned....There is no plan for creation...Man, too, has evolved. He is not a crown of creation designed by God, but as all mammals, the latest product of a mollusk... Spirit, morals and even the belief in God are only, according to Darwin, a product of the brain structure.” IF that were true, then life would indeed be hopeless. Then we might as well live for today, because tomorrow we are dead and gone.

Yes, the Theory of Evolution lacks answers to these and many other questions. For instance, evolution cannot explain the enormous difference in intelligence and intellect between man and all other animals. Professor Illis discussed this dilemma in another article entitled, “Can Apes Still Become Humans?” He wrote, “Not one scientist has been able to explain WHY the ape developed into man.... We cannot even postulate convincingly that man developed out of the ape...and not that the ape developed out of man...These are strange things that show us that man’s development is a mysterious matter that science does not understand... Today it is clear that evolution cannot be explained by science...Man is separated from animals (including the highest animals, the apes) through unbridgeable mental gaps... This strange being, man, does only exist once... All these characteristics which make us unique were acquired accidentally... Apes cannot develop into man, unless an unexplainable miracle occurs.”

The P.M. magazine, “The Wonder of Evolution,” confirms that man’s intelligence cannot be explained scientifically. They point out on page 60, “What is...the unique criterion of man’s brain? Is it constructed differently...? ‘No,’ explains Gerhardt Roth, Director of Brain Research at the University of Bremen. ‘The brain of the whale is even more complex than ours...’ Does man then have unique, higher developed nerve cells? Roth answers again in the negative. ‘Under the microscope, you

cannot distinguish man's brain cells from those of an ape.”

Though the brain material of humans and animals are not distinguishable, one cannot deny differences in the way the brains function. An astonishing scientific article in the German biological encyclopedia entitled “Brehm's Tierleben,” explains it thus, “The question whether animals are intelligent is mostly answered by lay persons in the affirmative... Oftentimes, actions by animals appear to be intelligent... Those mechanical actions which are not understood by the animals are called instinct. It should be clear, however, that this is just a designation and not an explanation of this totally unexplained phenomenon. Instinct has been one of the most mysterious and strangest secrets of nature... Only man lives in an environment in which intelligence, consideration and accountability is demanded—the animals know none of it.” These scientific comments should prompt us to wonder WHY do those differences exist? If man is only the highest developed animal, why does he KNOW what the animals do NOT know?

At this point, *religion* tries to intervene and explain the unexplainable in a spiritual way. The notion that evolution has taken place is widely accepted. But it is “spiritualized.” That is, supposedly God directed the process of evolution and He intervened at certain stages, under certain circumstances, sort of “helping it along.” It is believed that man evolved from apes, but that

along the way, God gave the evolving creature, man, certain mental and spiritual abilities, thereby separating him from the animals. *But this theological attempt to teach the concept of a theistic evolution overlooks the most important problem.* First, as we have seen, evolution is not scientifically proven, a fact that is admitted by some leading scientists. Second, the concept of a theistic evolution is simply irresponsible and actually damaging, as it rejects the clear teachings of the Bible without having any reason to do so, as we will see shortly. And we will also discover that the fossil record, for example, does not contradict the biblical teachings in any way.

*Those who have analyzed the issue of a theistic evolution, admit that it clearly contradicts the teachings of the Bible.* The article in “Brehm's Tierleben” points out, “The ancient idea, which had been mainly taught by Christianity, postulated that man was the crown of creation, a unique being, and that his soul, his intelligence and his language constituted a unsurpassable partition wall between him and the animals. But with the fundamental teachings of Darwin, this partition had to begin to shake.”

The P.M. magazine, “The Wonder of Evolution,” concurs, “For many centuries, man considered himself as the crown of creation. It was accepted what was written in the Bible, ‘And God said, Let us make man, an image equal to us, to rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air.’ Then Charles Darwin appeared... His teaching is universally known and has deeply



affected and shaken the Christian faith...His expedition [with the ship Beagle] changes the theologian [Darwin. Note that Charles Darwin was originally a theologian]. He begins to doubt the Biblical story of creation..."

## **THE PROOF OF CREATION**

While scientists tell us the beginning of the universe began with a "big bang," the Bible tells us something altogether different. God says in Genesis 1:1, "*In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth.*" The word "heavens" is plural, referring to the entire universe. In Isaiah 45:11-13, God says, "*Thus says the Lord, the holy One of Israel, and His Maker:... I have made the earth, and created man on it. I—My hands—stretched out the heavens, and all their host [the stars, planets, etc.] I have commanded.*"

The New Testament confirms these claims in Hebrews 11:3, "*By faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that the things which are seen were not made of things which are visible.*"

Hebrews 1:10 tells us, "*You, Lord, in the beginning laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of your hands.*" Again, we are told that it was God who brought into existence everything there is.

Revelation 4:11 states, "*You are worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power; for You created all things, and by Your will they exist and were created.*"

*You might wonder whether the Bible allows for creation through evolution. The answer is clearly "NO."* We just

read how in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth—the entire universe—out of things that are not material, things that cannot be seen. In other words, God did not create the universe out of a nucleus of energy or matter, which then exploded. We also read that God created the earth and the universe at the same time. However, man was not created at that time, as we will explain shortly. Nothing is said, though, how long ago this happened. The creation of the earth and the universe could have been millions or billions of years ago. The Bible also indicates that the creation did not gradually evolve over time.

Note God's purpose for His creation in Isaiah 45:18, "*For thus says the Lord who created the heavens, who is God, who formed the earth and made it, who has established it, who did not create it in vain, who formed it to be inhabited.*" The Hebrew word for "in vain" is "tohu," which means "empty" or "in a state of waste." When God created the earth, it was not created in a state of being empty or waste. Rather, we read in the book of Job, that the angels were delighted when they saw the beauty of the earth, as God had created it. Job 38:4-7, "*Where were you when I laid the foundations of the earth... when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?*" The angels would not have shouted for joy if the earth had been an empty, wasted, uninhabitable planet, which had to wait millions of years for physical life to evolve. No, the earth was created in a beautiful condition, capable, at the time of its creation, of supporting life.

## **THE EARTH BECAME VOID AND EMPTY**

With this in mind, let's read Genesis 1:2, "*The earth was without form [Hebrew "tohu"], and void, and darkness was on the face of the deep.*" A more correct translation would be, "The earth *became* void and without form." Some translations, like the Companion Bible and The New International Version, have made notations to this effect.

We saw that Isaiah 45:18 tells us that God did not create the earth in vain, or "tohu." The Hebrew word for "in vain" in Isaiah 45:18, "tohu," is the same word used in Genesis 1:2, and rendered there, "without form." So we read in Isaiah that God did not create the earth "void" and "empty," but we also read in Genesis 1:2 that the earth was "void" and "empty." Since the Bible does not contradict itself, the only explanation is that the earth, which had NOT been created "void", subsequently BECAME "void."

The reason why some translate Genesis 1:2 as, "The earth WAS void and empty," rather than, "The earth BECAME void and empty," is based on the fact that the Hebrew word, translated "was" or "became," can indeed mean both, based on the context. The word in Hebrew is "haya." It is up to the translator to decide whether to use "was" or "became," and unless the translator understands what transpired here, based on what the Bible says elsewhere, the resulting translation is going to be misleading.

Let's look at some examples that show that the Hebrew word "haya"

can mean "became." As a matter of fact, in the following passages, the word "haya" can ONLY mean "became," and NOT "was." Genesis 2:7 says, "*And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man BECAME [haya] a living being.*" Let's also read Genesis 19:26, "*But Lot's wife looked back behind him, and she BECAME [haya] a pillar of salt.*" Another interesting passage is found in Deuteronomy 27:9, "*Then Moses and the priests, the Levites, spoke to all Israel, saying, 'This day you have BECOME [haya] the people of the Lord your God.'*" Finally, 2 Samuel 7:24: "*For You have made Your people Israel Your very own people forever, and You, Lord, have BECOME [haya] their God.*"

Many theologians and scientists have correctly postulated that the state of emptiness, described in Genesis 1:2, occurred long after the state described in Genesis 1:1, when God created the earth. For instance, Joseph Free, Ph.D., Professor of archaeology and history, published a book in 1950, entitled, "Archaeology and Bible History." He writes on pages 19 and 20, "The date of the creation of the universe is an entirely different question from the date of the creation of man. The universe may have been created shortly before the creation of man...or long before, depending on whether or not a long period of time is involved in the first two verses of Genesis. [T]he original creation of the universe and the earth is described in Genesis 1:1, 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.' Then a period

of time followed during which ‘the earth was without form and void.’ ... This period of time may have been of any length, and could include the geological ages observable in the earth’s surface... After this cataclysmic period, the putting of the world in order is described in Genesis 1: 2b, 3 ff...

“In the nineteenth century George H. Pumber in his book, ‘Earth’s Earliest Ages,’ popularized this view that there may have been a long period or gap in Genesis 1:1, 2, and it is sometimes charged that the whole idea is due merely to his book. The possibility of a gap or a long period of time in Genesis 1:1, 2, has, however, been held by many competent theologians, including Hengstenberg (1802-1869), a German Lutheran scholar who became Professor of Theology at the University of Berlin in 1828, Franz Delitzsch (1813-1890), Professor at Erlangen in Germany and an outstanding Old Testament scholar, and others such as Boehme, Oetinger, F. von Meyer, Stier, Keerl, and Kurtz.”

On page 21, Professor Free discusses an interesting potential parallel scripture in the book of Jeremiah. He writes: “In warning Israel of God’s judgment on backsliding, the prophet Jeremiah presented his vision of the earth as being ‘without form and void.’ (Jeremiah 4: 23), using the same Hebrew words as those applied to the earth in Genesis 1:2. [Jeremiah 4: 23 reads, “I beheld the earth, and indeed it was without form and void, and the heavens had no light.”] Jeremiah was apparently led to think back to the desolation of the earth before the creation of man and compare it with

the cataclysmic state which would result if God’s judgment should fall on unrepentant Israel. This use of the very same words could point to a cataclysmic period in Genesis 1:2...”

We will later address what caused this cataclysmic period, and why the earth, after it had been created beautifully, BECAME a wasteland. But before the earth became empty, animals already lived on the earth. Man, though, did not exist. His creation is described in Genesis 1:26, after God had made the earth habitable again, and after He had created the animals which live, for the most part, still today. An interesting passage describing the re-creation or the renewal of the surface of the earth can be found in Psalms 104:30, “*You send forth Your Spirit, they are created; and You RENEW the FACE of the earth.*”

## **MAN CREATED IN GOD’S IMAGE**

Neither animals nor man have evolved, according to the Bible. On the contrary, we read that God created animals “according to their kind”—but insofar as man is concerned, God created man in God’s own image, according to God’s likeness—in other words, according to the God kind. (Genesis 1:26 and 27)

Animals were not created in such a way that they could develop from one kind or from one species into another kind or species. The Bible does not allow for big mutations, that is, for changes from one species into another species, or perhaps more accurately, from one kind into another kind. We are using here the

word “species” loosely, but we should realize that the Bible talks about “kind,” not “species.” The Biblical definition of “kind” might include several species, the way some scientists identify “species.” This is important to remember, as no one seems to know what a species is. The Encyclopedia Britannica pointed out in its 1967 edition that scientists often cannot agree as to what a species is. For instance, the Bible calls the “owl” a “kind,” (Leviticus 11:16), but scientists would call an owl an entire “order,” not just a “species.”

The point here is that evolution requires changes and transformations from one species or kind into another species or kind, but all our past and present experiences show that those mutations or changes did not, and do not occur. And remember, NO fossils have been found to prove that any such changes occurred in the past. A bird brings forth birds. As a matter of fact, an eagle does not bring forth a pigeon. A bird does not produce anything else but birds, it does not produce a fish or a mammal. And no fish evolves or changes into a bird, and no reptile into a fish. Rather, all animals reproduce according to their kind. No scientist is able to have a horse produce a dog, or a shark or a crocodile.

Darwin’s big mistake was to assume that, since little mutations or adaptations within a species do occur, big mutations or changes from one species into another must have occurred as well. This, of course, was a wrong assumption. On the other hand, it is true that animals within

their own species can change or adapt to their environment. Darwin saw on the Galapagos Islands that certain birds had, within their species, brought forth minor changes. And so it is today. Of course, we can breed different species of dogs or cats—but they will always remain dogs or cats. Within the species of cats, one can cross-breed. But one cannot breed a dog with a cat. Likewise, the birds, which Darwin observed on the Galapagos Islands, did not develop into other birds, and most certainly not into mammals.

We learn from the Bible that man is NOT the highest species within the animal world. Man did not originate from animals, rather, man was created directly by God, and in the image of God Himself. Before God created Eve, He asked Adam whether he could find a help mate from the animals, but he could not. So God created Eve from Adam, and Adam could later say, “This is bone from my bone, and flesh from my flesh,” as Eve was made from man, not from any animal. According to the Bible, man is a being who stands high above the animal world, destined and charged to rule over all the animals. Man’s origins are from God, not from an organic soup and subsequent evolution.

*What about the theistic version of the theory of evolution? As Louis Agassiz, Professor of Zoology, said, “The resources of the Deity cannot be so meager, that in order to create a human being endowed with reason, He must change a monkey into a man.” (Methods of Study in Natural History, 1863, p. iv).*

Darwin's concepts have brought much misery upon this earth. It is no secret that Adolph Hitler accepted Darwin's teaching of evolution and the survival of the fittest, and he believed that he was entitled to eliminate, what he deemed to be, substandard races. As the P.M. magazine, "The Wonder of Evolution," reports, Darwin's teaching also had a very bad effect on Darwin himself. His wife could see "how his research alienated him from religion... When the scientist begins to think about the consequences of his findings [which were, in fact, only theoretical ideas without any scientific proof or evidence], he is struck with migraine and depression. No doctor can explain his condition... his sufferings begin to become chronic. He can only work four hours a day..." Darwin was originally a theologian, believing in the inspiration of the Bible. But he leaned on his own human reasoning, rejecting God's word, which led to devastating consequences in his own life, and in the lives of many, many others.

## **THE BARRIER BETWEEN THE MIND OF MAN AND ANIMALS**

Let's return to an important issue that we briefly touched on before – the remarkable differences between man and animal. We saw that they cannot be explained scientifically. But one cannot deny that they exist.

The German biological encyclopedia "Brehm's Tierleben" discusses the unsurpassable partition wall between man and animals. One

article deals with an experiment to "show how the mental aspects of development in men and monkeys begin to differ dramatically, although they seemed to be identical in the earliest years." The article says, "Professor Kellog, psychologist at the Indiana University, raised his ten-month old son together with a chimpanzee of the same age under the exactly identical conditions. The chimpanzee understood the meaning of certain words much earlier than his son Donald did, although sometimes, it was the opposite. After ten months the chimpanzee topped Donald clearly in regard to memory, thinking and understanding; he understood much quicker and more reliably the connections of events surrounding them; his intelligence was extraordinary and was able to motivate him to action which went beyond what the little Donald was able to do... But once they reached the age of 1½ years, a remarkable change occurred within the development of these two little children [sic]. In a brief period of time, Donald became much smarter than the chimpanzee. He understood what was happening around him much easier, and began to think and to act on his own and in new ways. Nothing could be noticed insofar with regard to the chimpanzee. He had reached within 10 months the pinnacle of his ability to learn and absorb. His intelligence could not be increased or perfected any more."

Yes, there is a barrier that separates the mind of man from the animals. Just what is this barrier? We know it has nothing to do with the

physical attributes in the brains. The brains themselves do not differ enough to explain the differences in mental capacities and intelligence between them. If we adopt the theory of Darwinism, teaching that everything evolved by coincidence, this barrier should not exist. Although science acknowledges the existence of this barrier, they are unable to explain what it is, because it cannot be explained in physical terms. Rather, as we will see, it is something non-physical, something that cannot be tested in tubes or with physical instruments.

Now, some scientists do concede that the human brain must have a non-physical component. Dr. Wilder Penfield, a famous neurosurgeon, is remembered for his surgical treatment of epileptic patients. His patients remained conscious during their surgery and were thus able to report what they were experiencing when part of their brains were stimulated with a mild electrical current. Dr. Penfield wrote a book about his research entitled, "Mystery of the Mind." It was published shortly before his death in 1967. In this book he wrote, "Throughout my own scientific career, I, like other scientists, have struggled to prove that the brain accounts for the mind." But after many experiments, he stated: "To me, it seems more and more reasonable that the mind may be a distinct and different essence [from the brain]... Here is the meeting of mind and brain. It is not to be accounted for by any neuronal mechanisms that I can discover... Since every man must adopt for

himself, without the help of science, his way of life and his personal religion, I have long held my own private beliefs. What a thrill it is, then, to discover, that the scientist, too, can legitimately believe in the existence of... spirit."

What led Dr. Penfield to realize that the human mind must have, in addition to the physical brain, something non-physical, which he called "spirit"? Several years ago, Professor Robert Augrus explained Dr. Penfield's research and findings. Dr. Penfield operated on hundreds of epileptics to lessen or eliminate epileptic seizures without adversely affecting other brain functions. During the experiments, Dr. Penfield would put an electrode on the speech area, making the person temporarily unable to understand words or speak without the patient realizing this, as the brain has no sensitivity.

Professor Augrus pointed out that Dr. Penfield would show the patient a picture card and the patient could correctly identify the picture. When the electrode was applied to the brain, the patient could not speak, he could only snap his finger. When the electrode was removed, the patient said, "Butterfly. I could not get out the word butterfly. So then I tried to say the word, moth, but I could not get that either." Professor Augrus summarized this experiment as follows: "This demonstrates very well the difference between speech and thought. Speech and thought are not the same thing. Thought is directing speech, telling the brain, which is really like a fantastic computer, come up with the word for

this. I know what this thing is; I've identified it. Now give me the word for that out of the archives of memory. And that was temporarily blocked. So then he said, give me the name for a similar thing—and that was blocked too. In his frustration, he snapped with the finger. There's got to be something directing brain functions."

## **THE SPIRIT IN MAN**

Whether coincidence or not, at the same time that Dr. Penfield conducted his research from a scientific view, a Christian author was evaluating the same issue from a Biblical perspective. He, too, could see that the human mind is fundamentally different from the animal brain, and he wondered whether the Bible explains the reason for the difference. This author was Herbert W. Armstrong, and he published his findings in a book entitled, "The Incredible Human Potential." This is what he wrote on pages 74 and 75, "Animals are equipped with brain and instinct. But they do not have power to understand and choose moral and spiritual values or to develop perfect spiritual character. Animals have brain, but no intellect—instinct, but no ability to develop holy and Godly character. And that pictures the transcendental DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ANIMAL BRAIN AND HUMAN MIND. But what causes that vast difference? There is virtually no difference in shape and construction between animal brain and human brain. The brains of elephants, whales and dolphins are larger than

human brain, and the chimp's brain is slightly smaller.

"What then can account for the vast difference? Science cannot adequately answer. Some scientists, in the field of research, conclude that, of necessity, there has to be some non-physical component in human brain that does not exist in animal brain. But most scientists will not admit the possibility of the existence of the nonphysical. What other explanation is there? Actually, outside of the very slight degree of physical superiority of human brain, science has no explanation, due to unwillingness to concede even the possibility of the spiritual..."

Mr. Armstrong then explains that, according to the Bible, each human being has a non-physical component in his brain, called "the spirit in man." On page 81 of his book, he points out, "[T]his spirit is not the man—only something in the man... This spirit cannot see, hear, or think. The man sees, hears and thinks through his physical brain and the five senses of seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling and feeling. The spirit in man imparts the power of physical intellect to the physical brain, thus forming human mind.

"This spirit acts, among other things, as a computer, adding to the brain the psychic and intellectual power. Knowledge received in the brain through the eye, ear and the senses is immediately 'programmed' into the spirit computer. This 'computer' gives the brain instant recall of whatever portion of millions of bits of knowledge may be needed in the reasoning process. That is to

say that memory is recorded in the human spirit, whether or not it is also recorded in the 'gray matter' of the brain. This human spirit also adds to man a spiritual and moral faculty not possessed by animals."

Most people know nothing about the existence of the spirit in man—even many religious people—lay persons and theologians alike. When they read passages in the Bible describing the spirit in man, they assume the Bible is talking about the soul. But the soul is not a non-physical component of the human being. The soul, according to the Bible, is totally physical. The Bible does not teach the concept of an immortal soul. Rather, we read in Ezekiel 18:4, "*The soul who sins shall die.*" The word "soul" in the Bible refers to the living body of both man and animals. In Revelation 16:3, we read that every living soul—both men and beasts—died in the sea. The soul does NOT distinguish man from animals. Rather, the spirit in man is THE distinguishing factor between man and animals. It explains man's superiority over the animals and totally disproves the concept of evolution. In Romans 8:16, and in 1 Corinthians 2:11, more fully discussed below, it is expressly stated that there is a spirit in each man, which spirit is different from God's Holy Spirit.

In the book of Isaiah we are told that each human being has a spirit within him. "*Thus says God the Lord, Who created the heavens and stretched them out, Who spread forth the earth and that which comes from it, Who gives breath to the people on it, and **spirit** to*

*those who walk on it.*" (Isaiah 42:5).

We also learn that God sometimes influences man's spirit for His purpose. We could say that God inspires or motivates a person by "stirring up" the spirit in that person. Note 1 Chronicles 5:25-26, "*And they [Israel] were unfaithful to the God of their fathers, and played the harlot after the gods of the peoples of the land, whom God had destroyed before them. So the God of Israel stirred up **the spirit** of Pul, king of Assyria... He carried the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh into captivity.*"

Another example is found in 2 Chronicles 21:16-17, "*Moreover the Lord stirred up against Jehoram **the spirit of the Philistines and the Arabians**... And they came into Judah and invaded it, and carried away all the possessions that were found in the king's house, and also his sons and his wives.*"

Later, when God saw to it that His word and promise would be fulfilled to rebuild the destroyed city of Jerusalem and the temple, He inspired King Cyrus of Persia to issue a decree, permitting the Jews who were captured in Babylon, to return to Jerusalem. Both 2 Chronicles 36:22 and Ezra 1:1 record what exactly happened. "*Now in the first year of Cyrus king of Persia, that the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah might be fulfilled, the Lord **stirred up the spirit of Cyrus king of Persia**, so that he made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom, and also put it in writing, saying, 'Thus says Cyrus king of Persia: All the kingdoms of the earth the Lord God of heaven has given me. And He has commanded me to build Him a house at Jerusalem which is*



in Judah.” Even King Cyrus realized that God had influenced his spirit to make this proclamation.

But the work of rebuilding the destroyed temple progressed very slowly. There was a lack of leadership to motivate the people to accomplish the task at hand. Let’s read how God intervened, in Haggai 1:4, “*So the Lord stirred up the spirit of Zerubbabel..., governor of Judah, and the spirit of Joshua...and the spirit of all the remnant of the people; and they came and worked on the house of the Lord of hosts, their God.*”

The Bible strongly indicates that God gives the human spirit at the time of conception, and then takes it back at the time of death. We read in Zechariah 12:1, “*Thus says the Lord who stretches out the heavens, lays the foundation of the earth, and forms the spirit of man within him.*”

Ecclesiastes 12:7 says, “*Then the dust will return to the earth as it was, and the spirit will return to God who gave it.*” When the spirit in man leaves a person, that person is dead. James 2:26 says, “*For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also.*”

Jesus Christ Himself, at the time of His death, cried out to the Father to receive His spirit. What exactly did He say? Let’s read in Luke 23:46, “*And when Jesus had cried out with a loud voice, He said, ‘Father, into Your hands I commit My Spirit.’ Having said this, He breathed His last.*” When He died, His human spirit returned to God, as we read in Ecclesiastes. Hebrews 12:22-23 also confirms that the spirit of man returns to God in heaven when the person dies. “*But*

*you have come to...the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem [when we pray, we appear before God in heaven], to an innumerable company of angels,...to God the Judge of all, to the spirits of just men made perfect...*”

In the book of Job, Elihu, under God’s inspiration, tells us, “*If He [God] should set His heart on it, if He should gather to Himself His Spirit and His breath [since God gives both breath and spirit, they both belong to Him and are His. But the spirit being talked about here is the spirit in man, not the Holy Spirit, which is altogether different], all flesh would perish together, and man would return to dust*” (Job 34:14 and 15).

When God decided to destroy man in the flood, He made this statement in Genesis 6:3, “*And the Lord said, ‘My Spirit shall not strive [or abide] with [or in] Man forever, for he is indeed flesh; yet his days shall be one hundred and twenty years.’*” What God is saying here is that He would destroy man through a flood within 120 years from then. This spirit abiding in man cannot be a reference to God’s Holy Spirit, as man was to be wiped out because of his own evil doings. We know, on the other hand, that God gives His Holy Spirit only to those who obey Him, as we read in Acts 5:32. So, the spirit referred to in Genesis 6:3 is a reference to the spirit of man, which is temporary. Isaiah 57:16 tells us, “*For I will not contend forever, Nor will I always be angry; for the spirit [of man] would fail before Me, and the souls which I have made.*”

Understand though, that when a man dies and his spirit returns to

God, that spirit does not continue to live consciously, apart from the body. Rather, God “stores” it, so to speak, in heaven, until He unites it at the time of the resurrection of man with a new spiritual or physical body. The concept that man’s *soul* is immortal is as wrong as the concept that man’s *spirit* continues to live consciously after death. Rather, the body—or soul—dies, and the spirit of man returns to God to await a resurrection.

Note Ecclesiastes 9:4-6, “*But for him who is joined to all the living there is hope... For the living know that they will die, but the dead know nothing... Also their love, their hatred, and their envy have now perished...*”

And verse 10, “*Whatever your hand finds to do, do it with your might, for there is no work or device or knowledge or wisdom in the grave where you are going.*” In other words, there is no conscious activity after a person dies. The spirit does not continue in the realm of consciousness.

Jesus Christ also made it clear that dead people do not continue to live on. Rather, the dead will have to be brought back to life through a resurrection from the dead. In Matthew 22:31-32, He asked the Sadducees, since they did not believe in the resurrection, “*But concerning the resurrection of the dead, have you not read what was spoken to you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.*” If the dead persons of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob had somehow continued to live consciously after their death, including a conscious existence of their spirit

that had returned to God, then Christ’s words to the Sadducees would have been without sense.

## **WHY DOES MAN HAVE A SPIRIT?**

WHY does God give each human being a spirit? The spirit in man records all the human characteristics of the person, as well as his or her outward appearance. At the time of the resurrection, the spirit of the dead person is combined with a new body of the dead person. This means, all the experiences and memories and ideas of the former life are back in the resurrected individual, and the resurrected person will also look the same way he or she did in their former life.

The Bible teaches that there is a resurrection of people back to physical life, and also a resurrection to spiritual life. In the book of Ezekiel, a physical resurrection of the entire house of Israel is described. The prophet sees in a vision a valley with dry bones. Let’s read, this time in the New American Bible, what happens, beginning in Ezekiel 37:7, “*I prophesied as I had been told; and even as I was prophesying I heard a noise; it was a rattling as the bones came together, bone joining bone. I saw the sinews and the flesh come upon them, and the skin cover them, but there was no spirit in them. Then He said to me, ‘Prophesy to the spirit, prophesy, son of man, and say to the spirit, “Thus says the Lord God, From the four winds come, o spirit, and breathe into these slain that they may come to life.”’ I prophesied as He told me, and the spirit came into them; they came alive and stood upright, a vast army.*”

When a person dies, his body returns to dust. But the spirit of man in him has recorded the appearance of the person, the personality, the personal attributes, and God gives the spirit of that person back into the newly created physical body. Let's read Luke 8:49-55, "*While He was still speaking, someone came from the ruler of the synagogue's house, saying to him, Your daughter is dead. Do not trouble the Teacher. But when Jesus heard it, He answered him, saying, Do not be afraid, only believe, and she will be made well. When He came into the house, He permitted no one to go in except Peter, James and John, and the father and the mother of the girl. Now all wept and mourned for her; but He said, Do not weep; she is not dead, but sleeping. And they ridiculed Him, knowing that she was dead. But He put them all outside, took her by the hand and called, saying, Little girl, arise. Then her spirit returned, and she arose immediately.*" Jesus compares the death of a person with a dreamless sleep, out of which the person can awake. Remember when Jesus said that Lazarus was sleeping. He was in fact dead, but Christ knew that He would wake him up out of that sleep or death.

Just as the Bible teaches a resurrection to physical life, so it also teaches a resurrection to spiritual life. Those who died after having been counted worthy to enter the Kingdom of God at the time of Christ's second coming, will have part in a spiritual resurrection, as the Apostle Paul explains in 1 Corinthians 15:35-38, 42-44, "*But someone will say, 'How are the dead raised up? And with*

*what body do they come? Foolish one, what you sow is not made alive unless it dies. And what you sow, you do not sow that body that shall be... But God gives... a body as He pleases... So also is the [spiritual] resurrection from the dead [to spiritual life]: The body is sown in corruption [flesh and blood], it is raised in incorruption... It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body.*" But as with a resurrection to physical life, the resurrection to spiritual life will also incorporate the spirit that was in man and that recorded the person's characteristics.

The spirit in man imparts the mind and the intellect of man – a spirit that animals don't have. Note what Job's friend, Zophar, understood about this spirit in Job 20:2-3, "*Therefore my anxious thoughts make me answer... The spirit of my understanding causes me to answer.*" Elihu would later agree with this assessment. The New Jerusalem Bible translates Job 32:8, "*There is, you see, a spirit residing in humanity, the breath of God conferring intelligence.*" Let's also read verse 18, going back to the New King James Bible, "*For I am full of words; the spirit within me compels me.*"

One of the writers of the Psalms, Asaph, also understood that it was the spirit within him that motivated him to think and gave him intelligence. He says in Psalm 77:6, "*I call to remembrance my song in the night; I meditate within my heart, and my spirit makes diligent search.*" King Solomon, who wrote the books of Proverbs, likewise confirmed that it is the spirit in man that grants human understanding and is responsible for self-

awareness. He says in Proverbs 20:27, “The **spirit of a man** is the lamp of the Lord, searching all the inner depths of his heart.” The New Jerusalem Bible renders this verse, “The **human spirit** is the lamp of Yahweh—**searching the deepest self.**”

Turning now to the New Testament, we find an interesting statement regarding the spirit in man in Acts 17:16 and 17, “Now while Paul waited for them at Athens, **his spirit was provoked within him** when he saw that the city was given over to idols. Therefore he reasoned in the synagogue with the Jews and with the Gentile worshippers, and in the marketplace daily with those who happened to be there.” Some who read passages like these erroneously conclude that those statements refer to God’s Holy Spirit. But this is not the case. The Bible distinguishes clearly between the spirit in man and the Holy Spirit. God gives to everyone the spirit of man, apparently at the time of conception, while only those whom God specifically calls, He grants His Holy Spirit.

Paul says in Romans 8:14-16, “For as many as are led by the Spirit of God [the Holy Spirit], these are the sons of God. For you did not receive the spirit of bondage again to fear [a reference here to Satan, the god and spirit of this world], but you received the Spirit of adoption [or better, sonship] by whom we cry out, Abba, Father. **The Spirit** [God’s Holy Spirit] **Himself bears witness with our spirit** that we are children of God.”

Paul speaks very clearly about two spirits—the spirit of man and the Holy Spirit. Notice in 1 Corinthians

2:11 and 14, “For what man knows the things of man except the **spirit of the man** which is in him. Even so no one knows the things of God except the Spirit of God... But the natural man [a person who does have the spirit of man, but who does not have the Holy Spirit of God] does not receive the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him; nor can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.”

So we see that it is the spirit in man that explains the vast differences in self-awareness, intellect and intelligence between man and animals. This fact alone disproves Darwin’s theory of evolution. And though science widely promotes the theory of evolution, there are a few scientists who do recognize that man has a spiritual component within him. Listen to this astonishing statement from brain researcher Wolf Singer, as recently quoted in “Der Spiegel.” He states, “In this most complex matter of the universe [the human brain] something resides that recognizes itself as ‘I.’ This ‘I’ is ethereal. The human spirit cannot be measured with any balance in the gray substance...”

## **DO ANIMALS HAVE A SPIRIT?**

Are animals just “robots” without any spiritual components? Clearly, they don’t have the same spirit as man, but they have some kind of spirit in them that gives them the instincts God designed for each animal kind. Remember the young chimpanzee that was able to develop to a certain level of intelligence, and then reached a point where he was

no longer a match for the young child? This barrier, as we have seen, was the human spirit in the little boy. But what gave the chimpanzee the ability to even learn what he did, limited as he was? And you might have heard about the famous gorilla, Koko, who apparently can communicate to an extent in sign language? How can we explain such intelligence?

We already know that God, a Spirit being, created all matter and energy out of spirit. We read that if He were to take back His spirit, all matter would cease to exist. Notice Numbers 16:22, “*Then they fell on their faces and said, O God, the God of the **spirits of all flesh**...*” Again, Moses uses the same expression in Number 27:16, “*The God of the **spirits of all flesh**.*” Is this a reference to human beings only? It says, “all flesh.”

In the account of the flood in the book of Genesis, the term “all flesh” clearly refers to animals, as well as humans. For instance, Genesis 7:15 says that the animals went into the ark, “*two by two, of all flesh in which is the breath of life.*” And later in verse 21 we are told that “*all flesh died that moved on the earth: birds and cattle and beasts and every creeping thing that creeps on the earth, and every man.*” But notice verse 22, “*All in whose nostrils was the breath of the spirit of life, all that was on the dry land, died.*” This refers to a spirit residing in living creatures besides man.

Another interesting passage is found in Ecclesiastes, where King Solomon points out that just based on physical components, there is no difference between man and animals. We read in Ecclesiastes 3:19-20, “*For*

*what happens to the sons of men also happens to animals; one thing befalls them: as one dies, so dies the other. Surely, they all have one breath; man has no advantage over animals, for all is vanity. All go to one place: all are from the dust, and all return to dust.*” But then Solomon asks a remarkable question in verse 21, showing that, just as man has a spirit in him, animals also have a spirit. Reading from the New Revised Standard Version, “*Who knows whether the human spirit goes upward and the spirit of animals goes downward to the earth?*”

We already saw that Solomon says in Ecclesiastes 12:7 that the human spirit of man *does go upward* to God at the time of man’s death. His point here is that we don’t know what happens to the spirit of animals when they die. The Bible simply does not tell us. But the Bible states that animals have a spirit, too. This explains what science cannot explain—how animals communicate among themselves. Killer whales have been observed getting into formation to attack a blue whale. Bees, through a complicated dance, “tell” their fellow bees where pollen can be found.

This also explains how God communicates with animals, whether to bring in motion—in very special circumstances—instinctive behavior (such as, how birds know when to start flying to warmer climates), or whether to motivate animals to very specific individual conduct in a given situation. In our sophisticated material world, we sometimes neglect to realize that God, who has created this world, also sustains it. He is very

much involved in the events taking place here. Jesus Christ said that not one sparrow dies without the will of the Father.

Notice the question God asks Job in Job 39:27, *“Does the eagle mount up at your command, and make its nest on high?”* This is an instinctive action, as scientists would say, but HOW does the eagle know when to do it? We see here God’s involvement in this process. Let’s also note a certain animal conduct in response to direct intervention from God. Turn to Jonah 2:10, *“So the Lord spoke to the fish, and it vomited Jonah onto dry land.”* A similar incident is recorded in 1 Kings 17:4 and 6, *“And it will be that you [Elijah] shall drink from the brook, and I have commanded the ravens to feed you there... The ravens brought him bread and meat in the morning, and bread and meat in the evening, and he drank from the brook.”*

When God wants to inspire human beings to do something, He works through their human spirit. Likewise, God deals with the spirit of animals when He wants them to do something. In any event, all these considerations show how utterly false is the theory of evolution, a theory that only looks at physical things and tries to explain them strictly from a physical standpoint. A spirit in man, as well as in animals, proves that evolution cannot be true.

## **WHY SOME ANIMALS ARE EXTINCT**

Still, you might ask, doesn’t extinction of certain animals support the evolutionary idea of ‘survival of the fittest’? Let’s take a closer look.

Many animals became extinct long before Noah’s flood, not because of evolution or because of gradual adaptation and survival of the fittest, but simply because of catastrophes. Remember the Bible states that *“In the beginning God created the heavens and earth. And the earth BECAME void and empty, and it became dark on the face of the deep.”*

Here’s a quote from the magazine “The Wonder of Evolution.” On pages 15 and 17, we read: “The mass extinction 250 million years ago is perhaps the biggest catastrophe that has ever visited our planet...90 to 95% of all animals become extinct... Our clock keeps running—then suddenly, the earth becomes shaken by another catastrophe... 65 million years ago, a big meteor out of space approaches, ten kilometers in diameter. Near Mexico, it rams deep into the earth and creates a gigantic crater. Huge amounts of dust and ashes are thrown into the atmosphere. Firebrands and storms result, and volcanoes erupt, blowing even more ashes into the air. The earth becomes dark. A natural catastrophe of unimaginable proportions has begun, affecting first all the plants. Without sunlight they cannot survive. As a consequence, great famines break out, first amongst the plant eating animals, and ultimately amongst all living creatures on the planet.” On page 29, it reiterates, “It is assumed that the dinosaurs lost their basis for living about 65 million years ago when a huge comet crashed into the earth—a devastating catastrophe that was accompanied by a winter, lasting for decades.”

The BBC presented a television program entitled, "The Doomsday-Asteroid," reporting that in 1908 a meteor blasted into Siberia and set free an amount of energy exceeding the atomic bomb of Hiroshima hundreds of times. If the meteor had crashed into New York, half a million people would have perished. The program continued to explain that it can be seen from old myths, as well as from the records of geology, that in the past big objects hit the earth and produced a lot of damage. The program stated that contrary to the records of the Bible talking about catastrophes, modern science had argued that the surface of the earth was formed gradually through rain and wind.

This idea of the gradual formation of the surface goes back to Huxley. Following that theory, science had rejected the concept of any catastrophes in the past. Until the 20<sup>th</sup> century, so said the television program, catastrophes simply had no room within science. But then the geologist Gene Schoemaker showed that a huge crater in Arizona was formed through an asteroid that hit the earth. More than 200 such craters have been identified on the earth, having been caused by meteors.

The authors of "In Search of Noah's Ark," Balsiger and Sellier, report on some of those incidents. They state on pages 62 and 63: "The meteorite that fell in prehistoric times near Winslow, Arizona, made a hole 4,500 feet across and 600 feet deep. It flung out masses of rock weighing up to 7,000 tons and is estimated to have hurled out

altogether 400 million tons of rocks. The pressure of the impact exceeded 1,000,000 pounds per square inch.

"The still vaster crater 15 miles across at Ries Kessel in Bavaria also was made in prehistoric times by a meteorite the size of which must have been enormous. One cannot avoid comparison with the great meteorite of 1908 that crashed into the Tunguska valley in Siberia, destroying forests over a radius of twenty miles, and producing earth tremors recorded throughout the world. Although this meteorite probably weighed millions of tons, it must have been small compared with that that long before produced the craters at Winslow and Ries Kessel."

In the 1960s, geologists Louis and Walter Alvarez made an astonishing discovery. They found a layer containing metals that appear on this earth in only very small quantities, but that can be found frequently in meteorites and asteroids. This layer showed up between the age of dinosaurs and mammals. The idea was compelling that asteroids were responsible for the extinction of the dinosaurs. But established science reacted to this thought with anger. On the BBC television program mentioned earlier, Schoemaker stated that science was simply unwilling to even entertain the thought that a stone, the size of a mountain, falling from the sky, was responsible for a global catastrophe. Schoemaker explained that the asteroid responsible for destroying the dinosaurs was probably 10 kilometers in size, which, as he said, is still viewed as a relatively small

asteroid. Yet, the program pointed out that it is more or less accepted today that this asteroid destroyed at least two-thirds of all living creatures, and that 90% of the earth was engulfed in flames and the smoke darkened the sky for months, if not years.

It is very uncomfortable to realize, as scientist Clark Chapman of the planetary science institute explained, that an asteroid could hit the earth tomorrow. He stated that we know that they are out there, but that we have not found about 90% of them. If we continue searching for them, we would need 100 years to locate 99% of the asteroids that are circling the earth—and some of them are a hundred times bigger than the meteor that crashed into Siberia in 1908.

Those warnings are not cheap advertisements for Hollywood's catastrophic movies. In July 1994, scientists viewed with astonishment when 21 comets hit the planet Jupiter. The second comet, called Nucleus 6, produced an explosion of 6 million megatons. This catastrophe occurred within our solar system. Imagine the destruction if the comet had hit the earth! The program concluded with a sobering remark, "The only thing that we know for sure is that one day, this earth will be once again hit by a devastating rock."

### **IN THE BEGINNING...**

The Bible confirms a catastrophic event in the past that destroyed a previously beautiful earth. This event produced darkness and devastation that God had to remove when He renewed the surface of the earth. Looking at Genesis 1 more carefully,

we can see that the darkness was the result of comets or asteroids hitting the earth, as well as subsequent volcanic eruptions. Genesis 1:3 says that God said there should be light, and that there was light. But then we read that subsequently, God made the sun, the moon and the stars. Is this a contradiction? Was the great skeptic Voltaire correct when he asked sarcastically, "How could there be light, when there was not a sun yet?" The answer becomes clear when we remember what happens when a meteor or an asteroid or a comet hits the surface of the earth. The smoke from the flames can darken the sky for months, even years. Sunlight could not come through. God had to eliminate the darkness so that the light of the sun could shine through to the earth.

But still, how can it be that God made the sun on the fourth day, *after* He had already made light on the first day? The answer is that the Hebrew word translated "made" in verse 16 can also be translated "had made" or "will have made." One must always consider the context. Remember in Genesis 1:1, "*In the beginning, God made the heavens and the earth.*" God did indeed make the sun, moon and stars in the beginning, though we are not told the time frame of the original creation of these elements. Therefore, verse 16 must be correctly translated that God HAD already made the sun, moon and stars. Then on the fourth day God eliminated all the smoke and dust so that the sun, moon and stars could be viewed again in full clarity and strength.



Reading verses 14 and 15 again, “Then God said, *Let there be lights in the firmament of the heavens to divide the day from the night...and let them be for lights in the firmament of the heavens to give light on the earth.*” In other words, let them become fully visible. Until then they divided nothing, as there was still a lot of smoke and ashes.

Commentator R.K. Harrison, in his “Introduction to the Old Testament,” points out that Genesis 1 is written as if the writer was on the earth at the time he wrote, and describes the phases of re-creation in the way he would have seen them. From that standpoint, the writer would have seen the sun, moon and stars on the fourth day when God removed the darkness caused by the fallout. All good and well, but, you might ask, “If the darkness and devastation on the earth described in Genesis 1:2 was the result of asteroids hitting the earth, then why do we read in verse 2 that the earth was covered with water?”

Quoting again from “In Search of Noah’s Ark,” the book describes volcanic eruptions and the devastation they cause. The book quotes the Encyclopedia Britannica, describing a volcanic eruption in 1883 on the island of Java. It reads on pages 58 and 59, “Until the night of August 26-27, 1883, [the island] had an area of about 18 square miles; at that time the most terrific volcanic eruption of modern times destroyed most of the island, so that its present area is only six square miles. One of the explosions produced the loudest noise ever heard by man; the sound was heard

at a distance of 3000 miles. The shock waves produced by the eruption and the accompanying earthquake were felt around the world. It was computed that the column of stones, dust and ashes projected from the volcano shot up into the air for a height of 17 miles or more. *Tidal waves* produced by the eruption attained a height of 50 feet and killed more than 36,000 people along the coasts of Java and Sumatra. The dust caused a definitive lowering of temperature for two or three years and *heavy rains* worldwide during the six weeks following the eruption.”

Such huge tidal waves can also be caused by earthquakes in the ocean, moving through the ocean, as one magazine put it, with the speed of a jet airplane. For instance, in the spring of 1960, several earthquakes occurred on the coast of Chile. The subsequent tidal waves caused destruction as far away as Australia and Japan. In Chile itself a portion of the coast 500 kilometers in length and 30 kilometers in breadth sank about 2 meters. After the quake, salt water from the ocean was found inland for miles.

In December of 1811 and February of 1812, several earthquakes hit the Mississippi valley in Missouri, estimated at 8.3 and 8.7 on the Richter scale. The Mississippi River changed its course, and because the earth sank at that location, a lake came into existence, called the Reelfootlake, which is located today at the border of Tennessee and Kentucky.

As a matter of fact, scientists tell us that even today, *in order to see most of the earth flooded with water,*

not too many spectacular occurrences are necessary. For instance, Bangkok, Thailand, is located only one meter above sea level. A large portion of the Netherlands is actually under sea level. Many developing countries, in fact, are threatened by the possibility of tidal waves or tsunamis.

So it is possible, even from a scientific view, that meteors, asteroids and comets hitting the earth, combined with resulting earthquakes, volcanic eruptions and sinking of the earth, as well as huge tidal waves or tsunamis, could have resulted in the surface of the earth being covered with water.

However, the catastrophe that occurred some time between Genesis 1:1 and Genesis 1:2, causing the extinction of all the creatures God originally created, was not the only global catastrophe mentioned in the Bible.

Perhaps the most familiar worldwide destruction is the flood described in Genesis 7 and 8. Have you ever thought about what events must have occurred to cause such worldwide destruction? Quoting again from the book "In Search of Noah's Ark," page 58, "...[Gen. 7:11] says, 'On that day all the fountains of the great deep burst forth, and the windows of the heavens were opened'... A secondary source of water on the antediluvian Earth existed in vast subterranean heated and pressurized reservoirs either in the primeval crust or in the Earth's mantle... The pressurized waters below the crust suddenly erupted at a point of weakness. Collapse at one point would cause a

chain reaction leading to similar eruptions at many other points around the world. The resulting atmospheric turbulence, combined with immense amounts of dust blown skyward from volcanoes, would begin condensation and precipitation of the canopy... The process would be similar to modern day cloud seeding to cause rain."

To interject here, many theologians and scientists state that a vapor canopy once surrounded the earth. Theologians refer to Genesis 7:11 where it says that the "windows of heaven were opened." They feel this is probably a reference to the pre-flood vapor canopy. Another reference to this canopy can be seen in Genesis 1:6-7, where we read that God made a firmament and divided the waters under the firmament from the waters above the firmament, giving reference to a water vapor canopy. This canopy, scientists explain, would have created a greenhouse effect. This seems to be confirmed in Genesis 2:5 where we are told that the antediluvian world was watered by dew or mist, not by rain. This dew would have been dependent upon humidity, saturation, temperature, dew point and condensation—all made possible through the water vapor canopy.

Continuing now from the book "In Search Of Noah's Ark," citing from page 59, "We see the possible significance of the order of destruction mentioned in Genesis 7:11. Subterranean upheavals within the oceans, volcanic eruptions and earthquakes and the gushing forth of those waters triggered the opening of

the windows of heaven, and the canopy waters poured upon the Earth as torrential rains for 40 days and 40 nights before slacking off to light rain for the next 110 days...”

But what started the whole thing? Here is one possible answer from the same book. On page 62 it says, “We believe it’s plausible that a gigantic meteorite colliding with Earth could have jarred the Earth’s crust so tremendously that it set off the universal cataclysmic conditions necessary to have caused the rising of the sea beds, earthquakes, volcanoes and the collapse of the water canopy.”

We understand, of course, that it was God who brought about the flood. But as He used water to destroy the earth’s surface, it is legitimate to ask what else, based on Biblical evidence, God might have used to bring about the results. And a meteorite hitting the earth is a possible answer, since God has used meteorites at other times as well to bring destruction on this planet. Remember the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah? Looking at the Biblical record describing the destruction, we are prompted to ask if perhaps God used meteorites or asteroids when destroying Sodom and Gomorrah. Let’s read Genesis 19:24-28, “*Then the Lord rained brimstone and fire on Sodom and Gomorrah, from the Lord out of the heavens. So He overthrew [destroyed] those cities, all the plain, all the inhabitants of the cities, and what grew on the ground... The smoke of the land ...went up like the smoke of a furnace.*”

Consider also the plagues that

God poured out on Egypt at the time of Moses. Exodus 9:22-33 says, “*Then the Lord said to Moses, ‘Stretch out your hand toward heaven, that there may be hail in all the land of Egypt—on man, on beast, and on every herb of the field; throughout the land of Egypt. So there was hail, and fire mingled with hail, so very heavy that there was none like it in all the land of Egypt since it became a nation... Then the thunder and the hail ceased, and the rain was not poured on the earth.*”

Another possible encounter with a meteor can be seen in Joshua 10:11, “*And it happened, as they fled before Israel... that the Lord cast down large hailstones from heaven on them... There were more who died from the hailstones than those whom the children of Israel killed with the sword.*” Also note Judges 5:20, “*They fought from the heavens; the stars from their courses fought against [King] Sisera.*”

## **PUNISHMENT FOR SIN**

We have seen that God, who created the heavens and the earth and everything in them, has at times chosen to punish sinful mankind by destroying the entire surface of the earth, or in some cases, isolated regions. We have seen that the surface of the earth was destroyed, in all likelihood by asteroids, causing the extinction of dinosaurs. The cause for the destruction was sin. The Bible tells us that angels occupied the earth prior to man and their leader was Lucifer. But Lucifer became proud and haughty. He induced the angels under him to fight against the very God who created them. Of course, they lost.

You can read about this gigantic spiritual battle between the forces of good and the forces of evil in many places in the Bible; i.e.; Isaiah 14, Ezekiel 28, Revelation 12:4, 2 Peter 2:4, Luke 10:18.

Lucifer's name, meaning Lightbringer, was changed to Satan, meaning Adversary. The angels under him became known as demons. And because of the sin committed by Satan and his angels, the earth that they inhabited was destroyed. This physical destruction, caused by sudden catastrophes, explains part of the fossil record. Remember, fossils can only be formed in a sudden way. Gradual changes don't create fossils. Some fossils were formed during other catastrophes, such as the world-wide flood. Again, such catastrophes took place because of sinful conduct of the inhabitants of the earth. A lesson we should learn from this is that sin has a price—you reap what you sow. The fossil record proves that evolution *did not* take place, and *could not* have taken place. Rather, fossils establish the existence of sudden catastrophes.

But perhaps more importantly, the Bible tells us that such cataclysmic events are not merely a thing of the past. Rather, because of the continuing sinful conduct of mankind, they will happen again. Yes, God will surely bring destruction to this earth again, to teach mankind that sin does not pay. And, we are not without warning from God Himself.

Jesus Christ spoke repeatedly of increased earthquake activity just prior to His return to this earth.

Matthew 24:7 tells us that *“there will be famines, pestilences, and earthquakes in various places.”* Isaiah 24:19-20 warns us, *“The earth is violently broken, the earth is split open, the earth is shaken exceedingly. The earth shall reel to and fro like a drunkard, and shall totter like a hut; its transgression shall be heavy upon it.”* Revelation 11:13 tells us of a huge earthquake still to come, in the very near future, *“In the same hour, there was a great earthquake, and a tenth of the city [Jerusalem] fell. In the earthquake seven thousand men were killed.”*

Big earthquakes can, of course, occur without any impact from meteors. But as we saw, they can also be the result of such an impact. And it is interesting that some of these earthquakes soon to strike the earth are not “usual” earthquakes. Note Luke 21:25-26, *“And there will be signs in the sun, in the moon, and in the stars; and on the earth distress of nations, with perplexity, the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them from fear and expectation of those things which are coming on the earth, for the powers of heaven will be shaken.”*

Consider this account in Revelation 16:18, 20-21, *“And there were noises and thunderings and lightnings; and there was a great earthquake, such a mighty and great earthquake as had not occurred since men were on the earth. Then every island fled away, and the mountains were not found. And great hail from heaven fell upon men, each hailstone about the weight of a talent. Men blasphemed God because the plague of the hail, since that plague was exceedingly great.”*

Parallel scriptures in the book of

Isaiah add more insight into what is going to happen very soon. Isaiah 29:6 tells us, “*You will be punished by the Lord of hosts with thunder and earthquake and great noise, with storm and tempest and the flame of devouring fire.*” Isaiah 30:30 continues, “*The Lord will cause His glorious voice to be heard, and show the descent of His arm, with the indignation of His anger and the flame of a devouring fire, with scattering, tempest and hailstones.*”

It doesn't take a great deal of imagination to realize the awesome devastation that will occur again on the earth, caused by comets, asteroids or meteors. John writes about it in Revelation 6:12-13, “*I looked when He opened the sixth seal, and behold, there was a great earthquake; and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became like blood. And the stars of heaven fell to the earth, as a fig tree drops its late figs when it is shaken by a mighty wind.*”

Revelation 8:7-12 says, “*The first angel sounded: And hail and fire followed, mingled with blood, and they were thrown to the earth. And a third of the trees were burned up, and all green grass was burned up. Then the second angel sounded: And something like a great mountain burning with fire was thrown into the sea, and a third of the sea became blood. And a third of the living creatures in the sea died, and a third of the ships were destroyed. Then the third angel sounded: And a great star fell from heaven, burning like a torch, and it fell on a third of the rivers and on the springs of water. The name of the star is Wormwood; A third of the waters became wormwood, and many men died from the water, because it was*

*made bitter. Then the fourth angel sounded: And a third of the sun was struck, a third of the moon, and a third of the stars, so that a third of them were darkened; A third of the day did not shine, and likewise the night.*”

Darkness will again cover the whole earth. But why? Why will God bring such terrible destruction upon the earth? The answer can be found in several places in the Bible. Revelation 11:18 tells us that the time has come that God “*should destroy those who destroy the earth.*” Man continues to live in sin, and because of it, even the earth is affected. Hosea 4:1-3 says, “*The Lord brings a charge against the inhabitants of the land: There is no truth or mercy or knowledge of God in the land [Man would rather believe in the atheistic concept of evolution.] By swearing and lying, killing and stealing and committing adultery, they break all restraint, with bloodshed after bloodshed. Therefore the land will mourn, and everyone who dwells there will waste away, with the beasts of the field and the birds of the air, even the fish of the sea will be taken away.*”

Man has forsaken God. He refuses to seek God and correct his sinful ways, so God will bring destruction to the entire earth. He has done it before, and He will do so again. But you need not be a victim of those catastrophes—there is a way of escape if you are truly following God—keeping His laws, statutes and judgments—if you love Him with all your heart and your neighbor as yourself. How do we show love for God? By keeping His commandments. Note Revelation 3:10, from

the New Jerusalem Bible, “*Because you have kept my commandment to persevere, I will keep you safe in the time of trial which is coming for the whole world, to put the people of the world to the test.*”

The immediate future of this earth looks grim. But if you are one of God’s true followers, there is a way out. Just as God protected Noah and his family in an ark while the rest of the world perished in a flood, and as God protected Lot and his daughters by bringing them out of Sodom, so God will protect His people here on earth. We will not have been removed from this earth in a secret rapture, spending our time in heaven with Christ, but we will be at a safe place here on earth. Christ says in Luke 21:28, “*Now when these things begin to happen, look up and lift up your heads, because your redemption draws near.*” God is testing us today to see what’s in our hearts, to see if we will keep His commandments. Will you be one of those worthy of protection?

If we want to follow God, we must believe what God says, as we pointed out at the beginning of this

booklet. And God tells us very clearly in His inspired Word, the Bible, that *He* created the heavens and the earth, as well as man. We did not evolve from animals, but man was created directly by God.

How accurately the Apostle Paul described the wise and learned of his day who believed the concept of evolution, as we pointed out at the beginning of this booklet! He stated in Romans 1:20-23, “*For since the creation of the world His [God’s] invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse...Professing to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like corruptible man and birds and fourfooted animals and creeping things.*”

God is saying the same to all of us today. We also are without excuse if we replace the truth of God and His creation with the ungodly idea of evolution, essentially degrading man as descending from a mollusk. What an insult to mankind, and what blasphemy toward man’s Creator!

**United States**

Church of the Eternal God  
PO Box 270519  
San Diego, CA 92198

**Canada**

Church of God, ACF  
Box 1480  
Summerland B.C V0H 1Z0

**United Kingdom**

Global Church of God  
PO Box 2111  
Derby DE1 1ZR

**Belgium**

Le Siecle A Venir  
Allee du Grand Cheniat, 30  
B-6280 Loverval