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THE CRUMBLING OF EVOLUTION

D. James Kennedy, Ph.D.
Coral Ridge Ministries
P.O. Box 40
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33302

Text: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" (Genesis 1:1).

I hope that you will pay particular attention to this message, "The Crumbling of Evolution," because I believe it is vital to our country that this information which has been repressed be disseminated to the American populace, and that Christians be informed and able to speak on this issue.

"Christianity is fighting for its very life," said Richard Bozarth, an atheistic evolutionist. It is fighting for its life in its struggle against evolution because it is well-known that evolution makes the entire mission of Jesus Christ superfluous. Christ came to deliver us from sin — sin which entered the human race, we are told in the New Testament, through one man: Adam. Through the fall of mankind, through the advent of original sin, sin permeated the human race and it was to that problem Christ came to address Himself and to give Himself. If evolution is true then that whole idea of redemption is false and Christ came for naught; and Christianity is, therefore, untrue.

Evolutionists have long seen this. Unfortunately, many Christians have not. Rather, they have often sought for one type or another of compromise. Supposing evolution had proved itself to be a scientific fact, they felt there was nothing to do but accommodate themselves to this new "fact." Therefore, all manner of accommodations were conceived and evolution was acknowledged to be true by many within, as well as without, the church. The results of the introduction of this new evolutionary concept of life into the world a little over a hundred years ago, have been nothing less than staggering. They have affected virtually every single academic discipline that you will find in our educational system. They have affected every single sphere of our lives.

Are these results compatible with Christianity? Some Christians have tried to maintain that they are. Jacques Monod, a Nobel prizewinning scientist (not a Christian but an evolutionist), says: "[Natural] selection is the blindest, and most cruel way of evolving new species, and more and more complex and refined organisms...The struggle for life and elimination of the weakest is a horrible process, against which our whole modern ethics revolts...I am surprised that a Christian would defend the idea...."

People who say that the Bible simply says that God created man and does not say how are so utterly simplistic that their ignorance of both science and Scripture is overwhelming. If the first eleven chapters dealing with cosmology in the Scripture were simply to tell us that God created the heavens and the earth, might I point out to you that He successfully did that in the first verse of the first chapter! Several hundred other verses obviously were wasted! Furthermore, the concept of creation permeates not only the Old but the New Testament as well. Therefore, it cannot be dismissed so lightly. Further, the entire ethical system that flows from evolution is completely antithetical to all that is Christian.

Indeed, we are engaged in a life struggle. I might point out to you that every single anti-Christian "ism" that has come down the pike in the last century or more has found as its pseudoscientific foundation the idea of evolution. Whether we are talking about Nazism, Facism, Communism, Secular Humanism, Freudianism, Behaviorism, or any one of a dozen other "isms," they all rest their case on evolution. The two massive non-Christian, anti-Christian systems that dominate our world today are: in the East, Communism; and in the West, Secular Humanism. Both of these massive, atheistic systems rest upon the singular pillar of evolution.
Is it true? Must we accommodate? Must we bow the knee? If all the facts on one side of the case are presented and all the facts on the other side are repressed, that is not education — that is, by definition, brainwashing. It is precisely that brainwashing that has been going on in America for the last fifty or sixty years. I have never met a student in any public educational institution in this country who could tell me one fact he ever learned in school which contradicted evolution. All such facts have been utterly repressed.

Evolution has not established itself as an irrefutable fact, as its adherents would like people to believe, but, rather, it is crumbling on every side. The fortress is cracking; the walls are giving way; the citadel is coming down; there are fissures everywhere! The whole of evolution is in absolute chaos today and the public does not know it. Students are still being taught the same old lies.

What is evolution? In the words of one of the most prestigious scientists in the world, Dr. Paul LeMoine, an editor of L'Encyclopedie Francais: "Evolution is a fairy tale for adults." I am sure that to the average American who has been indoctrinated and brainwashed with evolution for so many decades, such a statement as that is positively stunning.

Dr. Duane Gish, a noted biologist, puts it slightly differently — but it is still a fairy tale. He said that if you kiss a frog and it turns into a prince, that is a fairy tale. But in evolution if you kiss a frog with the pixy dust of a little time, it turns into a prince — and that is science. Or, at least so we are told.

Four fissures in the foundation of evolution have appeared within the last two or three years and they have all been discovered by evolutionists. They totally demolish the whole structure of evolution and, yet, most people know nothing about them.

First, let us consider the origin of the universe. Since atheistic evolutionists reject God, they must postulate that matter is eternal. They are forever fond of asking the question: Where did God come from? If you get rid of an eternal God you are left with the necessity of eternal matter. As one scholar said: "The matter with matter is it has no matter." The fact is that increasing discoveries of science are showing that matter absolutely cannot be eternal. For example: The current wisdom in cosmological circles is that the universe began with a "big bang." Of course, with the idea that there was an initial bang and out of this the galaxies exploded and are moving outward, it did not take the evolutionists very long to realize that this theory just would not do. Why? The answer, very simply, is because a big bang had to have a beginning — and if there is one thing evolutionists cannot tolerate it is a beginning!

Matter must be eternal! The universe must be eternal because there is no God. It is absolutely inconceivable to suppose that the universe at one time did not exist and God did not exist — and then the universe started to exist. So the universe must be eternal.

Therefore, the evolutionists postulated the idea that instead of simply a "big bang" we had an "oscillating universe": The universe exploded and expanded for so many billions of years. Finally the gravitational pull began to act upon the galaxies; they slowed down and finally collapsed in upon themselves until they came together again into a composite piece of mass the size of a basketball (some of them say the size of a pea). Some evolutionists say it exploded once more so that we have an oscillating universe which goes in and out forever and ever. Thus they have dispensed again with a beginning — and with God!

There is not the first scientific fact, or piece of evidence, or bit of data, that confirms such a theory as an oscillating universe. It is simply based on the faith of evolutionists. Evolution is a religion and it is founded upon faith. I can easily bring forth two hundred statements from evolutionists stating the fact that evolution is based upon faith. In this case also, "faith is the substance of things hoped for; the evidence of things not seen."

But certain things are testable. Just a couple of years ago, two of the most esteemed astronomers in this country, Dr. Allan Sandage of the Hale Observatories, and Dr. James Gunn, using Mount Palomar's 200-inch telescope, after fifteen years of painstaking study of the red shift of galaxies, revealed their conclusions — which absolutely astonished, first of all themselves, and then the whole scientific world. They said that though they had always held to a belief in an oscillating or closed universe, the "premier fact" is that it is an open, expanding universe which will never close in upon itself. There was a beginning!
How do other evolutionists react to that statement? Isaac Asimov, probably the most prolific science and science fiction writer of all times said: "Emotionally I am an atheist. I don’t have the evidence to prove that God doesn’t exist, but I so strongly suspect He doesn’t that I don’t want to waste my time." When confronted with the scientific fact, he says: "I have a hunch that we will find the answer. Does not that cause great relief in the evolutionary community? We thought we were going to have to rest on scientific facts — but the "hunch" has come to the rescue again! The faith of evolution: the hunch. Though 99% of the necessary matter is missing, it will be found! We may base our cosmology upon Dr. Asimov’s hunch! And millions of children will continue to be taught that is the way it is.

Furthermore, physicists have made some examinations of the possibility of a collapsing universe and have found out that if ever it did collapse, the laws of physics absolutely preclude any collapsing universe from exploding once more. And so again, the scientific facts totally rule out the possibility of an oscillating universe. Therefore, the universe must have had a beginning. Therefore, there must be a God. But will our children be taught that in school next year? No. Because evolution is a dogmatic, narrow, bigoted religion. It will suppress and repress all scientific facts that do not support it.

Secondly, as all of you may remember from your school days, evolutionists had to create a story about how life began. For a century or more they tried to invent a story. This is like concocting a fairy tale. But it has to have a sort of scientific aura to it. You may recall that they used to say that life began by spontaneous generation: things just popped into existence. But the trouble with spontaneous generation was that it, too, was testable. And testable means scientific. Pasteur tested it and demolished it. But that only meant — to devout evolutionists — that though life was not arising now, it must have arisen sometime in the dim past — in the untestable, nonscientific past. That way, it could not be disproved.

It is into that land of the untestable that they always retreat because whenever anything in the theory of evolution is scientifically testable, it always proves to be false. To wit: Lamarkianism — the idea of the inheritance of acquired characteristics; that our children acquire characteristics which we developed in our lifetime. Not so! And it was decisively disproved. But now they have retreated, as always, into the dim past where they cannot be tested.

The fairy tale continues. In 1936 Alexander Oparin, a Russian biochemist, devised a story in which he postulated that life arose in a primordial soup of organic chemicals. Once upon a time molecules and atoms got together and formed biopolymers: they formed macromolecules which in turn formed amino acids. Finally these amino acids bound themselves together into long chains and produced proteins. These proteins got together by the hundreds of thousands and at last they created a living cell! However, the scientists realized that one thing was absolutely necessary: There must be no free oxygen in the atmosphere because oxygen destroys these rudimentary biopolymers, these amino acids, that are trying to bind themselves together. What do they do? Well, in a fairy tale you add anything you want. They created a new atmosphere in which there is no oxygen; a reducing atmosphere which is made of of methane, ammonia and water vapor — no free oxygen. And so, Oparin said, that is the way it was — once upon a time!

That theory was repeated in virtually every single biology text and primer for the last fifty years. That life began in the primordial sea in a non-oxidized atmosphere has been taught to tens of millions of school children all over the world, is that based upon fact? Not the slightest! It is based upon faith: the faith of evolutionary religion; that it must have been that way because evolution must have happened. How do we know that evolution must have happened? It is very simple: Here we are! And it is unthinkable to think that God created us, so we must have evolved, and, therefore, there must have been an ammonia, methane atmosphere.

But what happened? Along came real science with its testability. As recently as ten months ago, evolutionists Harry Clemmey and Nick Badham published an article entitled, "Oxygen in the Precambrian Atmosphere" in the March 1982 issue of Geology, a prestigious scientific magazine. In it they said: "Although biologists concerned with the origin of life in this planet have an early atmosphere consisting of reduced gases, this stems as much from ignorance of recent advances as from active opposition to them." This is to say that science teachers in our high schools and colleges who are presently teaching that life arose in a methane, ammonia atmosphere, are either ignorant of recent advances or they are actively opposing any scientific evidence that refutes their view of evolution.
Also, Dr. John Gribbin, of England, writing in New Scientist, said that the scientific folklore every child has been taught concerning the origin of life must now be completely abandoned and we must now rewrite all of our scientific textbooks. Can you imagine this? Dr. Henry Morris in an excellent book on this subject says the "assured scientific fact" of one generation becomes the next generation's "scientific folklore!" There was no non-oxidizing atmosphere in which life could originate. And remember: if there is oxygen present those amino acids will never bind together! Therefore, life could not have begun by merely natural means.

Thirdly, in addition to the origin of the universe and the disappearing reducing atmosphere, evolutionists are now faced with the science of probabilities in the origin of life. Creationists for years have been saying that the laws of probability completely destroy the possibility of evolution taking place. This was mostly ignored. But in recent years certain individuals of great prestige in the scientific community have been facing the cold realities of probability science as it relates to the formation of an initial living cell.

No less a figure than Francis Crick, one of the world's most prestigious biologists and co-discoverer of DNA, examined the possibilities of a cell coming into existence. When he discovered the incredibly complex molecule of DNA (the most complex molecule known to man), he began to examine the possibilities of this happening by chance on this earth and concluded that it was not possible. It could not have happened. But what did Crick do? Did he leap into the arms of "God"? No. He leaped into the arms of "directed panspermia." That is a new evolutionary fairy tale, my friend. You ought to be aware of it. It goes with Hansel and Gretel, The Three Little Pigs and some of the others.

"Directed panspermia" comes right out of "Star Trek" or "Star Wars." It means that some highly advanced beings on some other planet sent missiles out into the universe that had sperm cells, living cells, in them — and they planted us here on this earth! However, there does not happen to be the least bit of scientific evidence to support such a theory. But it is part of the faith and religion of evolution. It does not really solve the problem but simply extends the shadow because the question must surely be asked: Where did these advanced beings come from on another planet?

Well, we won't talk about that! But it seems that some other scientists did want to talk about that probability — even one, perhaps, of greater prestige than Francis Crick. I am speaking of Sir Fred Hoyle of Cambridge University, one of the most noted astronomers and mathematicians in the world today. In fact, he is the originator and founder of one of the two cosmogonies of our time: the Steady-State Theory of the universe (the Big Bank Theory). Having examined the probabilities of life forming on this planet, he said: "The notion that not only biopolymers but the operation programme of a living cell could be arrived at by chance in a primordial organic soup here on earth is evidently nonsense of a high order." Hoyle, who was an atheist all his life, said that what you and your children were taught in school as absolute scientific fact is nothing less than nonsense of a high order.

Hoyle went further than Crick and examined the possibilities of life arising by chance on some other planet, taking not merely four and a half billion years as the supposed age of the earth, but, rather, twenty billion years as the supposed age of the universe. He came to the conclusion that life would never have originated by chance in twenty billion years. The truth is that it would not have arisen by chance in twenty trillion times twenty billion years! It never would have happened at all. He came to the conclusion that the only way life could have come to pass is through the application of a very high order of intelligence which he says we may call (are you ready?): God! Sir Fred Hoyle of Cambridge, originator of the Steady-State Theory of the universe was forced by scientific and mathematical computations to conclude that the only conceivable answer for the origin of life in the entire universe is God.

He said that he is amazed by some of the evolutionary scientists who seem to sort of predicate that there is a miracle worker at work somewhere in nature: that there is a miraculous factor that is always coming to the aid of the biologists. He says that these people "are always to be found living on the twilight fringes of thermodynamics" the basic laws of the universe which totally conflict and confound the idea that life could have happened by chance. These scientists who say that it does are those that refuse to face the real laws upon which our universe is established.

So we have seen that evolutionists have no answer for the origin of the universe; the universe had to have a beginning; and there was no methane, ammonia atmosphere in which life could have come into existence, and the probabilities of it happening are zero.
Lastly, in October 1980 at a worldwide meeting of evolutionists in Chicago, Dr. Stephen Jay Gould of Harvard University (perhaps the most vocal advocate of evolution in America today) and Dr. Nils Eldredge of the American Museum of Natural History presented a new view of evolution. They said there that it has long been a "trade secret" of paleontologists that transitional forms do not exist; that missing links do not exist. He is saying that paleontologists have long known as a "trade secret" that there are no missing links. They know that there are not; they have always known it! And he said that the time has come for them to admit it.

Is Dr. Gould also going to leap into the hands of God? Well, not so quick for this atheist. He invents instead a whole new view of evolution: "punctuated equilibria"! Instead of saying as Darwin did, that between this species and that species, there were hundreds and thousands of minute transitional forms — none of which they have ever been able to find. They should be, as Darwin himself said, around by the billions; we should stumble over them when we step out the back door. But they do not exist.

"Punctuated equilibria" declares that species came into being, they stayed about the same for millions of years and all of a sudden there was a great leap, a saltation, and they jumped to an entirely different form. Like Dr. Richard Goldschmidt taught at the University of California in his "hopeful monsters" theory: A lizard laid an egg and another lizard came out; that happened a few hundreds of thousands of times, and one day another lizard laid an egg and a bird hatched out and flew away!

My friend, that does not even have the semblance of plausibility. It is, on the very face of it, an absurdity! If that were true, then everyone of you ladies who is "infanticipating" ought to view the idea of going into the maternity ward and having a baby, with considerable horror. I would suggest that you keep the windows closed lest "it" fly away!

And yet this is the extreme to which the atheistic evolutionists have been reduced in the last two or three years. We see here, indeed, that not over many tiny changes, but with a leap, the frog practically becomes a prince. A fairy tale for adults! Why do we not find transitional forms? Because there aren't any.

The entire citadel is collapsing all about the evolutionists. And yet virtually all of this evidence is suppressed and kept from our children so that they might be taught the evolutionistic, atheistic, amoral view of life which is destroying our civilization and our world today. May it be that Christians may become informed enough, vocal enough, and demanding enough that the scientific evidence for creation be taught along with the supposed evidence for evolution in our schools. (A recent poll indicated that 86% of the American people now desire to have creation as well as evolution taught in the public schools.)

May it be that this will no longer be suppressed by the evolutionists who are continuing to brainwash our children into believing their fairy tales — which they call science.