

Did Humans Evolve from Lower Life Forms, or Did God Create Adam?

You have never seen God. No one has ever taken a photograph of God. No one can write to Him and receive a letter with the return address "Heaven" stamped on it. Yet, millions worship various concepts of God in hundreds of different religions.

Evolutionists say there is no God. They say you and I evolved over aeons of time; that life began billions of years ago in some way, perhaps by a "chance strike of lightning in a primordial soup of methane and ammonia," and gradually evolved from simple viruses and amoebas to complex plants and animals. Is evolution true? Can it be proved?

by Garner Ted Armstrong

There are almost as many hypotheses for the beginning of life as there are atheistic evolutionists to propose them. Did we come from extreme cold, or extreme heat? Serious scientists propose each extreme. Did life arise from "cracks in rocks," or from "polka-dotted air bubbles in the sea"? Did we come from "green scum," or from "brown slime"? All of the above, and many more, have been proposed.

Can evolution be proved? Many seem to think so. Visit any of our natural history museums, where the evolutionary process is laid out for us in fabulous display, complete with reconstructed fossils of eohippus and brontosaurus. Our daily fare from science writers reporting the latest archaeological find which allegedly pushes the age of man back even further into the dimmest reaches of time: the latest bones dug up in the Olduvai Gorge; fossils found near the bottom of the Grand Canyon; new and hitherto undiscovered kinds of dinosaurs--all seem to support the theory of evolution.

But is evolution true? Can it be proved? For if it cannot, then there must be some other explanation for life on this earth.

Most Education is Anti-God

Modern education is based wholly on the evolutionary concept. Whether one studies mathematics, biology, paleontology, zoology, history, sociology, astronomy--whatever discipline--the evolutionary concept dominates. Museums are arranged so as to show young school-aged visitors the story of evolution.

Beautifully-done artists' concepts of primordial seas with a chance lightning strike illustrates how life "might have" begun. Then, in the museums and textbooks, worms, sponges, and tiny one-celled animals are arranged in careful order, leading to trilobites, fishes, and eventually amphibians, quadrupeds, dinosaurs, birds, monkeys, and men.

Wide-eyed children, generation after generation of them, are conducted through school texts and field trips to such museums which enforce the evolutionary concept in their minds.

Then, when it is "Sunday-go-to-meeting" time, earnest parents take those same children to the neighborhood church. There, they sit in pews, sing songs, attend children's Bible classes, and hear about Adam and Eve, about God and the devil, about Christ on the cross.

As adults, isn't this process a little confusing?

When the average church-going person reads the latest article by the newspaper science writer about a bone dug up somewhere which allegedly "proves" greater antiquity for the human race, pushing it back millions and millions of years, how does such a person deal with a religion which claims God created Adam only about 6,000 years ago?

And what of the so-called "intelligentsia" of our peoples; the think-tanks, universities, research institutes, and the like, who advise government and help shape policy? What do these men think of presidents who attend church, place their hand on the Bible and say "so help me, God" in their inaugural ceremony, and stand uncomfortably by as Dr. Billy Graham addresses God in prayer? Do evolutionists possess a cynical tolerance? Do they regard all those who act like they believe in God as eccentric, superstitious? One would so assume.

But evolution is not proved. It is merely a theory, and a theory so incredibly flawed, so filled with illogical suppositions, so shot through with error so as to be painfully humorous.

Evolution is a religion, after all, a faith, which is grounded in missing evidence, and therefore, like the religion it derides, based upon the "evidence" of things not seen--like billions of missing intermediate species, which would represent millions of times the species found in the fossil record.

If Evolution is True-HOW Did it Happen?

Evolution has never answered some of the most logical, basic questions about our world.

Evolutionists don't like tiresome old questions like, "Which came first, the chicken, or the egg?" Such a question is sure to bring hoots of derision from evolutionists and sarcastic reference to the Scopes trial. But which did come first? Do you know? Do they?

Which came first, bacteria, or plants? Which came first, plants, or animals? Which came first, flowering fruits, or the honeybee required to pollinate them? Which came first, the tiny plankton upon which whales feed, or the whales? Which came first, yeast cells, or enzymes? Which came first, sea anemones, or clownfish? Which came first, the lichen, or the alga, existing in symbiotic harmony, neither capable of surviving without the other? Which came first, male, or female? Where did sex come from? Did it evolve from dividing cells? Did "simple, one celled animals" experience orgasm upon division? These, and literally thousands of valid questions like them must be asked of evolution: questions like, What is law and where did it come from? What is gravity, and why does it act the way it does? What is matter, and where did it come from? What is energy, and how did it begin?

But let's begin right here at home, with ourselves.

Were We Once Only a Blob?

Suppose you painted a green blob, and hung it over your fireplace. When visitors come, you point to the blob and proudly say, "That is an amoeba--my ancestor!" It's bound to be a conversation piece.

Where did you come from? From your parents, of course. Most of us know the names of our grandparents. Some of us even know the names of our great-grandparents. But when it comes to our great, great-grandparents and those who came before us, most of us know nothing of them. Yet, we know they existed. We know that we are here because somewhere, somehow, over periods of thousands of years human beings met, married, and produced children.

We had human parents. At what distant point in time were our parents not human?

Did your ancestors and mine once inhabit caves, shape crude flint spears to hunt mammoths, and drag their women about by the hair? Did we once climb trees, shed our gills for lungs, replace our fins with feet, and develop skin instead of scales? Evolution pleads for time to answer such questions, assuming that, given enough time, practically anything is possible. Is that assumption true? Is literally anything possible, given enough time?

In time, could amoebas become complex organisms, which became fish, which crawled ashore, which grew legs, and wings, and hair, and then finally stood up and walked about, becoming men? Is this possible, if enough time is allowed?

Some years ago, students in a college classroom were given an example of how evolution might have occurred. "Suppose you had a monkey and a typewriter," the professor said. "Look at the keyboard of a typewriter. Now, suppose you had paper in the typewriter, and the monkey began playing with the keys. How long do you suppose it would take for the monkey to accidentally strike the proper keys to produce a two letter word like 'on,' 'or,' 'it,' 'so,' 'to,' or 'by'?"

"Only a few minutes!" piped one enthusiastic student.

"Excellent!" Said the professor.

"Now, how long do you suppose it would require the monkey to accidentally strike enough letters to produce a three-letter word? A four-letter word? A word of three syllables?"

The students pondered this. Giving their imaginations free rein, they supposed that in some weeks or months, or years, or aeons (and countless thousands of generations of new monkeys), the monkey could finally produce a word like "colloquial," or "evolution." This amazing accomplishment would require an infinitude of time, of course.

"Now then," the professor said, smugly, "How long before the monkey could accidentally type the entire Encyclopedia Britannica in all its volumes?"

Does this begin to daunt even the imagination of students in an evolutionary classroom? It should. How long before our monkey would type every book in the Library of Congress? Because, believe it or not, it would be easier for our playful ape to do so than for you, with your skeletal, muscular, digestive, circulatory, and nervous systems, and your mind, to have somehow evolved from lovesick amoeba!

The professor might have given skeptical students another analogy: "Suppose a truck backed up to a home site and dumped a load of bricks. Do you suppose it is possible that one brick might land, entirely by accident, perfectly aligned atop another brick?"

No student in his right mind would doubt this, even if he pondered why any sensible brick layer or truck driver would dump bricks at random, breaking many of them, when they are supposed to be hoisted off the truck on pallets, or what earthly use those two bricks would have, without mortar between them.

But our undaunted Professor continues: "Now, given enough time, dumping dozens of loads each day, continuing for millions and billions of years, do you suppose he could dump three, then four, then five bricks atop each other? Is it possible, given enough time, for him to dump, in place, a five-room house with two fireplaces, bay window, snug den, a large master bedroom, a gleaming, modern kitchen with about ninety-two energy slaves awaiting m'lady's whim, a fire burning in the fireplace, and a Mercedes parked in the garage?"

If any student, anywhere, answered "yes" to such a question, he needs to spend lengthy sessions with a psychiatrist, or perhaps apply for membership in the Flat Earth Society.

For, believe it or not, it would be more likely for our careless truck driver to accidentally "dump" a beautiful home out of the back of his truck than for you, with your marvelous skeletal, muscular, nervous, digestive, and circulatory systems, your vital organs, your fabulous gift of eyesight, and your ability to think and reason to have accidentally evolved by random happenstance!

Suppose you were walking home from school one day, and you saw the gleam of yellow metal in a weed-choked lot. Stooping to investigate, you found a fine Swiss watch lying there. It is a Patek Phillippe--a jeweled, precision, waterproof, shockproof wristwatch. How did it come to be there? Is it possible that, given enough time, that precision piece of equipment just gradually collected itself together, wound itself up, and finally lay there, waiting to be found?

Wouldn't your logical mind say to yourself that someone has lost his watch?

Our universe, our solar system, and our earth are all like that watch, which had a maker. They work. They run. They are living, in the sense that they show awesome power, force, and energy. Distant galaxies emit radio waves through space. Blazing stars send light into the blackness of distances so great they must be measured in "light years."

Our world turns on its axis once daily. The moon journeys around our world once each lunar month. Our world, with its moon, journeys around our sun, wobbling, or tilting slightly, once each year, producing seasons

Why? How? What caused this process? How did it begin?

To answer such questions requires painstaking investigation into the known laws of science; laws involving the conservation of energy, biogenesis, symbiotics, inertia, gravity, magnetism, and the laws governing all matter. One must determine what is "matter." Where did it come from? One must ponder ultimate origins.

Of course, the students never thought to ask the professor, "Where did you get the monkey? Who produced the typewriter? Who fed the monkey for all those billions of years? How did the typewriter last that long? What about all those billions of tons of paper? Who cut down all those millions of pine trees, built all those pulpwood mills, processed all that pulp into paper? Who drove the trucks to the mills?" Or, "Where did all the other monkeys come from--the males and females who continued propagating to produce new generations of monkeys?" For, as each monkey grew old, having managed to peck out only a simple sentence, it had to be replaced by another monkey who had to start from the very beginning. Could baby monkeys somehow "learn to type" by watching their parents' bumbling attempts to accidentally type a three-syllable word? Wouldn't they rather be off gathering bananas?

Obviously, instead of accidentally typing whole pages and books as a result of limitless time, the trick question was limited to the lifetime of only one monkey, who could no more pass on his experience with typewriter keys to his progeny than he could grow gills and return to the sea.

Our students didn't think to ask questions like, Where did the monkeys get all those bananas? And who seated them at the typewriter? And was it an IBM, or an L.C. Smith, or a Corona? Oh, there might be many questions thoughtful students could have asked. But they didn't. They were there to pass this course, not flunk it!

But if they didn't mind upsetting their evolutionary-minded professor, or getting an "F" for the course, they might have asked: Where did you get the truck? Where did the engine in the truck come from? Who designed the internal combustion engine? Who pumped, piped, refined, and sold the gasoline to the driver? Who tended the rubber plantation, obtained sap from the trees, processed it, and manufactured the tires for the truck? Who invented the battery, ignition system, electrical lights, and the hydraulic dumping mechanism for the truck? Who invented the gears, so the truck could go from forward to reverse? Who mined the iron, tin, nickel, chromium, copper, manganese, and other metals; invented the processes of metallurgy to combine them; then

manufactured the steel for the engine block, the frame, the precision gears, pistons, tappets, valves, and all the nuts and bolts of the truck? Who invented the water cooling system for the internal combustion engine?

Even more importantly, Where did the driver come from? Who knew how to operate the truck? Who were his parents, and their parents? Where did you get the bricks? Who made them? Why did the bricks fall when they were dumped? Where did gravity come from? How did millions of generations of drivers continually keep journeying to a brickyard to load up with another load of bricks? Who were their wives? Where did their children go to school to learn how to succeed them as a truck driver? How did the bricks stay together if there was no mortar to hold them fast? How could a truck load of bricks contain windows, doors, appliances, carpets, rafters, joists, beams, gypsum board, paint, hardware, cabinets, and electrical connections to the source of power? And one precocious student might have asked, "How come they didn't fire the truck driver for dumping those bricks that way, when they should have been off-loaded on a pallet?"

There are plenty of "if's" and "perhapses" implicit in the self-deceived professor's imaginary analogies, aren't there?

The wildly-imagining professor is exactly like all other evolutionists. They begin with matter; with an orderly universe; with law, energy, magnetic fields, gravity, isostasy, the laws governing moving bodies--thousands of other laws, such as those controlling matter, like how crystals form, and how water is present on earth in three forms.

They begin with their imaginary ape having just typed the entire encyclopedia! But apes do not accidentally type encyclopedias any more than explosions in electrical shops produce computers, or explosions in print shops produce books, or explosions in truck factories produce trucks.

But let's not wake up the professor. He is blind, after all, and according to the Bible, worse than merely spiritually blind.

"The fool hath said in his heart, 'There is no God.' Corrupt are they, and have done abominable iniquity: There is none that doeth good" (Psalm 53:1,2).

Evolutionists Worship a "Primal Urge"

If egocentric, vain, craven, lustful, greedy, mortal man ever admits there is a God, he must then deal with whether or not that God is the RULER Of His creation; whether or not man must OBEY God!

Evolutionists worship at the altar of "blind chance," or some mystical, unseen "force" that somehow caused each tiny so-called "simple" (there is no such thing as "simple" when one is dealing with life) one-celled plants, like yeast cells, to "bud," then divide, creating an exact clone of its parent. They somehow assume some power, or force, caused a spider (there are thousands of varieties of arachnida) to weave a beautifully symmetrical web, instead of merely stalking, then pouncing upon, its prey.

They muse that some mysterious impulse, some "urge," caused animals and fish to "evolve"; that a "loosely-hanging scale" on an ungainly caiman eventually "evolved" into a feather; and that crocodiles and hummingbirds are related!

Of course, this "force," this "primal urge," before whom they bow and scrape does not tell them how to live. It does not define the difference between moral behavior and sin; nor does it inform them about the purpose for their human existence, and their ultimate destiny. Later you will see some of their own admissions. Shockingly, one famous evolutionist came out and admitted their libido was a driving force in their philosophical and theoretical choices; that admitting God exists would interfere with their sexual preferences.

Now, let's get to it.

Let's begin with the creation itself, with the universe, the earth, and all matter.

Creation Requires A Creator

There are literally thousands of proofs that a Creator God exists. The proof of a Creator is found in His creation, in what He has designed, produced, and presently sustains. As the Bible says, "The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen..." (Romans 1:20).

We know a house had an architect and a builder. We know an automobile had a manufacturer. We know a painting had a painter. We know a chicken came from an egg. We know a carrot came from a carrot seed. We know a child had parents. We know a watch had a maker.

It is bovine stupidity to deny that creation had a Creator. To believe that the human mind "evolved" from simple, one-celled animals is, on the one hand, a carnal-minded, God-rejecting, supercilious example of intellectual vanity, and on the other hand, the very epitome of doltish stupidity, as you will see.

One of the most fundamental proofs of God is the CREATION which had to have a CREATOR.

By "creation," I mean everything that is, everything that exists, everything composed of matter; the universe, the solar system, our earth, and all life upon it.

Dr. Werner Von Braun said: "Atheists all over the world have... called upon science as their crown witness against the existence of God. But as they try, with arrogant abuse of scientific reasoning, to render proof there is no God, the simple and enlightening truth is that their arguments boomerang. For one of the most fundamental laws of natural science is that nothing in the physical world ever happens without a cause. There simply cannot be a creation without some kind of Spiritual Creator...In the world around us we can behold the obvious manifestations of the Divine plan of the Creator...We are humbled by the powerful forces that move the stars, and the purposeful orderliness of nature that endows a tiny and ungainly seed with the ability to develop into a beautiful flower.

"The better we understand the intricacies of the universe and all that it harbors, the more reason we have found to marvel at God's creation."

The late Dr. Von Braun knew about "powerful forces," for he not only developed the V1 and V2 terror rockets during World War II, but became head of America's space program.

Obviously, a study of only a part of creation would require enough books to fill a very large library. Every conceivable physical science would be involved: astronomy, biology, geology, and all their divisions such as historical and dynamic geology, microbiology, and genetics--a vast field of special disciplines involving every aspect of creation.

We will take a look at various examples of most of these disciplines, often with tongue-in-cheek, when we see the ludicrous evolutionary claims, and compare atheists' assertions with laws of chance and probability.

We have already touched upon major aspects of creation. Certainly, the atom, atomic structure, and Einstein's theory of relativity are vastly important. More of this under another vitally important proof of God, having to do with law.

Nothing is more immediately obvious, when thinking of "the creation," than the rocks beneath our feet. To illustrate only a few of these thousands of challenges to the vain theory of evolution, let's investigate the so-

called "geologic succession of strata"--a major foundation of the evolutionary theory--which states that the "oldest," and therefore "simplest" and "most primitive" fossil forms of life are invariably found at or near the bottom; that progressively more complex forms of life are found in younger strata; and that horses, camels, mastodons, sabre-toothed tigers, and man are found in the most "recent."

Can such assertions be substantiated by the billions of tons of evidence lying around us? Let's see.

Let's go to the bedrock.

Are the Oldest Rocks Always On the Bottom?

Evolutionary geology is built around the presupposition that our earth consists of layers of rock found in succession as they were deposited over aeons of time; that the very oldest rocks, containing no fossils, are at the bottom; that the "Archeozoic" rocks contain only "simple" life forms; that "Mesozoic" rocks contain ever more complex life forms until one arrives at the most "recent" strata, such as the ice ages (Eocene, Miocene, Pleistocene, and so on), where one finds mammoths and man.

Further, evolutionary hypotheses are based upon the supposition that all these rocks were laid down over vast aeons of time; that the fossils in the rocks were not laid down suddenly, as a result of great catastrophes, like a worldwide flood! Catastrophism, or the evidence that mass death and sudden extinction of species occurred, is anathema to many evolutionists. The flood of Noah's time is viewed by them as an ancient Hebrew beddy-bye story, a fable. They dismiss it as a causal factor in the deposition of strata.

Evolutionists are fond of arranging the fossils from "simple to complex" in museums and in illustrations in textbooks. There are insurmountable difficulties with the so-called "geologic succession of strata," however. Let's take a look at only a few of them.

First, there is no place on earth where the entire geologic succession of strata can be found. Obviously, the concept of the earth's sedimentary rocks being found in orderly form, from most ancient to most recent, is impossible to begin with. Where did the rocks come from?

Rocks are either sedimentary (water deposited), metamorphic (formed by changes caused by faulting, pressure, and so on), or igneous (volcanic). Since there are no fossils in igneous rocks, and since there are virtually no fossils in metamorphic rocks, scientists are limited to investigating the water-borne deposits, such as limestone and shale, to establish an age for the strata.

The strata are dated according to the fossils found in them. The fossils are dated according to the strata in which they are found. Does that sound rather arbitrary? It is. As we shall see, evolutionary geology immediately discards data facts-evidence in the amount of billions of tons of rock, whole mountain ranges, mammoth regions of the earth, where the fossils found in the rocks contradict their theories.

True science always alters the theory to accept proven facts. Not so with evolution. Facts--tons upon tons of them--are ignored in order to cling to a foolish theory. To illustrate this point, let's get right to one of the most poignant, and embarrassing, proofs.

"Upside Down"

When you walk into your bedroom and see the bed made, you probably suppose your wife spread the sheet on the bed prior to the cover, and the cover prior to the bedspread. She would look a little silly putting the bedspread on first, and then burrowing beneath it, attempting to spread the sheet. If she had done so, out of caprice, there would probably be evidence pointing to the fact, for it would be virtually impossible to do a neat job unless she once again straightened the bedspread.

When you view layers of rock as exposed in highway cuts, canyons (like the Grand Canyon of Arizona) and river banks, and you see massive layers, sometimes twenty or thirty feet thick, seemingly as smooth and cohesive as if they had been mixed in a blender, lying conformably atop each other in orderly succession, it is logical to assume the layers on the bottom (if no evidence of faulting, such as tilted, fractured strata, isoclinal, geosynclines, and so on, is present) were deposited first, then the ones immediately above them, and, lastly, the layer on the top.

You would be quite correct, of course. However, evolutionists often tell us we are wrong to assume the younger strata are always atop older strata. Why? Because the fossils found in so-called "younger" strata are often found BENEATH so-called "older" strata. When this occurs, as it quite frequently does, evolutionists become incredibly inventive. In order to tenaciously cling to their theories, they seek to explain away billions of tons of contrary evidence. In many places on earth, their arrangement of fossils is challenged by miles of rocks where the fossils are out of proper order, sometimes "upside down." Not that they are really "upside down," please note, but that it appears "older" fossils are found in rocks above "younger" fossils, when these "older" fossils were supposedly extinct for millions of years! Yet, the layers appear undisturbed! Problem! The rocks appear to have been smoothly laid down, and are conformable to each other, showing no evidence of massive faulting, over thrusts, or any other activity.

What kind of force would be required to superpose massive layers of rock, weighing millions of tons, atop other layers? Why, the kind of forces associated with mountain-building: over thrusts, isoclinal, synclinal, massive earthquakes on a scale never experienced in the history of mankind--the kind of earthquakes which caused the upheavals of the Alps, the Andes, Himalayas, and the Rocky Mountains, all of which have fossil shells at their highest elevations, showing they were once covered by shallow seas.

Any such movement of vast land masses would cause grinding, crushing destruction of the rocks closest to the moving layers, reforming them into "metamorphic" rocks, destroying most, if not all, fossils. Certainly, there could not survive such delicate fossil forms as worm tracks, ferns and leaves, ripple marks, and the like. Even a layman could look at two layers of rock, and determine if "slickensides" and various metamorphosed rocks were present, showing clear evidence of massive movement.

But what if the layer of rock (stratum) containing the so-called "older" fossils, and the stratum containing the so-called "younger" fossils beneath it show absolutely no evidence of any twisting, faulting, or movement? What if there is perfect conformity between them? You and I know that when mud is deposited by flooding, then gradually hardens, it begins to crack. Then, it erodes. Animals walk about upon it. Wind blows. Summer storms come along. In other words, any deposit of alluvial soil, slowly drying as the water which carried it there recedes, will show obvious evidence of the passage of time. Especially when that "time" is assumed to be measured in the millions or even billions of years!

Yet, in many cases, the two layers with their so-called "upside down" fossil record are lying perfectly, smoothly, uninterruptedly together, as if the tide of mud which had deposited the bottom layer had no sooner receded when another flow of different mud, containing different forms of life, came from another direction and was deposited immediately atop it. As if, obviously, the life forms imprisoned within the two layers of mud lived contemporaneously, and died in the same catastrophe, instead of the life form atop the other being millions of years "older" than the "younger" fossil form beneath!

Any forensic scientist, when presented with such folly during a murder trial, would rip it apart in seconds. No jury would ever say, as do evolutionists, that the fossils in the upper layer are obviously millions of years older than the fossils beneath them!

When one cannot even slip a thin knife between two smoothly-mixed layers of sandstone; when there is absolutely no evidence of any erosion, or overthrust faulting (which would crush the rock, grind it,

metamorphose it, and cause a completely different kind of rock structure), then one must assume the rocks were deposited exactly as they appear--the older on the bottom, and the younger on the top, like your sheet and bedspread.

It must irritate evolutionists to no end that there are many, many places in our earth where supposedly "older" fossils are found ON TOP of supposedly "younger" fossils. Encountering these puzzling occurrences caused evolutionary geologists, long ago, to invent excuses as to how such an embarrassing aberration could have come to pass. Further, evolutionary geologists assert that such strata are merely guilty of "deceptive conformity."

How do evolutionists arrive at such a conclusion? Once locked in to their theory, once denying there could have been zoological provinces containing vastly different species (such as coelacanths and man) contemporaneously, once insisting that their supposed "geologic succession of strata" is correct, they stolidly refuse to alter the theory to suit the facts.

Instead, they ignore the facts, or twist them into grotesque shapes, then invent incredible fairy tales, which are fallacious on their face, in order to cling to their empty theories. That this is patently dishonest, and anything but "scientific," seems not to bother them in the least. Like mesmerized, wide-eyed fanatics listening to a demented cult leader, they plod along their chosen path zombie-like, refusing to listen to logic or reason, denying what their own eyes plainly tell them.

Now, how do evolutionists know which fossil forms are "oldest"? Supposedly, because they are found "on the bottom," or in that layer of rock lying atop ancient granites and schists, the oldest layer containing fossils. But evolutionists have not truly found the "bottom" layer!

Which Layer of Fossil-Bearing Rock is on the Bottom?

Which stratum is the oldest of all fossil-bearing rock, and therefore (according to evolution) contains the "earliest" and "simplest" of all life forms?

Long ago, evolutionists used the order of fossils found in a few regions in Western Europe and New York State to establish their evolutionary column. They have assumed that fossil forms of ancient life are invariably found in the same order all over the world.

Such is not the case. In fact, evolutionary geologists have not yet determined, with any degree of certainty, which layer of rock is the "bottom" insofar as the fossil record is concerned.

As an eminent geologist says: "For any given limited locality, where stratigraphy can be followed out, the lowest beds are certainly the oldest. But we can make no progress by such a method when we come to deal with the world at large, for actual stratigraphical relationships can be proved over only very limited areas.

"These beds may be the lowest in this locality, may rest on the granite or crystalline schists, and have every appearance of antiquity. But other beds containing very different fossils, are in precisely this position elsewhere, and where stratigraphical order can no more prove the relative age of their fossils than the overlap of scales on a fish proves those at the tail to be older than those at the head" (Evolutionary Geology and the New Catastrophism, by Price: p. 78, emphasis mine).

Price goes on to show how "any kind of fossiliferous rock whatever, even 'young' Tertiary rocks, may rest upon the Archaean or Azoic series, or may themselves be almost wholly metamorphosed or crystalline, thus resembling in position and outward appearance the so-called 'oldest' rocks" (ibid., p. 79).

In his chapter on "Finding Bottom," Price concludes, "I see no escape from the acknowledgment that the doctrine of any particular fossils' being essentially older than others is a pure invention, with absolutely nothing

in nature to support it" (ibid., P. 87).

Evolutionary geology operates on a false assumption that the layers of rock on the earth are invariably found in the same order, like the layers of an onion. Obviously the whole world is not like an onion, with the oldest rocks on the bottom, progressing upward until arriving at the most "recent" rocks, for the earth is round, after all, and each layer of sedimentary rock was water borne, and had to come from some other area, where the materials the water carried were scoured by massive floods, tides, rivers, and so on. Logically, the area so scoured is now absent the exact amount of materials when were deposited elsewhere.

"Bottom" is naturally where there are no fossils in evidence, according to evolutionary theory. Bottom means, usually, "bedrock" of granite and various schists; metamorphic rock, atop which one finds sedimentary rock, containing various fossil forms. But, as Price proves: "Since the life-succession theory [evolution] rests logically and historically on the biological form of Werner's onion-coat notion that only certain kinds of rocks (fossils) are to be found at the 'bottom,' or next to the Archaean, or Primitive, and it is now acknowledged everywhere that any kind of rocks whatever may be thus situated [including Tertiary rocks, containing fossils of mammoths and men!], it is as clear as sunlight that the life-succession theory rests logtheory and historically on a myth, and that there is no way of proving what kind of fossil was buried first" (ibid., p. 87).

In spite of such overwhelming evidence, evolutionists cling to their false theory. Students who intend entering the teaching field in the subjects of anthropology or paleontology are not taught from books such as those by Nelson, Price, Whitcomb and Morris, and a host of others. They are never told about such books, which are dismissed, completely ignored, by evolutionary geologists.

Yet, there are many studious works which completely dismantle the evolutionary theory. Outstanding examples are Darwin On Trial, by Phillip E. Johnson, published by Regnery Gateway, Washington, D.C., and Evolution--Possible or Impossible? by James E Coppedge, published by Zondenran, Grand Rapids, Michigan. Price conclusively shows, most of the rocks of our earth prove great catastrophes occurred in the past; and most of the sedimentary rocks, including miles and miles of coal beds, show very recent catastrophes, such as massive floods. Since God's Word speaks of a global flood, and the rocks cry out in a many-decibeied roar that a "FLOOD DID THIS," Only a fool would ignore the obvious message of the rocks. It requires, on the average, about a forty foot thick layer of vegetation, ripped up, and water borne to then be crushed beneath subsequent layers of mud to form a seam of coal only one foot thick. Coal beds prove gargantuan catastrophes in the past, as do many, many other strata, such as marbles, which are sometimes formed from solid masses of sea bottom life.

But now, another of evolution's inventive excuses: When they find their fossil record out of order, even though there is no evidence of any faulting or overthrusts to explain how "older" strata ended up atop "younger" strata, they tell their students this is a "deception"! Their stolid refusal to see the truth before their eyes reminds one of the cultic blatherings of a Jim Jones.

Why Are the Rocks "Out of Order"?

Look at the charts which show the so-called geologic succession of strata, and the assumed arrangements of fossil life found in the rocks.

Then, imagine the difficulty to a young, enthusiastic believer in evolution who reported his findings along a railway cut in Canada. He wrote: "East of the main divide the Lower Carboniferous is overlaid in places by beds of Lower Cretaceous age, and here again, although the two formations differ so widely in respect to age [?], one overlies the other without any perceptible break, and the separation of one from the other is rendered more difficult by the fact that the upper beds of the Carboniferous are lithologically almost precisely like those of the Cretaceous [above them]. Were it not for fossil evidence, one would naturally suppose that a single formation was being dealt with."

Of course. But, because of the "fossil evidence," these geologists decided that, even though one bed of rock containing "older" fossils lay atop another bed of rock containing "younger" fossils without any perceptible break; even though they were lithologically almost precisely like those...above them, they had to deny what their own eyes told them, and cling to their utterly false system of dating the fossils.

Therefore, though their conclusion was contrary to all observable facts involving millions of tons of rock, they clung to their theory, and discarded the facts.

This is commonplace among evolutionary geologists. It is also dishonest.

The truth is that the so-called "geologic succession of strata" claimed by evolutionists to have been laid down over immense aeons of time--was laid down very rapidly, almost simultaneously! This fact, proved by countless billions of tons of evidence in the Rocky Mountains, the Alps, the Himalayas--all over the world--completely destroys the evolutionary hypothesis that life gradually evolved from "simple to complex."

"Deceptive Conformity"

All over the world, massive examples of so-called "deceptive conformity" exist. Evolutionary geologists would have us believe nature is "deceiving" us by having deposited in perfectly even, smooth, conformable fashion fossil-bearing strata containing so-called "older" fossil life forms atop much "younger" strata. Of course, to anyone who believes God; who believes the Noachian deluge completely covered the earth; that, in fact, the book of Genesis ushers us onto the scene after a global flood had covered the continents for an indeterminate period of time, these so-called "deceptive conformities" are not deceptive at all, but perfectly normal--laid down exactly as our eyes tell us. It is not the strata which are upside down, but the theories of God-rejecting atheists.

Study the "geologic succession of strata" carefully as you note the following:

(1) In Wyoming, a massive section of mountain consisting of Ordovician strata (dated, of course, by the fossils found therein) is found resting conformably atop Tertiary strata. Ordovician is supposedly more than 900 million years old, while Tertiary is a mere 100 million years old! Eight hundred million years supposedly passed between these layers, which are allegedly upside down, with the Silurian, Devonian, Carboniferous, Permian, Triassic, and Jurassic all missing between them!

How could this be? How could hundreds of millions of years pass with no evidence of rains, winds, floods, or erosion?

No such thing occurred. The rocks are telling the truth. Evolutionists are not.

(2) In Montana, a vast layer of Algonkian (pre-Cambrian, and thus allegedly more than 1 billion years old) rests conformably atop Cretaceous strata.

(3) In Alberta, Canada, the same incredible phenomenon is observed, with Algonkian atop Cretaceous.

(4) In Switzerland, Tertiary is below Jurassic, which is below Permian, with no evidence of erosion, faulting, tilting, upthrusts, overthrusts or any other dynamic action to account for such a situation. There are literally thousands of such cases, all over the world (see *The Deluge Story In Stone*, by Nelson, pp. 137-151 ff).

Nelson says: "The different 'ages' when strata are supposed by modern geologists to have been laid on the sea bottoms are named in order in the so-called geological column...since the one 'age' supposedly followed the other, the strata of each 'age' should follow the other in regular order. So one would naturally think. But strata which are said by modern geologists to be of 'Carboniferous Age' [Ecoal-bearing] are, it is admitted by them,

found to rest in many places on the earth on suata of 'Ordovician Age, and suata of 'Pleistocene Age' found to rest on strata of 'Permian Age,' and strata of 'Cretaceous Age' on strata of 'Devonian Age,' evenly and smoothly...where such things occur, i.e., where two strata, supposed to have been deposited in 'ages' that did not follow one another in natural succession, modem geologists say there exists 'deceptive conformity'" (Ibid., p. 150,151).

Deceptive? How so? The evidence of the rocks, the evidence of massive mountains, and whole ranges of them is positive, absolute. Whether layman or professional geologists, the layers cry out, "We were deposited in precisely the fashion you see us now!" But because evolutionary geologists find fossils from socalled "older" strata, bearing trilobites and other "very ancient" life forms on top of Cretaceous strata, bearing fossils from very "recent" ages, such as horses, mammoths, camels, and the like, they insist the mountains are lying to them, "deceiving" them! One can only marvel at this kind of cultic, superstitious "faith" in an empty theory--marvel at the blind stupidity of human beings who will deny what their own eyes tell them.

It is proved beyond the shadow of doubt that the "geologic succession of strata" which is like an evolutionist's Old Testament, is absolutely false!

All over the world, there are millions of tons of evidence which utterly destroy the neat arrangement of strata, and the ages attached to them, as seen in the chart.

Yet, the chart remains, like the idols of savages, the tarot cards of wizards, and the assertions by medieval "scientists" that flies came into existence by "spontaneous generation."

No doubt, you will be reading in your newspapers or seeing on television within a few weeks information about the latest discovery: a bone, or part of a skeleton of yet another dinosaur, or some fragment of human remains.

You will be confidently told of its incredibly great age. You will be told how it fits into the evolutionary pattern.

When you do, ask yourself a few questions. Where did they find the bone? How far down was it? In what "stratum" was it allegedly lying! What life forms were above it, and below it? How was its age established?

If it was established by the so-called "geologic succession of strata," you are watching just so much entertainment, complete fiction.

God IS, and commands His creatures: "Seek ye the Eternal while He may be found, call ye upon Him while He is near: "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Eternal, and He will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for He will abundantly pardon" (Isaiah 55:6,7).

Only the fool has said in his heart, "There is no God."

-End-

You may copy and distribute this information only to friends and family without changes, without charge and with full credit given to the author and publisher. You may not publish it for general audiences.

This publication is intended to be used as a personal study tool. Please know it is not wise to take any man's word for anything, so prove all things for yourself from the pages of your own Bible.

The Garner Ted Armstrong Evangelistic Association

P.O. Box 747

Flint, TX 75762

Phone: (903) 561-7070 • Fax: (903) 561-4141

More FREE literature is available at our Internet Web Site:

www.garnertedarmstrong.ws

The activities of the Garner Ted Armstrong Evangelistic Association are paid for by tithes, offerings and donations freely given by Christians and co-workers who are dedicated to preaching the gospel according to Jesus Christ.