

## **Daddy, Was Grandpa A Monkey?**

The question posed above appears somewhere between humorous and ludicrous, but requires some serious attention because it interferes with our search for our origin, a pre-requisite for beginning our journey to God. We must be careful not to be like children, impatient to start a long car trip across America. They do not have the maturity or experience to grasp the planning and preparation, the work and cost, that go into a long trip, even one designed for pleasure. They just want to get to the pleasure and get there quickly. The journey to God is the most arduous, profound, and important journey a man will ever make. Quite frankly it is the only one that a man will make that offers any lasting benefit.

The question of whether it is possible that grandpa, or more seriously one of our ancient ancestors, was a lower form of animal life out of which we evolved into the present species rests upon the evidence and the reasonableness of the hypothesis set forth to explain that evidence. The integrity of a house cannot be greater than the foundation upon which it is built. The mightiest castle, the magnificent mansion, the impregnable fortress is nothing but a visibly impressive, but essentially impotent, façade if the foundation is faulty. They will all crumble if the foundation was improperly fashioned. Thus, it is with the Theory of Evolution. While few of us are scientists, and fewer still as recognized experts in the field of evolution studies; while we have not the training, experience, or ability to collect, analyze, and fit the field evidence into the evolution model, we need not if we see that the whole system is built upon a faulty foundation. All the craft, expertise, and scientific work becomes nothing more than great intellectual energy expended traveling a dead end road. That is why we need to consider some of the foundational errors of evolution theory to see that grandpa was not a monkey, or anything like it. He, like you and I, was a specially created human being.

Consider these three significant points before we buy into Organic Evolution as a theory, much less a fact: 1) the principle of uniformitarianism (and its misuse), 2) time as a friend of evolution theory, and 3) the high degree of improbability that evolution of life from non-life could actually occur.

1. Evolutionists assume that all physical processes that are observed today were processes that have been in operation for all time, and they operate at the same rates. They assert that without evidence to the contrary, the assumption is valid. The problem arises in the inconsistency of their position. The Biblical account of the worldwide flood in the age of Noah is rejected because we have no modern experience of floods on such a grand scale. The worldwide flood does not meet the standard of the uniformitarian principle. But the most popular explanation of the origin of the universe is the Big Bang Theory. There is even less experience for such a cataclysmic, universe-creating explosion than for a worldwide flood, but because the evidence points to it, it finds wide acceptance. Does this not illustrate a great inconsistency? Furthermore, how can scientists make statements of fact about things they cannot see or reproduce in a laboratory? The assertion that the universe arose from

nothing and human life evolved from lower species is nothing more than pure speculation. If we are allowed to speculate on evolution fitting the evidence, should we not also be allowed to do the same with the model of special creation?

2. The evolutionists say that given enough time anything can happen. More than anything else they rely on time to validate their proposition. Evolutionist and Nobel Laureate George Wald of Harvard University discussing the spontaneous generation of life writes:

...given enough time, it will almost certainly happen at least once... Time is in fact the hero of the plot... Given so much time, the "impossible" becomes possible, the possible becomes probable, and the probable virtually certain. One has only to wait; time itself performs the miracles (see Thompson, *Creation Compromises*, 1995, p.116).

This line of reasoning violates one of the most widely accepted principles of physics, the Second Law of Thermodynamics, or Law of Entropy. While recent experiments have shown that this can be reversed in extremely small systems (at the molecular level) and for very short periods of time, the law remains "one of the bedrocks on which modern theoretical physics is based. It is one of a handful of laws about which physicists feel most certain. ([Click here for reference](#), click back button to return to article.) Dr. Wald's view of time as the "hero of the plot" and the performer of miracles demonstrates how the Theory of Organic Evolution is much more a system of faith than it is science.

3. In the Theory of Organic Evolution and the spontaneous generation of life, all hope is based on chance occurrence. This is another Achilles' heel to the model. With special creation being the only alternative to chance, the odds must be in the evolutionist's favor. The reality is the opposite. The late Dr. Carl Sagan, the famous and popular astronomer/physicist, calculated that the chance formation of life was 1 in 10 to the two billionth power. That is the number 10 with 2 billion zeroes following it. There is no way to adequately express this number. It has been calculated that there is only 10 to the eightieth power electrons in the universe. The chance for the spontaneous formation of life under the naturalistic model is 1 in a number too large to describe. The reasonable person has to conclude it is impossible. Professor Edwin Conklin of Princeton University assesses the probability of the accidental formation of life equivalent to "the probability of the unabridged dictionary resulting from an explosion in a printing shop."

The conclusion of the matter is this: the facts and odds are so much against evolution that we have to conclude it is impossible. We assert that the model of special creation far better fits the evidence than does the evolution model. No, grandpa did not arise from a lower form of animal. He was specially created in God's image, just as you and I.