

Why I believe the Genesis account of creation...

and strongly reject the words of the Pope

by Pastor Gene M. Humphrey

The *Fairbanks Daily News Miner* on October 25, 1996, had the following headlines: **Pope gives support to evolution theory.** The article went on to say the following: "Nearly a century and a half after Darwin's *Origin of the Species* Pope John Paul II has put the teaching authority of the Roman Catholic Church firmly behind the view that the human body may not have been the immediate creation of God but is the product of a gradual process of evolution."

The article went on to quote the pope as saying: "Fresh knowledge leads to recognition of the theory of evolution as more than just a hypothesis". The Pope is proposing **theistic evolution.**

What the Pope is saying is that he believes in the idea of theistic evolution. Evolution is explained in the formula of:

Non-living Matter + Time + Chance = Living Matter

The evolutionist would say that matter has always been here and that over a long period of time, amino acids and other stuff brought about the one-celled animals that evolved into other life forms until today we have, as the highest evolved animal, **MAN**. The Theistic Evolutionist adds God to this formula to explain where the non-living matter came from. In brief, God made the matter then stepped back and let evolution take its course. In his statement the Pope strongly endorses the theory of evolution.

I strongly reject the words of the Pope and theistic evolution because it is an insult to my intelligence

I am not a person with a brilliant mind, but you have to be pretty dumb to believe the garbage put out by the proponents of evolution. Evolution is said to come about.. through 1. Natural selection and 2. Chance Mutation. "Natural Selection" (the survival of the fittest) is the idea that the strongest animal life will adapt and reproduce their traits. For example, if there were in a baboon clan both light-haired and dark-haired baboons and if the dark-haired baboons were better suited for the environment and were bigger and stronger, they would be the ones who got the most food, and the ones who would first mate with the females. After a while, only the dark-haired baboons would be in the clan. The fish that could swim the fastest would survive to reproduce other fish like themselves. It sounds good, and there is no question that in time of hunger and drought the best fit survive. The only problem is that in real life some members of the primate family do not conceive when they first enter into heat but at the end of their cycle. It is not the dominate males that father the babies, but it is the inferior males who come after the dominate males have satisfied their sexual drives.

"Genetic Mutation" is the idea that the offspring will inherit the genes of their parents. Blonde- haired, blue-eyed people will produce the same. Sometimes, for some reason, the genetic information in the sperm of the male and the egg of the female will be faulty and will send a signal that will cause a mutation. Instead of having two hands, they may have only one, instead of ten fingers maybe twelve. This supposedly explains how a fish becomes an amphibian. His fin mutates to a "fin-leg" then on to a "leg". His gills change to being able to breath out of water. The "Survival of the Fittest" and "Mutations" do not work together but oppose each other. That means the mutant is at a distinct disadvantage. A fish with all good fins has a much better chance of getting food and escaping being eaten than a fish with one leg and fins. The fact of the matter is 99% of all mutations are harmful.

I remember one day reading about a mutant rooster that had no feathers but was totally naked. He could not stay warm. When outdoors, the mosquitoes had a feast with him, and because he could not fly with no

feathers he could not mate with the hens. He was at a distinct disadvantage to survive. It is also well known by any biologist today that a mutant animal, when he does reproduce, does so after his kind. The "totally naked rooster" would not reproduce a naked dog, or a naked cat, and not even a naked turkey, but a chicken.

The idea of evolution of life forms by natural selection and mutations really stretches one's imagination when it comes to the appearance of new body organs. W. A. Criswell in *Did Man Just Happen* pg.98-99, Zondervan,1972 makes the following comments concerning complex body organs and evolution. When we try to explain the first appearance of a new organ such as an eye (there was a time when there were no eyes according to theory), when we try to explain the first appearance of a heart (there was a time when there were no hearts), when we try to explain the first appearance of an ear (there was a time when there were no ears), when we try to explain the first appearance of a leg, or a lung (there was a time when there were not lungs and legs), when we begin to apply the theory to the actual first appearance of an organ, it becomes an astonishing thing.

For example, let us take the eye. There was a time of course, according to the evolutionist, when there were no eyes. Then where did that eye come from? Well, according to the evolutionist it came like this: upon the body of the creature, ages ago, there was a pimple, or a freckle, or a pigment of skin. And when the light shone off the creature, it was a little more sensitive where the pimple, or the freckle, or the pigment was on the skin. So the creature turned that freckle to the sunlight and as the waves of light beat upon that freckle, through millions and millions and uncounted millions of years, it gradually being irritated became a sensitive spot, and that sensitive spot through the centuries, gradually became a nerve, and that irritated nerve gradually turned into an eye. That is how your eye came to you. How could that one pimple, or that one freckle, or that one pigment, stay in the same place through millions and millions and uncounted millions of years while that eye was evolving. According to the theory, there had to

be another pimple, and another freckle, and another pigment in the skin because you have two eyes and not one. Is it not a remarkable thing that they just happen to be at the right place? Not on the bottom of your foot or on the top of your head but on each side of your nose, just right.

Is it not an unusual thing that there happened to be just two? As those waves of light played on the freckle, why did those eyes not appear all over the body? Is the eye not a marvelous thing? We do not see it changing anymore. Why do we not see eyes in the process of changing now? The theory is an astonishing thing when we apply it to the first appearance of any organ of the body.

Theistic evolution insults my intelligence.

Next let me say I reject the words of the Pope and the idea of theistic evolution because of what the BIBLE says.

The Pope and theistic evolution say that life came about through L-O-N-G periods of time and chance. The BIBLE says the world and all that is in it was created in six DAYS. Genesis 1:5 gives us the formula for the length of a day. *"The evening and the morning."* Though the Sun and Moon were not invented until day four (Genesis 1:14-19), the rotation of the earth on its axis on a 24-hour day began on the first day. These days are not long "day-ages" but 24-hour days. The Hebrew word translated "day" in the English is the word "YOM." It is used exactly as we use the word "day" in our own language. Day = a 24-hour day and also the time of daylight in a 24-hour day. It occasionally is used to show an indefinite time as the "Day of the Judges" . I might say in reference to Plack Road Baptist Church: "In the day of Gary Hampton," referring to the time that Bro. Hampton spent here as a missionary starting this church. But it can never mean an indefinite period of time when it is given distinct boundaries. I would not say, " In the first day of Gary Hampton, In the second day of Gary Hampton, in the 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th day of Gary Hampton and mean an indefinite time period.

It is obvious from the wording of Genesis that these are 24-hour days and that there were seven of them (Genesis 1:5, 8, 13, 19, 22, 31, 2:2).

The Pope and theistic evolution contradict the Bible when they say animals evolved from one species to another.

The teaching is that fish turn into amphibians and amphibians to mammals etc. But God's word says animals brought forth after their kind (Genesis 1:21). The sea animals brought forth after their kind, that is the blue whales made blue whales and tuna reproduced tuna (Genesis 1:25). The land animals brought forth after their kind. It is well known that even animals who are very much alike cannot mate and produce a new animal kind. The horse and the donkey are alike, but when they are bred the mule that is produced is sterile and cannot reproduce. The buffalo and the cow are similar and the mating of these animals create the beefalo, but it is sterile.

Creation of New Life Forms Ceased On Day 6.

In endorsing evolution, the pope is saying that we are still in the process of evolving today, and that God who started it out and then let things evolve is still with time and chance creating today.

I reject what the Pope implies,

The Bible tells us there was a day when God ceased from his work of creation (Genesis 2:1-2). *"On the seventh day God ended his work."* In the book of Hebrews God is comparing a spiritual rest to the Lord resting on the Sabbath, and the Bible makes it plain that creation is over. Hebrews 4:3 *"the works were finished from the foundation of the world"* and in Hebrews 4:10 it goes on to tell us that God ceased from his works.

LET ME GO ON TO SAY THAT NOT ONLY DO I REJECT WHAT THE POPE HAS SAID AND WHAT THEISTIC EVOLUTION TEACHES BUT I PERSONALLY RESENT WHAT THEY SAY AND TEACH FOR A NUMBER OF REASONS.

I. THE POPE DENIES VERBAL INSPIRATION

The Pope, in saying what he said has denied the verbal inspiration of the Bible. 2 Timothy 3:16 says: *"All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."* I believe that from Genesis to Revelation the King James Version (KJV) Bible I preach from is God's word. It is verbally inspired, it is complete, and it is without error. The Genesis account of creation is not a myth. The Genesis account of creation is not an allegory. The Genesis account of creation is not some story invented by Moses to explain how we got here. The Genesis account of creation is the **word of God**.

I resent those who make it out not to be.

II. I RESENT WHAT THE POPE HAS SAID FOR IT ATTACKS THE VERY WORDS OF JESUS.

In Matthew 19:4 Jesus said *"Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female."* It seems obvious to me that the Pope "has not read" and if he has he does not believe it. Jesus himself said that God *"made them male and female"* and that he made them "in the beginning." Listen, if you can believe what Jesus said then you must believe that God personally made them. Genesis 2:7 says: *"and the LORD formed man out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."* Man-kind is not descended from the animals. He is a special creation far above the animals. *"And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth."* When God made Adam, He made him far different than the animals. He breathed into him and man became a living soul. Man may be classified as a mammal, but he is not an animal. Only man has a soul, it is a part of his God likeness, and God personally took the dust and formed man. God personally breathed into his nostrils. He made them in the beginning and not late in time in the evolutionary scheme.

If we could measure time in the evolutionary scheme and compare it to a football field, it would be something like this. At the end zone at one end of the field primitive life forms began. The time it took for each of the other forms and species would take up a certain time space on the field. The primitive life forms would cover from 0 to maybe the 40 yard line. Following them in order would be the marine animals, land plants, amphibians, reptiles, mammals and man. Where in the scale of the football field from the one yard line to the other end zone 100 yards away would man come? Would it be at the 50, would it be the 60 (40 in the opposite end) would it be 80, 90, 95?

NO. It is not the one foot line or the one inch line. The history of man on the evolutionary scale measured by a football field of 100 yards, is represented by the thickness of a piece of paper. Theistic evolution says man came about late in life forms. Jesus says "at the beginning God made them male and female." **Someone is in error**, and it is not Jesus.

I RESENT anyone that contradicts Jesus even if it is the Pope.

III. I RESENT WHAT POPE JOHN PAUL HAS SAID, AND WHAT THEISTIC EVOLUTION TEACHES BECAUSE IT DENIES THE FALL OF MAN

The theory of evolution says that life comes about through the process of death. That is, the animals that are not the fittest die out and life goes on because those more adapted to their environment survive. The animals that die weed out the bad genes and help speed along the process of evolution. In this theory, death has been from the primitive life forms up until man evolved. In other words, death existed long before the existence of man. But the Bible claims that death came with Adam's sin. In Genesis 2:17 God warned Adam if he disobeyed by eating of the tree that "*thou shalt surely die.*" In Romans 5:12, it is obvious that death entered into the world because of Adams sin. "*Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world,*

and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. "

Listen, we die and *"the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now."* (Romans 8:23). Death came to the world through the sin of Adam. He was created in a perfect world, but his sin plunged the whole world into decay. Things do not progress today; they run down. Trees rot, metal rusts, young babies grow up, grow old and die, **all because of sin.**

IV. THIS BRINGS ME TO MY LAST POINT: I RESENT WHAT THE POPE HAS SAID AND WHAT EVOLUTION TEACHES, BECAUSE IT DENIES THE NECESSITY OF JESUS DEATH ON THE CROSS.

If death has always been since early evolution, and mankind appears late in time on the evolutionary scale, then sin did not cause death. It is not true that *"the wages of sin is death;"* It is not true that the *"soul that sinneth it shall die."* If evolution is right then all life, including man, must perish to further the process of evolution. In the scheme of evolution, death is necessary to bring forth advanced life forms. The idea of natural selection is the demise of the weakest and the survival of the fittest. But the Bible says. *"For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life."* The truth is evolution is wrong about death. Adam brought forth physical and spiritual death in his sin. Jesus' death on the cross gives sinful man the hope of life. If evolution is true and death has always been then Jesus was nothing but a martyr. If evolution is true, Jesus' death was not for the sin that brings about death, and life is not in His payment for that sin. But Jesus **is** the Savior for this lost and dying world.

I RESENT what the Pope has said because it makes Jesus' death irrelevant.

Can you not see that you are a special creation of God, with an eternal destiny in either heaven or hell? Can you not see that you are far superior to

the animals, can you not see that something is drastically wrong with the world in which we live; with death and decay all about us? Can you not understand that man's problem is a sin problem inherited from Adam? We are sinners by nature and sinners by choice. Can you not see that Jesus Christ had to come to die for you and won't you turn to him and trust him today? If you will you will find **life and life more abundantly.**

*Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous, Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord. ---
Romans 5:18-21.*

[Gene M. Humphrey is Pastor of the Plack Road Baptist Church in North Pole, Alaska. This article is printed with his permission.]