Chapter 43

The Creation Story

These lessons deal with doctrine. The first and primary reason for the writing of the Scriptures by the Holy Spirit was for doctrinal purposes. I realize, and you realize I am sure, that we are living in the last days before the rapture, in which the Body of Christ **"will not endure sound doctrine"** (2 Tim. 4:3). Instead, they have invented 200 translations of the Bible, each one designed to back up a peculiar false teaching by a particular group. We call these people "The Alexandrian Cult," as the new bibles come from Alexandria and North Africa. We have already discussed this at length in our previous study of the authority and inspiration of the word of God.

This lesson deals with the Creation Story, and when we say the "Creation Story," we mean the only scientific account of the creation in print. *The only scientific textbook on creation is the Holy Bible.* We may be entertained and amused at times by the futile attempts of people like Hutton, Darwin, Haeckel, Huxley, Lyell, Paley, and other deluded souls, as they try to conjure up scientific conjectures and theories, but there is only one *scientific textbook* in print that deals with creation, and that is the *Holy Bible (Authorized Version).*

We are dealing primarily with doctrine in these lessons, because **"All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine"**

first of all. The main purpose that God the Holy Spirit wrote the Bible was to clearly draw the line between what is so, and what is not so.

As the Antichrist prepares his kingdom, with the ecumenical movement and the return of the Charismatics to the pagan, Roman, North African church, what he is interested in doing is getting rid of *differences*. This will be perfectly acceptable to the apostate body of Christ in the last days, as most of their leaders will be college-educated, and in colleges you are taught to get rid of *differences*.

A college education today is based on the theory or the teaching that the greatest danger on earth is *war*. That is the first religious dogma of every college in America: the greatest danger and the most terrible, appalling thing is *war*. (A slight variation of this is "the greatest sin in the world is to refuse to progress or grow." These are the two RELIGIOUS DOGMAS taught by professors in every state university in the country.)

What is their solution for these dangers? I mean, if the man is an educated man, he can't just discuss what the trouble is. Surely, somewhere down the line he must have a cure for it, or at least *profess* to propose a cure. The cure postulated, propagated, and promoted by these Darwinian monkeys is that you will never get rid of war until you get rid of *differences*. Therefore, a college curriculum consists of teaching the young sucker that if you can make men act like *women* and make women act like *men*; make Catholics act like *Protestants* (with daily vacation Bible schools and Sunday school literature) and make Protestants act like *Catholics* (carrying crosses

and going to Mass); make Occidentals act like Orientals (by shaving their heads and teaching them to say "Ohm" and sit cross-legged) and make Orientals act like Occidentals (driving motorcycles and playing baseball); that if you can just get all the old people to dress and act like *children* and put five-year-olds around the television set discussing international politics like adults; if you can just get all the democratic, capitalistic people to adopt socialism in their government and get the Communists to trade wheat with you and become a little capitalistic; if you can just reduce the human race to a common, passive, mongrel conglomerate, then you will have peace on earth. That is what educated people *learn* in college.

In "Christian education" you are taught this: if you can just take the *King James Bible* of the Protestant Reformation and translate it according to the Vatican manuscripts of the Vatican in Rome, turning it into the Jesuit Rheims bible of 1582, and then take your Roman Catholic bible, American and Jerusalem editions, and retranslate them in common, plain English, like a *NASV*, that you will get rid of the *differences*.

The New Testament has a word for this: **"leaven."** In the Old Testament it is called **"adultery."** It consists of jamming two elements together that don't mix. In the world it is called "integration," and it is considered the most desirable thing on the face of this earth. Men by nature are spiritual fornicators, and the highest aims any unsaved man has are *peace* and *prosperity* (Deut. 23:6). Those are the only aims an unsaved man has in life: get along with your fellow man and get along good while you are doing it. That is

where your religion begins, and that is where it ends. *That* is the standard college curriculum.

These people, trying to bring to a common denominator and level things down to a mongrel, passive, conglomerate, gray mass, cannot dare take the full amount of truth given by the Bible, because the further you go into the Bible, the clearer it is that *things that are different are not equal.* That is the maxim of logic. You can't be rational and endure sound doctrine while adopting the approach of modern education. You have to be irrational to do it.

So, when we talk about doctrinal matters in these *Theological Studies* we are dealing with nitroglycerin, because the Body of Christ can no longer stand **"sound doctrine."** I don't know whether you realize it or not, but we have in this country a bunch of people, who are all premillennial, independent, dedicated Fundamentalists, who believe in the "plenary, verbal inspiration of the originals," who have been selling a bible that professes to be the *Authorized King James Version* on the cover, and inside the text is the text of the *American Standard Version* in five hundred places. They did it without batting an eye. I don't know whether you realize it or not, but I have literature in my office from the President and the head of the Bible Department at Bob Jones University (which professes to be a "bastion of orthodoxy") which advertises that it stands "without apology for the absolute authority of the Bible," saying that the Westcott and Hort Greek text from Alexandria, Egypt, is their idea of a "bible." You are nearing the end, friend.

Now, we believe that God is the Creator of

all things. We will make a detailed study of this much-accepted, but little-understood statement. Some Bible teachers steer clear of the subject, because of the bitter struggle put up by so-called "science," which is why the modern Fundamentalist alters 1 Timothy 6:20 to read "knowledge" instead of **"science."** Because the modern Fundamentalist reviser or translator is an apostate, afraid of science and scientific discovery, he has altered the *King James* text. This is the kind of modern, apostate Fundamentalist who cannot endure sound doctrine. We take our place with the Apostle John, who said in Revelation 4:11, **"Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created."**

The first thing we believe is that the Author of Genesis is the Author of history, and the Author of our salvation. In Genesis 1:1 the Bible says, **"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."** We accept the first verse (and all the succeeding verses of the Bible) as the infallible, inspired word of God. And when we say that, we are of course referring to the Bible that we have in our hands. If the leading Fundamentalists in America said, "We believe the Bible *IS* the infallible, inspired word of God," they would quite naturally be LYING, which could be proved as soon as they came down from the pulpit. When they come down from the pulpit and you ask them if the Bible they have in their hands is the infallible, inspired word of God, they will give you a very definite "No," and refer you to the unattainable, unavailable "originals." There may be

many things that we do not understand, but that doesn't undermine our belief in God as the Creator, or in the infallibility of the *Authorized Version*. We believe that Moses wrote the book of Genesis; he in fact wrote the first five books of the Bible.

In Matthew 19:4-6, Jesus refers to **"the beginning"** and the creation of Adam and Eve. Jesus Christ was not an evolutionist. He was what we call a "creationist." He certainly did not believe in "uniformitarian" geology. He believed in "catastrophic" geology, as anybody does who is completely rational. In Matthew 24:37-39, Jesus made a reference to the details of the flood. God gave the scientific account of his creation of Adam as a revelation of past history. If you will check your chronology, you will find there are only three men between Adam and Abraham, so don't you worry about the story being "handed down." There are only five men between Adam and Moses. So Moses (if he were to get his account of creation just from a man) would get it only *five times* removed, which is a great deal better than any word-of-mouth account that you've heard from your ancestors of, say, the American Revolution.

However, as God is capable of foretelling the future, he is able to reveal the past. Now, we admire the beauty, brevity, logic, and simplicity of the creation account given in the Bible, because it is the *only* scientifically accurate textbook on the subject. The resurrected Christ, in talking to the disciples on the Emmaus road, began to teach from the beginning, so Luke 24:27, 44 says he began at **"Moses."**

What is the purpose of the exact scientific account in Genesis? Some see only difficulties, contradictions, and scientific puzzles here. Well, we see God revealing himself as the powerful Creator. We see God as the God of order, logic, reason, and masterful planning. The purpose of Genesis is not to answer all the questions of Bible-rejecting, God-hating, Christ-defying, egotistical reprobates, but it is to give the accurate, *scientific account* that has never been changed or improved upon, and never will be. The purpose of Genesis is not to make us astronomers or geologists. The purpose is to lead us to worship God Himself as the Creator.

First of all is the matter of the date of creation. Here is where the controversy rages between Bible-believers and evolutionists. Some of the scientists maintain, from the study of geology, that the earth is a few million years old, while others say it is about 6,000 years old, and the contemporary geology bit says that it is 2,500,000,000 years old. The modern apostate Fundamentalist (who can't stand sound doctrine) says perhaps both sides are correct and the misunderstanding has arisen because of the unknown length of time between Genesis 1:1 and Genesis 1:3. No, there was no misunderstanding that arose there at all. The modern scientist or evolutionist, who believes in the theory of evolution and uniformitarian geology (and makes the earth millions and billions of years old), had no trouble "misunderstanding" anything in Genesis. He is simply a professional liar and lied to justify his own fallen nature. The figure of 6,000 years is, according to the modern Fundamental-

ist, quite inaccurate. Of course, approximately 6,000 years from Adam to present is accurate if you believe the Bible record. However, Genesis 1:1 refers to a date much earlier, maybe thousands of years. Nobody knows the exact time of the original creation of the world in verse 1. Genesis 1:2 is not the original creation because 2 Peter 3:5-6 tells us something happened to the original creation. Genesis 1:2 says something terrible happened, a great calamity of some kind: **"And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep."** This is undoubtedly connected with the events of Ezekiel chapter 28 and Isaiah chapter 14, but the event is described even more clearly in 2 Peter chapter 3. The modern body of apostate Fundamentalists who write apologetic literature about the flood have all rejected 2 Peter chapter 3 as referring to Genesis 1:2, which of course, it DOES. So, the modern apostate fundamentalist is just as heretical as the modern evolutionist, at least where rejection of the *King James* text is concerned.

This earth was immersed in water in Genesis 1:2, according to 2 Peter chapter 3. The most advanced apologetic from the Institute for Creation Research in California rejects that truth because they reject the *King James* as an infallible authority. We take it as the infallible authority, so we have *advanced revelation*: information revealed to us that they cannot find. When a man rejects light, of course, he can't see light. You can't see sunlight by turning your back on it, closing your eyes, and putting a paper bag over your head.

There is no particular point in going along

with any of the compromisers or apostates on these matters. After all, if science is supposed to be true knowledge, then true knowledge will certainly back up the *truth*. For example: have you ever noticed that in dating the beginning of the earth none of the scientists themselves agree? Their own words prove them to be liars. Did you know that Neve said the Simon LaPlace theory of the origin of the universe cannot be defended by any scientist? Merz, in *European Thought in the Nineteenth Century*, page 285, says the theory belonged to "the romance of science." Fleischmann says he denies evolution altogether. Rudolph Otto, in *Naturalism and Religion*, says Darwinism is theoretically worthless. Professor Pettigew of St. Andrews University, in *Design of Human Nature*, Vol. 3, says that there is no proof of man's direct or indirect descent. Professor Von Eisendorf, *Theologische Rundschau*, 1905, page 85, says there is no materialist explanation for creation. The Darwinian theory of descent does "not have one single fact to confirm it," according to Dr. N. S. Shaver of Harvard University, Dr. Ethridge, the fossilologist of the British Museum, Professor L. S. Beale of Kings College, London, Fleischmann from Erlangen, and therefore, all this stuff about "the scientists say" and "all scientists agree" is a lie. *They do not.*

There are some other rather startling facts, which the scientists themselves have produced, but which they never intended to produce, and which they now wish to God they had never found. Among these is the stultifying fact that when they tried to judge the date of the earth by various sources, they ran into proofs that the

world hasn't been here more than 10,000 years at the oldest.

The comets in the solar system are disintegrating so rapidly that none of them could be older than forty million years. The earth's magnetic field is decaying so rapidly that is could not have originated even twenty thousand years ago. Since there are 27.5 billion tons of sediment each year and there are 30.4 million cubic miles of continental crust above sea level having a mass of 383 quadrillion tons, you find that all the continents on earth would have been eroded away in fourteen million years, or seven times every billion years. This is the kind of stuff that goes on.

When you begin to study "half-lives" of radioactive materials, you suddenly discover there is not a chance that this earth could have been here more than *ten thousand years*. The sun has to be two and a half trillion years old to accommodate any evolutionist's theory, but the sun is losing 864 trillion tons of mass a year. A sun that old would have 25,000,000,000,000,000,000 tons more than what it has now. Why, bless your soul, that thing will not check out. It will not check out any way you try to make it check out. Anytime you start getting these wild dates over a million years, nothing checks out.

Lyell, for example—the famous father of uniformitarian geology—calculated that if Niagara Falls had three feet of erosion a year, then the ice age would be twelve thousand years ago. Then he made it one foot and got thirty-five thousand years, trying to put it back further and further, but it was not one foot: it was *five feet*. This made

a *96 percent error* in the findings of the father of modern geology. If you followed him, I wouldn't say you showed particular intellectual acumen or very good sense. When a man makes an error of 96 percent in a bad guess, he is not a very good man to follow if you want to talk about "scientific facts."

Perhaps the most profound thing that has ever been written about science's version of creation was by someone who never believed Darwin for five minutes. This comic poet (or whatever he was, may God bless his memory) penned the following classic and immortal words regarding the scientific theory of creation:

> Upon a rock yet uncreate an uncreated being sate
> Amid a chaos incohate.
> Beneath him rock, above him cloud;
> The cloud was rock, and the rock was cloud.
> The rock then growing soft and warm,
> The cloud began to take a form:
> A form chaotic, vast, and vague, Which issued in the cosmic egg.
> Then the being uncreate upon the egg did incubate
> And thus became the incubator
> And of the egg did allegate
> And thus became the allegator.
> And the incubate was potentate, But the allegator was potentater.

There is no "science of origins" anywhere except Genesis 1:1. If you want to get downright

"scientific" about it, every transformation of matter that results in the reduction of energy is a result of *degeneration:* the breaking down of the complex into the simple. The laws of thermodynamics know nothing about a breaking down of the *simple* into the *complex.* That is the peculiar hallucination taught by the United Nations and the Communist party. "Science" is supposed to be a correlated body of absolute knowledge, what they call "demonstrable, observable facts." Nobody can demonstrate that Genesis 1:1 is wrong, because nobody has ever observed it. Therefore, to talk about the account of Genesis chapters 1-3 as being "nonscientific" or "unscientific" is the most blatant, bald-faced hypocrisy that anyone ever tried to pull off. We have this "gospel" of dirt: Anaximander talks about "pristine mud coming from infinity" and Huxley's "bathybius" out of which everything evolved and Diogenes' "mind stuff" and Weismann's silly "biophores" and Spencer's ridiculous "vitalized molecules" and Darwin's "gemmules possessed with an affinity for each other which acted as though they had intelligence," which is as much as saying "from creative hobble-gobbles there came vitalized zimmyjimmies that contain enough higgley-piggley flap-dabbles to produce octapopaluses." It all comes to about the same thing when you boil it right down.

Thomas Henry Huxley, the famous deluded maniac, said, "Ph.D.'s in sociology will never be corrupted by power. Their strength is as the strength of ten men, because their heart is pure, and their heart is pure, because they are scientists." After that you write down "BALONEY."

That is, Huxley was one of the most deceived and deluded hell-bound sinners that ever burst hell wide open.

There are only *four* possibilities in regards to the universe. You may as well face it. Speaking from the standpoint of someone who is intellectually honest, rational, and possessed with sane faculties, there are only *four* possibilities:

1. The universe was *always here.*
2. The universe came from nothing *naturally.*
3. The universe came from nothing *supernaturally.*
4. The universe is only an imaginary *illusion.*

Now, you name one possibility that I didn't cover. After all, I have had ten years of college. I'm not exactly some grade school kid, you know: I have sat at a desk for twenty-two years. Tell me all about it, son. Some of you medical doctors, would you care to instruct me? I know some Greek and some English *you* don't know. You won't find the above list in Gray's *Anatomy.* Know what I mean, jelly-bean? There are only *four* possibilities:

1. It has always been here. *That is denied by the second law of thermodynamics.*
2. It came from nothing naturally. *That is denied by the first law of thermodynamics.*
3. Imaginary existentialism is the definition of an insane man, and drugs produce the same thing.
4. It came from nothing *supernaturally,* and that is the exact, pragmatic, objective, em-

pirical, scientific statement found in the *King James 1611 Authorized Version.*

The other three possibilities are ruled out by the scientists themselves according to their own profession of faith. Do you understand that?

You can have a nebular hypothesis as a theory for the origin or the planetesimal theory or the tidal theory or the binary theory or any other kind of theory, but all you've got is theoretical conjecture. You can judge age by the uranium breakdown. That will give you a maximum age of 1,800,000,000 years, because that is the oldest sample in igneous rock. The whole theory is built upon the conjecture of a constant atmosphere (which has never been) that turns lava to salt water and freezes salt water a mile deep at the Poles.

Imagine that! The rate of erosion at Niagara Falls would put the Falls in Michigan in the year 420,000 B.C. All this stuff is nonsense! If the earth was slung from the sun, it came out at 6000°F, and it had no chemical compounds, because they couldn't have been formed until it was below 4800°F. The oxygen would have had to come from *nowhere.* There are no silicates in metals because they couldn't be formed without oxygen, so we are told it was H_2O in a vaporous state until the temperature got below 374°. There is no H_2O in a vaporous state on Venus, Mars, Mercury, or the moon. And then we are to believe it rained until the whole earth was covered? Let me tell you something, bud: it takes faith to be an evolutionist. I mean, it takes FAITH. No geologist or paleontologist has any explanation for the ice cap

that covered the Pennsylvania swamps where coal beds were formed. It came down too slow.

The most grinding and condemning evidence produced against these silly evolutionists is the fact that if the earth, solar system, or universe were eternal (and had been here from infinity), they would have worn out at least nine hundred quintillion years ago (give or take a quadrillion), according to the second law of thermodynamics. The scholars' and scientists' own laws—which they have erected and constructed themselves—rule out evolution as a sane conjecture or rational theory. The law of entropy, in a closed system, would have destroyed this universe hundreds of millions of years ago. Evolution and good sense are "mutually exclusive," brother. The laws of thermodynamics (first, second, and third) prevent any sane scientist from believing that evolution is anything other than pure pagan speculation from primitive imagination. The three laws of thermodynamics prove *conclusively* that the *modern* scientist that believes in evolution has a mental problem and is intellectually dishonest.

Now, the Biblical account proclaims there is but one God, Who, by a spoken word, created all things. This one God is given in the Bible as the Creator (Ps. 148:5). Jesus Christ recognized Him as the Creator (Mark 13:19), so Jesus Christ was not an evolutionist. He was a *creationist*. His reference to the Noahic flood (Luke 17:27) shows that He was also a *catastrophic* geologist and not a *uniformitarian* geologist.

As we have pointed out, the ridiculous methods of dating by uranium breakdown, or by the decay of radioactive isotopes, the Libby Carbon

14 system, and similar nonsense only undoes the work done by the scientists because none of them can find any evidence that the earth has been here more than four million years, or four hundred million at the most radical. Yet the standard information given on every chart in college and high school in the country indicates a date of more than two billion years.

The oldest possible date you can get, in view of the present, observable, demonstrable fact of the decay of the earth's magnetic field, is ten thousand years. *That can be demonstrated.* This indicates that if a man sets a date back further than ten thousand years for this earth, he has had a temporary attack of lunacy. His pilot light has been blown out.

Consider the wonderful design in the proportions of land, water, and atmosphere. If the level of the ocean would rise a few feet, large portions of land would be submerged, and the Sahara Desert would become a lake. Consider heat and the evaporation of water: the balance is maintained. The air is perfectly balanced between oxygen and nitrogen: a ratio of 21 to 79. No chemical or physical law maintains this balance; it is kept by the power of God. The lavishness of creation, the hundreds of varieties of birds, flowers, animals, herbs, fruits, fish, trees, and ferns show that evolution could not possibly have provided it. And if it did, what would be the purpose of it?

A study of history and primitive man shows the savagery and natural brutality of man, as mentioned in Genesis, as a result of Adam's fall. An isolated tribe, newly discovered, will be an

instance of degeneration. Animals are not brutal like men. The male of the beast does not maltreat the female. The animal does not continually eat foods that harm him. This is a mark of degenerate *mankind* alone. Brutality is the result of the fall. No ape, dog, or cat has ever been found that is as depraved as man. When God tells the golden plover to fly, he flies. When God tells that bird in Alaska to fly to Honolulu and pick out the nest his mama and daddy made for him the year before, he takes off. Man is the only animal (to quote Darwin) that disobeys God.

The Bible speaks of six creative days. Some argue that each day was a millennium, using 2 Peter 3:8, but this is nonsense. That is *rejection of sound doctrine* by apostate Fundamentalists, because if each day was a thousand years, there would have been plants growing on this earth *without sunlight for a thousand years*, which is nonsense. First day: the division of light and darkness. Second day: the firmament, the division of atmosphere and water. Third day: dry land, the division of land and water. Fourth day: sun, moon, and stars, the division of day and night rulers. Fifth day: life—fish, fowls, whales. Sixth day: creatures, **"and God saw that it was good"** (Gen. 1:25).

According to the Genesis' account, man is created in the image and after the likeness of God. This means that any man with a college education, who doesn't believe the *King James Bible*, is set in direct contradiction to the truth of reality by the brainwashing his university gave him. If there is one thing that Darwin did *not* believe, he did not believe that man was cre-

ated "up" and *fell.* He believed that man started in a slime pit and *grew up.* If there is one outstanding falsehood taught yearly by 90 percent of the college professors in America, it is that man began wrong and is *gradually working up to get better,* while the Bible says man began at the *top* and dropped to the *bottom.*

Now, all this "monkey to man" business, this "puddle to paradise" of a modern *Pilgrim's Progress,* is built on the hypothetical theory that if you draw a little cartoon chart and then, each year, find something you think you can fit into your cartoon to make it look the way you want it, that this proves something. Of course, "monkey business" like this has been going on in colleges for years. All of these legendary, obscene fairy tales about "vestigial structures, biochemistry, blood precipitation tests, comparative anatomy, embryology, taxonomy, geographic distribution, genetics and controlled breeding, and fossil evidence" backing up evolution is just the highly-fabricated, complex speculation of pagan imagination. The supposed "mechanics of evolution," the variation and "mutations" transmitted in genetics through germ plasm, the natural selection, survival of the fittest, heredity and isolation, is a bigger fairy tale than you could find in *Disneyland* if you stayed there for three weeks.

In the Pliocene Period you are supposed to have Piltdown man, Peking man, Neanderthal man, Cro-Magnon man, modern man, the Neolithic, Bronze, and the Iron Ages, with civilization supposedly beginning with the Neolithic in Susa, Persia, about 20,000 B.C. These incredible

asses are trying to tell us that a drowned woman in Minnesota and a camel found one hundred feet above the Red River in Oklahoma prove that man was in America in 20,000 B.C. And so the incredible fairy tale passes down "from one campfire to the next"; this legend goes on and on in the colleges of America.

Julian Huxley says this "leap" from ape to man only occurred once and cannot happen again. A likely story. You will find that in *The Modern Synthesis*, Harper and Row, 1942. In *Early Man*, F. Clark Howell of the University of Chicago (there is a good, educated, Darwinian monkey), the professor of anthropology, says Pliopithecus and Proconsul had twenty-two million years to come up (with a gap of two million years), then 15,000 years for Dryopithecus and Oreopithecus (with a fourteen thousand years gap), then a fourteen million year gap for Australopithecus, a one million, six hundred thousand years gap for Ramapithecus (and advanced Australopithecus), eight hundred thousand years for Homo erectus (with a gap of one hundred thousand years before early Homo sapiens), with a gap of fifty thousand years before the Solo man, Rhodesian man, Neanderthal man, Cro-Magnon man, and the modern man, which is known as Dream Land, Fairy Land, Disneyland, with Pogo, Peanuts, and Charlie Brown. The evidence from which Dr. F. Clark Howell produced all this incredible nonsense amounts to some pretty color cartoons drawn by an artist. Do you notice how crowded it gets at the end? I suppose that you noticed that. Ramapithecus lasted two million years longer than all Rhodesians, Neanderthals,

and Cro-Magnons combined. This is the convenient doggerel put together by deluded sinners who reject the *King James* translation as the word of God and reject the evidence of their own profession, mistakenly supposing that the mad dreams of their deluded imaginations qualify them to talk about "objective, scientific discovery."

The Darwinian "theory of descent" does not have one single fact to confirm it, according to Dr. N. S. Shaver of Harvard University, Dr. Ethridge of the British Museum, Professor L. S. Beale of Kings College, London, Professor Fleischmann of the University of Erlangen, Germany. And the following people didn't believe it either: Professor Berkshire of Berlin, Asa Gray, Alfred Wallace, and Agaziz in America. The charts and the "outlines of historical geology" show a man with a missing link from an ape to a monkey to an extinct "theriodont reptile," who has a missing link between himself and a "cotylosaur" from a "stegocephalian," also extinct. Very convenient, Walt Disney. We appreciate the funny stories on Sunday morning in the color cartoon strips. Of course, they have nothing to do with anything objective or scientific, because the only *scientific account* of the creation of man is in *Genesis, chapters 1 and 2.*

We know the arguments put forth by those who are in cloudland, on cloud nine, with their heroin, but we are primarily concerned here with *scientific fact*, not nonsense. A *likeness* proves nothing. Through a telescope a mouse nest may look like a quadruped on the moon, but that doesn't mean anything. A fellow says, "Why the

vertebrae and invertebrae?" Well, why not? Why have monotony? Why have so many vertebrae? Because you can glorify God more with a vertebrate than you can with a non-vertebrate. The same artist can paint a picture of the dome of Yosemite and a picture of a sandpile. They may look alike, but they're not. Holiness is purity. Sin is dirt. Holiness is not sin, and purity is not dirt. They are still different, *even if you define them as the same.*

Growth is not evolution, though it is mistakenly called that. What Huxley called "a tendency to assume a definite living form" is fantasy. Imagine anybody talking about the sun rising for six thousand years as being a "tendency toward sunrising." No scientist has defined life or traced its source outside of Genesis chapters 1-3. How do you tell what is essential to life and what isn't? A mammary may prove you belong to the same race as your *wife.* It is impossible to prove that anything they call a "vestigial organ" is useless. All this talk about organs being "left over" from when you were climbing around in the trees and eating bananas is nonsense. Pure unadulterated horseradish, brother.

Domestication and breeding also show that evolution is a farce. When we quit breeding cats and taking care of them, they become vagabonds. When we quit breeding dogs and taking care of them, they become flea-bags. When we quit working potatoes, they become small, and the horses are not worth catching and breaking. That is, *when the string breaks, the kite falls.* There is a dead lift at each beginning in the evolutionary stages put out in your little color cartoon books

and your pitiful little college textbooks, which are about as scientific as *Alice in Wonderland.* Going from the Cambrian to the Ordovician to the Silurian, the Devonian, the Carboniferous with Mississippian and Pennsylvanian, the Permian, Mesozoic with the Triassic, the Jurassic, and the Cretaceous, Cenozoic with the Tertiary and the Quaternary periods might be a good way to make a living fooling chumps that don't know Latin or Greek, but who do you think you are trying to kid? Your grandmother? Every age began with a dead lift at each beginning *because only one-celled animals began it.* There is no such thing as a *two-celled animal.*

Evolution is a very poor *moral* theory, too. It makes the strongest and best armed survive. How does *nakedness* improve your chances of surviving? Did you ever think about that? When God made Adam he was naked. If you take off your clothes, *you* are naked right now. Animals aren't. Every animal you ever met *wore his own clothes* and grew them. Why would you think they were your kin? Imagine some incredible idiot talking about man being a "naked ape." There is no such thing as a naked ape. *Apes grow their own clothing.* Isn't it weird the way people talk when they are trying to justify their sins and their animal morals and animal standards? How did that ape, losing his natural-grown clothing, improve his chances of survival? Would you tell me that?

Have you noticed how double-minded these scientists are? For years they said the earth was the center of the universe. Then they said the sun was the center. Then they said the galaxy was the

center. Then they said the galaxy was off-center. Make up your mind, stupid. First they said everything was material, then they said everything was nonmaterial. First they said you could divide the smallest unit, then they said you couldn't. And you call that "science"? Demonstrable, provable knowledge; a correlated body of absolute fact? Are you kidding? Then they found something smaller than the *smallest* unit. Now, isn't that something? Imagine somebody taking that stuff seriously, brother. Just as seriously as a plastered owl.

Dr. Alfred Wong, professor of Physics at UCLA, says, "The Bible gives an authoritative and unified account about the origin of creation." Professor Edding said a nova is the last stage of evolution, not the *first*. Dr. Vanauer Bush, board Chairman of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the father of the modern analog computer, said, "Science never proves *anything* in an absolute sense." So, when we say that, we have a good many scientists on our side.

The fittest do not survive. There are supposedly proofs of eighteen foot sloths, twenty foot bears, eighty-five foot reptiles, twenty-five foot wingspan birds, and turtles with a twelve foot diameter. Where are they now? Easy. They did not survive. Did you notice that? (Ah, we have got some winners, boy, we have got some winners.)

An "image" means an outline or "shadow of a figure." Man was made in the image of God, and the image of God is said to be *Jesus Christ* in 2 Corinthians 4:4; Colossians 1:15; and Hebrews 1:1-3. Hence, Christ is called the **"last Adam"** in 1

Corinthians 15:45. *Likeness* denotes the resemblance of that shadow to the original object. In 1 Corinthians 11:7 we read that the man is **"the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man."** Notice the reference is not to an unsaved man. No unsaved man is made in the image of God, and no unsaved man is the glory of God. First Corinthians 11:7 is talking about a Christian marriage relationship between two people who have been born again. You will be careful to notice that *no man in the New Testament was ever made in the image of God until the new birth.* You were told this in Colossians 3:10. Therefore, the apostate Fundamentalist teaching that "man is made in the image of God" is a heresy. NO MAN IS MADE IN THE IMAGE OF GOD. He is made in the image and likeness of *Adam*, Genesis 5:3. He is NOT made in the image of God until he is born again, Colossians 3:10. *That* is sound doctrine. And it is reinforced and augmented by the fact that the expression **"the book of the generation(s)"** occurs only two times in your Bible: once in Genesis 5:1, the generations of fallen men, who are in the likeness and image of *Adam*, and once in Matthew 1:1 where you are getting ready to read about the born again people who are regenerated *under Jesus Christ.*

There are only two men in the Bible, one that is fallen, and One Who is the Image of God. The fallen man was made in the image of God but lost it. The Man Who is God's *Image* is Jesus Christ, 2 Corinthians 4:4. There isn't a man reading this book who was ever made in the image of God until he was regenerated by the Spirit and placed in Jesus Christ. That is sound doctrine. In the last

days, of course, the apostate Fundamentalists will reject that sound doctrine.

"The image of God" denotes not only a *physical* likeness to Jesus Christ in Adam's original creation but also the *spiritual* likeness. From Scripture we learn that it means knowledge, righteousness, and holiness, Colossians 3:10; Ephesians 4:24. It refers to moral likeness *and* physical likeness, although the modern apostate Fundamentalist will rule out physical likeness, because he has rejected the sound doctrine of Genesis chapter 5, Matthew chapter 1; 2 Corinthians chapter 4; and Hebrews chapter 1. No man is born again until he is in the condition of Colossians 3:10, until he has **"put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him."**

The conclusion is that Adam and Eve were created with intelligence, for Adam named the animals. *He did not evolve from the animals.* Man did not come from the animals. And it was the Lord Jesus Christ who said, **"But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female"** (Mark 10:6). The Lord Jesus Christ never began with amoral, bisexual, asexual, one-celled, hobbley-gobbley, living blabble-blobble. He said in Matthew 19:4, **"Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female...?"** The first man and the first woman were a male *man* and a female *woman.* That is what took place at the beginning. Jesus Christ said that God made them. Now, if your professor said He *didn't,* that shows your professor is lacking brains. You might pray and ask God to give him some wisdom so he won't talk and

act like a fool the rest of his life—which is quite common among educated people. "The bigger the belfry the more room for the bats."

All right then, man is a direct creation by God Almighty, according to Jesus Christ. It is true you have many college professors who think they are *smarter than Jesus Christ*, but of course you don't date your birthday from their birth; you date your birthday from the birthdate of Jesus Christ. These people who think they are smarter than Jesus Christ never can produce as many followers that live good lives as Jesus Christ. When we examine the *moral lives* of some of these Darwinian monkeys who wallow in filth, we never have to worry about who is smarter, them or Christ. We know who is the smartest. And we don't have to flip a coin. The smart man is the one who believes in creationism: that God made them at the beginning male and female. (And I don't mean neuter "shims" who are a combination of him's and she's.) I don't mean sexless, amoral, asexual people with no standards this monkey brand of mongrel, gray, integrated, magpie-nest, smorgasbord peon. I'm not talking about that. I am talking about an original creation made after the image of God, that God made Himself *directly*. That man disobeyed God and fell, and has been in trouble ever since.

Now, unconverted scholarship (and when I say that, I mean 98 percent of what you were taught in *any* college or university in America) has no rational explanation for breeding experiments or the mania to integrate. Having shown documentary films which put one race down on the level of Aborigines and Bushmen, they are

telling you that it is perfectly all right to step down to that level in order to "evolve." That is not rational. I'm not talking about politics or "white supremacy" or the Ku Klux Klan. I am talking about breeding experiments in a kennel. You don't get thoroughbred German Shepherds by taking the fence down. *You get them by putting the fence up.* A man who doesn't believe that is not a rational man.

Unconverted scholarship has no rational explanation for ephemeral marks in streams, erratic boulders that move northward instead of southward, or polystrata fossils where the fossil has been preserved in three or four different strata that were supposed to be twenty thousand years apart. Unconverted scholarship has no explanation for "missing links." They are still missing. No explanation for "ossiferous fissures"—the bones of animals and men piled together indiscriminately in high places. They have no rational explanation for the sudden freezing of Mastodons that had tropic vegetation in their stomachs when they were frozen. They have no rational explanation for a piece of Noah's ark, brought back from a boat that is 16,000 feet high up Mount Ararat. They have no rational explanation for fish fossils on mountains, no rational explanation for mountain ranges (orogenesis). They have no rational explanation for the polar caps, and no rational explanation for the survival of the *unfit* or the extinction of the fit. They refuse to follow their own laws of thermodynamics which have been proved experimentally. They dismiss the matter of mathematical formulas which they find in genetic codes. They dismiss

the mathematical phenomena demonstrated in Bible prophecy, and all evolutionists avoid physics, especially data on what we call "half-lives," which prove the earth could not have been here more than ten thousand years *at a maximum.*

So much for unconverted scholarship at every state university in any state. You unsaved evolutionists, Socialists, and Communists, who are teaching those bunch of suckers all that stuff and telling them to have an "open mind" and get rid of their preconceived standards in order to listen to your garbage, you have no rational explanation for *any* of the things I just listed. You are about as "scientific" as a three-year-old Hottentot discoursing on hieroglyphics and Babylonian cuneiform.

Finally, we accept the revealed account of Genesis as the right rule for life (and the exact, scientific, empirical, objective data on the matter) not only because we have observed that *unconverted* scholarship is crooked, but because *converted* scholarship is also crooked. All revisers of the Bible since 1800 ignore history. You won't find any discussion of the history of the Alexandrian text in the preface of *any* translator who used it as a basis for his text. That is, we have discovered that if you go to Christian college, you will be misled just as bad as at an unsaved university when it comes to HISTORICAL FACTS. There has not been one revision committee since 1800 that ever told you the truth about the history of the text they translated from, the *Alexandrian Vatican text of Egypt.* Converted scholarship refuses to follow their grammatical rules in translating. They invent rules to justify viola-

tions of rules. They insist on the mythological *LXX*, with no evidence of any kind to back them up. They continually lie about "the original Greek" or "Greek text." They refuse to examine the fruit of the preaching and teaching of the *AV 1611*. They continually lie about early and late manuscripts. They continually lie about King James and Erasmus. They continually lie about the scholarship of Westcott and Hort and Nestle. They refuse to translate *their own manuscripts*. The converted scholars in the major, fundamental, Christian colleges and universities in America have an irrational bias against liberals who use the same Greek text and material that they themselves use. That statement can be proved in court. (If you don't believe it, try it on me any time you get ready.)

As Bernard Ramm, the Neo-Orthodox, said in *Protestant Biblical Interpretation* (W. A. Wild Co., Boston, 1950), "Liberals set up, as the final canon of truth, their own reason." "Whatever in the Bible does not measure up to their taste or opinions may be rejected as the word of God." "Liberalism rejects an infallible Bible." "The literal interpretation of the Bible passage, if it conflicts with science, the Bible is wrong at this point." When Bernard Ramm set up *those* standards for what he calls a "liberal" theologian, he nailed the coffin shut on *every fundamental, born-again, saved, premillennial, independent, soul-winning, good, godly, dedicated, sincere, serious, conscientious, recognized Fundamentalist in America who has altered the King James Bible.* For every translator of the *ASV* and the *NASV* set up as the final canon of truth his own reason,

and he rejected anything that didn't measure up to his own taste or opinion. None of them believed the *King James Bible* was infallible. When the Bible passages conflicted with what they found in archaeology or science, they changed the passage. That can be proved in court with evidence in black and white. I have in my office 240 slides documenting that evidence from the letters, pamphlets, circulars, and books of these men, plus fifteen hours of lectures quoting the documented material.

Therefore, we accept the *King James* text of Genesis chapters 1-3 as the correct *scientific* account given on the origin of the universe and the creation of man, never disproven by any man, living or dead, of any degree of profession, of any faith whatsoever, saved or lost. We accept it as it stands.

Test for Lesson #17

Chapters 42 through 43

Name _____

ID# _____

Address _____

City,State,Zip _____

Directions: #1. Look at the memory verses at the end of the Test.
#2. Memorize them so that you can recite them without using your notes or your Bible.
#3. After memorizing the verses, you are ready to take the test.
#4. Take the test. You may use the lesson booklet and your Bible.
#5. When finished, send the completed test(s) to: [redacted]
#6. We will grade it and send it back to you with the next set of lessons.

Circle the correct answer to each question.
Questions #1 through #10 are 8 points each

1. The KJV Bible should be considered a "reliable translation", but not THE word of God.
   a. True
   b. False

2. The King James text is superior to any Hebrew or Greek text known to man.
   a. True
   b. False

3. The Bible proves itself to be the word of God by scientific and arithmetic means.
   a. True
   b. False

4. The original manuscripts are still in existence.
   a. True
   b. False

5. It can be proven that the King James Bible does contain a few minor errors of translation.
   a. True
   b. False

6. There is no "science of origins" anywhere except in the Book of Genesis.
   a. True
   b. False

Test #17 continued

7. The only scientific textbook on creation is the Holy Bible.
    a. True
    b. False

8. Fallen, sinful man is made in the image of God.
    a. True
    b. False

9. No man in the New Testament was created in the image of God until his new birth at the time of salvation.
    a. True
    b. False

10. All revisers of the Bible since 1800 ignore_____.
    a. Scholarship
    b. History
    c. Jesus' miracles
    d. the facts

Memory Verses are 5 points each

Revelation 4:11

Colossians 3:10

Psalm 119:89

Psalm 12:6,7