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Gorilla Genome Reveals Interesting Discovery

Joe Deweese, Ph.D.

Comparing nucleotide sequences is a slow process, but one that has dramatically increased the number of genomes that have been completely sequenced in the last few years. This genomic information has vastly increased our knowledge of living organisms. Recently, researchers reported the complete genome sequence of gorillas (Scally, et al., 2012). Evolutionists consider gorillas to be one of our “closest” living evolutionary relatives, second only to chimpanzees (Scally, et al., 2012).

To boil these results down, researchers have found that some DNA sequences in humans, chimps, and gorillas are very similar, while other regions are not. In essence, some of the DNA could be interpreted to suggest relationship, while other parts do not support—and even contradict—these alleged relationships. A much simpler interpretation of DNA sequence similarities between various living organisms would be that humans, gorillas, and chimps are not evolutionarily related at all, and that common sequences represent common design features that were implemented by God for various creatures that share common biological processes, environments, and anatomy. Sequence similarities across species, then, reflect the preservation of key regions of DNA over time because of the essential functions encoded by these regions rather than evolutionary relationship. In fact, this concept can be used to identify potential functions for unexplored or poorly understood regions of various genomes by comparison with regions of known function in other organisms.

In this discussion, it is essential to recognize the difference between the facts and the interpretations placed on those facts. Interestingly, there has been a slowly growing discontent regarding the concept of a universal tree of life, which is used to catalog evolutionary relationships. While still firmly holding to evolution, some scientists have suggested what would amount to a major overhaul of the concept, including some evolutionists who hold that there was not a single common ancestor of all life (Bapteste, Susko, et al., 2005; Dodtittle, 2009; McNerney, Psiani, et al., 2012). While evolutionists continue to debate the interpretations of the facts, it will be interesting to watch for the next genomic breakthrough as God’s Word continues to be upheld by the evidence.
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The “God Particle”? (2nd Update)
Jeff Miller, Ph.D.

[EDITOR’S NOTE: A.P. staff scientist Dr. Miller holds a Ph.D. from Auburn University in Mechanical Engineering with emphases in Thermal Science and Biomechanics.]

We have been closely monitoring the progress of the search for the elusive “Higgs Boson” particle—presumably dubbed the “God Particle” by many scientists (see Miller, 2011a and Miller, 2011b for previous discussion). The hunt has been a roller coaster ride, with scientists thinking they have found the particle and then changing their minds time and again. The Higgs Boson particle is “thought to be the fundamental unit of matter” (“Has Quest for the Elusive…” 2011). In theory, it could explain how other elementary particles have mass. The particle is a theoretical elementary particle that is predicted by the Standard Model of particle physics, but which had yet to be observed by physicists through experimentation, until now—or so scientists hope.

On July 4, 2012, scientists sent shockwaves through the world as they announced that they believe, with 95% certainty, that they have found the Higgs Boson particle using the Large Hadron Collider (LHC), a particle accelerator located in Switzerland (“The Elusive Particle…” 2012; see May, 2012 for more information on the LHC). How significant is this find to the believer? If there is a “God Particle,” does that mean the “Big Bang” is true? Does it mean that this particle can create matter? Does it mean that there is no God? Why do many call it the “God Particle”? Technically, according to the National Post, the name “God Particle” is an abbreviated form of its official, profane designation: “The God Particle” (a name used by Nobel physicist Leon Lederman as a draft title for a book), referring to the frustrations scientists have been going through trying to find the Higgs Boson. So, it actually had nothing to do with God. Apparently, however, the name was abbreviated to “The God Particle” to avoid offending readers—as though the abbreviated description is any less profane (“Higgs Boson Hunt Over…” 2012). The result of this name designation has been to give the impression that the particle is “God-like” and somehow eliminates the necessity of a God in creating the Universe, while substantiating the Big Bang Theory. So, to Big Bang believers today, the Higgs Boson is just not an energy particle which they believe gives an object its mass, but rather, it is “a theoretical energy particle which many scientists believe helped give mass to the disparate matter spawned by the Big Bang” (“Scientists Close In…”, 2010, emp. added). Big Bang theorists consider its existence “crucial to forming the cosmos after the Big Bang” (2010, emp. added). Therefore, the particle is “God-like” to such sadly deluded individuals, since it, in theory, “gives mass” and helped “form the cosmos.”

In reality, the existence of the Higgs Boson in no way eliminates the need for God. Consider the following. In the 1600s, Creation scientist Isaac Newton, after observing an apple falling to the ground, “deduced that the same force which caused the apple to fall to the ground causes the moon to orbit the Earth” (Paino, 2001). From this concept, in time, Newton formally articulated what we now call “Newton’s Laws of Motion,” the second of which says, in essence, that the force an object applies is equal to its mass multiplied by its acceleration. So an object’s weight on the Earth (i.e., “applied force” on the Earth) is equal to its mass times its acceleration (i.e., the acceleration due to gravity at the location where the object is on the Earth). Question: By discovering gravity, did Newton discover the “God Force” that keeps humans tied to the Earth? Did he disprove the need for God? Certainly not, and one even suggested such an idea. He merely discovered one of the characteristics of the created order—one of the “ordinances” that God set up to have “dominion over the Earth” (Job 38:35).

According to Rolf Heuer, the director of the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN) (the research center that houses the LHC), whether or not scientists have truly discovered the Higgs Boson still needs to be verified. Heuer said, “It’s a bit like sporting a familiar face from afar. Sometimes you need closer inspection to find out whether it’s really your best friend, or your best friend’s twin” (“Higgs Boson Hunt Over…” 2012). Assuming the find truly is what it purports to be, the particles will simply be another step in expanding our understanding of how God set up the Universe. Newton discovered that force is equal to mass times acceleration. But the next step is to answer questions like, “How is there mass? What gives an object mass?” If scientists’ theory is correct, the Higgs Boson will simply help shed light on those questions—i.e., how did God set up the Universe in such a way that an object has mass? In other words, the Higgs Boson may help us to understand more about how God “created” the “worlds”—showing us more about how “the things which are seen were not made of things which are visible” (Hebrews 11:3).

Also, the existence of the Higgs Boson in no way violates the First Law of Thermodynamics (i.e., creating energy or matter from nothing). In nature, nothing can be created or destroyed. But ever only change forms, according to the First Law of Thermodynamics (Miller, 2007). So, only a Supernatural force can create something out of nothing. The Higgs Boson particle is the logical next step.

And further, the existence of the Higgs Boson in no way disproves the existence of God. Someone had to create the Higgs Boson in the first place. And the existence of the Higgs Boson in no way refutes the Big Bang Theory, which is riddled with problems—as atheistic scientists themselves highlight frequently (see, for example, the recent article in New Scientist titled, “Bang Goes the Theory” [Geffer, 2012]).

As stated above, evolutionists consider the existence of the Higgs Boson “crucial to forming the cosmos after the Big Bang” (“Scientists Close In…”, 2010, emp. added). Notice that without the existence of this particle, Big Bang theorists recognize that the Universe could not even form after the Big Bang theoretically occurred. Its existence does not prove that the Universe did form in the manner suggested by the Big Bang Theory. Its existence does not even prove that the Universe could form after a hypothesized Big Bang occurred. Further, its existence does not prove that the Big Bang itself could occur at all. Its existence does not prove that material could exist forever or that God’s existence out of nothing, either one of which must be true in order for the Big Bang to even get started. And its existence certainly does not prove that the scientific laws governing the Universe could write themselves into existence. However, without the existence of the particle, theorists know that fundamental tenets of the Big Bang Theory could not happen. It’s another thing to say that they could happen. Thus, the discovery of the particle’s existence does not prove anything in the end, but only allows atheistic cosmologists to cross one of the many chasms that stand in the way of their theory even getting to the starting line in being considered a remote possibility. In other words, the Big Bang has not even reached one inch into the realm of proof. It remains firmly in the realm of impossibility. Bottom line: the Creation model still stands as the most logical explanation for the origin of the Universe—the model that is in keeping with all the scientific evidence.

Much more is missing in the quest to substantiate the Big Bang than a little particle can solve, and the list of those missing items is long. And the Higgs Boson will continue to do so, until true science—science that is in keeping with (cont. on p. 92)
By the grace of God, and with the encouragement of a number of A.P. supporters, in 2011 Apologetics Press embarked upon a new venture. We conducted our first-ever A.P. Christian Evidences Summer Youth Camp. Young people from all over came together for a week to study the most foundational pillar of the Christian’s faith—the existence of God.

For the second summer in a row, young people and several adults (who graciously volunteered their time to help as counselors and upkeep) came together for a lot of fun, fellowship, and spiritual growth. To the right are some of the comments from those who attended (or whose children attended) an A.P. camp this summer:

- “I just wanted to thank you...for such a wonderful week of camp...I’m not sure how many times during the week that my girls came to me with excitement and told me how wonderful their Bible classes were. That is why I wanted to bring them. Of course they enjoyed all the other activities as well. It was just a very positive experience all around. All the girls are still talking about it and we are already looking forward to next year!”

- “I wanted to take some time to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to all of you for the great job you all did with the A.P. camp. John could not quit talking about all the fun he had, and he was especially excited about all the great lessons he heard. Words cannot express the gratitude we have for all of you and the time, effort, and sacrifice you put into this week to make it so successful. It has not gone unnoticed...We will definitely be attending camp again next year and trying to bring some more from Texas if we can.”

- “Our boys had a great time at camp. Thank you so much for all of the hard work and hours you spent and women you spent in the camp. We appreciate it so much!”

Yes, we are already making plans to have at least one week of camp next year with the theme centering on Creation and Evolution. We hope that your children, grandchildren, or the youth at the church you attend, will consider joining us for one or more fun-filled weeks of camp.

For more information, please call 1 (800) 234-8558
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Jeff Miller, Ph.D.

RECENTLY, we addressed the latest fossil finds that are drawing the attention of the evolu-
tionary community—Australopithecine sediba (Miller, 2012; cf. Butt, 2010). Lee Berg-
er, an evolutionary paleoanthro-
pologist at the University of the Wa-
bari in Johannesburg, South Africa, doc-
ted two sets of sediba fossils in 2008 that some are claiming to be rep-

dent of the immediate line-

ancestral ancestor of the genus, Homo. The sediba fossils continue to be in the lime-
light, as in April, Scientific American fea-
tured them in an article titled, “First of Our Kind” (Wong, 2012).

No essential new evidence was pre-
sented in this article, which attempted again to prove that humans evolved from sediba, beyond what was discussed in our previous articles. What is new in this article is a further exposition of the dissent in the evolutionary community over their alleged fossil evidence for evolu-
tion. The evolutionary community sim-

time cannot come to a consensus about the implications of its fossil finds, which illustrates the fact that the fossils cannot be definitely used as proof of evolu-
tion, since they can be interpreted in so many ways.

While Berger and others contend that the sediba fossils are representative of the ancestor of Homo, others vehemently disagree. William Kimbel of Arizona State University is known for leading the team that found the alleged 2.3 mil-

lion-year-old upper jawbone in Hadar, Ethiopia that many evolutionists, up to this point, have believed to be the earli-
est evidence of the genus Homo. Kimbel responded to Berger’s assertion, saying, “I don’t see how a taxon with a few char-
acters that look like Homo in South Africa can be the ancestor (of Homo) when there’s something in East Africa that is clearly Homo 300,000 years earlier [i.e., the jawbone he discovered—JM]” (as quoted in Wong, p. 36).

Leakey of the famous fossil finding Leakey family, said, “There are too many things that do not fit, particularly the dates and geog-

raphy. It is much more likely that the South African hominins are a separate radiation that took place in the south of the continent” (as quoted in Wong, p. 36).

Rene Bobe, a biological anthro-
pologist at George Washington Uni-

versity, believes the sediba fossils to be “too primitive in their overall form” to be the claimed ancestors (Wong, p. 36). Bernard Wood, a paleoanthropologist and professor at George Washington University, as well as a senior scientist at the National Museum of Nat-

ural History, said, “There are not many characters linking it to Homo.... I just think it is a species not yet to be evolved into [hominids]” (as quoted in Wong, bracketed item in orig., p. 36).

Headlining evolutionists cannot agree with each other about what their fossil evi-
dence proves, how can their evidence be used to definitively prove anything?

One of the fascinating admissions that was made in this article by the evolution-
ists is that, contrary to the picture painted by many evolutionists, the human evolution is a matter of fact. Kate Wong, evolutionist and senior science writer for Scientific American, said, “The origin of our genus, Homo, continues to be one of the biggest mysteries facing scholars of human evo-

lution. Based on the meager evidence available, scientists have surmised that Homo, first appeared… (Wong, p. 31, emp. added).” Palaeontologists often rely on a few isolated fossil bones, found here and there around the world, to con-
struct their alleged tree of human evo-

lutionary proof. Wong went on to say:

For decades palaeoanthropologists have combed remote corners of Africa on hand and knee for fossils of Homo’s earliest representatives. That effort has brought only modest gains—a jawbone here, and handful of teeth there. Most of the recovered fossils instead belong to a group of ancient ances-
tor species—likely of the genus Homo—characters linking it to Homo—the number of intermediate vari-

evations is growing. In truth, if the scientific evidence is allowed to flourish. It might come to a consensus about what their fossil evidence supports this truth.
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Jeff Miller, Ph.D.
Theistic Evolution—A Devastating Doctrine

This practice can be devastating in the long run, destroying one’s faith in the Bible and Christianity and giving ammunition to the Bible’s skeptics. How so? The theistic evolutionist often tries to get around the clarity of the Genesis account of Creation by contending that it is not a literal, historical account, but rather is figurative and symbolic. In other words, Genesis chapter one does not actually mean what it says. The Bible certainly uses figurative language at times (e.g., in the Psalms, Revelation, Daniel, etc.). However, the fact that we can know that such language is being used, proves that there are textual indicators that distinguish historical from figurative and symbolic genres of writing in the Bible.

For example, when Genesis 25 describes Esau’s appearance as being “like a hairy garment all over,” we understand that his skin was not literally a hairy garment. Rather, it was similar to the appearance and feel of a fur coat. When Genesis 23 says “a biography of the Lord makes me to lie down in green pastures” and “leads me beside the still waters,” we understand that the text is not speaking literally, but figuratively.

In Daniel chapter 2, Daniel interpreted King Nebuchadnezzar’s dream. Nebuchadnezzar saw a head of gold, chest and arms of silver, belly and thighs of bronze, legs of iron, and its feet composed of iron and clay. Daniel said to Nebuchadnezzar, “You’re the head of gold” (vs. 38). We, of course, understand that Daniel was not speaking literally. He was explaining that the gold head of the image was symbolic and represented the greatness of Nebuchadnezzar’s Babylonian empire in comparison to the lesser kingdoms that would follow him. We can know that Revelation is not describing figurative and symbolically, because John tells us so right at the beginning of the book (i.e., Revelation 1:1—“And He sent and signified it...”) Revelation is a book filled with signs, not to be taken literally.

Similarly, one can easily distinguish the difference between a heavily symbolic account of Creation, like that given in Psalm 104, and the account given in Genesis one—which is given in straightforward, narrative terminology. Genesis one gives every indication of being a historical account of Creation. [Note: Biblical Hebrew scholar, Steven Boyd, in the book Thousands...Net Billions, engaged in a fascinating study, where he showed, using a statistical analysis of verb uses in 97 poetic and narrative biblical texts, that Genesis 1:1-23 unquestionably belongs in the category of narrative texts (DeYoung, 2005, pp. 157-70)].

That said, if a text like Genesis one, that has no indication that it is anything other than a historical narrative, is taken to be figurative, as the theistic evolutionary proposition requires, then what would keep a person from doing the same thing anywhere else in the Bible? How can we know for certain what was really born of a virgin, was crucified, and was resurrected? What would prohibit such accounts from being interpreted as figurative and symbolic as well? Some have gone so far! When the Bible tells us things that we should or should not do to be pleasing to God, what would keep us from interpreting those areas of Scripture as figurative as well? Interpreting Genesis one as figurative has far reaching implications.

In truth, one can come to know what is in the Bible is figurative and what is not. When the evidence from the biblical text is weighed (cf. Thompson, 2000), it is clear that Genesis one relates a literal account in six, approximately 24-hour days, within the last 10,000 years. The scientific evidence supports this contention, as we point out on a regular basis at Apologetics Press. However, such issues highlight how critical the interpretation of Scripture is fundamentally to our interpretation of Scripture. Reading things into the biblical text that are not warranted can be a very slippery slope. Such practices are just as forbidden as adding man-made doctrines and practices into the church of the Bible (cf. Matthew 15:8-9; Colossians 3:17; 1 Corinthians 4:6; John 4:24; Revelation 22:18-19; Galatians 1:8-9).

Consider further, if theistic evolution is true, then Moses was in error in his writings and was, therefore, not inspired by God. Moses clearly stated in Exodus 20:11 that everything—“the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them”—was made in six days. When the plural form of the Hebrew word for “day” (yom) is used in Old Testament non-prophetic literature, like Exodus 20:11, it always refers to literal 24-hour periods of time. The same can be said when this Hebrew word is preceded by a numeral, as in Exodus 20:11 (cf. Thompson, pp. 188-201). Why? Because it would make no sense to speak of six “long periods of time.” So, according to Moses, the entire Universe, with everything in it, was created in six, literal, 24-hour periods of time. If theistic evolution were true, then Moses’ writings—a significant section of our Bibles—would be in error, and the skeptic would be accurate in concluding that Moses was not inspired by God. And further, any other biblical characters who quoted from Moses’ writings as though he was an inspired author (including Jesus, Himself—Matthew 4:4,7,10)—would also be in error. If theistic evolution were true, Paul also would be in error. Speaking of man kind, Paul said in Romans 1:20 that certain attributes of God have been “clearly perceived since the creation of the world” (ESV). If theistic evolution is true, mankind would have not been around to “clearly perceive” or see the world until billions of years after “the creation of the world.” Thus, the conclusion is all the more true. Paul was in error and was not inspired by God—a contention which would eliminate much of the New Testament. And further, Jesus, Himself, said in Mark 10:6 concerning Adam and Eve, “But from the beginning of the creation, God ‘made them male and female’” (cf. Matthew 19:4-5; Genesis 1:27). Again, if theistic evolution were true, man was certainly not around “from the beginning of creation.” Evolutionary theory supposes that mankind was not around for the vast majority of the Universe’s history. If theistic evolution is true, Jesus, Himself—the son of Almighty God—is in error and finding his own way. Indeed, theistic evolutionary positions strike at the very heart of the Christian faith—the integrity and inspiration of the Bible, the inspiration of Moses and Paul, and the deity of Christ Himself.

Several have said to Apologetics Press personal over the years, “Does it matter? What’s the big deal if someone believes in theistic evolution?” This latest poll, and the implications of belief in this devastating doctrine with regard to the biblical text, make it clear that this matter should be no “sweating.” It is critical that the Christian prepares himself for the defense of the truth on any topic (1 Peter 3:15). We are commanded to “prove” or “test all things; hold fast what is good” (1 Thessalonians 5:21). The proper interpretation of the first chapter of the Bible is no exception to this command. The Christian should be ready to cast “down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God and brings every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ” (2 Corinthians 10:5).
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Apologetics Press was blessed this summer to sponsor two camps at two different locations in Alabama: Indian Creek Youth Camp in Oakman, Alabama, and Backwoods Christian Camp near Lineville, Alabama. During the first session (June 10-15), some 170 individuals from 27 different churches in seven states gathered to study the theme for the week—“The Reliability of the Bible.” Every class and lecture focused on the amazing accuracy of God’s Word—from the smallest details (cf. Matthew 5:18), to matters as foundational and important as the deity and resurrection of Christ. Young people were encouraged to remember that a proper interpretation of Scripture will always result in humans coming to the same, inevitable conclusion as the psalmist: “The entirety of Your word is truth, and every one of Your righteous judgments endures forever” (Psalm 119:160).

During the second session, conducted at Backwoods Christian Camp (June 24-29), five A.P. staff members and writers (including three credentialed scientists) spoke throughout the week about the amazing evidences for the existence of God. More than 100 individuals, from several churches in at least five different states, spent this week together, becoming acquainted with the ageless arguments for the existence of God.

The spiritual impact of these summer camps is inestimable. Without question, many young people have been permanently influenced for good in the shaping of their thinking concerning things eternal. The fun, fellowship, and spiritual growth were simply tremendous—life-changing and spiritually transforming.

Plans are already underway to conduct one or more camps next summer centering on Creation and Evolution. We hope that your children, grandchildren, and the youth at the church you attend, will consider participating in one or more of these thrilling summer camps.

Dave Miller
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