Lesson 10 – Creation vs. Evolution

“In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.” (Gen. 1:1)

It is a simple yet profound statement that begins the Bible. With this statement and the passage that follows, we have a description of the origin of mankind and all that we see. It is stated as a fact of history and not suggested as a working hypothesis or theory. It is either true or it is not. Have we concluded the Bible to be reliable and of Divine origin? Then, we should accept these truths.

The question of origins is one that has been debated for a long time. It is only natural to wonder where we came from and what cause is sufficient to explain all that we see. The Bible is quite clear on the subject. The Lord was the creative force and it was all spoken into existence in six days: Gen. 1-2; Ex. 20:11; Heb. 11:3; Psa. 33:6ff; Jn. 1:3,10; Acts 17:24; Eph. 3:9; Col. 1:16; Rev. 4:11. Furthermore, He continues to govern or sustain all things: Col. 1:17; Heb. 1:3; Acts 17:28; 2 Pet. 3:7. Of course, many people have attempted to offer other explanations for the origin of mankind, life, and the universe. The most popular theory is that of evolution.

I. Evolution

You’ve heard the term throughout your life. What do people mean when they talk of evolution? The term literally means an “unfolding” or “unrolling,” as in the opening of a rose bud or the development of an embryo. However, the term has generally come to be used to describe a theory for origins. “The theory of evolution may be defined as the hypothesis that millions of years ago lifeless matter acted upon by natural forces, gave origin to one or more minute living organisms which have since evolved into all living and extinct plants and animals, including man. A more simple definition: belief in change with descent from a common ancestor. Evolution as defined here, involves pure chance.

“Dr. G.A. Kerkut, an evolutionist, makes a distinction between the General Theory of Evolution and the Special Theory of Evolution: ‘There is a theory which states that many living animals can be observed over the course of time to undergo changes so that new species are formed. This can be called the “Special Theory of Evolution” and can be demonstrated in certain cases by experiments. On the other hand there is the theory that all living forms in the world have arisen from a single source which itself came from an inorganic form. This theory can be called the “General Theory of Evolution” and the evidence that supports it is not sufficiently strong to allow us to consider it as anything more than a working hypothesis. It is not clear whether the changes that bring about speciation are of the same nature as those that brought about the development of new phyla. The answer will be found by future experimental work and not by dogmatic assertions that the General Theory of Evolution must be correct because there is nothing else that will satisfactorily take its place.’”1 Others use the terms “micro-evolution” (small changes like the improvement of animal stock; change within bounds; differentiation, variation, fluctuation) and “macro-evolution” (large changes; e.g. a water animal becoming a
creeping thing, which becomes a beast, which becomes a man). Micro-evolution is easily observed, and there is no debate over this. Macro-evolution, however, has never been observed.

“‘All reputable biologists have agreed that evolution of life on Earth is an established fact (Drs. Vance and Miller).’
‘The first point to make about Darwin’s theory is that it is no longer a theory, but a fact (Sir Julian Huxley).’ Such statements could be multiplied many times. Their intent is to teach that indeed, evolution is a ‘fact’ of science, and that anyone ‘reputable,’ anyone ‘entitled to a judgment,’ accepts evolution as a fact.

“Organic evolution is not a ‘fact’ of science. It is not now, has never been, and will never be. Even many prominent evolutionists have been willing to admit openly that it is not. Dr. Robert A. Millikan, Nobel laureate in physics, has well said: ‘The pathetic thing is that we have scientists who are trying to prove evolution, which no scientist can ever prove.’ Dr. G. A. Kerkut listed seven assumptions upon which evolution is based, and then made this startling remark: ‘The first point that I should like to make is that these seven assumptions by their nature are not capable of experimental verification.’

“Why do people believe evolution? Why is evolution such a popular theory? 1) ‘The main reason most educated people believe in evolution is simply because they have been told that most educated people believe in evolution (Dr. Henry Morris). 2) ‘Evolution itself is accepted by zoologists, not because it has been observed to occur … or can be proved by logically coherent evidence, but because the only alternative, special creation, is clearly incredible (D.M.S. Watson, an evolutionist).’ ‘Evolution is unproved and unprovable. We believe it because the only alternative is special creation, and that is unthinkable (Sir Arthur Keith).’ 3) Some are honestly convinced that there is evidence to support such a belief.”

II. Supposed proofs of evolution

A. Comparative embryology

“In his Origin of Species, Darwin asserted (in a discussion that occupied 12 pages) that similarity among the various embryos of animals and man was a primary proof of the theory of evolution. He called it, in fact, ‘second to none’ in importance. Ernst Henrich Haeckel (1834-1919) was a German biologist and follower of Darwin. He developed the so-called ‘theory of embryonic recapitulation’: successive stages of embryonic development repeat the evolutionary stages of one’s animal ancestry. He said that ‘ontogeny (the development of one) recapitulated (repeated) phylogeny (the development of the race).’"

In recent decades, this theory has been rejected by evolutionists such as Dr. George G. Simpson and Sir Arthur Keith. Keith stated, ‘It was expected that the embryo would recapitulate the features of its ancestors from the lowest to the highest forms in the animal kingdom. Now that the appearances of the embryo at all stages are known, the general feeling is one of disappointment; the human embryo at no stage is anthropoid in appearance. The embryo of the mammal never resembles the worm, the fish, or the reptile. Embryology provides no support whatsoever for the evolutionary hypothesis.”
Haeckel was also an accomplished artist, and he used falsified drawings to accompany his articles. He altered the illustrations of his colleagues and also used the same illustration labeled as a human, a dog, and a rabbit to show their similarity. The University of Jena was forced to convene a university court, and five professors “convicted” Haeckel of fraud. His works were first published in 1866, and we have known for over 100 years that this theory is not correct. Yet, Haeckel’s drawings are still turning up in modern biology texts as “proof” of evolution. This quote from Dr. John Tyler Bonner, who was head of the Biology Dept. at Princeton, explains why: “We may have known for almost a hundred years that Haeckel’s blastaea-gastraea theory of the origin of the metazoan is probably nonsense, but it is so clear-cut, so simple, so easy to hand full-blown to the student.” (1961)

B. Vestigial Structures

“Vestigial structures are those found in man and animals which evolutionists claim to be degenerate and thus useless. We are told that these so-called “degenerate” structures, while useless to present day animals, were at one time useful to their evolutionary predecessors. These structures are said to be “remnants” – leftovers – which eventually will be lost through evolutionary processes of selection. Years ago, when this “proof” was first set forth, there were literally hundreds of examples of these so-called vestigial structures. For example, Alfred Weidersheim published a list of 180 vestigial structures in the human system – which came to be thought of as a walking museum of antiquity!

“As Dr. R.L. Wysong puts it: ‘Not too long ago man was imputed to have 180 vestiges. Organs like the appendix, tonsils, thymus, pineal gland and thyroid gland were on the list. Today, all former vestigial organs are known to have some function during the life of the individual. If the organ has any function at any time, it cannot be called rudimentary or vestigial … As man’s knowledge has increased the list of vestigial organs decreased. So what really was “vestigial?” Was it not man’s rudimentary knowledge of the intricacies of the body?’

“Another point that needs to be considered is this: ‘If man does have 180 vestigial organs, organs that were once functioning, then in the past he would have had more organs than he now has. In the past he would have been developing the organs that he presently has plus he would have had the 180 functional vestigial organs. So the farther we go back in time, the more complex the organism! Rather an interesting evolutionary twist.’ (Wysong) Those evolutionists who keep up with the scientific literature rarely discuss this issue any longer. Actually, when you consider that there are no evidences of the transitional stages between functioning organs and useless organs, then these so-called ‘useless’ appendages would prove degeneration, not evolution. Evolution is the rise of new, different, and functioning organs, not the wasting away of organs.”

C. Comparative Anatomy

“Dr. Carl Sagan, the eminent Cornell University astronomer, wrote: ‘The inner workings of terrestrial organisms – from microbes to men – are so similar in their biochemical details as to make it highly likely that all organisms on the Earth have evolved from a single instance of the
origin of life.’ It is no secret that the comparative sciences, especially anatomy and physiology, are considered among the strongest alleged evidences for evolution. In fact, much of the case for ‘amoeba-to-man’ type evolution is built upon arguments from similarity.

“It goes without saying that using descent from a common ancestor to explain similarities is one of the most ‘logical’ and appealing ideas used by evolutionists today. This ‘descent from a common ancestry’ idea seems to make sense. For example, that is how we explain such similarities as brothers and sisters looking more alike than, say, cousins. They have parents closer in common. And, evolutionists have an impressive array of data at their disposal. They point out, for example, that the wings of a bat, the forefoot of a turtle, the forefoot of a frog, and the arm of a man all have the same general structure. They also point out that the forefoot of the dog, the flipper of the whale, and the hand of a man have essentially the same bones and muscles.

“It is here that an extremely valuable lesson can be learned in the creation / evolution controversy. That lesson is this: it is rarely the data that are in dispute – it is the interpretation placed on the data that is in dispute. In the case of similarities, both evolutionists and creationists examine the same data. The evolutionist, however, says that similarity is proof of common ancestry. The creationist, on the other hand, says that similarity is proof of creation according to a common design! …There is a ‘catch,’ however. Dr. Ferenc Kjiss, Dean of the medical Faculty, University of Budapest, reminds us: ‘…it is necessary for the evolutionists – in order to maintain their theory – to collect only the similarities and to neglect the numerous differences.’ Dr. T.H. Morgan, evolutionist of Columbia University, candidly admitted what many evolutionists do not wish to become common knowledge when he said: ‘If, then it can be established beyond dispute that similarity or even identity of the same character in different species is not always to be interpreted to mean that both have arisen from a common ancestry, the whole argument from comparative anatomy seems to tumble in ruins.’ Or, as Wysong puts it: ‘If the law of similarity can be used to show evolutionary relationships, then dissimilarities can be used to show a lack of relationship …’

“The textbooks on evolution usually concentrate solely on the similarities. Now, however, we have data (from the evolutionists themselves) concerning the differences. Among some of the most interesting data, however are those presented by Dr. Colin Patterson, senior paleontologist of the British Museum of Natural History, during a 1981 visit to the United States. Dr. Patterson suggested to the scientific societies in this country to which he spoke that he had ‘experienced a shift from evolution as knowledge to evolution as faith.’ He then presented specific example after example of how the evolutionary hypothesis of common ancestry acted as an ‘anti-theory’ that conveys ‘anti-knowledge.’ He presented data on amino acid sequences for the alpha hemoglobins of vipers, crocodiles, and chickens. Evolutionists ‘know’ that vipers and crocodiles (two reptiles) should be much more closely related than either is to a bird. But the crocodile and chicken showed the greatest similarity (17.5% of their amino acids in common), with the viper and the chicken the next most similar (10.5%) and the two reptiles with the least similarity (5.6%). An examination of the amino acids in myoglobin showed that crocodiles and lizards (two reptiles) share 10.5%, but that a lizard and a chicken (reptile/bird) also share the same percentage (10.5%)! Dr. Patterson also dealt with the
differences between men and apes – differences he said must be re-evaluated in light of new data at hand. He then described studies of mitochondrial DNA done on man and various primates. Where there should have been a high percentage of similarities, there was a very low percentage. After all of his data were presented, Dr. Patterson (a confirmed evolutionist) remarked: ‘The theory makes a prediction, we’ve tested it, and the prediction is falsified precisely.’

“The creation model suggests similarities due to a common Designer who used ‘economy of design’ (just like architects and other designers do today, locating items that work well and using them consistently in each thing they design). The Creator used those things He knew would work well in all (or most) organisms, because He knew we would all have to breathe the same air, drink the same water, eat the same types of organic foods, and in general co-inhabit the Earth. He then varied the ‘blueprint’ as He saw fit, to adapt an organism to a particular environment… The creation model accounts for both similarities and differences. The evolution model cannot account for numerous differences, thereby ‘tumbling in ruins.’”

“I will praise You, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made; marvelous are Your works, and that my soul knows very well.” (Psa. 139:14)
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