Lesson 11 – Creation vs. Evolution (Part II)

“... Then god saw everything that He had made, and indeed it was very good ... thus the heavens and the earth, and all the host of them, were finished.” (Gen. 1:31-2:1)

The Bible is quite plain about God’s work in creation. It is not a point of debate with the Bible writers, and there is no ambiguity. God was the originator of all that exists. Of course to the unbeliever, the question of origins is hotly debated. Evolution continues to be the assumed answer, and to question it often brings scathing ridicule. How can we defend the truth when confronted with the theory of evolution? As we will continue to see in this lesson, it’s really not that hard. The long road of changing thought on evolution is littered with dead concepts and debunked ideas. Evolution can easily be refuted when it is examined honestly and openly; let’s continue with our look at the supposed evidence.

I. Spontaneous Generation

“In biology, one of the most widely respected laws of science is the Law of Biogenesis … It simply says that life comes only from previous life of its own kind. We see this law play out everyday all around the world. Everyone knows that kittens come only from female cats; cows produce only calves, etc. Over the years, the truthfulness of this law has been documented by thousands of scientists, one of the most famous of which was French microbiologist Louis Pasteur. His work dealt a crushing blow to the notion of spontaneous generation (the idea that life arises on its own from nonliving sources). While teachers and professors will talk about the importance of Pasteur’s work, they often go on to tell their students that evolution has occurred as a result of spontaneous generation.

“The truth of the matter is that evolution could not have occurred without some form of spontaneous generation. For this reason, some scientists have concocted experiments in an attempt to create life from nonliving substances. But after all these attempts, life never has been created from something nonliving. Now, think critically for a moment. If scientists have designed carefully planned experiments to create life from something nonliving, and yet have failed miserably every time, how can we be expected to believe that ‘nature’ did it using accidents, chance, and blind forces? On the contrary, whether in nature or in the laboratory, scientists never have documented a single case of spontaneous generation. Life comes only from previous life of its own kind, which is exactly what the creation model teaches.”

II. The Fossil Record

“Dr. LeGros Clark, a renowned evolutionist, said: ‘That evolution actually did occur can only be scientifically established by the discovery of the fossilized remains of representative samples of those intermediate types which have been postulated on the basis of the indirect evidence. In other words, the really crucial evidence for evolution must be provided by the paleontologist whose business it is to study the evidence of the fossil record.’ Indeed, if the theory of evolution
is a true account of the origin of life on Earth, it is obvious that the record of gradual development of plant and animal forms to higher forms should be found imbedded in the crust of the Earth in successive layers.”

A. Predictions
Before we evaluate the fossil record, let’s ask ourselves, ‘what do we expect to find?’ Depending on your belief, your prediction would be quite different.

The evolution model predicts:
1) the oldest rocks that bear evidence of life would contain the most primitive forms of life capable of fossilization;
2) younger rocks would contain evidence of more complex forms of life;
3) there would be a gradual change in life forms from simple to complex;
4) there would be huge numbers of transitional forms (as Darwin said, “The number of intermediate and transitional links between all living and extinct species must have been inconceivably great.”);
5) boundaries between types should blur as we look back in their fossil history (It should get more difficult to tell cats from dogs and mammals from reptiles, etc.);
6) the criteria we use to classify plants and animals today would be less and less useful as older and older fossils show the in-between characteristics of presumed common ancestors for different groups.

The creation model predicts:
1) the fossil record would show a sudden and explosive appearance of very diverse and highly complex forms of life;
2) there would not be a gradual change in life forms from simple to complex;
3) there would be a regular and systematic absence of transitional forms, since there were no transitional forms;
4) variations of the types created would be found with extinction evident among some;
5) the same kind of criteria used to classify plants and animals today ought to work just as well with fossils.

B. An “Explosion” of Life
As we examine the fossil record, what do we in fact find? Evolutionists will classify various sedimentary layers with corresponding periods of evolutionary history; we will use these terms accommodatively. When the lowest layer of the evolutionary geologic timetable (the pre-Cambrian) is examined, what is found? Very little. The “oldest” fossils found have been some marine blue-green algae near Australia where the same kind of algae can be found today. Some invertebrates such as soft-shelled jellyfish have also been found in this layer but not much else. However, as we examine the next layer (the Cambrian), there is an “explosion” of life. Millions of fossils of highly complex forms of life have been found including sponges, corals, jelly fish, worms, mollusks, crustaceans, etc. Every one of the invertebrate forms has been found as well as some vertebrates. “As John Klotz comments: ‘It is hardly conceivable that all these forms should have originated in this period; and yet there is no evidence for the existence of many of them prior to the Cambrian period.’ The creation model predicts such an explosive appearance
of these highly diversified forms. The fossil record actually yields facts in strong disagreement with the evolution model!" 

C. Absence of Transitional Forms

“As one begins to examine other parts of the fossil record, searching diligently for those ‘transitional forms’ which Darwin said must be there in ‘inconceivably great numbers,’ what we actually find does not fit with what the evolution model predicts. It turns out that the ‘transitional forms’ are quite elusive – or, in fact, absent altogether! Consider these quotations from evolutionists as they comment on the paucity of the fossil record in regard to transitional forms:

‘… I still think that to the unprejudiced, the fossil record of plants is in favor of special creation’ (E.J.H. Corner)

‘This regular absence of transitional forms is not confined to mammals, but is an almost universal phenomenon, as has long been noted by paleontologists. It is true of almost all orders of all classes of animals, both vertebrate and invertebrate. A fortiori, it is also true of the classes, and of the major animal phyla, and it is apparently also true of analogous categories of plants.’ (G.G. Simpson)

‘It is a feature of the known fossil record that most taxa appear abruptly.’ (G.G. Simpson)

‘Despite the bright promise that paleontology provides a means of ‘seeing’ evolution, it has presented some nasty difficulties for evolutionists, the most notorious of which is the presence of the ‘gaps’ in the fossil record. Evolution requires intermediate forms between species, and paleontology does not provide them.’ (David Kitts)

The ‘transitional forms’ which must be in the fossil record if evolution is to be true are simply not to be found! The creation model predicts the abrupt appearance of highly complex and diverse forms of life, and no evidence of transitional forms between these basic forms of life. The fossil record reveals exactly that.”

D. Classification Criteria

“Creation is also supported by our ability to use the same criteria to classify both living plants and animals and those found as fossils. Even among extinct types, we don’t find ‘in-between forms,’ or forms that are any harder to classify (when the fossil evidence is complete enough) than plants and animals living today. Most people just assume that fossils and evolution go hand in hand. Some people even seem to think that ‘believing’ in fossils is almost the same as ‘believing’ in evolution. We’ve been thoroughly indoctrinated with educational materials and entertainment touting evolution, and it’s hard to even think that fossils argue so strongly against evolution and for creation … Charles Darwin wrote the following: ‘intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic change, and this is perhaps the most obvious and serious objection which can be urged against the theory.’ … He blamed the conflict between fact and theory on ‘the imperfection of the geologic record.’

“Well, it’s now over 120 years [as of 1982] since Darwin made that statement, and we’ve unearthed thousands of tons of fossils from all over the world. What does all this massive amount of evidence show? David Raup reviews the evidence for us. He has been the curator of the famous Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago. That museum houses 20% of all fossil
species known, so Raup is in a position to speak with considerable knowledge about the fossil evidence. The title of his article in the January, 1979, issue of the Field Museum Bulletin is ‘Conflicts Between Darwin and Paleontology.’ Raup starts by saying that ‘most people assume that fossils provide a very important part of the general argument made in favor of Darwinian interpretations of the history of life. Unfortunately, this is not strictly true.’ He mentions that Darwin expected those gaps in his theory, those missing links, to be unearthed by future discoveries. Then Raup summarizes those discoveries:

‘Well, we are now 120 years after Darwin, and knowledge of the fossil record has been greatly expanded … ironically, we have even fewer examples of evolutionary transition than we had in Darwin’s time. By this I mean that some of the classic cases of Darwinian change in the fossil record, such as the evolution of the horse in North America, have had to be discarded or modified as a result of more detailed information.’

What a statement! Darwin said the fossil evidence was perhaps the most obvious and serious objection against his theory. Raup is saying that 120 years of research have made the case for Darwinian evolution even worse.”

**III. Genetics as Evolution’s Mechanism?**

“Darwin, in his *Origin of the Species*, had argued that species are always changing, the result of natural selection. His concept was that of descent with modification, with continual and gradual change. Geographical distribution and natural selection, Darwin felt, were the modes of evolution. Then, at the turn of the century, the science of genetics began to appear on the scene. Some geneticists came to believe they had the answers as to how variation and change occurred. It was done, so they said, by genetic mutations. The new idea, in regard to evolution, then became that species arose by mutations which were incorporated into the system by natural selection. Today the alleged mechanism of Neo-Darwinism is genetic mutations plus natural selection. Theodosius Dobzhansky, the renowned evolutionary geneticist, stated that ‘the process of mutation is the only known source of the new materials of genetic variability, and hence of evolution.’

“Evolution without a mechanism is like a car with no engine – it’s not going anywhere. Evolutionists soon realized that natural selection alone was not a sufficient mechanism. Organisms would not change from one species to another unless the genetic material somehow changed. Mutations are hereditary changes caused by alterations of the original genetic material … We are told that ‘nature’ has ‘selected’ beneficial mutations and incorporated them into various organisms, eventually causing those organisms to change from one kind to another. If mutations are the ‘only known mechanism for evolution,’ there are some very serious problems.”
A. Problems with Mutations

1) "Mutations are random. C.H. Waddington, the famous evolutionary geneticist, once said: ‘It remains true to say that we know of no way other than random mutations by which hereditary variation comes into being …’ Henry M. Morris agrees: ‘There is no way to control mutations to make them produce characteristics which might be needed. Natural selection must simply take what comes.’ In other words, ‘nature’ isn’t selecting at all. Rather, ‘nature’ is pressed into accepting whatever it is that appears.

2) Mutations are very rare, not common. How often do random mutations occur? Dr. F.J. Ayala, evolutionary geneticist, states that ‘It is probably fair to estimate the frequency of a majority of mutations in higher organisms between one in ten thousand and one in a million per gene per generation.’\(^7\) "The mathematical problem for evolution comes when you want a series of related mutations. The odds of getting two mutations that are related to one another are one in a hundred trillion. Any two mutations might produce no more than a fly with a wavy edge on a bent wing. That’s a long way from producing a truly new structure, and certainly a long way from changing a fly into some new kind of organism. You need more mutations for that. So, what are the odds of getting three mutations in a row? That’s one in a billion trillion \((10^{21})\). All of a sudden the ocean isn’t big enough to hold enough bacteria to make it likely for you to find a bacterium with three simultaneous or sequential related mutations. What about four mutations? \(10^{28}\). All of a sudden, the earth isn’t big enough to hold enough organisms to make that very likely. Four mutations don’t even make a start toward real evolution. But even at this point some evolutionists have given up the classic idea of evolution, because it just plainly doesn’t work."\(^8\)

3) "Good mutations are very, very rare. There are at least three types of mutations, theoretically: bad, good, and neutral. How often do good mutations occur? Dr. H.J. Muller, Nobel laureate in genetics, said: ‘Accordingly, the great majority of mutations, certainly well over 99%, are harmful in some way, as is to be expected of the effects of accidental occurrences.’ Dr. Dobzhansky remarked that ‘Most mutants which arise in any organism are more or less disadvantageous to their possessors…’ Dr. C.P. Martin, an evolutionist, said: ‘Accordingly, mutations are more than just sudden changes in heredity; they also affect viability, and, to the best of our knowledge, invariably affect it adversely. Does not this fact show that mutations are really assaults on the organism’s central being, its basic capacity to be a living thing?’\(^9\)

B. Conclusion on Mutations

What can we conclude from these problems with mutations? As Dr. Simpson stated, “Unless there is an unknown factor tremendously increasing the chance of simultaneous mutations, such a process has played no part whatever in evolution.”

“Harvard’s Stephen Gould (1977) quite clearly recognizes the difference between evolution and mutations. Evolution, he says, involves ‘profound structural transitions.’ Mutations, he says, produce only minor variations, like we see in experiments with ‘flies in bottles,’ that start as flies and end up as flies. In a later article, Gould (1980) simply says, ‘That theory [orthodox neo-Darwinian extrapolationalism], as a general proposition is effectively dead, despite its persistence as textbook orthodoxy.’ Gould believes our knowledge of genetics is now sufficient to completely reject the explanation of evolution as the slow, gradual selection of small mutational changes. He prefers to believe instead that evolution occurs in giant steps, radical
restructuring of whole DNA sets producing what he himself calls ‘hopeful monsters.’ But he admits that no such hopeful monster has ever been observed.”

“The list of arguments used to support both evolution and creation could go on and on. There probably are as many arguments for each model of origins as there are scientists to make them. But we always must remember that the facts behind the arguments are the important things, not the false interpretations(s) of those facts. The facts say that life comes only from previously existing life; evolution says life comes from nonliving sources. The facts show that no transitional forms of half-and-half organisms exist in the fossil record; evolution maintains that there should be millions of transitional forms. The facts show that similarities sometimes show common ancestry, but also can show common design. Facts are stubborn, impartial things that refuse to budge for people of high estate or low degree. The concepts of creation and evolution stand on opposite sides, and the facts stand behind only one of them. Which is it?”
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