7

EVOLUTION, PART TWO

Are human beings created in the image of God, or are they accidental combinations of chemicals? Our answer to that question largely determines what we believe and how we live. If we evolved accidentally from chemicals, then secular humanism is a reasonable faith. But if evolution is false, then secular humanism is not only false, it is a dangerous and destructive pagan religion. Thus, evolution is humanism's most important doctrine, and for that reason it is vigorously taught and promoted as an established scientific fact.

Chapters six and seven set forth evidence to prove that not only is evolution not a scientific fact, it is not even a reasonable theory. Chapter six presented 3 lines of evidence, based on 3 established laws of

science, to show that evolution is in hopeless conflict with all three of these laws, but that creation is in perfect harmony with all of them. In chapter seven we will consider 5 more lines of evidence, based on actual observation and scientific discovery, to show that evolution is unreasonable and false.

Darwin recognized many problems with his theory, but it was his expectation that future discoveries and scientific advances would prove him to be right. Just the opposite has happened. The more we discover and the more we learn, the more certain it becomes that the universe and all that is in it, including human beings, were created by a supernatural Creator.

THE STABILITY OF THE BASIC KINDS OF LIFE

Creationists believe that God created all of the different kinds of plant and animal life. In His wisdom, He provided mechanisms by which living plants and animals could change and adapt to changing environments, but could not go beyond their own kind. He gave each kind its own "gene pool" which is the chief means by which changes and adaptations are achieved.

By selective breeding it is possible to produce many different varieties within one kind of life. This has been done many times with both plants and animals. But is is not possible to produce a different kind. For example, by selective breeding, many different varieties of cattle have been produced. Desired traits have been developed by selecting for breeding stock, individuals possessing those traits. We have varieties that produce more meat, or more milk, or richer milk, or

have no horns, or are resistance to disease, etc. But all of these different varieties are still within the cattle kind. No amount of selective breeding has ever produced a different kind.

Selective breeding produces different varieties within a kind by sorting through the gene pool which God gave to that kind. The process has been compared to sorting through a barrel of marbles of all different sizes to find the largest marble. Without looking you take out two marbles and discard the smaller. Then take out another marble and again discard the smaller. At first progress is fairly rapid, but as the retained marble gets larger, progress becomes slower, until at last the largest marble is found and change in size stops.

Of course the gene pool for any kind of life is vastly more complex that a barrel of marbles. But livestock breeders use selective breeding to sort through the gene pool in much the same way, at first making fairly rapid progress, and then slowing as the limits of the gene pool are approached. Beyond those limits they cannot go. Selective breeding cannot produce a different kind of life.

Evolution claims to be an ongoing, universal process producing new and more complex kinds of plants and animals. The means by which this is accomplished is natural selection. Within any kind of life are individuals that possess traits that give a survival advantage and thus these individuals live and produce more offspring to whom they pass these traits. So natural selection is selective breeding carried on by nature instead of man.

The classic example of natural selection, to which evolutionists always point, is the case of the peppered

moth in England. In 1850, when the trees were covered with a mottled gray lichen, about 98% of the moths were gray colored. This color gave them excellent camouflage when resting on the gray lichen so they were less often eaten by birds, and thus lived to reproduce more light colored moths. But the environment changed. By 1950 air pollution had killed the lichen, and now the trees were darker so that now the dark moths had the better camouflage, and 98% of the moths were of the darker color.

Of course, the moths are still moths. A new kind has not been produced. Because of the change in environment, those moths possessing the genes for dark color became the principle breeding stock, just as livestock breeders may select cattle with genes for higher milk production to use for breeding stock. Thus natural selection can work under just the right circumstances. But, like artificial selection, natural selection works with the gene pool which God gave to the kind and cannot go beyond that kind. God, in His wisdom, provided this means for a kind to adapt and survive under changing conditions.

Evolutionists claim, however, that the gene pool can be changed by mutations. It is true that some kinds of radiation and certain chemicals can produce mutations by damage to the reproductive cells, and that these random changes can be passed on to future generations. Much work has been done with fruit flies, using x-ray to produce the damage and thus developing varieties of fruit flies with miniature wings, or vestigial wings, or with other deformities, but never producing anything but a fruit fly.

Science is based on observation. Certainly, very intense observation has been going on since 1859 (the

year Darwin published his theory) as evolutionists have eagerly sought to prove that new kinds of life are produced by natural means. But the search has been to no avail. The basic kinds or types of life are completely stable. There can be many variations within the type or kind, but no new kinds of life have been observed.

Morris and Parker, page 119:

> If evolutionists really spoke and wrote only about observable variation within type, there would be no creation/evolution controversy. But as you know, textbooks, teachers, and television documentaries insist on extrapolating from simple variation within type to the wildest sorts of evolutionary changes. And, of course, as long as they insist on such extrapolation, creationists will point out the limits to such change and offer creation instead as the most logical inference from our observations. All we have ever observed is what evolutionists themselves call "subspeciation" (variation within type), never "transspeciation" (change from one type to others).

In *Darwin on Trial* at page 151, Professor Johnson, from his perspective as an expert in the fields of evidence and logic, commented as follows on this tactic of unlimited extrapolation which is used so often by evolutionists:

> Their most important device is the deceptive use of the vague term "evolution."
>
> "Evolution" in Darwinist usage implies a completely naturalistic metaphysical system, in which matter evolved to its present state of organized complexity without any participation by a Creator. But "evolution" also refers to much more modest concepts, such as microevolution and biological relationship. The tendency of dark moths to preponderate in a population

when the background trees are dark therefore demonstrates evolution – and also demonstrates, by semantic transformation, the naturalistic descent of human beings from bacteria.

If critics are sophisticated enough to see that population variations have nothing to do with major transformations, Darwinists can disavow the argument from microevolution and point to relationship as the "fact of evolution." Or they can turn to biogeography, and point out that species on offshore islands closely resemble those on the nearby mainland. Because "evolution" means so many different things, almost any example will do. The trick is always to prove one of the modest meanings of the term, and treat it as proof of the complete metaphysical system.

The stability of the different kinds of life is in perfect harmony with creation. But it is in direct conflict with evolution. God is a Creator of order, not chaos.

FOSSILS

Evolutionists said the reason the different kinds of life appear to be so stable and we have never been able to see any new kind of life being formed, is that evolution happens too slowly to be observed. Evolution requires millions and even billions of years. Therefore the only place to see evidence of the different kinds of life being formed is in the fossil record.

A fossil is any remains or traces of plant or animal life preserved in the rock formations of the earth's crust. The fossils, according to evolutionists, were deposited over the same billions of years that evolution was taking place, and thus would give us the record of all the different kinds of life as they developed from common ancestors. Paleontology (the

study of fossils) would surely provide conclusive proof of evolution. Again evolutionists were to experience bitter disappointment.

Billions of fossils have been found, and if evolution did happen, certainly the evidence would be found here. In fact, for many years evolutionists claimed the fossil record did prove evolution, and fooled the public and even many scientists into thinking the evidence was there. Sir Fred Hoyle's comment on this is interesting. Hoyle, page 41:

> Undoubtedly one of the greatest scoops of the propagandists supporting Darwin immediately after publication of *The Origin* was to persuade not only the public, but even very competent scientists in fields other than biology and geology, that the fossil record supported the theory almost to the point of giving proof of its correctness. Yet the situation was quite otherwise, as Darwin himself recognized, since he devoted an entire chapter of *The Origin* to "the imperfection of the fossil record'."

It is true that fossils are generally found in groups of the same kind. Evolutionists say this is because the simpler forms lived earlier and left fossils and then died out and more complex forms came later and their fossils are found in higher layers. They have identified 12 major rock systems and have constructed a "geologic column" with the simple forms of life at the bottom.

Although this geologic column is widely reproduced in textbooks and museums, there are many problems with it. No where in the world is the complete column found. It is constructed in the minds of geologists from rock layers found in different parts of the world. In some places the so-called older layers are

found on top of younger layers. Some layers contain "misplaced fossils" – that is, kinds of life found in rock layers that supposedly were laid down millions of years before that kind of life evolved. So called "polystratic fossils" are found – that is, fossils in a vertical position and extending through more than one rock layer – layers supposed to be millions of years apart.

Creationists say all this fossil arrangement is explained by the fact that different kinds of life live in different ecological zones, and thus their fossils are found in different groups even though they may all have lived at or near the same time. Furthermore, fossils are not formed by gradual deposition, but by sudden catastrophe such as a great flood or a volcanic eruption. This explains why fossils are sometimes misplaced and are sometimes found in a vertical position.

But the most striking characteristic of the fossil record is the absence of all the billions of intermediate forms that Darwin's theory calls for. If, as Darwin claimed, all living things gradually evolved from common ancestors, then billions of fossils should have been left of all those transitional forms – from invertebrates to vertebrates; from fish to reptiles; from reptiles to birds; etc. But they are not there. All of the billions of fossils that have been found are of distinct kinds.

Denton, page 162:

> Despite the tremendous increase in geological activity in every corner of the globe and despite the discovery of many strange and hitherto unknown forms, the infinitude of connecting links has still not been discovered and the fossil record is about as discontinuous as it was when Darwin was writing the Origin. The inter-

> mediates have remained as elusive as ever and their absence remains, a century later, one of the most striking characteristics of the fossil record.
>
> It is still, as it was in Darwin's day, overwhelmingly true that the first representatives of all the major classes of organisms known to biology are already highly characteristic of their class when they make their initial appearance in the fossil record.

Perhaps the most stunning blow a lawyer can receive is to have his star witness take the stand and testify for the other side. The fossil record has dealt just such a blow to evolution. If real visible evidence of evolution was to be found anywhere, it was to be in the fossil record. But it is not there. Instead the fossils reveal the sudden appearance of all the different kinds of life. The fossils testify in favor of creation.

NO SATISFACTORY MECHANISM FOR EVOLUTION

Under the right conditions it is possible for natural selection to occur. As with the peppered moths, natural selection can favor certain traits and cause that trait to predominate. But natural selection does not produce the different traits. It simply works to eliminate or suppress those traits that are less desirable. What produces the different traits upon which natural selection can operate?

One proposed mechanism for producing these different traits was Lamarckism. This was the theory that traits acquired by parents during their lifetime can be inherited by their children. Thus a wood cutter, who developed large arm muscles using the ax and saw, would have children with muscular arms. Repeated

experiments proved that is not true. Changes in the body cells do not affect the reproductive cells.

Darwin then turned to the chance variations which are found in any kind of life, as the mechanism producing the different traits upon which natural selection can work. But, as seen earlier, these proved to be all part of the same gene pool and, while selective breeding could sort through this gene pool to produce new varieties within the kind, it could not go beyond the gene pool to produce new kinds of life. Even more telling against this theory, is the fact that such a process would produce gradual change that would have been amply recorded in the fossils. Of course, the fossil record shows just the opposite – no such gradual change occurred.

Next evolutionists turned to mutations – random damage to the reproductive cells – as the mechanism producing the different traits upon which natural selection can work. However, the reproductive cells are incredibly complex – far more complex than any machine built by man – and just as it is unlikely that a hammer blow to a computer would improve it, so it is highly unlikely that random damage to reproductive cells would improve the offspring. Of course, actual experience proved that to be true. The unfortunate offspring produced by mutant genes usually die at birth or shortly thereafter, and almost never are better able to survive. Thus they provided nothing upon which natural selection could work.

Conceding that large or macro-mutations would not work, evolutionists contended that small or micro-mutations could make very small changes in the offspring that might be beneficial and thus could be preserved by natural selection and become the mecha-

nism for evolution. The first problem with this is that in order to produce a new kind of life, a long series of related mutations would be required. According to Morris and Parker, page 97, the odds against getting only 3 related mutations in a row are one in a billion trillion, and 3 related mutations wouldn't even make a good start toward producing a new kind of life.

And then there is still the fossil record. If new kinds of life were produced by a long series of micro-mutations, then the record of this would have to appear in the fossils – but it isn't there. Faced with this inconvenient truth, evolutionists have lately turned back to the unlikely mechanism of macro-mutations.

Morris and Parker, page 146:

> A new concept of evolution is outlined by Stephen Gould in *Natural History* for June-July, 1977, in an article titled "The Return of Hopeful Monsters." Gould, who teaches paleontology at Harvard, says, "The fossil record with its abrupt transitions offers no support for gradual change . . .". Then he goes on to propose that "Macroevolution proceeds by the rare success of these hopeful monsters, not by continuous small changes within populations."

This, the most recent of the evolutionary theories, is called "punctuated equilibrium." According to this theory, evolution proceeds by great leaps, with a whole new kind of life being suddenly produced by a macro-mutation, followed by long periods of equilibrium. But what an unlikely, absurd mechanism this is. Imagine the odds against hitting a computer a mighty blow with a sledge hammer and thereby turning it into a color television. Such odds would be insignificant compared to the odds against inflicting accidental damage to the reproductive cells of a reptile and

thereby causing it to produce a bird. Then imagine the odds against such a thing happening twice within a short period, for if the hopeful monster is to reproduce there must be two of them, one who just happened to be a male and another that just happened to be a female hopeful monster.

Why do highly educated scientists even consider such far-fetched theories? Because, if secular humanism is to remain a viable religion, it must have evolution. The fossil record shows only distinct kinds of life. The transitional forms, the "missing links" envisioned by Darwin, are not there. The fossils support creation. God created the different kinds of life, male and female created He them. It takes a far-fetched theory to get around that truth. The complete failure of evolutionists to come up with a reasonable mechanism for evolution, is telling evidence against evolution.

INSTINCTS

Instincts are a real problem for evolution. Hundreds of strange behavior patterns exhibited by living creatures have defied explanation on evolutionary grounds.

Consider, for example, the Indian tailor bird that makes its nest from two leaves by punching holes in the edges and sewing them together with cotton fibers. Or the little water spider who lives in a diving bell made of silk. She breaths air and supplies her diving bell home by bringing down bubbles of air from the surface. How could natural selection teach such things as these? How many baby birds fell to the

ground and how many baby spiders drowned while their parents were slowly learning the correct techniques? Or are we to suppose that some random damage to the reproductive cells suddenly endowed birds and spiders with such knowledge as this?

The impossibility of explaining instincts by natural means, is one of the reasons that Sir Alister Hardy concluded that evolution must be guided by some spiritual force. He cited examples even more strange than those above.

Hardy, page 225:

> It concerns a little free-living freshwater flatworm called Microstomum which has only a very simple nervous system. It stores in the surface layer of its body the nematocysts or stinging-capsules which have been produced by cells in the body of the polyp Hydra upon which it feeds simply in order to obtain weapons to use for its own defense. When Microstomum has sufficient nematocysts it will no longer attack Hydra even if it is starving. When the hydra tissues have been digested, the nematocysts which so remarkably have not been discharged, are picked up by cells lining the stomach, the endoderm, and passed through to cells of the inner tissue, the so-called parenchyma; these cells, like wandering amoebae, now carry the nematocysts to the outer skin, the epidermis, where they are arranged and turned into position ready to fire the stinging threads like so many guns mounted ready to counter any attack.

How did this little flatworm learn that it could live a safer life by arming itself with stinging capsules from a hydra? How did it learn how to eat the hydra without setting off the stingers? How did the wandering cells inside the flatworm learn how to pick-up the stingers and transport them to the outer skin, arrange them

where they were needed and aim them in the right direction? Clearly such behavior could not have developed gradually through natural selection. Until fully perfected, it would have had no survival value – in fact just the opposite.

Could this be the result of a macro-mutation? Could random damage to the genes that control development of the nervous system have resulted in a flatworm with all these skills? That is like asking if you could program into a computer the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* by hitting it with a hammer. But that is not the only problem evolutionists have. Sir Alister Hardy described elaborate instinctive behavior by sponges, which are animals that have no nervous system at all. (Hardy, page 226) How can a mutation change the nervous system of an animal that has no nervous system?

Countless examples of strange and wonderful instinctive behavior could be cited. How God has made animals, birds, fish, worms, spiders, sponges and single cells behave the way they do, we do not know. But we can see that God, in His wisdom, made these instincts so strange, so wonderful, so bizarre, that no reasonable person could believe they are the accidental result of evolution. Truly, as the inspired Apostle Paul wrote, atheists are "without excuse" (Rom. 1:20).

HOMOLOGY

Homology refers to parts of different kinds of life that are corresponding in type of structure, as the wing of a bat and the foreleg of a mouse are considered to be homologous. Evolutionists claim that all

these similar structures prove descent from a common ancestor. Creationist argue that it simply shows design by the same Designer. They say it is logical that creatures created to live in the same environment would have similar organs, that is, similar lungs to breath the same air, etc.

For many years evolutionists regarded homology as one of their best arguments. Many charts were made showing just how arms, front legs, wings, and flippers all came from the same common ancestor. Evolutionists were sure that as we learned more about the make-up of our bodies, the more homologous relationships we would find. But again they were doomed to disappointment. Problems began to arise as biologists learned more about genetics:

Hardy, pages 211 – 212:

> When I was an undergraduate student just after the First World War, and indeed when I was a professor in the '30's, it all seemed so obvious. The same homologous structures must clearly be due to the same hereditary factors handed on generation after generation from the early ancestor with occasional changes by mutation; the wide variety of form seen in different animal groups being due to natural selection acting upon these factors or genes which were handed on, with mutational changes, from the original ancestral form. . . . In truth we can no longer say that homologous structures are always due to the same – homologous – genes, however modified by mutation, handed on in the process of descent. Any animal structure we are looking at is produced by the combined effects of a particular gene-complex and the influence of the environment in which the animal develops; and we now find that what we have been calling homologous structures are often produced by the action of quite different genes.

In other words, the "scientific fact", taught in biology classrooms, that arms, front legs, wings, flippers, etc., are all due to the same hereditary factors handed down from a common ancestor, proved to be little more than wishful thinking when it turned out that such structures may be produced by quite different genes. But more serious problems for evolution were yet to come. With the development of the new science of molecular biology, evolutionists were confident that here at last they would find strong evidence of evolutionary relationships. Once again they were doomed to disappointment:

Denton, pages 277 – 278:

> On the other hand, the new molecular approach to biological relationships could have provided very strong, if not irrefutable, evidence supporting evolutionary claims. Armed with this new technique, all that was necessary to demonstrate an evolutionary relationship was to examine the proteins in the species concerned and show that the sequences could be arranged into an evolutionary series. . . . The prospect of finding sequences in nature by this technique was, therefore, of great potential interest. Where the fossils had failed and morphological considerations were at best only ambiguous, perhaps this new field of comparative biochemistry might at last provide objective evidence of sequence and of the connecting links which had been so long sought by evolutionary biologists.
>
> However, as more protein sequences began to accumulate during the 1960s, it became increasingly apparent that the molecules were not going to provide any evidence of sequential arrangements in nature, but were rather going to reaffirm the traditional view that the system of nature conforms fundamentally to a highly ordered hierarchic scheme from which all direct evidence for evolution is emphatically absent.

Dr. Denton, speaking from the perspective of his specialty, molecular biology, reached this conclusion:

Denton, pages 290 – 291:

> There is little doubt that if this molecular evidence had been available one century ago it would have been seized upon with devastating effect by the opponents of evolution theory like Agassiz and Owen, and the idea of organic evolution might never have been accepted.
>
> This new era of comparative biology illustrates just how erroneous is the assumption that advances in biological knowledge are continually confirming the traditional evolutionary story. There is no avoiding the serious nature of the challenge to the whole evolutionary framework implicit in these findings.

Thus the whole study of homology and comparative anatomy, once thought to be strong evidence in favor of evolution, has now proven to be very strong evidence against evolution.

CONCLUSION

Other evidence against evolution could be presented, but the eight lines of evidence presented in chapters six and seven are probably the most important. These are all based on established scientific law and actual scientific observation and discovery. These eight lines of evidence are:

1. Evolution's direct conflict with the First Law of Thermodynamics.
2. Evolution's direct conflict with the Second Law of Thermodynamics.
3. The practical impossibility of spontaneous generation of life.

4. The stability of the basic kinds of life.

5. The absence of intermediate forms in the fossil record.

6. The lack of a satisfactory mechanism for evolution.

7. The inability of evolution to explain complicated instinctive behavior.

8. The absence of homologous relationships between different kinds of life.

Brief mention should be made of two arguments that were formerly used in support of evolution – the recapitulation theory and the vestigial organs theory. Both of these arguments were based on erroneous data, and are no longer used by knowledgeable evolutionists.

Morris and Parker, page 6:

> The old arguments for evolution based on the recapitulation theory (the idea that embryonic development in the womb recapitulates the evolution of the species) and vestigial organs ("useless" organs believed to have been useful in an earlier stage of evolution) have long been discredited.

In the final chapter of his book, Dr. Denton, compares the tenacity with which evolutionists defend their theory, with that of the medieval astronomers who believed that the Earth was the center of the universe. As the evidence piled up against them, these astronomers, instead of considering that their theory might be wrong, kept trying to explain the new evidence by modifying the theory until it became "a fantastically involved system entailing a vast and ever-growing complexity of epicycles."

So it is with modern evolutionists. As the evidence

mounts against them, they refuse to consider the alternative of creation, and instead devise ever more bizarre theories to explain away the obvious facts. The tragedy is that the general public is not informed of all the evidence against evolution. In fact, evolutionists have repeatedly gone to court to keep such evidence out of our public schools, and millions of people continue to believe that Darwin's theory is scientific fact.

Why do respectable scientists persist in this deception? Like the medieval astronomers, some are probably incapable of setting aside all they have been taught and accepting a wholly different way of thinking. But the basic cause is that set out at John 3:19; they refuse to come to the light because they love the darkness. They want to escape from God.

Study Questions

1. Since neither evolution or creation is a scientific law, how can we determine which is a reasonable faith and which is a blind faith?
2. What means did God provide to enable plants and animals to adapt to changing environments?
3. Explain why natural selection is not the same as evolution.
4. If evolution really happened, why should the fossil record provide the best evidence for it?
5. What is the most striking characteristic of the fossil record and why is this strong evidence against evolution?
6. Why are macro-mutations such a poor mechanism for evolution?
7. Why have evolutionists nevertheless been forced

to turn back to macro-mutations?

8. Why are instincts a difficult problem for evolution?

9. What effect has the new science of molecular biology had upon the evolutionary claim of homologous relationships between different kinds of life?

10. Why do millions of people still cling to the evolutionary faith?