

What About Evolution?

Many say human beings are the culmination of millions or even billions of years of evolution starting with a one-celled organism which gradually developed into higher forms of life. Through all of those years, one “kind” kept changing into a higher “kind” until finally there was a human being. Such a view is often promoted as a scientific truth. But, let’s examine some of the facts. Here are eight reasons not to believe that such a process produced animals and humans.

1. Because no evolution can be observed in our day.

If evolution occurred for millions of years with one “kind” evolving into a higher “kind” through a series of intermediate, transitional steps, then still all around us we should be able to see millions of creatures in those transitional stages. We should see in our world today those part-frog/part fish or part chimp/part human. But not a single such form is anywhere to be seen. Did this process go on for millions and millions of years and then suddenly stop as soon as humans evolved? If so, why? If not, then where are organisms for us to see which are in the process of becoming something “higher?” If we can observe no cases of one “kind” changing into another “kind” in our world today, then it is not the case that such a process was going on for millions of years and then suddenly stopped.

2. Because the fossil record does not support evolution.

Billions of fossils have been found and, if evolution were true, then among them there would certainly be millions of transitional creatures showing one “kind” in the process of evolving into another. After all, think how many transitional steps there would be between a one-celled organism and a human. Such forms, however, are not to be found. Even evolutionary paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould admitted in an article in *Paleobiology* (1980): “The absence of fossil evidence for intermediary stages between major transitions in organic design, indeed our inability, even in our imagination, to construct functional intermediates in many cases, has been a persistent and nagging problem for gradualistic accounts of evolution.” While evolutionists point to a few cases among fossils which they think might represent a transitional creature, the vast number of intermediate fossils which would certainly be found if evolution were true are nowhere to be found.

As evolutionists have tried to find the missing link between humans and chimps or ape-like creatures, they have put forth several cases which they claimed were part ape and part human. Unfortunately for the evolutionists, however, further study has shown

these to be false. The Piltdown Man, for example, which for years appeared in museums and in textbooks as a link between humans and apes, has now been found to be an intentional falsification by Richard Dawson. He connected a jawbone, some teeth, and part of a skull to “create” a human form which he called “Piltdown” because it came from that location in England. First presented in 1912, in 1953 it was discovered that the jawbone was from an orangutan and the skull from a small human. For generations, then, Piltdown Man was used to “prove” evolution, but it was a fake. It was no missing link at all. The Nebraska Man, also publicized for many years as the missing link, was developed from a tooth which turned out to be that of a pig. So again, not a form between apes or chimps and humans. A more recent case was “Lucy,” claimed to have been discovered in Ethiopia in 1974. Now it is recognized by most even in the evolutionary camp that Lucy is not a transitional figure between apes and humans but, rather, is likely composed of bones from two or three different creatures, none of which is human. Isn’t it strange that many world famous scientists keep being fooled by these frauds? In addition, scientists have now discovered that human DNA is different in important aspects from ape DNA. If, however, humans were descended from apes, then the DNA would show much greater similarity.

So, billions of fossils and among them not one conclusive case of one “kind” in the process of becoming a different “kind.” Instead of millions of fossil forms in the changing process, as would be the case if evolution were actually true, there is not even one case which conclusively shows one type of being becoming another. There are, of course, changes within a “kind” such as a beak growing longer or a change in a creature’s color, but no proof of one “kind” becoming a higher “kind.” While some of these “micro” changes are found in fossils, the intermediate transitions from one “kind” to another are not in the fossil record.

Just to be clear, minor changes within a “kind” are called “microevolution” or small evolution. Such changes do occur because there is built into each “kind” the capacity to adapt when in varying circumstances. “Macroevolution,” on the other hand, is a term to describe large evolution or transitions moving one “kind” into another “kind.” It is this type of evolution for which conclusive evidence does not exist.

Another factor in considering the fossil record is the Cambrian explosion. In the geological layer called the Cambrian, there suddenly appears a huge number of fossils representing a host of different creatures—in their fully developed and highly complex forms. The level below the Cambrian contains few fossils and certainly not prior forms of those creatures which suddenly appear in the Cambrian layer. This sudden appearance is, of course, not the way the evolution would have changed simpler “kinds” to more complex “kinds” through a process lasting millions of years. The

world-wide flood of Genesis 6 was the major depositor of the fossils in the Cambrian as indicated by the fact that the fossils of many sea creatures appear high on mountainsides. So, if the fossil record fossil does not show it, then evolution must not be true. And the fossil record does not show it.

3. Because evolution provides no satisfactory answer for how “nothing” became “something.”

Evolutionists must explain where the first cell came from which, they say, came the beginning of the evolutionary process. Since scientists generally agree the earth and its inhabitants have not always been here, there had to be a point of beginning. Two of the reasons we know there was a beginning are (1) because scientists know that energy moves from a more useful to a less useful state and if our system had always been here, we would be out of useful energy by now; (2) the sun is being used up and is decreasing in size so if it always been here, it would have been used up long ago.

So there was a beginning but, at that point, did “nothing” produce “something?” By what process would that be possible? Some evolutionists seek to answer their dilemma by saying that the substance to start the evolutionary process on earth came from outer space. Not only is there no proof of such an event, but that explanation still would not answer the original question of how did the first cell arise anywhere. Certainly no scientist has ever demonstrated producing something from nothing. So if something cannot come from nothing, then the evolutionary explanation does not work.

4. Because evolution provides no satisfactory answer for how non-life became life.

Even if there had been a primordial swamp, as some evolutionists use in their explanation, and this swamp produced a non-living cell, what evidence is there that a non-living cell could produce a living one. Many scientists over the years have sought to demonstrate how that could happen, but none of these many efforts to produce life from non-life has ever worked. If the greatest scientists in their sophisticated labs cannot produce life by using their vast knowledge and equipment, are we really to believe that life could appear from non-life entirely by chance? So if evolution cannot demonstrate how life could come from non-life, then it didn't actually happen.

5. Because evolution provides no satisfactory explanation for the process by which one “kind” can become another “kind.”

There are recognized types of animals—dogs, horses, elephants. An animal can reproduce with another of its own type, but cannot reproduce with a different “kind.” Within each “kind,” of course, lies the possibility of variations within that type. As mentioned above, this is called “microevolution,” and changes at this level can and do take place. Dogs, for example, can be bred to develop more or less fur, to have different

colors, or whatever breeders think makes a better looking dog, but dogs cannot reproduce with cats or rabbits or horses. So breeders can vary the size or color within a particular “kind,” but they cannot breed across the line between them. Sometimes a new type of butterfly or beetle is discovered, something that has not been seen before. Darwin found variations, for example, among the beaks of finches, but this does not prove one “kind” became another. It only shows that within a given “kind,” the possibility of adaptation is built in.

For evolution to be true, however, there would have to be a means by which reproduction could jump the “kind” barrier. Evolution’s explanation for this “process” is that a series of “mutations” transformed one “kind” into a “better kind.” Yet, there is no evidence of mutations in the past having changed one “kind” into another, and no scientist today can make that happen in the laboratory. And since mutations tend to produce less desirable rather than more desirable characteristics, this process is not a good explanation for such vast improvements as moving from a one-celled organism to the amazing functions of the human body and brain. In fact, not one mutation in a being’s DNA has been found to produce a better creature. Such mutations or mal-functions create problems rather than improvements: cancer, down-syndrome, sickle cell anemia, hemophilia, color blindness, birth defects, muscular dystrophy and cystic fibrosis. Since evolutionists cannot offer a suitable process for how a lower “kind” can become a higher “kind,” then they have not provided a satisfactory explanation for the evolutionary process and it should, therefore, be rejected.

6. Because the second law of thermodynamics shows that all systems tend toward disorder.

Everything in nature moves “downhill.” Things in nature do not move toward becoming better but worse; they move from more complex to less complex, from more functional to less functional. A human body, for example, does not grow better as it ages, but worse. In view of this law for which there are no known exceptions, how likely is it that an evolutionary process at work in nature would move from a one-celled organism with no capacity to move or think to becoming better and better until a complex human being came about? And think just of the huge jump just from apes or chimps to man. They cannot speak or write or do complex thinking. If, then, the second law of thermodynamics, which has been demonstrated in so many ways, is true, then the development of a lower being into a higher one could not have occurred.

7. Because everything in the universe shows intelligent design.

No one could imagine a watch or a car or an airplane or a computer coming into existence with no intelligence behind it. If we cannot imagine these objects coming about just by chance and without intelligent design, how, then, can we imagine the

human mind that made them coming entirely by chance? Picture the entire universe with its stars and galaxies operating according to fixed patterns and laws, as they do. Then ask, “Can something so far beyond human ability to produce or even to comprehend come into existence entirely by chance?” If a watch cannot happen by chance, then galaxies certainly cannot come about by chance. A great testimony to this truth came from a man who once was the world’s most renowned atheist, Oxford professor Anton Flew. Primarily because he recognized DNA’s complexity, Dr. Flew changed his mind and said “It is more likely that God exists uncaused than the universe [exists uncaused] (75, 144, *There is a God*, with Ray Varglese, 2007). Flew recognized that within a single cell, there is enough information to fill 1,000 volumes of an encyclopedia. His point was that many things about the universe, including DNA, are far too complex to have come into existence from nowhere with no intelligence designing them. So which is more likely, that human sight, hearing, and thinking came about through a powerful, intelligent being or that these amazing things came from nowhere entirely by chance?

8. Because the Bible says that God created everything.

The first chapter of Genesis says God created everything—the universe, the sun and moon, the earth, all the plants and animals, and, on the sixth day, two human beings with reproductive powers. Having seen that evolution does not provide a believable answer to where all beings came from, we turn, to a different possibility, the one presented in the Bible. It reports that everything came from an intelligence who has always existed and who alone has power to create something from nothing. As Dr. Flew said, it is easier to believe that an intelligent being has always existed than that all the elements of the carefully designed universe came into being from nothing and developed into their marvelous forms entirely by chance. Since the Bible has proven to be correct in so many things it tells about, it should not surprise us to find that its explanation for the origin of life and the beginning of the human race is the best possible answer. It says God created two grown human beings, a male and a female, and that from them came all other human beings. And Jesus agreed when he said that at the beginning God created them male and female (Matthew 19:4). In 1 Timothy 2:13-14, Paul speaks of Adam and the woman who sinned. So the Bible says that God began the human race by creating two fully-developed people. This scriptural account is far more in agreement with such matters as intelligent design and the fossil record than is evolution. The entire Bible story is built around its account that these two humans sinned which caused God to bring vast changes on the earth along with death for the humans he created for “in Adam all die” (1 Corinthians 15:22). If there were no Adam and Eve, then the entire basis for the Bible story would not exist.

Conclusion.

So eight reasons to believe the Bible account of creation. Genesis 1 says God created human beings by starting with two fully-formed and functioning humans and placing them in a created universe. An eternal, intelligent, and powerful force, which we call God, created this finely tuned universe and highly intelligent creatures. This plan is much more likely to be correct than that there was nothing and suddenly there was something and from that something, entirely by chance, came a living cell which over millions of years produced complex, thinking human beings. Since the evidence for such an evolutionary explanation is badly lacking, the biblical account is far more likely.

Jonathan Sarfati has written *Refuting Compromise* in which he takes many of the above thoughts into much greater detail.