

Comparing Creation and Evolution

edited by Paul G. Humber

This document may be copied and distributed free of charge.

It was compiled by various persons who believe that true science and biblical Christianity go hand in hand.

We often hear in the secular media, as well as in many non-Christian religious arenas, that man is basically good and that this goodness can be encouraged and promoted until the world is at peace and all is harmonious. This point of view denies the God of the Bible and His Word of truth about our true condition as sinners. Increasingly, today, the idea of humanism — that man is the determiner of right and truth — is being taught in the media, in our public schools, and even in some churches claiming to be Christian. Along with this humanist approach, we then find that abortion suddenly becomes a “right” for a woman, and even that religious objections to this are said to be based on religious myths and outdated ideas.

Evolutionism

The religiously believed philosophy of evolutionism — the idea that all forms of life on earth are the result of changes, beginning with an original cell, which just happened to come together to form the diversity of life — follows directly from humanism. Evolutionary ideas stretch beyond the origin of life and its many variations, declaring that the universe itself originated in an unexplained sudden expansion billions of years ago, and that this sudden expansion resulted in galaxies, including our own, and eventually resulted in life itself. Thus, even our consciousness and our ideas of right and wrong, good and evil, are said to be the result of an accident, or a series of accidents, which took place over enormous amounts of time. This not only denies the God of the Bible and the messages of creation and redemption and accountability to Him, it denies any supernatural intelligence.

Theistic evolution

Theistic evolutionists try to combine humanistic evolution and what God says. They say God “did it through evolution.” God certainly could have done it that way, but the fact is He says He didn’t. Genesis records six days of Creation — the creation of various “kinds” of life supernaturally, separately, and only capable of reproducing “after their own kinds.” The two ideas — evolution and creation by God — are at odds with each other. In order to intermingle them, you must fudge important aspects of one and / or the other. Thus, theistic evolutionists find themselves in a position of needing to believe

current secular evolutionary thought to an extent that requires ignoring or re-interpreting God’s Word, the Bible.

Twenty-Two Points

In order to assist those who wisely believe that God knows how to communicate and means what He says, the following points may be noted about creation vs. evolution. They offer a brief overview of the listed topics, not a detailed explanation. While the list could be expanded both in number and in detail, we believe that this discussion will be important and helpful to the concerned Christian.

1. **For and Against:** Either matter was created or it is eternal. Christians believe God created matter. Humanists believe that matter, after evolving its own intelligence, “created” God. These views are dichotomies. Thus, any argument against one of these views is an argument for the other. Similarly, creation itself is either the result of intelligence or it is not. The theory of evolution (as described in textbooks and the scientific literature) argues for a non-intelligent cause and process. Creation, in any form (there are non-Christian forms of creation beliefs), argues for an intelligent cause and process.
2. **Fossil Record:** The fossil record is a record of things that have died. Relationships between fossils are determined in one of two ways. Either they are based on the idea that the fossils are so close to being alike that we believe they are the same sort of plant or animal, or they are based on preexisting ideas about the relationships, which, in turn, also pre-determines the conclusions. We often read about this or that “transitional” (in-between) form bridging the gap between one kind of organism and another. It is important to remember that the transitional forms that have been found are only transitional because they are declared to be so. We have no evidence that they are not simply another “kind” of plant or animal.

For instance, if someone who had never seen a bat were to look at a fossilized bat, they might easily declare that this was a transitional form between birds and mammals! But we know that bats are contemporary and highly specialized creatures, and are not transitional forms of any kind. The same thing happens with fossils. We make numerous assumptions anytime we see a fossil and then declare it to be, for example, “transitional” between birds

and dinosaurs, or between fish and reptiles.

The reality is that a “transitional” form, like beauty, is in the eye of the beholder. People tend to see what they want to see, and the theory of evolution, after all, demands transitional forms. Thus, some discoveries are declared “transitional” and heralded loudly in the press. When a fossil’s “transitional” status is retracted, however, it is often done very quietly, with little or no press coverage. An excellent example of this is “Lucy,” which was heralded so loudly during the 1970’s and 1980’s as a key transition of human evolution and undeniable proof that humans had “evolved.” During the 1990’s, though, many evolutionists, including one of her discoverers, quietly began removing “Lucy” from the human evolutionary tree (See: *Science*, 1996, Vol. 272, p. 654 and *National Geographic*, 1996, March, p. 96). Thus, all the hyperbole gives the impression that a great many transitional forms have been found. The truth is far different. (See: http://palaeo-electronica.org/2002_1/editor/icon.htm)

3. **Genetic Stability (Stasis):** The fossil record reveals distinct kinds of plants and animals with no evolutionary connection to each other. Because of these gaps in the fossil record, there have been a number of theories proposed to explain them while still holding to evolution. “Punctuated equilibrium” is the idea that evolutionary changes happened very quickly in small, isolated populations, leaving no fossil record. The fossil record itself, however, is very much in accord with what we read in the Bible: plants and animals were created according to “kind.” (For additional help, see www.arn.org/arnproducts/books/b021om.htm.)

4. **Simple vs. Complex:** Evolutionists must declare that the earliest life forms were quite simple, and that time and some mysterious evolutionary process has led to the complexity and variety of living things we see on the Earth today. However, the concept of “simple to complex” is, itself, a misleading simplicity. When he proposed his “theory,” Darwin, reflecting the scientific knowledge of his day, considered the cell to be a sort of little “blob.” We now know that the “simplest” of all cells possesses a bewildering intricacy and sophistication. In this single cell, thousands of proteins interact in specific and orderly ways in a protected environment. Nutrients are taken in, broken down, used, and waste expelled. Even

bacterial cells exist in a complex community where they react to their environment, communicate with each other, and replicate in a chain of events we still don't completely understand. There is nothing simple about *any* cell. There was nothing simple about any cell at any time. And, yet, a cell is the "simplest" form of life we can find! So the idea of "simple to complex" fails to acknowledge that even the "simple" is still more elaborate and sophisticated than any feats of human engineering.

5. Complex vs. Simple: Evolutionists sometimes try to go in the opposite direction. They speak of the "complexity" of a snowflake or a tornado in an attempt to show that natural processes can produce "complexity." Biologically speaking, there is a huge difference between the complexity of a cellular system and the complexity of a snowflake or a tornado. This is an area of potential confusion that evolutionists have found they can readily exploit if they use enough fancy-sounding words and "pretend" that the same natural process that formed a snowflake could form a cell. Neither snowflakes nor tornados can take up specific nutrients, break them down to use for energy, replicate themselves, communicate with other snowflakes or tornados, or form the complex biological communities that cells do. Snowflakes are beautiful, tornados are powerful, but they are not living and they do not even begin to approach the intricate complexity of cells.

6. Only One (All-Inclusive) Human Race: Many illustrations of human "evolution" have shown the darker-skinned people as emerging from the ape-line first, and the lighter-skinned humans being the actual final products of evolution (even as recently as *National Geographic*, Nov. 1985, pp. 574-7). In line with this reasoning, evolution can be held responsible for many of the horrors of racist ideas that existed in the late nineteenth and into the twentieth centuries, and even until now.

It was not so long ago that darker-skinned people were considered not yet fully human in the evolutionary sequence. Referring to Darwin's, *On the Origin of Species...*, Stephen Jay Gould wrote, "Biological arguments for racism may have been common before 1859, but they increased by orders of magnitude following the acceptance of evolutionary theory" (Stephen Jay Gould, *Ontogeny and Phylogeny*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1977, p. 127).

Hitler also is known to have adopted evolutionary ideas to support genocide and the concept of the promotion of a superior (white) race of men and women. The underlying evolutionary thinking becomes very clear in his book, *Mein Kampf*, where this evil ruler spoke of "lower human types." He criticized the Jews for bringing "Negroes into the Rhineland" with the aim of "ruining the white race by the nec-

essarily resulting bastardization." He spoke of "Monstrosities halfway between man and ape" and lamented the fact of Christians going to "Central Africa" to set up "Negro missions," resulting in the turning of "healthy ... human beings into a rotten brood of bastards." In his chapter entitled "Nation and Race," he said, "The stronger must dominate and not blend with the weaker, thus sacrificing his own greatness. Only the born weakling can view this as cruel, but he, after all, is only a weak and limited man; for if this law did not prevail, any conceivable higher development of organic living beings would be unthinkable." A few pages later, he said, "Those who want to live, let them fight, and those who do not want to fight in this world of eternal struggle do not deserve to live."

But as real science has discovered that all humans are genetically the same species and all can successfully marry and have children across "racial" lines, evolutionists have retreated from the idea that skin color determines how far up or down the evolutionary ladder one might be. This is also their conclusion based on the need for "political correctness." The conclusion that all men are human from the start, however, can be found in the Bible: "He made from one, every nation of mankind to live on all the face of the earth" (Acts 17:26). We all come from one set of parents. (For additional help, see *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal* 13(2): 101-111, 1999 and www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-164.htm.)

7. Four Basics: The theory of evolution depends on four things being true: enormous amounts of time, fortuitous chances, specific types of mutations, and natural selection. None of these four events supports evolution at all.

Time results in things breaking down. Decay is a natural process of time, and time alone has never been shown to have any other effect. Time certainly has no capacity to organize or integrate material in a functional manner. If you leave a bicycle out in the weather, it rusts and falls apart — it does not become an automobile.

Chance is an argument proven wrong time and again. There is no valid reason to suggest that a blind, natural process (i.e., chance) could ever produce something as complex as the "simple" cell. In his book *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, molecular biologist Michael Denton asked whether it was "really credible that random processes could have constructed a reality [that] ... is complex beyond our own creative capacities, a reality that is the very antithesis of chance, which excels in every sense anything produced by the intelligence of man?" (p. 342).

Mutations, or changes in the genetic content of organisms, especially with respect to the higher order of animals, are almost always detrimental, and often lethal. While some mutations (especially in the plant and microbial

world) may prove "beneficial" under certain conditions, changing those conditions usually renders the "benefit" almost useless. In fact, populations of organisms often oscillate between various forms as environmental conditions change — a wonderful testimony to the adaptive design within all living things. In general, mutations are either neutral (i.e., no change in cellular activity) or they reduce or eliminate a pre-existing cellular activity, such as loss of transport systems, regulatory systems, enzyme specificity, etc.

However, this is the opposite of what is required by evolution (specifically "common descent"). Rather, to account for all the diversity of life, evolution requires mutations that account for the origin of these specific cellular activities. Despite hundreds of examples of mutations in a wide variety of species, there is no unambiguous example of a mutation that fulfills this requirement. And, if such an exception were found, it would be just that — a rare exception. This is not a reasonable basis for an entire theory of biological development and diversity.

Natural Selection fits very nicely within a creation model. What Darwin did was to assume that this "selection" process would drive a "building" process, whereby organisms that did not possess the ability to walk would be pressured into developing such an ability, or whereby organisms that did not possess the ability to fly would be pressured into developing that ability. As such, natural selection was given a capability it never did possess — the ability to generate or create something. All natural selection can do is select among the features that are already present in the biological world. It acts as a weeding-out system, not a development system. If enough genetic "information" is eliminated from the gene pool, a new trait or feature may emerge (e.g., dog breeds), but this is only if such features and traits were initially within the gene pool. These concepts were first stated by William Blyth, a creationist, not Charles Darwin. (See: www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-283.htm)

8. Variation is Not Evolution: Evolutionists have attempted to prove their case by mixing up two different processes under the term of "evolution." The first is variation. We see variation everyday. Puppies and kittens are all born with individual differences in their size, coloring, and personalities. In fact, we know that sometimes these differences can be huge. Would someone looking at the fossil record think that both Chihuahuas and Great Danes were the same species or that they lived at the same time? Perhaps not. But they are. We can see some remarkable variations within certain kinds of organisms, but we still recognize them as dogs, horses, cats — or people. We know Pygmies and Zulus and Germans and Chinese are all human beings — just different

varieties.

Because the word “evolution” is often defined simply as “change” or “change over time,” evolutionists point to these variations within kinds as the sort of changes which, when accumulated and selected by “nature,” have resulted in the common evolutionary descent of all life. But, such evolutionary descent (*e.g.*, the supposed evolution of fish to human) requires much more than simply “variation.” It requires massive changes in body-type, biochemistry, and behaviors.

It is a false argument to point to the small variations we see on a daily basis, and then claim that this proves the evolution of a one-celled organism into ferns, people, elephants, butterflies, and oak trees. In fact, as mentioned under point #7, only specific types of changes are required to accomplish the claims of evolutionists. Expression of genes already present, or mutations that eliminate functions already present, are not the types of changes required by evolution. Yet, such changes are constantly offered by evolutionists as examples of how evolution proceeds.

9. **Dino Bones Not that Old:** There is now strong evidence that some things presumed to be millions of years old by evolutionists are not that old. One good example is non-fossilized dinosaur bones. The evidence suggests they are not very old at all, since they have not undergone enough decay to be millions of years old. (See: www.answersingenesis.org/Home/Area/Magazines/docs/v14n3_dino.asp)

10. **Living Fossils:** Many life forms, once thought by evolutionists to be extinct, have been found alive, healthy today and virtually unchanged. Coelacanths, for example, were thought to have become extinct 60 million years ago, but they live today! Another example is the Wollemi pines in Australia, which appear to be genetic clones of each other. Evolutionists scramble quickly to invent new explanations. Under the guise of “science always corrects itself,” they have to resort to ever more inventive explanations to keep evolution alive, despite the mounting evidence against it. So what we end up with is the explanation that, while some populations of Coelacanth survived unchanged, others, in other environments, changed drastically and evolved into other forms of life. The lack of genetic changes in the Wollemi pines, which are supposed to be millions of years old as a species, has no evolutionary explanation. However, it is fully consistent with creation. (See: www.creationresearch.org/creation_matters/98/cm9803.html)

11. **Going Up or Down?** It is a general observation that all non-living things tend to degenerate, but this is also true of living systems. At best, they fulfill the potential of the genetic code passed down to them from their

ancestors; then they age or succumb to attack, accident, disease, or accumulated injuries. This supports the concept that everything is on a general path of degeneration from a higher state of organization, which was initially provided by an act of intelligent creation. Degeneration and evolutionary advances are opposing concepts.

12. **Cave Men:** The Neanderthal is often presented as a “pre-human” creature; however, there is mounting evidence that the Neanderthal was just as human as we are. They were simply a variation of human being in the same way that the Pygmy or Zulu is. Their brains were as large or larger than ours, and the evidence that they were intelligent beings is showing up in a variety of places. It might also be pointed out that the book of Job describes humans who lived in very difficult circumstances and dwelt in caves at least part of the time (Job 24:2-12 and Job 30:1-8). The evidence of “cave men” in the Bible is quite clear, but the reason for their mode of living is one of degeneration — not evolution.

13. **Religion / Science Harmony:** The idea of a conflict between religion and science is a product of the evolutionary mind. There is no conflict between the facts of nature and the revealed truth of the Bible. The conflict arises from the evolutionary interpretation of nature and its facts — an interpretation designed to eliminate the need for God and to relegate Him either to non-existence, or to impotence after the first moment of creation.

To the contrary, the design and complexity of everything we see in creation cries out, as Paul wrote to the Romans, about not only the reality of God, but also about His eternal power and divine nature, which many choose to ignore, preferring a lie (“For although they knew God, they neither glorified Him as God nor gave thanks to Him, but their thinking became futile and their foolish hearts were darkened;” see Romans 1:18ff).

Moreover, many of the founders of the scientific disciplines were Christian creationists not just by default, but as devoted believers. There are many hundreds, perhaps thousands of scientists today who also are Christian creationists, contrary to what the evolutionists would have us believe.

14. **Atheistic Bias:** Science is traditionally affirmed to be the knowledge and study of that which can be discovered and examined by man; *viz.*, natural phenomena. Thus, it is difficult to know how to deal with the non-natural. There have been attempts, for example, to discern the benefits of prayer on healing. But, in general, we have been left with two choices: 1) to admit that limitations exist and that science finds it difficult to measure the supernatural; or 2) to deny even the possibility of causes or influences which are not natural. Scientists today, for the

most part, have chosen the second option, essentially denying that there are any supernatural causes or influences, outside of nature itself, which affect nature.

This is, however, irrational thinking. If we see a painting of a flower, we know there was a painter who painted it. Evolutionary science, however, denies that any supernatural agency or intelligent designer could have formed the actual flower, itself, which is much more detailed and complex than a painting could ever be. Rationality would demand that if the painting had a painter, the actual flower must have had a Creator / Designer. While William Paley’s classic “watchmaker” argument for design has been widely rejected, it has never been discredited. (See M. Denton. 1985 *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, pp.316, 339-341.)

A modern application of Paley’s argument would be that the existence of a computer demands a computer designer, and the existence of a computer program demands a computer programmer. No one would seriously suggest that either a computer or the software it utilizes could ever be the result of random chemical reactions or natural processes, or random typing upon the keyboard. Yet, evolutionists maintain that living systems, which are far more sophisticated and intricate than even the most sophisticated computers, are merely a product of blind, natural processes. This *is* irrational thinking that contradicts all of our observations and experiences.

15. **Sexual Reproduction:** The presence of two different sexes is a puzzle for evolutionists. Single-celled organisms reproduce by dividing or budding. Each “daughter” cell is exactly like the “parent.” So where did the male / female difference come from? Genetically, this male / female difference helps control, usually by elimination, the presence of persistent mutations in a population — the very mutations needed for evolution to continue. So the advent of sexual reproduction evolutionarily is a real dilemma for which evolutionists have no satisfactory explanation. The Bible is clear that human beings were made male and female from the beginning. Although it may not state explicitly the same for animals, the fact that these animals are identified as beasts and birds and fish, also from the beginning, is a strong indication that they, too, were male and female from the beginning.

16. **Complex Relationships:** When we look at nature, from any vantage point in our world, we see truly complex relationships among various living things. For example, plants require insects for fertilization, animal populations are kept in check by a predator / prey relationship, and ants “farm” and “milk” aphids, which live on plants. Food chains are not simple chains but can be very complex. Some life forms are parasitic of others, and some depend on others

for their existence, even though they are not parasites. Evolution declares that each of these complex relationships developed accidentally through time, although they have little basis for explanations of how. Yet, for evolution to make its continual and oft repeated claim of being the unifying “theory” of biology, it must account for such relationships. On the other hand, such complex “inter-species” relationships can be readily understood within a creation framework.

17. **Biased Molecules:** All cells are made up of thousands of large molecules (macromolecules), which are made up of long strings of amino acids, sugars, and other smaller molecules. There are different ways that amino acids and sugars can be formed. However, all living things require a special form of amino acid, called “left-handed,” and a special form of sugar, called “right-handed.” In nature, both right- and left-handed amino acids and sugars are formed. Yet, letting one right-handed amino acid into a protein or one left-handed sugar into DNA/RNA is like throwing in a broken gear.

Evolutionary thinking declares that these left-handed amino acids and right-handed sugars came together fortuitously through time to form life. Yet, there is no known reason for this to have happened, nor is there a known environment in which it could have happened. Despite the numerous speculations offered by evolutionists, this problem still poses a major dilemma for any random, mechanistic origin of life.

Also, life is not simply having the right chemicals at the right time and place. Life is a series of intricate processes and interactions in which chemicals are involved. What is more, these processes of chemical actions are under specific control by the cell. Which came first, the chemical reactions or the cell’s necessary ability to control them? This series of processes, by its very nature, is strong evidence that living things were formed as an act of intelligent creation.

18. **Massive Great Wall:** The structure of the universe is such that astrophysicists have difficulty believing it could have been formed by any natural means. In 1989, a structure was found to be so enormous that it is 5,000 times wider than our galaxy, the Milky Way. The origin of this massively-sized structure (called “The Great Galactic Wall” by Margaret J. Geller and John P. Huchra of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics) cannot be accounted for by any known naturalist mechanisms. According to *Science* (November 17, 1989), the wall is so large that it could not have been built by gravitational attraction during the supposed 15 billion year age of the universe.

Then, in 1990, a survey, involving the Kitt Peak National Observatory in Arizona and the Anglo Australian Observatory in Australia, found that this structure was one of seven “great

galactic walls,” making the total structure 30,000 times larger than the Milky Way. The existence of such structures that defy evolutionary explanations clearly illustrates how much is not yet known about the universe, and how much care should be taken in offering other “evolutionary” explanations of astronomy. (See: www.creation.on.ca/cdp/articles/Lsu.html)

19. **Antibiotic Resistance:** Mutations can give bacteria a resistance to certain types of antibiotics. As such, evolutionists have frequently pointed to this phenomenon as a means of “seeing evolution in a Petri dish.” However, analyses of the mutations that produce this resistance suggest a much different conclusion. Instead, these mutations reduce or eliminate the binding affinity, regulatory function, or transport capacity of certain proteins. While these mutations provide the bacterium a resistance to certain antibiotics, they do so at the expense of these cellular functions.

Such mutations clearly provide variation within the bacterial population and, as such, fit nicely within a creation model. However, evolution claims to be an explanation for the *origin* of biological functions and diversity. Mutations that reduce or eliminate cellular functions cannot be offered as examples of how those functions “evolved” in the first place. In fact, (as discussed under #8) such mutations are the exact opposite of those required by evolution.

20. **Peppered Moths:** In 1848, apparently 98% of peppered moths in Britain were gray, the rest being black. When the Industrial Revolution put large amounts of soot on the trees, the light color became a liability to moths that lived on tree trunks. These moths were easily seen by birds, making them more likely to be eaten than the dark moths. Within 50 years, the population of gray moths decreased to 5%. However, the enforcement of various air pollution laws dramatically reduced the soot pollution, and gray moths once again predominated. This, however, is merely variation within species — a nice example of change in gene frequency, not evolution. No new organism, nor any new characteristic, came into existence. There were gray and black varieties in 1848, and there are gray and black varieties today.

More recently, the original study data have been challenged. First, the moths do not generally position themselves on tree trunks, so they would not have been such easy prey for birds. Second, the moths on tree trunks, pictured in textbooks, were artificially placed there for photographing. (See: J. Hooper. 2002. *Of Moths and Men: an Evolutionary Tale*. Norton Publishing, NY)

21. **Not Even a Theory:** Evolutionists boast that evolution is more than a theory, saying even that it is “a proven fact!” This is either hubris, delusion, or a lie. Evolution is a mere presup-

position; it hardly qualifies even as a theory. It certainly is not a proven fact.

Think for a moment about UFO’s. Some may believe that little green men are physically abducting people from the desert and transporting them elsewhere. If billions of dollars were being spent to promote this notion as verifiable science and most respected academicians were teaching it as truth, then it would not be surprising, given the dynamics of social peer pressure, that many people would adopt the UFO notion as true science. An irony exists, however. Even with the tremendous efforts of many academicians in promoting evolution and scorning the Bible, many Americans still are not persuaded of the evolutionary “presupposition.” Perhaps this is because it requires people to ignore all their experience and observation, such as life only comes from life and design requires a designer. Thus, accepting evolution’s claims may require too large a leap of faith for many people.

22. **Life Source:** A foundational fact of biology is the Biogenetic Law, which asserts that “life comes only from life.” Biologists have never observed a single exception to this truth. Prior to the germ theory of disease (proposed by Ignatz Semmelweis, and finally accepted following the work of Louis Pasteur in the 1860’s) it was believed that organisms generated spontaneously from nonliving matter. This was called “spontaneous generation” and accounted for the popularity of Darwin’s *Origin of Species*... (first published in 1859). However, no exceptions to either Pasteur’s conclusions or to the Law of Biogenesis have ever been demonstrated; and no mechanism or condition is known by which life could have arisen from non-life.

Humanistic evolutionists, on the other hand, *believe* that it is possible that the first life assembled itself from nonliving molecules (“spontaneous generation”). They have no proof for this; in fact it violates all known science. It is a blind leap of faith into the dark. By way of contrast, Christians believe that Jesus was and is the Source of all life and that He, along with the Father and Holy Spirit, is the Eternal One. He said, “I AM (the Greek is emphatic) ... the Life” (John 14:6).

Produced in cooperation with Skilton House Ministries, P.O. Box 1045, Glenside, PA 19038-6045.

Contributors: Harry Akers, Kevin Anderson, David Bradbury, Robert Gentet, Ed Garrett, David Harris, Paul Humber, Lane Lester, Ron Pass, Allen Roy, Dave Sack, Helen Setterfield, Curt Sewell, Doug Sharp, Laurence Tisdall, and Glen Wolfrom.

Paul G. Humber, Executive Director of Skilton House Ministries and faculty member of the University of Phoenix (Philadelphia Campus), served as editor, and may be contacted at humber@juno.com.

© 2003 Creation Research Society
www.creationresearch.org