

Study Guide #4: Evolution or Creation?

Introduction

In this Study Guide, we will examine the question of the development of living things. Do the scientific facts and logic point to the theory of evolution or to an instantaneous creation by God?

Question #1: What are the basic elements in the theory of evolution? And what do you believe about them?

Answer: The 2 basic elements in the theory of evolution are (1) genetic mutations and (2) natural selection. Evolutionists themselves have eliminated every mechanism except genetic mutations as the cause for new life forms eventually emerging. Within the context of genetic mutations, natural selection is the process of long struggle in which only the fittest organisms survive—known as the “survival of the fittest” principle. There is a major problem associated with each of these 2 processes. *First*, scientists admit that at least 90 percent of all mutations are harmful to an organism; some say as much as 99 percent. Entire bodies consist of billions of cells, and humans have trillions of cells. The problem is that long before a type of creature could experience a sufficient number of mutations to convert it into an entirely different type of creature, the creature would have become extinct from all the harmful mutations. In terms of natural selection, note that it operates on the principle of subtraction, not addition. It says nothing about new life forms eventually coming into existence, but only about the numerous deaths resulting from that principle.

Question #2: Does the Law of Entropy have anything to do with evolution?

Answer: The Law of Entropy, also called the Second Law of Thermodynamics, states that naturally all things, living and non-living, tend toward chaos, disorder, and death. Yet the theory of evolution says that all life forms move naturally from the simple to the complex, which is just the opposite of this natural law.

Question #3: How would the process of mutations have to work to explain evolution?

Answer: The principle of irreducible complexity states that a sufficient number of beneficial mutations would have to occur simultaneously to create all of the new body parts of a new bio system (e.g., circulatory system, neurological system). Then they would have to become attached to each other properly in order for the new bio system to function. This has been compared to all of the parts of a standard mouse trap, which would then have to be put together in such a way as to create a working mouse trap. Evolutionists respond by saying that each



Mouse Trap

mutated part either has no function before it becomes part of the new bio system, or it has a different function that disappears once it's connected to make a new bio system work. However, there are 2 key problems with the evolutionists' argument. *First*, it doesn't deal at all with the fact that the overwhelming percentage of mutations being harmful. *Second*, it doesn't address the issue of what mechanism exists to connect the mutated parts together in a way that makes it function as a new bio system.

Question #4: Can evolution explain how life began in the first place?

Answer: No. It's a self-evident truth that life comes from life, not from non-life. This truth has been confirmed billions of times and has never been falsified. But evolutionists insist that just the right mix of chemicals were zapped by some form of energy one day, and life simply came into being. Of course, where did the chemicals and the energy come from? Evolution cannot account for those building blocks. Often evolutionists refer to the Miller experiment in 1953 as proof that life can be created in a laboratory. An American biochemist, Dr. Stanley Miller, electrified a lab container of several gases then thought to be part of the earth's original atmosphere and created some amino acids. When the experiment was conducted many years later with different gases *then* thought to be in earth's original atmosphere, molecules of formaldehyde were created—a substance that destroys proteins. In neither case was life itself actually created. These experiments, far from creating life, proved that naturalistic means *cannot* create life.

Question #5: What does the fossil record tell us about the evolution of life?

Answer: If evolution were true, we should expect to find numerous examples of intermediate, or transitional, forms of life in the fossil record. These would be fossils of creatures who were in the middle of their evolution toward new life forms. But no such transitional fossils have been definitively found. Once in a while, a scientist will come along and claim he has discovered a transitional fossil, such as the



Lucy

discovery of "Lucy" in Ethiopia in 1974. In most cases, these discoveries only contain a fraction of the number of bones of a whole creature. For example, only about 40 percent of Lucy's bones were discovered. In most cases, paleontologists arrange these bones in what amounts to an educated guess. At other times, nearby bones are said to have been part of the discovery, although that fact can't be established beyond a reasonable doubt. Some such discoveries turned out to be hoaxes, while others are sometimes later identified as the bones of some known species in our lifetime.

In order to explain this lack of evidence in the fossil record, many evolutionists in the second half of the 20th century proclaimed a new theory called *punctuated equilibrium*. This theory states that there were long periods of time with very little change among life forms, but occasionally these periods were punctuated with a sudden burst of change. Of course, if one can believe that there could be periods of sudden change so that new life forms came into existence with no transitional forms first, then why is it illogical to believe that God created all creatures instantaneously?

Question #6: What does bilateral symmetry say about evolution?

Answer: Bilateral symmetry refers to the fact that if you drew a line down the middle of thousands of mammals, each side would be the same as the other one. For example, creatures with eyes generally have 2 eyes, 2 ears, 2 legs (if they have legs at all), 2 feet (if they have feet at all), 2 wings (if they have wings at all), 2 arms (if they have arms at all), and so on. Evolution might dictate that one of each entity would form, but not 2 simultaneously. Therefore, the presence of bilateral symmetry strongly suggests that the theory of evolution is not true.

Question #7: How does evolution account for two genders of most creatures?

Answer: If evolution were true, we wouldn't expect 2 separate genders to evolve. Think about it for a moment. If all living organisms evolved from a single-celled microorganism by splitting into 2 parts, why would an organism—even assuming it could think and then choose to do so—split itself into 2 different genders and then have to spend time and energy finding one of its opposite gender in order to produce another copy of itself? It just doesn't seem reasonable to us that the 2 genders could have evolved by random forces.

Question #8: Can evolution occur with very small, incremental changes over millions of years?

Answer: All living things consist of cells, with most species having millions or even billions of them. Review Explorer I, Study Guide #2 for the evidence about the complexity of just 1 living cell and for the fact that S.E.T.I (Search for Extra Terrestrial Intelligence) would conclude that finding only 3 to 5 consecutive electromagnetic “notes” meant they came from an intelligent source. Yet evolutionists would have us believe that the great complexity of all living things on earth is simply the result of natural random forces. Given enough time, they argue, mutations and natural selection have produced the amazing varieties of living organisms that are on our earth today. In other words, time is essentially the atheists' god. We think it's much more reasonable to believe that an Intelligent Designer (God) created the universe and all living things.



Satellite Dish Aimed at Outer Space

Questions #9: Hasn't Carbon-14 dating proven that life has existed on earth for millions of years?

Answer: No. Carbon-14 dating techniques were invented in the early 1950s by an American chemist, Dr. Walter Libby (d. 1980). Carbon is the basic substance of life, and there is both Carbon-12 and radioactive Carbon-14 in the earth's atmosphere. Cosmic rays convert some of the atmosphere's Nitrogen-14 atoms into Carbon-14 atoms. All living things ingest both kinds of carbon into their system. We also know that Carbon-14 decays into Nitrogen-14 over time, so that one-half of an organism's Carbon-14 decays in 5,730 years after its death. This is called its half-life. Then it takes another 5,730 years for one-half of the remaining Carbon-14 to decay, and so on. Basically, anything that used to live or anything with carbon in

it can be dated by measuring the amount of Carbon-14 left in a dead organism. This theoretically includes wood, coal, diamonds, charcoal, fossils, bones, seeds, and seashells, as well as insects, fish, mammals, and humans. But in practice, the maximum age an organism can be dated is as old as between 50,000 and 80,000 years. Anything older than this range is considered to be infinite. For example, all fossils all date beyond this age range. Even Dr. Libby himself admitted that Carbon-14 dating is not reliable beyond about 4,000 years or so (to about 2000 B.C.). Therefore, it's clear that Carbon-14 dating cannot prove that life has existed for millions of years on this planet.

Question #10: But doesn't Carbon-14 dating prove that life is much older than the Biblical chronology of 6,000 to 10,000 years? Also, how do evolutionists defend their view of millions of years of life on the earth?

Answer: To rely on Carbon-14 dating, at least 2 assumptions must be made. *First*, it's assumed that the amount of Carbon-14 in the atmosphere and in living things today has always been the same. *Second*, it's assumed that the radioactive decay rate has always been the same as it is today. This is based on the principle of uniformitarianism, that change has always occurred at the same slow, incremental way that it does today. Unfortunately, these are both assumptions that we can't prove to be true because we have no way to verify that by observations or experimentation. Oh, for a time machine! Under Question #11, we will discuss a plausible scenario that would explain why Carbon-14 dating shows dead organisms to have lived more than the 6,000-10,000 years given in the Biblical chronology.

Estimated dates older than Carbon-14 can take us are usually based on the depth in the ground that an organism is discovered. At current rates of soil deposition and erosion, geologists estimate the age of an object. This, too, of course, is based on the principle of uniformitarianism. Again, see our discussion under Question #11 for a plausible explanation for the dating of organisms older than they actually are.



Tree Rings

[NOTE: Even tree-ring dating is not always reliable. It's believed that in a normal year a tree produces 1 ring. By counting the rings, one can theoretically determine a tree's age. But even under normal conditions, some trees either create no rings or an extra ring during one year's time. Under extreme weather conditions, especially with numerous patterns of alternating strong rain storms and dry weather, trees often create several rings in a single year. Therefore, uniformitarianism is not a reliable principle even for counting tree rings.]

Question #11: Could the Biblical Flood story cause the earth and its dead organisms to appear older than they actually are?

Answer: Yes. *First*, please note that the Biblical story of a global Flood is not the only global Flood story in history. Nearly *every* culture has a global Flood story, and while the details vary considerably, there are 3 points common to the large majority of them: (1) The entire world was flooded with water; (2) the reason given was that God or the gods were angry at mankind's wickedness; and (3) a few people were saved in a large boat. Given the fact that ancient people weren't nearly as ignorant as modern man likes to think, it's

very unlikely that all of these cultures were mistaken about it being global in nature. Therefore, it's not irrational to believe that such a Flood may have actually occurred.

According to Genesis 7:11-12, the global Flood occurred because **“the fountains of the great deep were broken up”** (NKJV), *and* it rained for 40 days and 40 nights consecutively. Genesis 1:6-7 also describe a water canopy above the earth before the Flood. Although some commentators think this simply was a reference to clouds, note that verse 7 says that these waters were **“above”** the firmament (or expanse, sky), not “in” it. Such a canopy of water vapor may have been sufficient to keep out most cosmic radiation from interacting with our atmosphere. If true, then there was a time when Carbon-14 was barely measurable on the earth. Thus, organic material that lived before the Flood would appear to be much older than they actually are by Carbon-14 dating. [NOTE: Remember that the less Carbon-14 detected in an organism, the older it will appear to be.]

Furthermore, the Genesis description would mean that tremendous upheaval caused by the Flood could account for the ring of fire of volcanoes underneath and around most of the Pacific Ocean. From our own observations, this Flood could have cut straight through rock and carved out huge canyons. This upheaval may also account for the fact that the earth is tilted on its north-south axis today, thus accounting for profound climate changes. And, of course, a global Flood would have certainly caused great soil depletion in some areas and huge soil deposits in other places, instantly burying millions of creatures and other organic material and caused such great pressures and heat that created the fossil fuels of coal, oil, and gas. Finally, the enormous heat may have been sufficient to alter the decay rate of inorganic elements and thus causing minerals to date by radiometric dating techniques much older than they actually are.



Global Flood

In short, if the global Flood really happened, such an event could account for the very old ages of both organic and inorganic materials on the earth today. We don't have to prove that the Flood happened, or that it was responsible for the old ages measured today. But it raises reasonable doubt that the old ages that evolutionists give for things on earth today are not accurate. It also provides a rational person with the very real possibility that the Biblical chronology of life on earth being only 6,000 to 10,000 years old is accurate.

Question #12: How could the global Flood have created fossil fuels in just 150 days, assuming that the Flood did happen?

Answer: It doesn't take millions of years, only the right conditions, to create fossil fuels. Coal is created from carbon and certain gases. Dead organic matter decays into peat, which becomes coal under great heat and pressure. Oil and natural gas are created from dead organic material, especially plankton, which mixes with inorganic material and becomes sedimentary rock and organic shale under great pressure. Increased pressure and temperatures convert the shale into a wax-like material that contains oil shale. With sufficiently high temperatures, oil shale is then converted into oil and natural gas. The petrification of wood is even simpler. The eruption of the volcano at Mt. Saint Helens in Washington State in 1980 petrified thousands of trees buried under volcanic ash and the water of nearby Spirit Lake in a matter of just a few months.



Trees Strewn in Spirit Lake

[NOTE: We now know how to artificially make petrified wood, coal, and even crude oil by applying heat and pressure to organic materials. In fact, there's an industry that makes petrified wood for use in flooring homes. Currently, it takes too much energy to artificially make coal and crude oil, and environmental concerns discourage the development of this technology. But the point is that it only takes the right conditions to create these things. According to the Biblical account of the global Flood (Genesis 6-8), it's highly probable that numerous volcanic eruptions and the rapid burial of organic material under water created all of the conditions necessary for

creating petrified wood, coal, oil, and natural gas in the 150 days of the Flood.]