

#115 “Creation Vs. Evolution”

by Brent Barnett

www.relevantbibleteaching.com

Creation versus evolution is a debate that rages on, though it shouldn't have to. The evidence against evolution is so overwhelming, yet some still choose to believe in it. As we will see, the facts clearly point to the reliability of the creation account and even more conclusively to the irresponsibility of the theory of evolution. And it is only that, a theory.

Here is an overview of the theory of evolution. Billions of years ago a super-compacted ball of matter existed. The ball of matter spontaneously exploded for an unknown reason, and as gravitational and electromagnetic forces developed, the universe and our solar system was formed. Fortunately for the sake of life, the earth ended up just the right distance from the sun to support life. Early earth was a violent place, with volcanoes erupting with fire, melting other frozen materials (or some variety of this story). Somehow water and an atmosphere were formed as the lava melted the ice. A prebiotic soup as it is called was formed in a puddle of water. Certain chemicals under certain perfect conditions created amino acids and then proteins and then grew more complex until an amoeba with DNA was formed. The amoeba gradually over millions of years changed into a more complex organism. Billions of years then passed where earth changed, the atmosphere changed, and life grew from simple to complex, from single-celled organisms to fish to birds to reptiles to mammals and eventually to primitive ape-men which gradually changed into humans. One story says that the ape men which were hunched over migrated to Africa which had tall grasses. They realized that if they could see over the grass that they could survive easier, so they stood upright like humans. Gradually they grew smarter and more humanlike.

As you might imagine, the things that are taught as fact and scientific evidence are much closer to imagination and fiction. Evolution has no explanation whatsoever for how the initial ball of matter came to be. Even Darwin admitted in chapter 14 of his *The Origin of the Species* that the origin of matter required a creator. Naturalistic scientists after Darwin have tried to come up with an explanation, but none is possible. God is the only explanation for the beginning of matter. Genesis 1 says that the earth was formless and void. We can take this to mean that there was no matter until God spoke it into existence. Furthermore, there is no explanation for why this ball of matter suddenly exploded. Also, explosions are chaotic and do not result in order but rather chaos. Our universe carries evidence of order and design. The fact that the earth is just the right distance from the sun, the mere fact that there is such a thing as a sun which brings light and heat, and the mere fact that physical forces hold the earth together and make it orbit around the sun in a mathematically extremely delicate balance are far too orderly to believe that they were a result of chance in a cosmic explosion. I believe that God put things right where they needed to be.

As for the conditions of the earth prior to life as the theory states, there is absolutely no evidence whatsoever that early earth was what they claim it was. There is absolutely no

evidence of little pools where simple life formed. A major belief of creation science is that life cannot come from non-life. Using the second law of thermodynamics, that things go from order to disorder, scientists have shown that the chance of life forming from non-life even under ideal conditions is smaller than 1 in $10^{40,000}$. That is ten with 40,000 zeros after it. It is the same likelihood as a tornado going through a junkyard and leaving behind a perfectly engineered and buffed Lexus. It just isn't ever going to happen no matter how much time is allowed to pass. Experiments have been done to synthesize organic compounds under conditions that were supposed to be on the early earth. Under ideal conditions and with the intervention of scientists at specific times, simple compounds have been produced. Unfortunately for evolutionists, they are a far cry from any actual living organism's complexity. Even the DNA in an amoeba is thousands of times more complex than what scientists have engineered under their ideal conditions. It is also important to note that what was engineered required the intelligent and creative mind of the scientist.

So even if we granted the evolutionists the impossible, that simple life emerged on earth from non-life, the simple life still has to get more complex until humans are evolved. Evolutionists like believing that evolution has had billions of years to work because it makes us think that anything can happen if given that amount of time. Unfortunately, we have no hard evidence of species changing from one to another, like an ape-man or fish-bird. The fossils that evolutionists have claimed are transitional forms like half fish-half bird are either a hoax or unclear as to what they are. Other explanations are just as likely or more likely. The most important fact, however, is that with billions of years worth of transitional forms, we should have far more than a handful of fossils. We should have countless fossils of transitional forms. But we do not. Evolutionists have tried to explain this away by saying that when species change into other species that it happens really quickly, so that is why there are so few forms to be found. This appears to me to be nothing more than hedging away from the obvious truth and creating a theory that has no evidence to it whatsoever. As for ape-men, the same answer applies. Some have been hoaxes while other have been humans with bone diseases that create the hunched over effect and protruding forehead and jaw. But again there have been so few that have even been considered as possible ape-men that the lack of examples indicates that there never were ape-men. Also, why and how do male and female forms of creatures come to exist? How is it that they so perfectly complement one another? It just makes no sense that a creature starts standing up and becomes human or finds that it needs to fly so it sprouts wings. The transitional forms with half leg and half wing would have gotten killed off before they could have ever become fully birds, assuming that that was possible in the first place. Nowhere do we observe one species changing into another. This is as the Scripture states, "after its kind" (Genesis 1:21,25).

Man in particular is different than all of the rest of creation. Genesis 1 says that only man was created in the image of God. Only man is rational, appreciates beauty, can problem solve, can appreciate art and music, enjoys creating things, and has a mind and soul, among other things. How does a monkey suddenly develop all of these additional faculties innate to humanness unless God created man that way to begin with? Evolutionists have some serious problems when it comes to dealing with the theory of

evolution on a macro level.

It seems to me that it requires much more faith to believe in evolution than it does in creation. I would rather believe that a divine being spoke things into existence than the impossible became possible and defied all that we know about science. It is without a doubt reasonable to believe in God as Creator.