

Creation vs. Evolution

A summary



By Joshua Stucki

“But at the beginning of creation God ‘made them male and female.’ –
Jesus, Mark 10:6

Restoration Movement Literature

This booklet may be copied and distributed freely in its original, unmodified form.

This author is unapologetically for Biblical creation as literally described in Genesis chapters one and two. This book attempts to defend that position – in summary - scientifically, logically, historically, biologically, and most importantly, Biblically. The issue of believability and a frequently asked questions (FAQ) section follows the main paper.

It should also be noted that I have chosen all “pro-evolution” websites (up and until the “FAQ” section) and other “pro-evolution” links as references for all claims in this work so as to demonstrate no bias from objectively analyzing the given evidence.

SCIENTIFICALLY

An overwhelming number of scientists believe evolution is the correct theory of how life came to be as it is today on our planet.¹ However, this is an absolutely meaningless statement; truth is not subject to a popular vote, even among so-called experts.²

Instead, to be strictly “scientific” about evolution, one has to apply “the scientific method” to evolution, which one simply cannot do. The scientific method is as follows:

1. Make observations.
2. Propose a hypothesis.
3. Design and perform an experiment to test the hypothesis.
4. Analyze your data to determine whether to accept or reject the hypothesis.
5. If necessary, propose and test a new hypothesis.

¹ <http://www.talkorigins.org/indexcc/CA/CA111.html>

² <https://yandoo.wordpress.com/tag/truth-by-consensus/>

Step #1: Evolution cannot be observed; in fact, it has never been observed.³ This breaks rule #1 of the scientific method, necessarily invalidating the rest, but for argument's sake, evolution will be dissected through the rest of the scientific method as well.

Some scientists will refute the above and say that evolution has been observed and can be observed now.⁴ Of course, the kind of evolution that “can be observed” is the kind no one disagrees about – adaptations and changes within “kind” – like how a peppered moth can adapt to its surroundings, but in the end, it is still always a moth.¹⁰⁺¹¹ Therefore, this is really no proof at all, but simply attaching the word “evolution” to processes all scientists of any stripe accept anyway.

Step #2: Evolution proposes the hypothesis that all species come from a common ancestor. There is no consensus, however, on the origin of all genetic ancestors, or the origin of the ancestor before that, etc. This is called the logical fallacy of “infinite regress”. Evolutionists simply claim this is unknowable, however logic (and common sense) dictates that *time does not go backwards*.⁵

Step #3: Evolution is absolutely un-testable. Every single experiment designed to demonstrate evolution happening in real-time has failed: life has never been made from non-life⁶, no kind of animal, insect, or other living thing has ever become another kind⁷, and no observation of evolution (from one kind of living being to another) has ever occurred in the real world.³ In the end, all “evolution” ever observed is just adaptation within the same kind.¹⁰⁺¹¹⁺¹²

³ <http://creation.com/has-evolution-been-observed-dawkins> (Dawkin's statement is astounding)

⁴ <http://atheism.about.com/od/evolutionexplained/a/ObservedEvolution.htm>

⁵ http://rationalwiki.org/wiki/Infinite_regress

⁶ http://people.chem.duke.edu/~jds/cruise_chem/Exobiology/miller.html

⁷ <http://www.truthinscience.org.uk/tis2/index.php/component/content/article/127.html>

Step #4: The analysis of data is where evolutionists claim to support their theory⁸, since they cannot observe it in real-time or test it according to traditional scientific methods.⁹ The problem with this approach is that by skipping steps 1-3 of the scientific method (since they simply cannot apply to evolution), there is by definition a great “leap of faith” (which ironically creationists are often accused of) to get to the fourth step of the scientific method - the step of analysis.

So what does the analysis of the data reveal? The greatest “proofs” of evolution are the adaptations of a particular kind of animal or insect in their respective environments: the peppered moth is one of the most famous examples.¹⁰

Possibly the greatest irony of all the proofs for evolution (including the peppered moth, the Galapagos finches¹¹, or fruit flies¹²) is that regardless if the being studied is a moth, finch, or fly – in the end – all that ever comes out is a moth, finch, or a fly. There are variations, adaptations, and differences within each kind (which no one at all denies), but things are still what they are, no matter how many variations, adaptations, or differences develop. This reality is ultimately what keeps creationists completely unconvinced evolution above all.

Step #5: Finally, the last step of the scientific method is that if your hypothesis fails, then develop a new one and try again. Of course, the scientific community refuses to let evolution go, because if evolution is not true, then the alternative – creation – has to be true. It is the unacceptability of the alternative that provides the motivation to “prove”

⁸ http://evolutionwiki.org/wiki/Macroevolution_has_never_been_observed

⁹ <http://www.proof-of-evolution.com/what-is-the-scientific-method.html>

¹⁰ <http://www.millerandlevine.com/km/evol/Moths/moths.html>

¹¹ <http://www.darwinadventure.com/galapagos-darwin-finches.htm>

¹² http://evolution.berkeley.edu/evolibrary/article/evo_42

what cannot be proven, and to ultimately believe in the impossible, to put blind faith in the theory of evolution.

Finally, virtually every evolutionist agrees that science has embraced evolution although it cannot use the scientific method to validate it.¹³ Every time, the scientific method is “explained away”: even pro-evolution websites cannot help but say that it is the scientific method itself that distinguishes fact from falsehood, story-telling from reality.¹⁴ Yet, evolution somehow stands alone, simply because they say it does.

LOGICALLY

The most basic law of logic is the following: “A” cannot be “non-A”. This is simply stating the basic reality that something cannot be what it is and not what it is. If this basic principle were not true, then nothing can ultimately make sense.¹⁵

Therefore, evolution cannot be science, because it cannot – by definition – be tested by the scientific method. It is either science or it is not, and clearly then, it is not!

Notice that there are not “two” scientific methods, or that the scientific method described above is “a scientific method” among many potential methods. No, there is one – and only one – scientific method. Therefore, if something cannot be tested via that singular method, by nature it cannot be proven scientifically.

This seems so obvious it is hard to take seriously that this is what is going on among “the scientific community” today, but it is. Scientists can certainly prove a great many things via science (which is really just short

¹³ http://arn.org/docs/newman/rn_statusofevolution.htm

¹⁴ <http://evolutionbiology.com/the-scientific-method/>

¹⁵ http://www.academia.edu/182399/The_Law_of_Non-Contradiction_as_a_Metaphysical_Principle

for “the scientific method”), but the things they cannot, are by nature, not scientific. Evolution is, therefore, not scientific.

The question is then begged: evolution is officially deemed a “theory”. What does this mean?

A scientific theory is, to be kind, an educated guess on what may or may not have happened based on the available evidence. Now, there is nothing wrong with holding theories; it is theories by which we test what can be tested. The ironic thing, again though, is that evolution cannot be tested. It will always be in “a theory” state, because it cannot be observed, it cannot be demonstrated, and it cannot be proved via the scientific method.

So, if “A” cannot be “non-A”, or “evolution that cannot be tested by scientifically” cannot, therefore, be “science”, then what are the logical alternatives?

There is only one: if life did not evolve, then it was put here, each kind of living thing put here as it is now.

Now, this does not necessarily prove “God” or the Bible’s account of creation; however, it does necessarily debunk that we came from nothing, or we evolved from one kind of living thing into another whatsoever.

This logical reality has occurred in many scientists minds but instead of attempting to the Bible at its word and seriously investigating its claims, wild theories of seeding from unknown alien worlds¹⁶ and the like have sprouted.

¹⁶ <http://io9.com/5918189/could-panspermia-have-created-life-on-earth>

When the so-called “scientific community” has to create – literally from thin-air – wild theories about unknown ancient aliens from an unknown planet with unknown technology for no known reason “seeding” earth, are creationists really the crazy ones in the room anymore?

HISTORICALLY

Evolution, through the eyes of history, is mostly blank: the theory was largely created and spread by Charles Darwin in his famous book, *The Origin of Species*, starting in the year 1859.

Observation by the greatest scientific, philosopher, and cultural minds before Darwin all came to the same basic conclusion: what exists is what is, and it has always been that way, outside of the obvious, observable adaptations of each kind.

Darwin, in his travels to the Galapagos Islands, observed various finches that had a great variety of beaks, color, and other attributes. This inspired him to write his book theorizing that these finches evolved to adapt to their environment, and then took it farther to surmise that possibly all things evolved, and not only evolved in the adaptation sense, but changed from actually one kind of living thing to another over time. For the latter, Darwin (along with the rest of the scientific community to this day) offered no direct evidence, but was simply trying to explain in any way how life might have come to be through only natural means.

Very suddenly, the greatest minds of times past were almost universally ignored, and evolution caught a firestorm of popularity, because it was first theorized mechanism that could seem to replace God in the creation of things. Although evolution (in regards to things in our time actually changing from kind of living thing to another) has never

occurred, and thus has had absolutely zero impact on anything real, it is incredibly popular, taught in public schools, to the exclusion of everything else.¹⁷

It is mind-boggling how history has been ignored, and a single theory - completely unable to be tested scientifically – has come to replace universal historical consensus and understanding on the issue. But so it is.

The following, famous “meme” description may help:

“Atheism – The belief that there was nothing and nothing happened to nothing and then nothing magically exploded for no reason, creating everything and then a bunch of everything magically rearranged itself for no reason whatsoever into self-replicating bits which then turned into dinosaurs. Makes perfect sense.”

This, my friends, is how the world thinks, and why Christians must “transform their minds” to see truth through God’s Word instead of our fallen world (Romans 12:1+2).

BIOLOGICALLY

The mechanism of evolution relies on two specific ideas: 1) natural selection, and 2) genetic mutation.

Natural selection certainly is real and does occur; no one denies this. Stronger animals dominate, weaker animals tend to decrease or die off. Species go extinct while other species that adapt to their environments and survive. There is no argument here.

¹⁷ <http://www.patheos.com/blogs/daylightatheism/essays/why-creationism-isnt-science/>

The real question is the issue of genetic mutation. Genetic mutation definitely does happen (both incidentally in nature, and now also deliberately through labs), but is there any way to genetically manipulate one kind of living being into an entirely different kind of living being?

Simply, no: although the basic structure DNA is shared among all living things, it cannot be crossed, shared, or exchanged with living beings of a different kind.¹⁸ This is most evident in the simple matter of reproduction: two living things of the same kind can reproduce, but living things of different kinds cannot. No degree of genetic manipulation has or is going to change that reality.¹⁹

Yet, the evolutionists continue to say that at “some point in the past, this had to have happened” without one shred of evidence in history, biology, or science to support such a statement.²⁰

Then there is the prevalent question if there is such a thing as a positive genetic mutation (specifically, that would actually result in a better, improved, entirely different being). This question was thought to be solved in the positive with genetically-modified foods (GMO's) but now the negative effects of manipulating with the natural genetics is being heavily questioned.²¹ It seems that things as they are presently are inherently, largely, in their “best” state already. This would seem to assume that whoever or whatever made these living things already had the basically-best design in mind from the beginning (with evolution, this is staggeringly impossible to imagine). Instead, creationists adopt the most logical answer: God, the perfect designer whose designs by definition cannot be significantly improved on.

¹⁸ <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2012/11/121106201124.htm>

¹⁹ http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/explainer/2006/11/humanderthals.html

²⁰ <http://sciencerey.com/biology/zoology/oliver-the-chimp-is-he-a-humanzee-half-human-half-ape/>

²¹ <http://responsibletechnology.org/10-Reasons-to-Avoid-GMOs>

No wonder organic foods are so popular? ☺

As well, life is irreducibly complex (see FAQ question #4 below).

Finally, the explanation of how life came from non-life is completely outside of evolution's ability to answer (the truth is that it cannot answer it). Virtually all scientists agree on that point.²²

BIBLICALLY

Finally, the Word of God flatly contradicts evolutionary theory. The new "pope" is wrong.²³

According to Genesis chapter one, God created the earth (vs. 1) before He created light (vs. 3). God created vegetation before the sun and moon (vs. 14-18). God created fish and birds at the same time (vs. 20-22). God made all the different kinds of animals "according to their kinds" at the same time (vs. 25).

In Genesis chapter two, God created woman from man (vs. 21-23).

Now let us look at what Jesus says about creation (Christians, of any kind, especially should be convinced by this information!): Jesus always went to Scripture (specifically, in His days on earth, the Old Testament) to prove His points. Jesus believed that Scripture was reliable (John 10:35) and that the prophets (including Moses, author of Genesis) were accurate (Luke 24:25-27).

Jesus believed Adam and Eve were literal, historical figures set at the beginning of creation (Matthew 19:3-6, Mark 10:3-9), their son Abel was a literal prophet who was martyred (Luke 11:50-51) and that Noah and the Flood really happened (Matthew 24:38-39).

²² <http://darwiniana.org/abiogenesis.htm>

²³ <http://www.vice.com/read/pope-francis-says-evolution-and-the-big-bang-are-ok-by-him-100>

On top of that, Jesus referred to Moses, Lot, the judgment of Sodom and Gomorrah, the miracles of Elijah, and even the story of Jonah to be actual history and never allegorized any of it (John 3:14, John 6:32-33, 49; Luke 17:28-32; Matthew 10:15; and Matthew 12:40-41).

Jesus believed and taught that Scripture was a higher authority than man's opinion (Mark 7:5-13). Jesus said all Scripture was accurate to the last jot (Matthew 5:18).

Jesus quoted Scripture a minimum of 41 times as authoritative, including texts from Genesis 1-11. Jesus believed the Bible is right!

Jesus IS truth embodied (John 14:6). Jesus also said to trust Scripture inherently (John 3:12) as it is the basis for all truth.

Most compellingly, Jesus said specifically that the writings of Moses was foundational and everything else hinged on it (John 5:45-47).

Specific verses where Jesus spoke about a young earth can be found in Mark 10:6 – “But from the beginning of creation, God made them male and female.” Mark 13:19-20, ““For those days will be a time of tribulation such as has not occurred since the beginning of the creation which God created until now, and never will. Unless the Lord had shortened those days, no life would have been saved; but for the sake of the elect, whom He chose, He shortened the days.”

Luke 11:50-51, “... so that the blood of all the prophets, shed since the foundation of the world, may be charged against this generation, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah, who was killed between the altar and the house of God; yes, I tell you, it shall be charged against this generation.”

Jesus believed that man existed at the beginning of the creation of the world – not millions or billions of years after it came to being. Jesus believed that Abel, Adam and Eve’s son, lived at the beginning of creation. Jesus refers that tribulations with men have occurred since the beginning of creation – not billions of years after men had evolved from this or that.

Finally, in John 1:1ff we learn that Jesus IS GOD and was WITH GOD IN THE BEGINNING. Following that thought, we see that Jesus was THERE in Genesis in 1:26, “Let us make mankind in our image...” US! My goodness, God really is a trinity!

According to the Bible, God created everything already with age (Genesis 2:7, 15-17).

All of the above stands flatly in contradiction with evolutionary theory so going back to the most basic law of logic – the law of non-contradiction – only one can be correct: evolution or creation?

The simple evidence from the above rejects evolution scientifically, logically, historically, biologically, and Biblically. Creation stands alone.

This also leaves many modern-day “Christians” who claim to embrace evolution in a bind: who is right – their Lord or man?

SOCIALLY

Although the so-called scientific community largely supports evolution, the general populace is far less inclined.²⁴ Depending on the

²⁴ <http://www.gallup.com/poll/114544/Darwin-Birthday-Believe-Evolution.aspx>

survey, “very positive” support for non-theistic evolution can be as low as 15%.²⁵ Why is this?

Although lots of theories abound, it boils down to one basic principle: believability. How believable is it that all living things come from nothing and then through unproven processes by chance and time produce what we know as life today? This results in more people actually believing the Biblical account than the evolution account, despite a universal monopoly that evolution presently enjoys in our educational system!²⁶

THE BOTTOM LINE

- 1) Evolution is not scientific because “the” scientific method cannot be used to observe or test it.
- 2) Evolution is logically contradictory and purely speculative.
- 3) Evolution is historically immature and beyond the imaginations of the greatest minds of history on any level before 1859.
- 4) Evolution is biologically unworkable.
- 5) Evolution contradicts the creation account of the Bible, Jesus’ own words, and even every Bible scholar for nearly 1900 years after its initial writings.
- 6) Finally, evolution is simply unbelievable, as reflected in the populace still generally rejecting it despite a complete monopoly in our nation’s high schools and universities.

²⁵ http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/06/05/americans-believe-in-creationism_n_1571127.html

²⁶ <http://www.gallup.com/poll/170822/believe-creationist-view-human-origins.aspx>

Evolution is simply another one of the world's lies. Another of the world's lies is to trust it for financial wellness, personal security, and protection of liberty, when all along its money systems have always eventually failed, its nation-states always eventually fall, and its concepts of liberty always end up warped. No, freedom only comes in Jesus Christ! (Galatians 5:1ff) This author has no personal use for the world's lies, and I encourage you to avoid them all the same, evolution included.

FAQ

1) What about the Big Bang?

Scientists are already saying it did not happen.²⁷ Christians were considered ignorant for denying it all along, but again, the Bible was right.

2) What about Lucy and other “transitional” life forms and fossils?

Turns out scientists have also reversed course on “Lucy” after forty years of, “If you do not believe this, you are ignorant” talk.²⁸

Other “transitional life forms” and “evolutionary fossils” have already been rendered defunct.²⁹ There is no reason to believe this trend will not continue well into the future.

Interestingly (though not surprising), science has now discovered “a four legged snake”.³⁰ This should not surprise Christians (or Jews) at all, because that is exactly how the snake is described in the beginning in

²⁷ <http://www.techtimes.com/articles/32659/20150214/big-bang-didnt-happen-new-theory-suggests-universe-has-no-beginning-no-end.htm>

²⁸ <http://www.jpost.com/Health-and-Sci-Tech/Science-And-Environment/Israeli-researchers-Lucy-is-not-direct-ancestor-of-humans>

²⁹ http://evolutionwiki.org/wiki/Fake_Fossils

³⁰ <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/2015/07/22/snake-four-legs/30536861/>

creation before losing its legs (Genesis 3:14). In the end, the Bible is always right. It just takes “science” awhile to catch up sometimes.

3) Surely 99.5% of the “scientific community” cannot be wrong!

There is really no need to explain the multiple errors “science” has made in the past couple of centuries because truth is simply not up for a vote or debate. 100% of scientists could say evolution was right; for that matter, 100% of scientists could say creation was right. Neither determines what really is right, or true, because again – truth is not determined by consensus.

4) Let’s assume evolution is wrong. Can you prove creation to be correct?

Although it is beyond the space of this small volume to go into all of the proofs of Biblical creationism, here is a quick summary:

a) It is simply easier to believe all things have always been as we see them now than to “imagine” they all evolved from a common ancestor. Simply look at the polls.³¹

b) Earth is the perfect distance from the sun; the moon is the perfect distance from the earth. Our sun is in a perfect position to deliver a reasonable amount of heat, energy, and radiation (i.e. light) to our planet. Our solar system results in minimal collisions with other objects with earth. Our atmosphere is perfect for supporting life. Our oceans, skies, and lands teem with life. Human beings are the only confirmed sentient beings in the universe. How did such an amazing array of things line up to support life and human existence by chance?

³¹ <http://phys.org/news/2014-01-americans-dont-evolution.html>

Some will mention the latest “earth cousin” discovery, specifically, Kepler 452-B. This is a planet that is supposedly like earth, approximately 1,400 light years away. The important thing to understand about Kepler 452-B (or any other “earth cousin” planets) is that there is no way to actually test for life, or atmosphere, or water, or anything else concrete. All we know is that the planet is “positioned similarly” to earth relative to its star. This is highly inconclusive and if it is anything like other “earth cousin” planets that been discovered, likely a dead end.³²

c) Life is irreducibly complex: part of an eye does not partially see; it does not see at all. Part of an ear does not hear at all. Part of a heart does not pump blood by itself, so on, and so forth. Many biological systems simply had to be made all at once for them to function at all, leaving no room for evolutionary development.

Even microcellular organisms are irreducibly complex. Even single cell amoebas have multiple internal functions, complex chemical reactions, and requirements to life.³³

d) The origin of life is an absolute mystery with God. With God, by definition a supernatural, first-cause being, logically and sufficiently answers this question that especially atheists will never be able to answer.³⁴

e) Three of the world’s major religions support the Biblical account of creation (Christianity, Islam, and Judaism). The historical records for the Genesis creation account dates almost back to recorded history began.³⁵

³² <http://www.wired.com/2015/07/actually-earths-cousin-may-nothing-like-earth/>

³³ <http://www.ideacenter.org/contentmgr/showdetails.php/id/840>

³⁴ <http://www.allaboutscience.org/what-is-spontaneous-generation-faq.htm>

³⁵ <http://www.allaboutcreation.org/when-was-genesis-written-faq.htm>

f) The worldwide flood theory accounts for fossils at the poles, fossils buried together, worldwide oil supplies (consisting of decayed, compressed/”cooked” living things buried over time), and the separation of the continents.³⁶

g) The Bible has many scientific discoveries spelled out hundreds of years before any man otherwise “discovered” them.³⁷

h) The autobiographical evidence for the Bible exceeds any other ancient literature by many orders of magnitude, making it the best preserved collection of books of ancient history by far.³⁸

There are many more points of evidence. Suffice to say, the body of evidence is overwhelming, but unfortunately, largely ignored.

5) What about carbon dating? It says the earth is billions of years old.

Carbon dating carries with it a very high number of assumptions that simply cannot be known:

- 1) How much of the isotope was there in the beginning?
(ASSUMED to be a consistent amount)
- 2) Did external factors affect the rate of decay of the isotope?
(ASSUMED to be a constant rate of decay unaffected by outside factors)
- 3) How are wildly different results calculated? (The result that is ASSUMED correct is the one consistent with present evolutionary theory)

³⁶ <http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/evidence-suggests-biblical-great-flood-noahs-time-happened/story?id=17884533>

³⁷ See this author’s free book, “Volume 2: Basic Objective Reasons to Believe in God, Jesus, and the Bible”

³⁸ <http://www.alwaysbeready.com/bible-evidence?id=99/#manuscripts>

Among other factors, carbon dating has never proven reliable, or even useful, other than to support the circular-reasoning façade that is carbon dating supports evolution, evolution supports carbon dating, etc.

6) What about the Second Law of Thermodynamics, sometimes called, “The Law of Entropy”?

The Law of Entropy states that heat + a closed system always brings about decay.

Since the jury is still out if the universe is ultimately a closed system or not³⁹, this is still up for debate, though many creationists consider it a shut case.⁴⁰

This author believes there are much better (and well supported) lines of evidence than attempting to wrestle with this question. Presently, I rank this an unknown factor in general, and simply cannot be conclusively used to prove either position on its own.

7) Didn't Darwin deny evolution on his deathbed?

It does not matter. The truth or falsehood of evolution does not depend on any one (or group's) beliefs alone.

8) What is “Intelligent Design?”

Intelligent Design, or “ID”, is simply another word for those who posit that God made the universe. It is not necessarily a creationist position, which by comparison takes the position that God made the universe *as the Bible describes*.

³⁹ <http://www.space.com/24073-how-big-is-the-universe.html>

⁴⁰ <http://www.icr.org/article/does-entropy-contradict-evolution/>

Therefore, there are lots of “ID” people out there who still believe in evolution, just that God directed it. This is not a consistent position (see “BIBLICALLY” subtitle above).

9) If the Bible is true, can aliens exist? Or can aliens anyway?

This may seem a bit off topic, but this question is asked quite a bit. The truth is that 1) no one knows if extra-terrestrial life exists, and 2) the Bible does not discuss it. So, it is one of those rare things that the broader “scientific” community and the Bible presently agree on. ☺ We simply do not know.

10) What about moon dust thickness? Joshua’s extra long day in Scripture? Other commonly made anti-evolution assertions?

These are largely unsubstantiated, and some “creation evidences” are not evidences at all. It is important not to become overly zealous (“zeal without wisdom is foolishness” – Proverbs 19:2) and start quoting erroneous “facts” that may not have credibility themselves. A good list of these commonly misused arguments are here:

<http://creation.com/arguments-we-think-creationists-should-not-use>

When Peter says in 1 Peter 3:15 that we should always have an answer ready, delivered with love and grace, it is important that it is a *right* answer. Christians should never be afraid of good research; all the same, Christians should never propagate bad research.