

Some Scriptural and Scientific Arguments Which Defy Evolutionary Teachings

In a recent lecture, Dr. John Whitcomb pointed out a very illusive seldom discovered strategy for the spiritual warfare that Christians are called upon to fight.

Christian soldiers, for the most part, are shooting at the wrong things. The enemies of the Lord are attacking the very foundation of the Christian faith which demands a literal interpretation of the Genesis account upon which so much depends. Christians on the other hand, are combating the evil things which are built upon a foundation of atheistic evolutionary teachings. Stated another way, much preaching in our day is directed toward the sinful fruits such as pornography, homosexuality, abortion, and the like, instead of being directed at the sinful root which is the basic underlying cause of these sinful acts.

It is the purpose of this paper to fire some shots at the ungodly foundation of evolutionary teachings by setting forth some Scriptural, as well as scientific, arguments which contradict them. This writer believes these arguments will substantiate the fact that those who espouse the evolutionary

hypothesis do so out of a faith-commitment and not on the basis of true scientific evidence.

It is also the intention of this writer to present these arguments as simply as possible so that the average church member may be able to understand them and use them against the continual onslaught of erroneous atheistic and humanistic teachings. After being enlightened with these arguments, it is hoped that these will lead the believer into a greater confidence in God's revelation and a deeper reverence for our great God.

The Creation of Adam and Eve

Where did man come from? This is a question which is very easily answered in the Word of God and poses absolutely no problem whatsoever for the Bible-believing Christian who holds to a literal interpretation of the Scriptures. However, for the myriads of men who have been permeated with the atheistic teachings of evolution, it is a question to which an answer can only be found in the ungodly theory which relies on an assumed process that cannot be scientifically or empirically supported.

According to the Scriptures, one finds the origin of man to be the marvelous result of a sudden and supernatural creative

act of God which occurred on the sixth day of creation. Genesis 2:7 states:

And the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul (KJV).

The skeptic should note it is no mere coincidence that the chemical elements of man are comprised of the very same elements which are found in common soil and also that man is dependent upon these very same elements from the soil to sustain him physically. Dr. M. R. DeHaan has given the following analysis of the composition of man's body:

Chemically the body of man differs not a particle from the earth out of which he was taken. The human body consists (like the body of animals) of about eighty-five percent water (hydrogen and oxygen), calcium, sodium, iron, nitrogen, phosphorus, arsenic, and a larger number of rarer elements (173).

It must be recognized and acknowledged that Adam was created a mature man instantaneously and that he was not the product of some creative process which came about over a period of time either with or without the assistance of God.

The Scriptures also clearly reveal the means and the manner by which Eve was created and came into existence. Genesis 2:21,

22 states:

And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam and he slept: and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; and the rib which the Lord God had taken from man, made He a woman, and brought her unto the man (KJV).

Notice these Scriptural accounts are not only repudiated and ridiculed by those who subscribe to evolutionary teachings, but they are discarded for a humanistic and satanic theory propagated and popularized by an atheist named Charles Darwin. If Adam and Eve were not created the way the Bible states they were, then just how did they get here? According to Darwin and other disciples of his evolutionary teachings (despite certain variations) man came about through a long process of evolution from other forms of life and this process required millions of years to accomplish. As to the origin of life itself, inquirers concerning this question are asked to accept an explanation like the one given in a high school biology book:

...large numbers of organic molecules formed in the ancient seas. Some of these molecules were separated from seawater by some kind of membrane. Other organic molecules were perhaps brought into this

simple "chemical machine". (Oram 296)

In a recent lecture to graduate students at Piedmont Bible College, Dr. John Whitcomb posed these questions to ask of those who espoused the evolutionary hypothesis and contradict the Biblical account: "If Adam evolved as a man from lower animals, then where did Eve come from?" Genesis Module, Piedmont Bible College, Winston Salem, 4 April 1995. This is a very good question and a very strong argument which defies evolutionary teaching! If it took millions of years for Adam to evolve into a man, then how did a man suddenly begin to evolve into a woman, or for that matter, how could any lower animal form change from male to female or vice versa?

The creation of Adam and Eve was done supernaturally and suddenly by the Lord. Dr. Duane Gish, a biochemist and associate director of the Institute for Creation Research, has concluded this fact and made this statement:

We do not know how God created, what processes He used, for God used processes which are not now operating anywhere in the natural universe. This is why we refer to divine creation as special creation.

We cannot discover by scientific investigations anything about the creative processes used by God. (25)

Sir Fred Hoyle has made a somewhat humorous statement con-

cerning the absurdities of the improbabilities of the evolutionary hypothesis but it is based upon scientific probabilities. He says:

The chance of life evolving from non-living matter is comparable with the chance that a tornado sweeping through a junk-yard might assemble a Boeing 747 from the materials therein. (qtd. in Whitcomb 90)

Mechanism for the Evolutionary Process

According to the evolutionary hypothesis every living thing has evolved from some lower less complex form of life. Now how did all these marvelous changes occur? What was the mechanism that produced these innumerable developments from one form into another and for the better? The answer is mutations. And what are these? They are chemical changes in the genetic structure of cells which are caused by radiation or some kind of harmful disorganizing agent (Morris, "The Twilight of Evolution" 43).

Evolutionists have studied the fruit flies, *Drosophila*, very closely and cite the abnormalities found in their wings, legs, and bristles as evidence of the evolutionary process.

Commenting on these changes Theodosius Dobzhansky stated:

Most mutants which arise in any organism are more or

less disadvantageous to their possessors. The classical mutants obtained in *Drosophila* usually show deterioration, breakdown, and disappearance of some organs. (qtd. in Davidheiser 209)

Henry Morris spoke on the harmful effects of mutations in organisms and compared their effects in this way:

The effect is analogous to what would happen to, say, a television picture tube if a bomb were exploded inside it. There would be a change, all right, but it would, in all probability, not be an improvement! (Morris, "The Twilight of Evolution" 43)

James Crow stated the harmful effects of mutations in an article entitled "Genetic Effects of Radiation." Notice his comments:

Mutations and mutation rates have been studied in a wide variety of experimental plants and animals, and in man. There is one general result that clearly emerges: almost all mutations are harmful. The degree of harm ranges from mutant genes that kill their carrier, to those that cause only minor impairment. Even if we didn't have a great deal of data on this

point, we could still be quite sure on theoretical grounds that mutations would usually be detrimental. For a mutation is a random change of a highly organized, reasonably smoothly functioning living body. A random change in the highly integrated system of chemical processes which constitute life is almost certain to impair it (qtd. in Morris, "The Twilight of Evolution" 43).

The reader may well ask at this time, if the evidence concerning mutations is too weak to provide a mechanism for the evolutionary hypothesis, then why is it so tenaciously held by evolutionists? The answer is that they have nothing else as a basis to try to substantiate their theory (Davidheiser 209).

George Gaylord Simpson, an evolutionist, has calculated the possibility of development of species through the mechanism of mutations. He concluded if the mutation rate was on the average of one in 100,000 the probability that five simultaneous mutations would occur would be 1×10^{-22} . Notice what this means according to Simpson:

This means that if the population averaged 100,000,000 individuals and if the average generation lasted but one day, such an event as the appearance of five

simultaneous mutations in one individual would be expected once in every 274 billion years. (qtd. in Whitcomb 87)

It should be noted by the reader that the evolutionist bases his argument of mutations as a mechanism on the time factor - that it took millions of years to bring about these changes. But what would be the results if the time factor were removed? Donald Patten, not only agreed that mutations produce harmful effects, he has also cited a good example of what happens when organisms experience mutations and the time factor is removed:

Mutations, it is now understood, are not superior. The germ tissue, and the organization of modules within the cells are sufficiently delicate and precise that any disruption, such as damage to a gene or shearing of a chromosome, is almost sure to be in the direction of disorganization and imbalance, that is to say, inferiority. One of the most striking examples of collective mutations are the mutations induced in massive amounts at Bikini Atoll. The genetic results included abundant deformity and sterility among the fish population. Mutations it is now known, are rarely adaptive, sometimes neutral, often harmful, and

occasionally lethal. They are never described as superior (Patten 239).

The Law of Thermodynamics

According to evolutionary teachings there must necessarily be a continual process presently taking place which leads to an increase in the organization and development of all living things. In other words, simpler forms of life have supposedly developed into more complex forms over vast periods of time to produce the present higher animal forms which include man.

The inquiring mind at this point should ask - is there any evidence to support the fact that this process is now presently taking place? The answer to this question is an unequivocal no! And this is not only the answer of the Scriptures it is also the answer of true science when the second law of thermodynamics is applied. What is this law? It is a scientific and observable law which states that everything in this universe, including living things, tends toward decay and disorder rather than growth and development (Morris, "The Twilight of Evolution" 29 -36).

According to this law everything in this universe is like a clock which is running down. As it runs, more and more energy

is expended, and this results in a diminished state from its former state (Davidheiser 220).

When this law is applied to organic things there is an observable genetic "drift" or "drag" which tends toward decay and extinction rather than organization and development (Whitcomb 129). Dr. John Whitcomb has on this basis made the following statement:

...but so far from developing into new kinds, or even improving existing kinds, such variations are always characterized by intrinsic genetic weakness of individuals, in accordance with the outworking of the second law of thermodynamics through gene depletion and the accumulation of harmful mutation. Thus, the changes that occur in living things are always within the strict boundary lines of the created kinds and always more toward ultimate extinction. (94)

It should be noted that the second law of thermodynamics scientifically defies any evolutionary hypothesis that lower forms of life could become higher forms. It shows that the trend in this universe concerning everything is to form less complex distributions rather than more complex ones. It should also be noted by the reader that this law has not be

discredited. While it is reportedly accepted almost unanimously among men of science, evolutionists see no contradiction between it and their theories of evolution. This blindness is willful because this law contradicts their ungodly and unscientific teachings (Davidheiser 221).

Dr. Duane Gish pointed out the undeniable implications which the second law of thermodynamics has upon the evolutionary hypothesis:

Of all the statements that have been made with respect to theories on the origin of life, the statement that the second law of thermodynamics poses no problem for an evolutionary origin of life is the most absurd...
(qtd. in Taylor 55)

The Biblical Law Concerning Kinds

One of the foundational principles of the theory of evolution says there can be no fixed limits to the variations of living organisms. Evolution contends that all living things have evolved from a single - celled organism. Evolutionists see a "single tree" of living things in which one kind evolves into another kind (Whitcomb 93).

But what saith the Scriptures? The Word of God says all living things can only produce "after their kind" (Genesis 1:11,12). This means that God so programmed each organism with its own structure of DNA so that each organism can only produce after its kind. In this program which God has for individual "kinds", there is a potential for tremendous amounts of variations, but there can be no "new kinds" (Morris, "The Genesis Record" 63).

The laws of Mendel, which are basis to the science of genetics, well support this foregoing fact. It is also an established fact that in every new variation there is an essential weakening in every isolated variety and not a higher state of development (Morris, "The Twilight of Evolution" 43).

Dr. Whitcomb expressed these God-ordained limitations concerning certain kinds in the following manner:

Instead of a "single tree" of living things, the Bible presents the picture of a great forest of trees of living things, each tree supernaturally created with the potentialities for variations or branches, but within the strict confines of the created identity of the tree. (Whitcomb 93)

This means when God created the DNA code of the "tree" of dogs to read D-O-G it can never become a cat. There may well be

variations through cross-breeding, but whether it's a Dachshund or a Great Dane, it's still a dog (Whitcomb 100)!

The Differences in Cellular Structure

It is the general consensus of evolutionary teachings that all present forms of life evolved from one single primitive cell. From this single cell a higher form developed through transmutation until all the marvelous species that we know today evolved. Evolutionists would have people to believe that simple protozoan forms of life were passed on to metazoan forms which in turn were passed on to simple fish forms. This form of life was then passed on to simple reptile forms. And from these forms to birds and from birds to mammals and then the same life form was passed on to man.

There is a fundamental flaw in this hypothesis that is not only silenced by evolutionary constituents but it is brought out very clearly in the Scriptures (Rimmer 10 -29). The Bible states in I Corinthians 15:39:

All flesh is not the same flesh but there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds. (KJV)

Stated scientifically it can be said:

All protoplasm is not the same protoplasm, but there is one kind of protoplasm of man, another kind of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds.

(Rimmer 23)

Upon investigation of this fact, biologists have discovered that every cell of every living organism has its own genetic code, so that its DNA code can only reproduce the same DNA or genetic code. Simply stated, every diverse living thing had parents with the same genetic code (Taylor 22-23).

With this scientific fact discovered and substantiated one researcher has said"

At that moment, when the DNA/RNA system became understood, the debate between evolutionists and

creationists should have come to a screeching halt...

(I.L. Cohen, qtd. in Taylor 24).

Now why do you suppose dogs do not become birds or something else? It is because God wrote the DNA genetic code of each, as well as every, living organism. And this is why each kind remains the same and reproduces after its own kind. And this is an argument that defies evolutionary teaching (Taylor 24 - 25).

Upon analysis of the foregoing arguments, the scientific

community should be a little less inclined to continue their propagations regarding the evolutionary hypothesis for the existence of living organisms. One would think they would at least be conciliatory toward the teachings of creationism.

But quite the contrary is true. Recently, Dean Kenyon, professor of biology at San Francisco State University was forbidden to teach his introductory biology course because he rejects evolution as an explanation of life's origins. The decision of the administration was "to protect inexperienced students from faulty scholarship."

The contention of Kenyon and his colleague, Steven Meyer, is that life is too complex to have formed naturally. Kenyon, who used to be an evolutionist, is now convinced on the basis of chemical and biological evidence that the development of life on earth was the result of "intelligent design" rather than mere chance (Eugene Scott, "The Creation/Evolution Debate." ,Current Thoughts and Trends• Vol. 10.4 (1994): 8).

The unwillingness of evolutionists to make concessions regarding their erroneous teachings centers around one all-important, as well as, self-condemning issue. If life just evolved through some incredible naturalistic process then man has no responsibility to God who created him. And to hold to the evolutionary hypothesis concerning the origin of life is to

deny God and to condemn oneself. This fact is clear from Romans 1:18:

For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and God-head, so that they are without excuse. (KJV)

Finally, it must be concluded on the basis of the arguments presented, that those who adhere to the teachings of the evolutionary hypothesis do so out of a faith-commitment, and not on the basis of scientific evidence, although it is propagated to be so.

Works Cited

- Davidheiser, Bolton. ,Evolution and Christian Faith. • New Jersey: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1969.
- DeHaan, M.R. ,The Chemistry of the Blood• . Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1943.
- Gish, Duane T. ,Evolution The Fossils Say No• . San Diego:

- Creation-Life Publishers, 1972.
- Holy Bible. ,The Scofield Reference Bible• . New York: Oxford University Press, 1909.
- Morris, Henry M. ,The Genesis Record• . Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1976.
- . ,The Twilight of Evolution• . Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1963.
- Oram, Raymond F. ,Biology Living Systems• . Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1976.
- Patten, Donald W. ,The Biblical Flood and the Ice Epoch• . Seattle: Pacific Meridan Publishing Company, 1966.
- Rimmer, Harry. ,The Theory of Evolution and the Facts of , Science• . Berne, Ind.: Research Science Bureau, 1945.
- Scott, Eugene. "The Creation/Evolution Debate.", Current , Thoughts and Trends • 10 (1994): 8.
- Taylor, Paul S. ,Origins Answer Book• . Mesa, Az.: Eden Publications, 1993.
- Whitcomb, John C. , The Early Earth• . Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1994.