

Creation vs. Evolution by Paul Simpson

In the last 2000 years, the western world had generally accepted that there is a God who created all things until; in 1859, it was offered an alternative. This was the year in which Charles Darwin published his book – The Origin Of Species. In it, he put forward his theory of how we came to be here called “The Theory of Evolution”. This became 2nd only to the Bible as an explanation for our existence but to many people now, it is the 1st. It is interesting to note that Darwin waited 20 years before publishing his book for fear of ridicule at putting forward such a theory.

So, what is the theory of evolution?

A basic explanation goes like this:

In the beginning, there was nothing but hydrogen. This was pressed together into a big ball and then, for reasons we will probably never know, this ball exploded in a big bang. Under the influence of gravity, particles came together to form galaxies and stars began to shine. One small planet that came into being was put Earth, which was in the exact right place in our Solar System, but it was different back then. Lightening flashed around back and forth in the Earth’s atmosphere of methane and ammonia for 2 billion years until, entirely by chance, a group of molecules came together that could reproduce and life on Earth began – about 600 million years ago.

Over millions and millions of years, the first simple beginnings of life evolved through generation after generation until those that didn’t stay as fungi and bacteria became plants and animals. About 400 million years ago, these kept on evolving until they became the many different forms of life that we know today. Man himself came from ape like creatures that first took upright steps 4 million years ago.

There are many different problems with this theory and remember, that is all it ever was, a theory put forward by Darwin to explain how the world came into existence. I’ll touch on several of the problems:

Early evolutionists were mixed up with the difference between species evolving and man’s selection, or natural selection. Take dogs for example: Through man’s select breeding, especially over the last 100 years, we now have dogs of all shapes, colours and sizes; ranging from Chihuahuas to St. Bernards. However, they are still all dogs and breed true generation after generation. It doesn’t matter how you cross breed them or what you do to them, are still, and always will be, dogs. It should also be noted that mules, half donkey – half horse, are largely infertile and are unable to reproduce. Likewise, Ligers and other cross-species animals. This means that new animal species cannot be created this way, contrary to what was thought by early evolutionists.

An example often used to show evolution in progress is how the European Pepper Moth changed its predominant colour between the years 1850 and 1950. In 1850 lichen on trees was a light colour; the moths were too and they were camouflaged from predators. Only 2% of the moths were dark. After 1850 however, the Industrial Revolution caused acid rain. This killed the lichen leaving dark coloured tree trunks. Now the light coloured moths stood out to predators and were eaten, while the dark ones were camouflaged. By 1950, most moths were dark coloured and only 2% were light. This was not due to the moths changing colour, the light ones were simply being eaten and the dark ones were able to survive and breed. Since 1950 the lichen is returning to trees so there are now more light coloured moths again. All this is natural selection in progress where the moths that survived were the best breed for the environment. This cannot be used as proof for evolution because evolution must have an increase in genes and genetic information but this has not happened.

Early evolutionists believed that evolution consisted of selection and a thing called pangenesis. This is where offspring inherit characteristics that their parents have acquired, but this is false. An example of pangenesis is that, it was thought, if animals stretched their necks to reach leaves then, gradually, over a period of time, each generation would get longer necks. This coupled with selection would produce giraffes, but this again does not happen. It is like if you go to the gym and build up huge muscles, you don’t pass them on to your children. They are born soft and fragile and have to build themselves up. You do not pass on physical traits that you have acquired. This theory of evolution does not work. We can throw out pangenesis.

Modern evolutionists recognize this fact, so believe evolution consists of selection and mutations. It is true that mutations occur but unfortunately, there are no good mutations. Mutations actually take things away from a species. The only things that come from them are birth defects, diseases and disorders. Each person gets about 100,000 genes from each parent of which 1 is probably a mutant gene. So, the average person is born with 200,000 genes of which neither of their parents had, and the chances of us having mutations are 2 in 200,000. The chances of these mutations happening in the same area, for example in the hand, generation after generation are impossible figures. In addition, all you can get from mutations is variations in genes that already exist. They don’t change into other things as in the evolution theory where a fin eventually changes into a foot and a leg into a wing. Once again, it just does not work.

Another problem is the complete absence of missing links. These would be fossil remains of creatures that are changing from one kind into another. None have been found that could be definitely classed a missing link. If evolution were true there should be abundant evidence everywhere preserved in the crust of the earth. Furthermore, why are there no transitional creatures living today? Instead, we see millions of defined species that breed true generation after generation.

There are so called missing links that evolutionists recognize between reptiles and birds. We will look at several: The first is the fossil remains of a creature called Archaeopteryx that was found in 1860. This was supposed to be a perfect example as it had feathers, wings, teeth, claws on its wings, a long bony tail and no keel bone (sternum) on its rib cage. Most of these things are associated with reptiles, the first two with birds. Nevertheless, if you look at each feature individually a different picture arises. No living birds have teeth but several fossilised ones do. Likewise, some reptiles have teeth while others, such as turtles do not. The ostrich has claws on its wings. Penguins have bony tails and there are living birds without keel bones. There are no features on this creature that cannot be found elsewhere. Many now think that this was one of the first birds, not a transitional one.

The next missing link is called Pro-Axis. This creature was supposed to use its arms in front of itself, jumping up to catch insects with them. The arms were supposed to be the first wings, covered in feathers and, wanting to go higher Pro-Axis' wings developed flight. There are several problems with this too. Firstly, wings coming around the front like us clapping hands is the opposite action to that needed for flight so it would never get off the ground. Secondly, there has never been any fossil evidence of such a creature found. It is purely hypothetical, but a creature that must have existed according to many evolutionists.

It is amazing how evolutionists stick to these theories for we see scales and we see feathers, but nothing in between. We find legs and we find wings, and nothing in between.

Imagine for example, that a reptile laid an egg and against all odds in an absolute freak of nature, a fully formed bird hatched out. The odds must be similar to a hen laying an egg and a baby dinosaur hatching out. It is incredible that anyone would even consider such a thing. If the first bird did appear this way, then what are the chances that another of the opposite sex would appear also? Not even possible.

So, evolution is based on genetics that have never been seen and fossils that have never been found. We have the answer, why look any further? Creation is based on genetics that are observed everyday in the laws of science and fossils found by millions all over the world. This is without even looking into God's word. You need more faith to believe in evolution than you ever would for creation.