

LESSON SIX - EVOLUTION

INTRODUCTION:

A. That man is a unique part of the creation is undeniable. He possesses characteristics and faculties that are not only unknown in the highest form of animal life, but which, from the very nature of the case, could not have been the result of a gradual development from the animal kingdom.

B. Here we are face with two choices as to how we shall account for man's unique nature:

1. Man was **created by God** (**Gen. 1:1, 11, 25-28; 2:7**).

a. This accounts for his origin.

b. This accounts for his intellect, religious intuition, esthetic appreciation, and moral consciousness.

c. This accounts for his dominion over the animal world(**Psa.8:4-8**)

2. Man is **the product of evolution**.

a. The difficulties of this position we will explore in a moment, but for the time being a passage from **Isaiah 29:15** is well to keep in mind. "Ye turn things upside down! Shall the potter be esteemed as clay; that the thing made should say of him that made it, He made me not, or the thing formed say of him that formed it, He hath no understanding?"

3. A supposed third choice: **theistic evolution**.

a. Evolution, as defined by Earnest Haeckel, is the "non-miraculous origin of the Universe." **This accepted explanation rules out God.**

b. Evolution is not compatible with **Genesis 1:11, 12, 21, 24, 25.**

c. The same class of men who refuse a literal application of Genesis 1 & 2 are the same ones who deny the "literal" virgin birth, resurrection, miracles and atonement; and who "spiritualize" and "symbolize" the Lord right out of business making the religion of Jesus Christ a farce.

D. In this lesson we will give some reasons **why we cannot accept evolution** as an explanation for the origin of man.

I. **IT IS AN UNPROVED THEORY.**

A. There is a **difference between "fact" and the "theory"** in the field of science(dealing with knowledge of facts).

1. "Theory" is defined as "a belief not yet tested in practice" or "a hypothesis," or "something **assumed** as a starting point for scientific investigation."

2. If evolution were always identified for what it is, **an unproved theory**, (or rather, a whole raft of different and opposing theories) instead of being taught as a proven fact of science, the faith of many unsuspecting young people would not be shaken by their contact with it.

B. Here we have some quotations from prominent scientists putting evolution in its proper perspective:

1. **Sir Arthur Keith**, The British Museum: "Evolution is unproved and unprovable."

2. Two professors from Aberdeen and Edinburgh in the book, **Ideals of Science and Truth**: "We do not know whence man emerged, nor do we know how man arose, for it must be admitted that the factors of the evolution of man partake largely of 'maybes' which have no permanent position in science."

3. **Professor Fleischman**, Zoologist of Erlangen: "The Darwinian theory has not a single fact to confirm it in the realm of nature. It is not the result of scientific research, but purely the product of imagination."

4. **Sir William Dawson**, Geologist from Canada: "It is the strangest phenomena of humanity. It is utterly destitute of proof."

5. **Dr. Robert Millikan**, Physicist and Nobel Prize winner: "The pathetic thing is that we have scientists, who are trying to prove evolution which no scientist can ever prove."

C. **EVOLUTION: THEORY OR DOGMA?** an editorial from Christianity Today

In an epoch making series of decisions, the California State Board of Education has ruled that the creationist view of the origin of life must be presented along side the (naturalistic) evolutionary one when the life sciences are taught in California schools. This ruling has been strenuously opposed in the name of "scientific objectivity" by, for example, Stanford University professor David S. Hogness, who said, "Today the arguments against evolutionary principles must, I think, be place in the same arena as those advance by the 'Flat Earth Society.'"

Hogness's statement illustrates the unscientific and dogmatic determination of those who believe in naturalistic evolution to see to it that no alternative explanations of the origin of life get a serious hearing. People who doubt the roundness of the earth can, if comes to that, be taken several thousand miles out into space, where they can see for themselves. But neither Hogness nor any of his fellow believers, no matter how perfect their evolutionary theory may seem, can take doubters back millions of years in time to show them that

evolutionary theory is not only plausible but in fact describes what happened.

Commenting on the state of mind represented by Hogness, which is widespread in the scientific and educational community, the noted scientist and educator Sir Julian Huxley had the frankness to observe that **naturalistic evolution reigns almost unchallenged, not because it has been proved, but because "the only alternative is clearly unacceptable." And what is the only alternative? Some kind of belief in Creation, which clearly presupposes that there is a Creator.**

A non-Christian biologist who himself accepts the concept of evolution, G. A. Kerkut, observed in 1961 that candidates he examined for the Ph.D in biological science **did not even know there are scientific arguments against evolution**, and were equally unaware that in accepting naturalistic evolution (that is, evolution on a purely naturalistic basis, with no divine Mind guiding it) one also accept a number of far-reaching implications that cannot be proved but are of a philosophical or religious nature(cf. Kerkut, IMPLICATIONS OF EVOLUTION, Pergamon, 1960).

In other words, to propose evolution as a mechanism while not denying the possibility, or even the probability, that a supernatural intelligence stands behind it is one thing; to present it as self-evident truth, excluding God as an "unscientific hypothesis," is itself an unscientific hypothesis, because it demands faith in an unbroken chain of natural causes for which there can at best be supporting **evidence but no convincing proof**. There are, within the very evidence presented for naturalistic evolution, things that point in a theistic direction. Nobel Prize winning French biologist Jacques Monod has ruthlessly tried to suppress any lingering belief that the universe has a Designer, attributing everything, without exception, to Chance and Necessity. However, as Roman Catholic psychoanalyst Marc Oraison pointed out, Monod in effect attributes to "Chance" the qualities of omniscience that theists ascribe to God.

The very determination of the evolutionists to prevent objections to naturalistic evolution from being raised in public school science courses is evidence that objections have some merit; otherwise simply to present them would be the best way to have them rejected by the students. So what we are faced with is a kind of trial of Galileo in reverse. The "religious" party is saying: "We have questions that may undermine some of your scientific dogmas" and the "scientific" party is in effect replying: "Your objections are not scientific and may under no circumstance be permitted to threaten the confidence of the students in our teachings."

Christians and others who believe in God have often alleged that the public schools have reached the point where they **impose a doctrine of naturalistic secularism on all their pupils**. The emotional reaction of a large part of the scientific and educational establishment to California's initiative lends support to the charge that for them evolutionary naturalism **is not a demonstratable scientific fact, but a hallowed religious dogma that must be defended by strict censorship of all contrary arguments and facts**.

Christians should not allow themselves to be intimidated by a new kind of obscurantism posing as scientific objectivity. Having been persuaded that suppression by Christians of controversy and troublesome evidence unacceptable to society at large, we should not be frightened into silence when others attempt similar maneuvers. To present the evidence for evolution and offer a naturalistic explanation for it is one thing; to suppress all evidence and argument that points in any other direction on the grounds that it is "religious" is another. Both creation and naturalistic evolution are "religious," or at the very least philosophical. In Washington, D. C., the religion editor of the STAR NEWS, William Willoughby, has filed suit in the U. S. District Court to enjoin the National Science Foundation from excluding everything but the Darwinian view from public schools through its officially endorsed textbooks, and thus in effect coercing him to pay taxes to support "anti-religious acts against his belief that man was created by God."

Christians cannot expect that the public schools promote a Christian world and life view, but they can and should insist that whenever the subject matter moves into the area of philosophical or quasi-religious commitments, the students be told what is happening and made aware that other credible options are available. More than this we should not ask of public schools, but less than it we cannot accept, unless we are willing to make of them established churches of secular materialism.

II. IT DOES NOT ACCOUNT FOR THE ORIGIN OF MAN.

- A. If all the accounts of the development within various species are granted, that **still does not explain the origin of life**.
- B. Life comes from life...this is a scientific fact! There is life in a million different forms all about us. Where did it come from? If not from a creative God then dead matter produced it. This can never be proved.
- C. Some noteworthy quotes on this subject
 1. **Charles Darwin**: "The mystery of life remains as impenetrable as ever."
 2. **Sir Oliver Lodge**: "All the many attempts in the direction of spontaneous generation have failed."
 3. **Dr. John Coulter**: "The study of evolution has nothing to say concerning origins. When one goes beyond the observed changes and tries to trace the successions back to their source, he is in the region of speculation and outside the boundaries of science."

III. NOT ONLY DOES IT HAVE NO PROOF FOR THE BEGINNING OF LIFE, BUT TWO THIRDS OF THE WHOLE CHAIN ARE MISSING.

"All early fossils can be arranged in an orderly sequence of evolutionary change."

Richard E. Leaky, NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC, July, 1973.

- A. Anthony Standen, scientist, in the book, SCIENCE IS A SACRED COW, says of the phrase "missing link:" "It is a **most misleading phrase**, because it suggests that only one link is missing. It would be more accurate to say that the **greater part of the entire chain is missing, so much that it is not entirely certain whether there is a chain at all**"(p. 106).
- B. "The first assemblage of organisms is found in the Cambrian rocks."(MAN AND THE BIOLOGICAL WORLD, p. 352) They tell us there has been life on the earth for two billion or even three billion years, yet admit that the earliest fossil record is only one half billion years old. Hence, by their own admission, at least two thirds of the whole theoretical chain (that is supposed to trace man back through a graduated series of animals to the tiniest one celled animal) is devoid of proof!
- C. The real issue with Evolutionists is not whether there has been development and improvement within a species, but whether there has been "**transmutation, the crossing of the line between vegetable and animal and animal and man**."
- D. But, many ask, "What about all of the pre-historic men we have seen pictures of in the textbooks?"
 1. Many assume that these furnish the link between man and ape.

2. Many also assume that whole skeletons have been found to bridge this gap. But such is not the case!
- The Heidelberg man, discovered at Heidleberg, Germany, in 1907 consisted of [one jaw](#).
 - The Java man was put together from a cranial cap, a thigh bone, and a few teeth. [It could not even be proved that they were from the same creature](#).
 - The original Peking man consisted of [one tooth!](#)
 - The Piltdown man that was considered by ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA to be the greatest find of the century and is still to be found in some textbooks was proven to be a [hoax](#) in 1954. (If most of the greatest scientists in the world were taken in by this fraud, how can we trust their scholarship on the others?)
 - Dr. Austin Clark, Biologist of the Smithsonian Institute said, "Man is not an ape and in spite of the similarity between them there is not the slightest evidence that man is descended from an ape...there are no such things as missing links. [Missing links are misinterpretations](#)."
 - Dr. E. A. Hooten: "[These alleged restorations of ancient types of man have very little if any scientific value and are likely to mislead the public...](#) so put not your trust in reconstructions.

WHERE EVOLUTION STANDS TODAY is the title of an article in LIFE magazine(Oct. 19, 1959). As one first begins to read this article he gets the impression that scientists have uncovered something that makes evolution no more a "theory" but a "fact," or as some evolutionists prefer, "a verified theory." In the first paragraph is the statement: "Today discovery upon discovery of missing links in the evolutionary chain ... continues to affirm Darwin's inspired vision, and evolution is accepted by scientists and by mankind in general the world around ;... Yet for all remaining riddles and missing links, the towering edifice of Darwin's thought stands today on foundations that have solidified with each advance of human knowledge."

Now, the forgoing statements leave one, who does not know better, with the impression that the teaching that man descended from lower forms is a fact and stands on a solid foundation. But this article follows suit just like the other evolution books and articles that I have had a chance to read. The failure of the article we will discuss..

Evolutionists have uncovered many fossils of men and animals. Knowing the general attributes of ape and of man, they have tried to fit these remains into an evolutionary scale to prove that man descended from these lower forms. Keep in mind that they have only found INTERMEDIATE FORMS and not TRANSITIONAL FORMS. There is a lot of difference! Our LIFE article begins to break down here. It is stated: "Some of these crucial links are still missing. Although many have been found in recent years, for every link uncovered by the scientist's spade, new empty spaces are revealed above the and below in the evolutionary chain. Though the gaps grow smaller with each discovery, it is likely that they will never be filled, that missing links will always evade and challenge man's imagination." ... At first we got the impression that there were no doubts about evolution. Mind you, evolution can not be proven correct with our the "missing links," but now they say that some gaps will "never be filled."

Because things are similar does not prove one descended from the other. Three hundred similar intermediate forms between man and ape might be found, but this would not prove descent. Another assumption of the evolutionist! We are familiar with the mating of the horse and the donkey with the result being a mule. It is conceivable that evolutionists might uncover the bones of these tree animals and set up a scale to show that the donkey evolved into the mule and the mule into the horse. Again, let me emphasize: Similarity, per se, does not prove descent.

(see Farrell Jenkins, "Where Does Evolution Stand Today?" An [EVIDENCE QUARTERLY tract](#))

[CURIOUS FOSSILS](#)

Click here:

[Scientific Evidence for Creation Home page](#)

or

Go to: <http://www.bible.ca/tracks/>

[RICHARD E. LEAKEY'S SKULL](#)

In the early 1970's, Richard E. Leaky found a skull – labeled **SKULL 1470**. Under the picture of the skull in National Geographic Magazine was this caption and the following comment.

DISCOVERY IN KENYA OF THE EARLIEST SUGGESTION OF GENUS HOMO - NEARLY 3 MILLION YEARS OLD - COMPELS A RETHINKING OF MAN'S PEDIGREE.

"[Either we toss out this skull or we toss out our theories of early man](#)," asserts anthropologist Richard Leakey for this 2.8 million year old fossil, which he has tentatively identified as belonging to our own genus. "It simply fits no previous models of human beginnings." The author, son of famed anthropologist Louis S.B. Leakey, believes that the skull's surprisingly large braincase "[leaves in ruins the notion that all fossils can be arranged in an orderly sequence of evolutionary change](#). It appears that there were several different kinds of early man, some of whom developed larger brains earlier than had been supposed."(Leakey, NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC, July, 1973, p. 819)

This skull disproves the basis for the theory of evolution; that is, that all fossils can be arranged in an orderly sequence. That is the foundation principle of the theory.

[IV. IT FAILS TO ACCOUNT FOR THE UNIQUE NATURE OF MAN.](#)

A. Man alone has the capacity for rational thought, a sense of morals, an esthetic nature, is inherently religious, a conscience, marks of personality.

B. Where did these come from? If they evolved, which is the first generation to possess a vestige of them? How different was that generation from the generation immediately before?

V. ALL OF ITS VAUNTED "PROOFS" HAVE FALLEN BY THE WAYSIDE.

A. Lamarck's theory of "acquired characteristics" that was so widely acclaimed earlier has been discarded. As early as March 17, 1947, LIFE MAGAZINE reported: "Until 1900 many biologists believed that the characteristics plants and animals acquired from their environment were passed to their offspring. Modern genetics has proved they are not."

B. Darwin's theory of natural selection has been rejected. In his book, THE MEANING OF EVOLUTION, page 230, George Simpson, Curator of the American Museum of Natural History, announced that that theory was "bound to be wrong."

C. Mutations produced by radiation were supposed to be the answer for evolutionists, but here again, in spite of all the experiments which have produced an amazing number of varieties (99% of which have been harmful), there has still been no evidence whatsoever of transmutation(the crossing of the species). Experiments by Prof. H. J. Muller of the University of Indiana on a little fruit fly have, by radiation, produced the equivalent of one half million years of human evolution. But did it turn into a bumble bee or a June bug? No, they changed its eyes from red to white and back again, its wings from long to short and back again, but it still is nothing but a fruit fly.

D. Vestigial organs were once considered strong proof by evolutionists. These so called "left over" organs were supposed to be carryovers from previous life forms no longer useful in our present development. In man, they used to list 180 organs, including such things as the thyroid gland, pituitary gland, etc., as vestigial organs. Of course, modern medicine has shown the uses of all but a few of these, and Prof. E. S. Goodrich of Oxford University says, "He would be a rash man indeed who would now assert that any part of the human body is useless.

E. Along this line, one of the strongest arguments against evolution is the absence of "nascent organs" or organs in the process of developing for use in the next stage of evolution. "Although the anatomy of thousands of species of animals has been carefully studied, it is impossible to name a structure in any of them which is even probably in a nascent condition" (De War, TRANSFORMIST ILLUSION, p 166). In other words, no fish has half formed legs in preparation for the transition to amphibian, no reptile has half formed wings in preparation for the transition to bird life, no species of ape has a half formed soul in preparation for becoming a man.

VI. IT'S LOGICAL CONSEQUENCE IS THE "SELECTIVE BREEDING" OF HUMANS BEINGS.

A. Darwin's DESCENT OF MAN, 1874 edition, pp. 149-150: "With savages, the weak in body or mind are soon eliminated; and those that survive commonly exhibit a vigorous state of health. We civilized men, on the other hand, do our utmost to check the progress of elimination. We build asylums for the imbecile, the maimed, and the sick, we institute poor laws; our medical experts exert their utmost skill to save the lives of everyone to the last moment. There is reason to believe that vaccination has preserved thousands who, from weak constitutions, would have succumbed to smallpox. Thus weak members of civilized societies propagate their kind. **No one who has attended to the breeding of domestic animals will doubt that this must be highly injurious to the race of man.**"

B. Dr. Woolsey Teller, founder of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism says: "Someday, when the world gets wiser than it is today, it may take up selective breeding of humans."(Bales - Teller debate).

C. Dr. George Simpson in his book, MEANING OF EVOLUTION, page 333, says: "The means of biological evolutionary progress are already becoming clear, although it is doubtful whether we are ready yet to apply them well." He goes on to show that selective breeding is one of those methods.

D. Let the implications of such statements sink in! All of the sickening cruelty of heathen societies "survival of the fittest," all of the stench of Hitler's "Master Race" ovens are wrapped up in these conclusions. Some evolutionists may say that they are not willing to go that far...but why not? If man is just a superior form of animal life (but is he?), why not selective breeding to improve the race? Why should moral, religious, and sociological factors even enter into the picture? One of the hardest questions for the evolutionist is "if man is

just a higher animal, why is it wrong to kill a man but not wrong to kill a deer or chicken? Why are we any different or better than the mold that grows on old baloney in the refrigerator?