

# Evolution



*God created life “according to its kind.”*

*<sup>20</sup> Then God said, “Let the waters teem with swarms of living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth in the open expanse of the heavens.” <sup>21</sup> God created the great sea monsters and every living creature that moves, with which the waters swarmed after their kind, and every winged bird after its kind; and God saw that it was good. <sup>22</sup> God blessed them, saying, “Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let birds multiply on the earth.” <sup>23</sup> There was evening and there was morning, a fifth day. <sup>24</sup> Then God said, “Let the earth bring forth living creatures after their kind: cattle and creeping things and beasts of the earth after their kind”; and it was so. <sup>25</sup> God made the beasts of the earth after their kind, and the cattle after their kind, and everything that creeps on the ground after its kind; and God saw that it was good (Genesis 1.20-25).*

**Introduction: The Science That Never Was**

**No scientific evidence exists for evolution. By evolution, I**

mean the idea that life began from a common ancestor and that changes have occurred in organisms over time to produce new species. When I state no evidence exists to support evolution I mean exactly this. I do not mean evidence is weak in some areas or lacking in others. I mean *no* scientific evidence exists period. None. Nada. Zero. Zilch. This was true in Darwin's day and nothing has changed in 150 years.

What I do *not* mean by evolution is the scientific fact that changes occur within species. Darwin *observed* that beak sizes varied among finches. Darwin was practicing science. Everyone knows such changes occur. This is known as microevolution and has been observed for thousands of years. It is science.

What is Evolution?

Since evolution has no scientific support, what is it? Evolution is literature, myth, ideology, religion, or philosophy. Take your pick. What it is not, is science. When evolutionists talk about science in relation to evolution they use microevolution (which everyone has observed and agrees happens) as evidence. But invariably, evolutionist "proof" exits the realm of science into metaphysics and teleology.

How evolutionists think is revealed by a quotation by Richard Lewontin, a Harvard evolutionary biologist:

*Our willingness to accept scientific claims that are against common sense is the key to an understanding of the real struggle between science and the supernatural. We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, in spite of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a prior commitment, a commitment to materialism. It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary,*

*that we are forced by our a priori adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counterintuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door.*<sup>1</sup>

In a lecture on Darwin's influence to modern thought, Ernst Mayr stated:

*Darwin introduced historicity into science. Evolutionary biology, in contrast with physics and chemistry, is a historical science—the evolutionist attempts to explain events and processes that have already taken place. Laws and experiments are inappropriate techniques for the explication of such events and processes. Instead one constructs a historical narrative, consisting of a tentative reconstruction of the particular scenario that led to the events one is trying to explain.*<sup>2</sup>

Tom Wolfe, in his book *The Kingdom of Speech*, wrote:

*There were five standard tests for a scientific hypothesis. Had anyone observed the phenomenon—in this case, Evolution—as it occurred and recorded it? Could other scientists replicate it? Could any of them come up with a set of facts that, if true, would contradict the theory (Karl Popper's "falsifiability" test)? Could scientists make predictions based on it? Did it illuminate hitherto unknown or baffling areas of science? In the case of Evolution...well...no...no...no...no...and no.*

*In other words, there was no scientific way to test it. Like every other cosmogony, it was a serious and sincere story meant to satisfy man's endless curiosity about where he came from and how he came to be so different from the animals*

*around him. But it was still a story. It was not evidence. In short, it was sincere, but sheer, literature.*

In Wolfe's words, evolution is literature. Stephen J. Gould, the Harvard paleontologist and evolutionist, called Darwin's narratives, "Just-So" stories, based upon Kipling's tales.<sup>3</sup> C.S. Lewis called it myth. It is also ideology and politics. In theological language, it is idolatry. What it is not, is science.

Beyond this is evolution's elitist appeal. Intellectuals (almost by definition, atheists) accepted evolution from its advent. If one wished to be hip, to be accepted in the social inner-ring, one embraced evolution. Not to accept it was to identify oneself with the witless mob. This *zeitgeist* has not changed. Wolfe noted:

*At the higher altitudes of society, as well as in academia, people began to judge one another socially according to their belief, or not, in Darwin's great discovery. Practically all Church of England clergymen were well educated and well connected socially, and by 1859 the demystification of the world had extinguished whatever fire and brimstone they might have had left. The sheerly social lure of the theory, the status urge to be fashionable, was too much for them. Subscribing to Darwinism showed that one was part of a bright, enlightened minority who shone far above the mooing herd down below.*

Most people think science motivated Darwin to advance his theory of evolution. The truth is rather different. Darwin had grown up in a family of atheists. His grandfather, Erasmus, wrote about evolutionary ideas in his book *Zoonomia*. His father held these views. By the time Darwin boarded the *Beagle* to begin his biological exploration and survey, he had largely abandoned belief in the Bible. His most psychologically

compelling motivation to advance evolutionary ideas, however, was the Christian doctrine of eternal punishment. Darwin wrote in his autobiography:

*Thus disbelief crept over me at a very slow rate, but was at last complete. The rate was so slow that I felt no distress, and have never since doubted even for a single second that my conclusion was correct. I can indeed hardly see how anyone ought to wish Christianity to be true; for if so the plain language of the text seems to show that the men who do not believe, and this would include my Father, Brother and almost all of my best friends, will be everlastingly punished. And this is a damnable doctrine.<sup>4</sup>*

Darwin recognized if Christianity were true, his family and friends were or would be in hell. Therefore, Darwin wished to create an alternate reality, one in which God was unnecessary. If God does not exist, mankind has no accountability for good or evil, future reward or punishment. What impelled Darwin was not science but theology.

### What is Known by Science

The Bible is important in any discussion about the origin and progression of life for it is God's revelation of reality. The Bible is a scientific book. Its record can be falsified by observation. We observe that species adapt, mutate, and variate. This is exactly what the Bible has declared. We produce seedless grapefruit. We breed sheepdogs. We observe numerous changes can occur within a species. But we also observe that boundaries exist. One species does not become another species. This is what the Bible asserts.

Gregor Mendel founded the science of genetics. Mendel discovered through experimentation the hereditary boundaries the Bible has revealed. Though Darwin and Mendel were contemporaries, Darwin had no scientific understanding of

genetics. None. The evolutionary family trees Darwin created were imagined. He had no scientific basis for them.

Another area in which the Bible is confirmed as science is the Bible's statement that all biological life was created within a 3 day period. We observe that lifeforms go out of existence. We do not observe them coming into existence. This fits with what the Bible declares. God created all biologic life at a point in time and ceased creating. If evolution were true, we should see new life forms coming into existence. We don't. We observe species going out of existence. This is because God ceased creating after day six. The Biblical record is verified and evolution falsified.

Yet another scientific area that proves the Bible is true is death. All things die. Why? Science does not understand life or death. Why should living organisms not go on forever? Science has no explanation. The Bible does. The Bible reveals death is the result of sin. Science observes entropy. But why does everything go from a higher state of order to a lower state? Science does not know. But the Bible tells us why.

## Proofs of Evolution

Evolutionists have proposed varying proofs for evolution. The problem with these proofs is that they can just as easily prove creation. Representative proofs of evolution are some of the following:

1. Evolutionists maintain we have a universal genetic code. So do creationists. The evolutionist claims the universal genetic code is evidence of a common ancestor from which all life descended. Is this a valid conclusion? It is one interpretation. But it fails upon further examination. It is better explained that God created or programmed living creatures to have similar characteristics. All watches have numbers or dials. But all watches did not spring from a common ancestor. Rather, each watch or watch type was designed after

a common design. If someone demonstrated all watches came from a common source, they would also discover they were created by a watchmaker. And watches are a lot less complex than single-celled organisms.

Evolutionists expand such reasoning into the areas of morphology, cytology, pathology, etc. But again, equally strong arguments can be made that similar morphologies, cytologies, and pathologies demonstrate creation. The same may be said of natural selection, variations, and mutations. Evolutionary arguments work equally well in a creation model.

2. Evolutionists claim the fossil record shows that the simplest fossils are found in the oldest rocks and a smooth and gradual transition exists from one form of life to another. But fossils are regularly found "out-of-place" in the geologic column. To complicate matters, "living fossils" remain relatively unchanged throughout their history. Then there is that nasty matter of the Cambrian explosion. Embarrassing.

Abandon All Evidence Ye Who Enter Here or Problems of Evolution

1. One problem is the fossil data. No transitional forms exist. None. Darwin was aware this lacuna posed a significant problem for his theory. But he reasoned, given time, transitional forms would be discovered. They have not. Darwin should have recognized this was not a problem more time would resolve. We have millions of species. For Darwinism to be true we should find billions of transitional forms for each species in the fossil record. The vast spectrum of living creatures would require septillions of transitional forms. Instead, we have zero.

2. Another problem is the origin life. How does life come from non-life? No scientific evidence exists to show this occurs. None. People used to believe in spontaneous generation, e.g.,

maggots from garbage, in which life came from non-life. No one believes this anymore. Except evolutionists. They believe life came from non-life. They *believe*. They have no evidence. But they have faith it occurs. Enter metaphysics.

3. A third problem is design. We observe incredibly diverse and complex designs in living organisms. How did this happen? By chance? By natural selection? Darwin knew almost nothing about the complexity of organisms. William Paley's watchmaker analogy remains unrefuted. Complex design requires a designer. Watch birds. They hurtle and suddenly brake into a mass of leafy branches to land deftly on a tiny limb. Think of the telemetry required. Our most brilliant computer, mechanical, and electrical engineers have no clue how to replicate such autonomous capability. Give scientists \$100 billion. Tell them to develop this technology. They will fail. It is far, far beyond man's intelligent design skill. Yet evolutionists tell us this technology happened by chance and random selection? Does anyone believe a million monkeys with paint kits will paint a Mona Lisa in a billion years? Or a Charlie Brown cartoon? If that is not enough, read the evolutionary explanation of bird flight. It is at the same scientific level as the belief that the earth is upheld by a giant turtle.

4. Another problem is that all observational data reveal kind produces kind.<sup>5</sup> Variations occur. Mutations occur. But kind always produces kind. Transmutations do not occur. None. A dog always produces a dog. A cat is a cat. A bird is a bird. A horse is a horse, of course, of course. We find no counter-examples. The fossil record confirms the same. It reveals millions of different kinds. Each fully formed. None transitional. It has been that way for millennia and it's going to stay that way. No transitional forms exist and none will be found. God did not design life in this manner.

The first chapter of Genesis records God's declaration that He created animal life after their kind (Genesis 1.20-25). This

was also true for the vegetable kingdom (Genesis 1.11-13). God built biological systems with marvelous sophistication, complexity, and adaptability. He designed and programmed them to adapt to different conditions. Even at cellular and molecular levels immense complexity exists. God put limits on the design so that kind always produces kind. No genetic mutations or processes have ever been observed that increase information in the genome. That is science. This is what we see. We do not observe kinds crossing their programmed boundaries. We find no transmutations. Transmutations are the magical mystery tour of evolutionists. They are the stuff of myth and bad sci-fi. Evolutionary scientists (an oxymoronic term) are tailors of the emperor's new clothes—a suit made from whole cloth.

5. Mathematics kills evolution. Scientists have proved the universe had a beginning. Given the complexity of life, mathematicians have demonstrated insufficient time exists to make the evolutionary changes and variations we see. Even if the universe were a million times older than it is it could not happen. The probabilities are too vast. One has a better chance winning the Powerball lottery a billion times in a row than for life to emerge through random selection. Because Stephen J. Gould, the Harvard evolutionist, recognized this problem he introduced the idea of punctiliar equilibrium: evolution by leaps and bounds. But again, we confront that nagging problem: no evidence.

6. Whence morality? How does evolution explain man's moral nature? Morality is universal. Societies and cultures may have different particular laws but everyone agrees it is wrong to steal, to lie, to murder, etc.

7. What about the mind? How did intelligence form? How do mind and body interact? What about sex? The simplest organisms reproduce asexually. How did sex come into being? What about language? Man is the only biological creature with a language of syntax and grammar. What about love? How does evolution

explain love? It cannot. Why is man the only creature who worships God? Evolution provides no answers. Nor does evolution provide answers to man's deepest questions: Who am I? What is my purpose? What happens when I die? We could go on, but the case is made. Why beat a dead horse? Any of the above points is a mortal wound to evolution.

### Why This Essay?

This essay is written for two reasons. The first is to make you *think*. When evolutionists present scientific facts, they are facts useless in proving evolution. They present assumptions as scientific proof. But assumption is not observation. The *only scientific evidence* useful to prove evolution is a record of transitional and transmutational forms. Everything else is smoke and mirrors.

In the early, heady days of evolutionary theory, evolutionists argued scientific facts supported evolution. Such "facts" have proved wanting. They do not exist. As more scientific investigation in the life sciences has occurred, scientific evidence for evolution has become increasingly elusive. As a result, to preserve the myth, evolutionists increasingly rely on propaganda, intimidation, and courts to impose their will.

Evolutionists are people to whom theory is dearer than fact. Darwinism is a 150-year-old moribund theory—a just-so-story, a world-myth, an imagineered Jedi-mind trick. Delusion.

The second reason for this essay is because of Jesus' words to the Jews of His day. He told them if they would not believe Moses, they would not believe Him (John 5.45-47). Moses wrote that God created the heavens and the earth (Genesis 1.1) and fashioned the earth in six days (Genesis 1.3-31; Exodus 20.11). Moses wrote that God created a man, Adam, and a woman, Eve. If one will not believe Moses, it is unlikely one will believe the words of Jesus, the Creator (John 1.3, 10; Hebrews 1.2; 1 Corinthians 8.6; Ephesians 3.9; Colossians 1.15-17) who

has the words of eternal life (John 6.68). Trust God. Whoever believes in Him will not be disappointed (Romans 10.11).

<sup>1</sup> Lewontin, Richard. "Billions and Billions of Demons," *The New York Review*, 9 January 1997, p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> Ernst Mayr was one of the towering figures in the history of evolutionary biology. The quote is from Mayr's lecture, "Darwin's Influence on Modern Thought," delivered in Stockholm on receiving the Crafoord Prize from the Royal Swedish Academy of Science, 23 September 1999. It was published on ScientificAmerican.com, 24 November 2009.

<sup>3</sup> Stephen J. Gould, "Sociobiology: The Art of Storytelling," *New Scientist*, November 16, 1978. Evolutionists never forgave Gould for this article.

<sup>4</sup> See the extract from Darwin's [Autobiography](#). Certain [statements](#) in Darwin's autobiography (1st edition) were removed at the request of his wife.

<sup>5</sup> The Hebrew word in Genesis for "kind" is      and means "kind," "sort," "species." It is always expressed as             "according to its kind."

©2013 Don Samdahl. Anyone is free to reproduce this material and distribute it, but it may not be sold. Updated, 18 January 2019.