

EVOLUTION AND CREATION

Dr F A Tatford

Among the many attacks made upon the Bible, that of the evolutionary theory is by no means the least dangerous or the least subtle. In the world of the evolutionist there is neither room nor need for a Creator, and the Genesis record of creation is flatly dismissed.

The Bible reveals that life first originated in God who is life, but the evolutionary theory claims that life was evolved from primordial protoplasm, and that by innumerable stages of variation, selection and evolution, the climax was eventually reached in man. There is, of course, some measure of truth in this, in view of the progressive stages of creation. The unicellular organism, which consisted of a single cell, was the predecessor of the multicellular organism; following upon these came the invertebrates, or spineless animals, and then the vertebrates, or animals possessing a spinal column, the last stage of all being man. The Darwinian theory suggests that in no instance, did a separate act of creation take place, but that each distinct type was evolved from a simpler predecessor, its complexities and varieties gradually developing at a later stage. Instead of a separate creation of each distinct species, we are told that all species had a common origin, and gradually diverged by reason of environment and selection.

The fallacy of evolution is indicated by the fact that not a single link or intermediate form between the species has been discovered. Indeed, the rocks and fossils give a direct testimony against evolution. All species discovered are absolutely definite and distinct from each other. "There is no sign" writes Urquhart, "of mixture, or of confusion, or of infinitesimal or of indeterminate varieties." Again Le Conte writes: "The evidence of geology to-day is that species seem to come into existence suddenly, and in full perfection, remain substantially unchanged during the term of their existence, and pass away in full perfection. Other species take their places apparently by substitution not by transmutation." There is no evidence moreover, of any link whatsoever between inorganic matter and a living organism of any character.

The first chapter of Genesis states that each species was made "after its kind" and Kindersley aptly remarks that "each 'breeding species' in nature is established and protected from the appalling confusion which would follow promiscuous inter-breeding on any considerable scale, by its twin attributes, (a) fertility inter se (with its own kith and kin), (b) sterility inter alia (against all other 'breeding species')." Similar species may be crossed and hybrids produced, but hybrids are almost invariably sterile, and it is virtually impossible to produce a permanent new species by this means. Breeding or cultivation may produce artificial variations, but when the products are left to themselves, they revert in time to the original type. "In spite of all efforts of trained observers," said Darwin himself, "not one change of a species into another is on record." Huxley confirms this when he declares, "There is no positive evidence that a group of animals has, by variation and selective breeding, given rise to another group which was in the least degree infertile with the first."

It was at one time argued that there was conclusive proof of the evolutionary theory in the human embryo. The human species, it was said evolved by many stages from the unicellular amoeba, and the human embryo passes through the same stages in its short pre-natal history of nine months. Sir Oliver Lodge wrote, "Each individual recapitulates rapidly the evolutionary process. At a very early stage, the human embryo and the embryo of a tadpole are very like each other. Later it passes through further animal likenesses." Haeckel also says, "The evolutionary evidence of comparative ontogeny, or embryology shows that every vertebrate, like every other animal develops from a single cell."

There is, however, no evidence that there is any connection between the changes of the embryo and the history of the species. The suggestion that each embryonic form or development indicates the

stages through which the species originally passed in course of an evolutionary process is not now generally accepted, and it has been established that any resemblance of the human embryo to that of other creatures at different stages of its growth is purely superficial, and that there is no essential likeness. As Prof. McCready Price aptly remarks, "Inasmuch as any one of the higher animals starts from a single fertilised germcell exactly like any other-even under a microscope - there must be many characteristics in the early stages of their development wherein they would seem to run parallel to each other. After a certain stage is reached, however, they begin to diverge, and to become differentiated in appearance."

Moreover, Prof. Fairhurst declares that "there are radical differences between the embryos of vertebrates and invertebrates. Worms and other articulates in embryo lie doubled backwards around the yolk, while all vertebrates are doubled in the opposite direction. According to the theory that the embryonic condition is a recapitulation of the stages of organic evolution, this fundamental fact on invertebrate embryology ought to have been preserved by the vertebrate. Evolution gives no account of this reversal of position by the vertebrates."

In addition, the flesh of the human embryo is always essentially different from that of any other creature. The argument from embryology is ill-founded, and Prof. A. Sidgwick says, "After fifty years of research and close examination of the facts of embryology the recapitulation theory is still without satisfactory proof."

The protagonists of evolution ignore one vital factor when they lose sight of the evidence of human blood. The corpuscles and capillary blood vessels of human beings of all races are uniform, and careful research has been unable to produce exceptions to this general rule. There are essential differences, however between the blood of man and that of any other species of animal. Indeed, the transfusion of the blood of one species into another frequently results in death. The blood test is a very strong argument against the theory of evolution.

It is sometimes argued that evidence of evolution is seen in the presence of organs in the human body which apparently have no useful function to perform. These, we are told, are vestigial organs, and in *Outline of Modern Belief*, it is stated that "man's body is a veritable museum of relics inherited from pre-human ancestors," and that "some anatomists have made a list of over a hundred of these vestigial structures."

Against this, it must be pointed out that even Darwin suggested "that very many structures which now appear to be useless will hereafter be proved useful." E. S. Goodrich says, "Some few years ago, it was held that such organs in man as the thyroid gland, the pituitary gland, the suprarenal glands and others, are useless structures, functionless, vestigial remnants. They are now known to be of the greatest importance. He would be a rash man indeed who would now assert that any part of the body is useless." Sir Arthur Keith also writes, "It has always been the custom to regard those organs whose functions or uses are unknown as useless, rudimentary, or vestigial organs. As our knowledge of the body has increased, the list of useless organs has decreased." Any argument based upon the presumption of vestigial organs is fallacious.

Another suggested proof of the evolutionary theory is based on the similarity of the construction of the human body and of the body of the ape. Says Haeckel, "The same 200 bones compose the skeleton in man and in the four tailless anthropoid apes, our nearest relatives. The same 300 muscles serve to move the various parts of the skeleton. The same hair covers the skin; the same mammary glands provide food for the young. The same four-chambered heart acts as central pump of the circulation; the same 32 teeth are found in our jaws; the same reproductive organs maintain the species; the same groups of neurons or ganglionic cells compose the wondrous structure of the brain."

The similarity is so marked that it necessarily attracts attention but even such a remarkable likeness fails to establish man's simian ancestry. The similarity is simply the resemblance of animals of the same group or family of species, and proves nothing more than that man and the ape both belong to the same family, so far as physical construction is concerned. There is no real link between them. "We seek in vain," says Virchow, "for the missing link."

The argument of similarity of physical form has been too strongly stressed. As another has pointed out, "It is the life-mentality, not the organism, that fundamentally determines the kind of being."

The central point of the physical system is the brain, and evolution necessarily demands a gradually increasing brain capacity. Says Joseph Cook "Increased cephalization is the law of progress in animal forms. In *Lessons From Nature*, Prof. Dana shows that the capacity of the cranium of the lowest existing man is 68 cubic inches, whereas the cranium of the highest man-ape has a capacity of only 34 cubic inches. There is thus a tremendous gap between the lowest man and the highest ape - a gap which the evolutionary theory requires an incalculable time to bridge, and during which time there would be thousands of stages. Yet the most careful and minute search has failed to produce a single example of an intermediate stage. The argument from the similarity of physical form is superficial.

Countless attempts have been made to discover the missing link between man and the ape, but all efforts have been fruitless. Every fresh discovery of an ancient tooth or an old bone is hailed with delight, but the joyful cries soon die away when it becomes evident that the antiquity of the find is too dubious to provide any real support for the theory.

In 1894, Du Bois discovered in volcanic deposits in Java a small, incomplete skull in one place, and nearby a diseased femur (thigh bone), and not far away two molar teeth. "These were hailed as remains of the missing link," says Prof. G. F. Wright, "and it was forthwith dubbed *Pithecanthropus erectus*. The skull was indeed small, being only two-thirds the size of that of the average man, but Prof. Cope, one of our most competent comparative anatomists, concluded that as the 'femur is that of a man, it is by no means a connecting link.' The erect form carries with it all the anatomical characteristics of a perfect man." The British Museum authorities consider the remains insufficient for a definite opinion and state that their original possessor "may be an ancestral man, or it may be merely a gigantic and precocious gibbon."

At Piltdown (Sussex) in 1911 were found four fragments of a skull the right half of a lower jaw and a tooth. From these has been reconstructed an apelike creature, and it was claimed that the Piltdown man lived over 100,000 years ago. Prof. C. Schwalbe, the great German anatomist, declared that "the proper restoration of the Piltdown fragments would make them belong, not to any preceding stage of man, but to a well-developed, good-sized *Homo sapiens*, the true man of today." But even his theory has been proved incorrect and the remains exposed as a fake.

A human jaw found in the sands of the Mauer River near Heidelberg, was also regarded as an important discovery, and its age was computed at 700,000 years. Thoughtful scientists, however, now question the antiquity of this find also, and indicate that there is no evidence to suggest any connection between the jaw and the long-sought missing link.

In 1937, the third lower molar tooth of a fossil ape (*Australopithecus transvaalensis*) discovered in a cave near Krugersdorp, South Africa, was triumphantly hailed by scientists all over the world as indicating man's direct descent from the ape. Unlike the gorilla, the chimpanzee and the orang, which are presumed to have had the same ancestors as man, the *Australopithecus* was authoritatively stated to be in the direct line of descent, and this dogmatic conclusion was founded upon the inconsiderable trifle of a third lower molar tooth!

Despite all efforts and research, no satisfactory evidence has yet been produced of any link between man and the ape, and Prof. H. F. Osborn, the greatest American authority on fossil vertebrates, says that "the idea of man's ape ancestry is a myth and a bogey."

There are many peculiarities possessed by man which are found in no other animal, and these effectively separate the human being from the beasts of the earth.

Alone of all animals, for example, man possesses true heredity, by which the faculties, nature and characteristics of the parent are transmitted to the children. In the possession of a conscience and the ability to discern between good and evil, as well as of a soul and the capacity to know God, man is unique in the animal world. He alone of all creatures has the ability to reason, to distinguish colours, music and beauty, to love and to hate, to sorrow and to rejoice. He alone uses articulate language, makes and employs tools, uses fire, etc. These facts are beyond the power of the evolutionist to explain.

The Bible declares that man was created by God in the image and after the likeness of God (Gen. 1:26). To those who accept the authority of the Scriptures, this is final. There is no room here for a gradual evolutionary process.

It is, however, evident that there was a divine order in creation. Each successive act of creation indicated progress, and each creature was an advance upon its predecessor. Man was not only the last creature to be created? but was also the culminating point of creation. God had a definite plan before Him and, as Psalm 139 indicates, He had man in mind from the first, and each work was but a step nearer the final end. Agassiz points out that the aim "in creating successively all the different types of animals which have passed away was to introduce man upon the face of our globe. Man is the end towards which all the animal creation has tended from the first appearance of the Palaeozoic fishes."

There is, however, not the slightest evidence in support of the Darwinian theory, and many of the leading scientists of today wholeheartedly reject it. The result of accepting the evolutionary teaching is plainly indicated by T. H. Huxley. "Evolution, if consistently accepted," he writes, "makes it impossible to believe the Bible."

Sir William Dawson declares, "If the universe is causeless and a product of fortuitous variation and selection, and if there is no design or final cause apparent in it, it becomes literally the enthronement of unreason, and can have no claims to the veneration or regard of an intelligent being. If a man is merely an accidentally improved descendant of apes, his intuitions and decisions on things unseen must be valueless and unfounded. Hence it is a lamentable fact that the greater part of the men of science, who are evolutionists, openly discard all religious belief."

In other words, when carried to its logical conclusion, the choice lies between the Bible and evolution, Christ and Darwin. For the Christian, the decision is removed beyond doubt or question.

Creation of the World

The Bible opens with the explicit statement, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." The apostle John adds that "All things were made by Him (the Word of God); and without Him was not anything made that was made" (John 1.3), and this is confirmed by Paul in Col. 1.16, "For by Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, . . . all things were created by Him, and for Him.

The grand simplicity of the Scriptural record is emphasised by comparison with the cosmogonies of other "sacred books," with their fantastic mythologies. The most familiar of the creation myths is

probably the Babylonian, an account of which may be found in the Creation Tablets of Assurbanipal's Library in the British Museum. According to this story, there first existed an abyss, out of which arose the goddess Tiawath and then other deities who made war upon her. Eventually Merodach slew her and divided her body asunder, forming heaven from one half and earth from the other. Merodach is then reputed to have decapitated himself and to have formed man from his blood and bones.

The Egyptian story is equally absurd. In the watery primeval abyss, Nu, the sun god, Ra, came into existence. (In some versions, Osiris is stated to have been the creator: in others, Khepera assumes the honour). Having begotten himself, the god then created the earth, light, men, vegetation and other deities.

The sacred books of India literally teem with ideas concerning the origin of the world and the human race, and it is impossible to examine them all in a brief statement. The chief Brahman theory attributes creation to Brahma. "The supreme Brahma, the supreme soul, the substance of the world, the lord of all creatures, the universal soul, the supreme ruler Hari (Vishnu), of his own will having entered into matter and spirit agitated the mutable and imitable principles, the season of creation having arrived." A vast egg came into existence, from which Brahma was born and which later formed the universe. Buddhism, on the other hand, teaches that there was no first cause, but that matter is eternal and "that every portion of animated existence has in itself its own rise, tendency, and destination." Zoroaster, the great teacher of the Parsees, taught that God, the eternal and self-existent, first brought light and darkness into being, and then, out of them, created the universe.

The Chinese cosmogony has been well summarised by Lewis Spence. "From nothingness an atom is formed. In the course of ages, it splits into a male and female principle, which again splits in two. From the cooperation of these four elements springs a being whose body is broken up into the constituents of a universe, and the worms from its decomposing corpse become men."

In Japanese mythology, the source of all things is stated to have been an egg, which, having quickened with life, became heaven and earth.

Scandinavian cosmogony resembles the Babylonian. Out of a primeval abyss a being, Ymir, arose, who became the progenitor of a race of giants. The gods slew Ymir and made the universe from his body.

"Anaximander," says Prof. G. F. Wright, "traced everything back to an infinity which gradually worked itself into a sort of pristine mud, out of which everything else evolved; while Thales of Miletus tried to think of water as the mother of everything, and Anaximenes practically defied the air. Diogenes imagined a 'mind stuff,' which acted as if it had intelligence; while Heraclitus thought that fire was the only element pure enough to produce the soul of man. These speculations culminated in the great poem of Lucretius entitled *De Rerum Natura*. His atomic theory was something like that which prevails at the present time among physicists. Amid the unceasing motion of these atoms, there somehow appeared, he said, the orderly forms and the living processes of nature.

Details might be added of the weird Celtic and Mexican myths or the fanciful Roman stories, but sufficient has been written to demonstrate the absurdity of these myths.

Present day theories vary. We are told, for example, that, for millions of years, matter existed in the form of vast nebulae, or masses of hot gases, which gradually condensed and solidified into stars. Parts torn out of these stars formed planets which rotated around their parents, the earth in this way becoming a satellite of the sun. Some theorists suggest that matter was initially brought into being by First Cause, while others contend that matter was eternal. It is difficult to accept that our own

galaxy of the Milky Way, with its 100,000 million stars all rotating regularly around the nucleus, and some with their own satellites rotating in turn around them, merely happened, and that the millions of galaxies beyond, each with its own billions of stars, and all possessed of the same inherent property of ordered and consistent motion, are due purely to chance. There must have been a Creator who made them and decided upon their orbits. This is what the Bible states. "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God" Heb. 11.3). This is as true of the planet on which we live as of all God's other works.

A practical difficulty arises in connection with the age of the world. If the unbroken chronological continuity of the Pentateuch be assumed, it would appear that the world was created approximately 6,000 years ago, and this is at once in serious conflict with scientific facts. As Prof. Hitchcock says, "The denudations and erosions that have taken place on the earth's surface indicate a far higher antiquity to the globe . . . than the common interpretation of Genesis admits."

There have been at least five great geological ages, viz., the Ezoic, Palaeozoic, Mesozoic, Cainozoic and Quaternary (human life first appearing in the last of these), and it is claimed by the geologists that the age of the earth is anything from 8 to 1,500 million years. Prima facie, therefore, the critics appear to have some ground for their contention that the Bible is inaccurate and unreliable from a scientific point of view.

In no place, however, does the Bible state that the world was created 6,000 years ago, and investigation soon disposes of the possibility of a Scriptural error. There are two possible explanations. In the first place, the Hebrew word *yom*, which is translated day in Gen. 1, does not necessarily refer to a solar day of 24 hours, nor even to the period of daylight as opposed to night. The word is frequently used to describe a long period or an age, and might possibly be thus interpreted in Gen. 1. The six demiurgic days of the chapter, therefore, might conceivably represent six long periods of time, corresponding with terrestrial geological history. On the other hand, it should be pointed out that these days of divine labour are compared in the fourth commandment (Exod. 20.9-11) with the literal days of the week.

A more probable explanation is that which places a wide gap between the first and second verses of the chapter. The Hebrew particle *vau*, which is translated and noted in Gen. 1.2, may be copulative, disjunctive, or adversative, and might equally well be translated then, after or afterwards. The erudite Dr. Dathe renders it "but afterwards . . ." If this is the correct solution to the problem, the first verse stands alone as a sublime statement of fact, and there is ample space if necessary, for millions of years to intervene between the first and second verses of Genesis 1.

(3845)

© COPYRIGHT The Estate of Frederick Tatford. Reproduced with permission. No part of this article, however small, may be reproduced or stored in any system whatsoever. It must not be copied, altered or downloaded. Failure to comply is illegal being theft and contrary to International Copyright law and will render any offender liable to action at law.