

## Evolution and the Bible

The "*Theory of Evolution*" is nothing more than just that, **a theory**, a theory that is not substantiated by **any** kind of scientific proof whatsoever and, yet, this "*theory*" has, by far, been the most influential argument against the Bible because this theory has been presented **as if** science has proved its validity...and reliability...thereby, disproving the Biblical account of creation! However, once again, science has **not** proven the theory of Evolution because this theory is, itself, **un**-scientific!

Purporting to explain the origin, meaning, and destiny of all things, evolutionists insist that evolution is a **fact** of science, however, because science can only observe the **present**...and only *speculate* about the past or future...in a very real sense, the, so called "*Theory of Evolution*" makes assumptions that go beyond the realm of science.

The impossibility of "*living*" organisms developing naturally from "*non-living*" organism has been dealt with in a previous lesson so we won't delve into this subject here... suffice it to say that evolutionists admit that...even in this day and time...man is unable to change inert matter into living matter...and, yet, despite the reality of this fact, the same evolutionists go on to promote a *theory* that purports that the processes of life evolved out of non-living chemicals.

The evolutionists makes an assumption about:  
 an atmosphere which doesn't exists . . .  
 an oceanic composition which doesn't exist . . .  
 processes that no long exists . . .  
 and then proceeds to use his false assumptions to explain  
 a generation of **hypothetical** primitive organisms  
 which no long exist.

### THIS KIND OF REASONING IS JUST NOT SCIENTIFIC

Despite the fact that a wide variation of characteristics is possible within any living species...and that many particular varieties may be developed by different breeding processes which reproduce units with distinctive characteristics...there are, nevertheless, always found to be **inter-fertile** and, if left alone for several generations to mix freely, will tend to revert back to the original ancestral species.

The similarities that are obviously present among different organisms...such as the similarities that exists between man and monkey...are better explained by the fact that these organisms had the same *Designer*, rather, than the fact that these organisms "*evolved*" by the process of evolution. In other words, the similarity between different organisms point to a common *Creator* rather than to a common evolutionary ancestor.

While organisms do...as entities unto themselves...develop and mature...the *Theory of Evolution* teaches something entirely different than this process of maturity because it teaches that one kind of living species changes into that of another kind of living species and, yet, as we've already mentioned, despite the impossibility of this kind of change, there are Christians who...having accepted this evolutionary process as God's creative process... endeavor to interpret Scripture in the "*light*" of this evolutionary process...however...once again, we reiterate that it is **impossible** to make the Bible story of creation agree with the Theory of Evolution.

## REASONS FOR REJECTING THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION

### 1. ONE SHOULD REJECT THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION BECAUSE IT IS A THEORY THAT RESTS UPON A MASS OF MERE SUPPOSITIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS.

The evolutionists' premises are filled with such expressions as, "*It is probably...*" *It is likely...*" "*You may suppose...*" "*The probabilities are...*" etc. They never have **one single proven** premise from which to draw their conclusions.

In his account of man's origin ["*Descent of Man.*" Vol III, p. 3772], Darwin writes, "*Man is descended from a hairy quadruped [that is, a four footed animal] furnished with a tail and pointed ears, **probably** arboreal in its habits. This creature, if its whole structure had been examined by a Naturalist, would have been classified among the quadrumana [four hands like monkeys]. The quadrumana, and all the higher mammals, are **probably** derived from an ancient marsupial animal [that is, having a brood pouch like the kangaroo] which was derived ...through a long line of diversified forms...either from some reptile or some amphibian-like creature [that is, having gills so as to live in water or on land] which was derived from some fish-like animal. In the dim obscurity of this past, man's early progenitor must have been [meaning **probably** was] an aquatic animal [that is an animal living and growing in water] provided with gills, with the two sexes united in the same individual."* [Emphasis mine]

Darwin's conclusion that, "*Man, therefore, was **probably** descended from some fish-like creature having the two sexes united,*" is a statement which, of course, is based on mere supposition, supported by no proof whatsoever.

In "*Descent of Man,*" p. 624, Darwin gives his theory of how man lost his hair. He says, "*The females **probably** preferred the males which had the least hair, and their offspring - through heredity - would **probably** have the same inclination in selecting their mates, and so, we **suppose**, man became hairless.*" Note again that all of this is but mere supposition without any proof. [Emphasis mine]

In "*The Other Side of Evolution,*" p. 23, Darwin describes how man got his eyes. He states, "*Eyes originated from some animal having pigment spots or freckles on the side of its head, which - when turned to the sun - agreeably affected the animal, so that it acquired the habit of turning that side of its head to the sun, and its posterity inherited the same habit and passed it on the other generations. This pigment spot, or freckle, acquired sensitiveness by use, and so, in time, a nerve developed which was the beginning of the eye. From this incipient eye came the present wonderful combination of lenses, nerves, and muscles, all so wonderfully adjusted.*"

One wonders how did all descendants come to have these pigment spots, or freckles, in the very same place on the head? Why did not some descendants have these "*pigment spots*" on the side of their heads, on the top, or back, of their heads? How did they all happen to have these freckles in the very same place? However, such tremendous difficulties never

troubles an evolutionist. Why? Because all he needs...from which to draw any conclusion...is a mere **assumption**.

Minds, capable of accepting as truth that which is such illogical nonsense, are most assuredly in a state of "*Devil-ution*," and not Evolution.

Anyone who demands that his conclusions be drawn from proven facts will never be able to accept the Theory of Evolution because it is based on such foolish, and illogical, reasoning that draws its most stupendous conclusions from a mass of

**suppositions and assumptions.**

2. ONE SHOULD REJECT THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION BECAUSE NO PROOF HAS EVER BEEN FOUND...EITHER FROM FOSSIL OR LIVING FORM...THAT SUBSTANTIATES ITS POSTURE THAT...IN THE EVOLUTIONARY PROCESS...ONE KIND OF SPECIES CHANGED INTO ANOTHER KIND OF SPECIES.

In his "*Life and Letter*," Vol III. p. 251, Darwin says, "*There are two or three million species on the earth, sufficient field, one might think, for observation. **But it must be said today that, in spite of all the efforts of trained observers, not one change of one species into another is on record.***"

That fact is still true today..."*not one change of one species into another is on record*"...yet...despite that fact...and the fact that the Evolution Theory doesn't even endeavor to explain why...after over **one hundred years** of research in the geological stratus, and among all living animals...no evidence has been discovered to verify that one kind of living species has ever changed into another kind of living species...evolutionists are more willing to believe this utterly false and unproven theory than they are to believe the Bible record of God as the Creator of man...and the universe.

3. ONE SHOULD REJECT THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION BECAUSE ALL HYBRIDS ARE STERILE

One can cross the horse and the ass and obtain the mule: but no mule can ***reproduce*** his kind.

Among the thousands and thousands of classified species of animals, there is not one known instance where, upon crossing different species, the begotten animal has not been sterile...and if this has always been the case then we have no reason to believe that it will not **continue** to always be the case...which means that we can accept as fact that all hybrids [that is, offspring of two animals of different species] will always be sterile...and, they being sterile, makes the creation of a new species an impossibility by any other means than the Bible record of God as their Creator.

4. ONE SHOULD REJECT THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION BECAUSE OF THE GREAT GULF BETWEEN THE BRUTE AND MAN.

There are some great gulfs which the Theory of Evolution cannot bridge:

(A) **There is the gulf between man's body and the brute's body which the Theory of Evolution cannot cross.**

The Theory of Evolution makes the assumption that there must have been hundreds of intermediary forms of life between the ape and man, yet, once again, no proof of this has ever been found either in living, or fossil, form.

Since the germ cells of the different species of young, undeveloped animals differ as widely among themselves as the cells of full-formed organisms, it is impossible for the different species of animals to have originated from...to have the common origin of...the same cell.

Because chemistry can analyze the blood of man...as well as the blood of a hundred animals...and never err in assigning each drop to its proper heart...it is able to tell us that there is no more possibility of consanguinity [which means being descended from the same ancestry, or being related by blood] between man and the ape than there is between man and any other animal. Chemistry separates man from all created animals by a distance that is almost infinitely greater than the distance which exists between the lower forms of animal life and the lion, or any other form of higher animals.

(B) The greatest gulf of all between man and the ape is the fact that man possesses a conscience...while an ape does not. Man's conscience...which enables him to distinguish right from wrong...which approves, or condemns, him...and which leads him to reverence, and worship God... is what makes a man a *moral being* while other animals... creatures... are *amoral beings* [which means they are neither moral or immoral].

Since the attributes of justice and mercy, and the fear of God, are not...in **any** way...the attributes of brutes, these attributes never could have been produced by the evolution of their instincts. A conscience...a moral sense...could not possibly have "*evolved*" from what does not, in any way, exist within animals.

No! Evolution cannot bridge these tremendous gulfs between the man and the ape!

5. ONE SHOULD REJECT THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION BECAUSE IT CANNOT POSSIBLY ACCOUNT FOR MEN LIKE MOSES, SOLOMON, SOCRATES, MUCH LESS, **CHRIST!**

We have placed Christ with these other great men **only because** evolutionists count the Lord Jesus Christ as a mere man and not as God. They admit that He was the best man the world has ever known...the One Who ought to be the ideal for all mankind ...the greatest of all spiritual teachers, and the One who enjoyed the greatest amount of Divine inspiration...yet, they say, He was only *a man*.

If evolution is really the "*law of Nature*," then there could never have been a fall... as recorded in the Bible...because...according to the Theory of Evolution...man has been getting

better...and brainier...ever since the beginning of his existence, and he will continue to evolve and grow better all through eternity.

Because we possess the true record of Christ's wonderful life and teachings within the Bible, we know that He lived the noblest...and best...life the world has ever known. In view of this...if, then, evolution is a fact...if men have, from the beginning of time been growing *better and brainier*...why have we not had another Christ...or many other Christ's...or, for that matter, why have we not had men who have far surpassed Christ by this time? This most assuredly would have happened if the Theory of Evolution was a fact.

The greatest men Greece has ever known lived from 500 to 300 B.C. If evolution is really a fact, why must one look **back**...rather than **ahead**...to find the better, brainier, men?

The greatest Greek teachers...Zeno...Socrates...Plato... Aristotle...and Epicurus...all lived between 500 and 340 B.C.
---

- Phidias, the greatest Greek sculptor, lived around 490 B.C.

- Pericles, the greatest Greek Statesman, lived around 490 B.C.
- Demosthenes, the greatest Greek orator, lived around 385 B.C.
- The greatest Greek poets...Tragedienness...Aschylus...Sophocles  
...and Euripides...all lived between 529 and 485 B.C.
- Aristophanes, the greatest Greek comic poet, lived around 440 B.C.
- The greatest Greek Historians...Herodotus and Xenophon...lived between 490 and 300 B.C.
- Alexander the Great, the greatest Greek general, lived around 356 B.C.

Now, if evolution is a fact...if men have really been evolving down through the ages, growing better and brainier...why is Greece, today, compelled to look **back** to their period [500 to 300 B.C.] for all her greatest men? Why doesn't Greece have just as great...or greater...men today?

To any logical mind, the fact that the greatest men lived **before** our day should be conclusive proof that **devilution** [devolution]...rather than evolution...is the law of nature because: *Before a man comes in touch with Christ's life and teachings...and accept Him as his personal Savior...he always goes . . .*

*down . . .*

*down . . .*

*down . . .*

so, in reality, a man only beings to "*evolve*" after he is *born-again*...which is exactly what God's Word teaches us!

#### 6. ONE SHOULD REJECT THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION BECAUSE THE FINDINGS OF ARCHAEOLOGY HAVE PROVEN IT TO BE UTTERLY FALSE

The theory that modern civilization evolved out of barbarism is certainly not borne out in the discoveries of archaeology because, as far back as archaeology can carry us, these discoveries show man to be already civilized...building cities and temples...carving hard stone into artistic form...and even employing a system of pictorial writing...which verifies to us that the Bible view is right after all...that...civilized man has been civilized from the beginning...from the time God first created him.

#### 7. AND, THE GREATEST REASON OF ALL WHY ONE SHOULD REJECT THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION IS BECAUSE IT GOES AGAINST CHRIST'S TEACHINGS WHICH CONFIRM THE GENESIS RECORD OF CREATION

In Matthew 19:4, we read, "*And He [Christ] answered and said unto them, Have ye not read [in the book of Genesis] that He [God] which made them at the beginning made them male and female.*" Again, in Mark 10:6, Christ says, "*But from the beginning of the creation God made them [men and women] male and female.*"

Why should one believe Christ's teachings on creation in preference to believing the Theory of Evolution?

**1. One should believe Christ's teachings on creation simply because Christ is very God...the God Who created all things.**

John 1:1-3 teaches, "*In the beginning was the Word [Christ], and the Word was with God, and the Word [Christ] was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him [Christ]; and without Him was not anything made that was made.*"

Colossians 1:16-17 tells us, "*For by Him [Christ] were all things created, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by Him and for Him [Christ]; And He is before all things, and by Him all things consist [stand together].*"

Since the Lord Jesus created everything, surely He knows how He did it!

**2. One should believe Christ's teaching on creation because Christ proved that He had the power to create.**

The only miracle that Christ performed...that is recorded in all four Gospels...is the feeding of the five thousand "*men*"...and since Scripture tells us that the figure did "*not include women and children*"...and since women and children were also fed that day...the total number of people fed that day would probably have been about 20,000 people! [See Matthew 14:13-21; Mark 6:32-44; Luke 9:10-17; and John 6:9-13].

Jesus fed 20,00 people with five loaves and two fish...and after "*they all ate and were satisfied the disciples picked up twelve baskets full of the broken pieces left over!*" The Greek word that is used from the "*baskets*" is **kophinos** ...which is the same word...in the Greek language...that is used for "*coffin*"... which means that those twelve baskets were big...**B-I-G**...baskets.

How did Christ perform this miracle? The answer is that He did it by direct creation! Do you suppose that it would have required any more Divine power to have created the whole vegetable, and animal, kingdoms then it did to have...*instantaneously* ...created sufficient bread and fish to feed twenty thousand people? The answer is **No!**...because the Christ Who performed this wonderful miracle proved to all logical minds that He was the real Creator of this universe.

**3. One should believe Christ's teachings on creation because He is God's Own truth personified.**

In John 14:6, Christ says, "*I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father, but by Me.*" And, in John 18:37, Christ says to Pilate, "*Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Everyone that is of the truth heareth My voice.*"

Evolutionist's admit that Christ was the best man that every lived...the supreme example of genuine goodness the world has ever known...yet, in reality, Christ is either what He claimed to be...truth personified...or He is a deceiver and a deliberate liar, and, as such, utterly unworthy of our confidence.

**4. One should believe Christ's teachings on creation because Paul, the Apostle, substantiates these teachings.**

In 1 Corinthians 15:47, Paul says, "*The first man [Adam] was made of dust (choikos) out of the earth (ek ges)*"...which means, then, that he was **not** "*made out of the ape.*" And in 1 Timothy 6:3-4, Paul writes, "*If any man teach otherwise [other than the teachings of Christ], and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ...he is proud, knowing nothing.*"

The meaning of the Greek word that Paul uses here for "*proud*" is, "*to have the mind beclouded with smoke of self-conceit.*"

To try and compare the Theory of Evolution with Christ's teachings on Creation is comparable to trying to compare the light given off by a farthing candle with the light given off by the blazing sun at noon day...or...said in a more *Biblical* way...Choosing to believe man's Theory of Evolution...rather than Christ's [God's] teaching on Creation...is comparable to choosing to walk in the darkness of man's thinking...and untruth...rather than to walk in the light of God's Word...the Truth!