

A Creationist's Challenge To Evolutionists

Written by: Robert Congelliere

In *Time Magazine*, August 23, 1999, evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould asserted that "evolution is as well documented as any phenomenon in science" and "we can call evolution a 'fact'". This is typical of the stratagem used by evolutionists: If you make a statement strong enough and repeat it often enough, you may be able to convince yourself and others that it may be true. I would like to remind evolutionists that, despite their dogmatism, there are many knowledgeable people who do not believe that the evidence supports the theory of evolution.

One of the most-powerful pieces of evidence against evolution is the fossil record. If evolution occurred by slow, minute changes in living creatures, there would be thousands of times more transitional forms of these creatures in the fossil beds than complete forms. Since the billions of fossils that have been found are all complete forms, the obvious conclusion is: Evolution has never occurred. Though evolutionists have stated that there are many transitional forms, this is simply not true. What evolutionists claim to be transitional forms all have fully functional parts. A true transitional form would have non-functioning parts or appendages, such as the nub of a leg or wing.

(1) Where are the trillions of fossils of such true transitional forms?

Critics of creationism often say that creationism is simply religion, whereas evolutionism is based on science. The Bible says in Genesis 1 that all creatures reproduce "after their kind" (no change to another kind, i.e., no transitional forms). So the complete absence of transitional forms in the fossil record supports creationism.

(2) Is this scientific evidence for creationism, or isn't it?

I have also noted that evolutionists only discuss this subject in the broadest terms. If evolution is true, why don't they give us answers to questions such as these:

(3) Where did all the 90-plus elements come from (iron, barium, calcium, silver, nickel, neon, chlorine, etc)?

(4) How do you explain the precision in the design of the elements, with increasing numbers of electrons in orbit around the nucleus?

(5) Where did the thousands of compounds we find in the world come from: carbon dioxide, sodium chloride, calcium hydroxide, hydrochloric acid, oxalic acid, chlorophyll, sucrose, hydrogen sulfide, benzene, aluminum silicate, mercaptans, propane, silicon dioxide, boric acid, etc.?

How was it determined how many bonds each element would have for combining with other elements? When did these compounds develop from the elements (before the big bang, during the big bang, after the big bang)? When evolutionists use the term "matter", which of the thousands of compounds are included? When evolutionists use the term "primordial soup", which of the elements and compounds are included? Why do books on evolution, including grade-school, high-school and college textbooks not include such important, basic information? Evolutionists are masters of speculation. Why don't they speculate about this?

(6) How did life develop from non-life?

(7) Where did the human emotions, such as love, hate, and jealousy come from?

(8) What are the odds that the evolutionary process, proceeding by random changes, would produce human beings, plus millions of species of animals, birds, fish, and insects, all with symmetrical features, i.e., one side being a mirror image of the other? We take symmetry in all these creatures for granted, but is that a reasonable outcome for a random process?

(9) What are the odds that of the millions of species of animals, birds, fish, and insects, a male of each species developed at the same time and in the same place as a female of the same species, so that the species could propagate?

(10) Why are there 2 sexes anyhow? This is not foreordained in the evolutionary framework. Is there some sort of plan here?

(11) If the first generation of mating species didn't have parents, how did the mating pair get to that point anyhow? Isn't evolution supposed to progress when an offspring of a mating pair has a beneficial mutation?

Conclusion: No parents, no evolution. A species would have to jump from a primitive form to a fully developed male and female, each with the ability and instinct to mate.

(12) How did the heart, lungs, brain, stomach, veins, blood, kidneys, etc. develop in the first animal by slow, minute steps and the animal survive while these changes were occurring?

For example, did the first animal develop 10% of complete veins, then 20%, and on up to 100%, with veins throughout its entire body and brain? Then how did the heart slowly develop in the animal and get attached to the veins in the right spot? How did the blood enter the system? The blood could not enter before the veins were complete or it would spill out. Where did the blood come from? Did the blood have red corpuscles, white corpuscles, platelets, and plasma? At what point in this process of development did the heart start beating?

Did the animal develop a partial stomach, then a complete stomach? After the stomach was formed, how did the digestive juices enter the stomach? Where did the hydrochloric acid as part of the digestive juices come from? What about its kidney and bladder? The animal better not eat anything prior to this. How did the animal survive during these changes? (And over thousands of years?) Of course, at the same time the animal's eyes must be fully developed so it can see its food and his brain must be fully developed so the animal can control its body to get to the food.

Like the heart, brain, veins, and stomach, all of the organs and systems in the first animal's body must be fully functional in the first moments of life. This indicates that evolution couldn't occur, and the fossil record indicates that it didn't occur. In other words, if you cannot come up with a detailed, feasible scenario of how the first animal developed, the whole evolutionary theory goes out the window, because it never could have even gotten started. Or is your attitude going to be: "Don't bother me with such details. My mind is made up."?

(13) Why do books on evolution, including biology textbooks, always start with a fully developed animal when

attempting to explain how one species developed into another species? Why don't evolutionists first explain how the first animal developed? (An animal with a heart, lungs, brain, stomach, etc.)

(14) What are the odds that the evolutionary process, proceeding by random changes, would produce a system in human reproduction whereby exactly 50% of offspring are male and 50% are female (based on 50% X-chromosomes and 50% Y-chromosomes)? Again is there some sort of a plan here?

To a creationist, the incredible complexity of human life, animal life, plant life, and the universe is absolutely overwhelming evidence that there must have been a designer. Evidence for a designer: The law of gravity is basic to an understanding of the universe.

(15) Where did the law of gravity come from? Did it have a beginning? Isn't it reasonable to assume that when matter was created, the law of gravity was established at the same time to regulate matter?

Further evidence: The earth receives an incredible amount of energy from the sun, even though the sun is 93,000,000 miles away. Yet the earth only receives one part in 2 trillion of the sun's total energy. And since the sun is only an average star among the 100 trillion billion stars in the universe, the total energy in all these stars is absolutely beyond human comprehension. (I have read that the number of stars is greater than the number of grains of sand in every beach and desert in the world.)

(16) Where did this energy come from? Isn't the only reasonable answer that it was the result of a creative act by an almighty designer/creator?

(17) Why do evolutionists summarily dismiss the evidence from design without any serious consideration?

Professor D.M.S. Watson, zoologist and Chair of Evolution at University College London has given us some insight as to why this is so. He said, "Evolution [is] a theory universally accepted not because it can be proved by logically coherent evidence to be true, but because the only alternative, special creation, is clearly incredible". This of course is an admission that the foundation of evolution is not science, but a rejection of the

supernatural. Evolution then is simply the best alternative anyone has been able to come up with. This also means that evolution is the only field in science where one decides on the answer first, and then looks for evidence to support that predetermined answer.

(18) Other than rejection of the supernatural, how else can one explain the steadfast adherence of evolutionists to this theory even though they do not know the origin of the 3 main bases of evolution: the origin of matter, the origin of energy, and the origin of life?

If you believe in evolution:

(19) Can you give us just one coercive proof of evolution, i.e., a proof that absolutely eliminates any other possible explanation for the origin of the universe, the material world, and human life?

(20) Isn't it true that rather than *proofs* of evolution, all that evolutionists can come up with are *evidences* for evolution to someone who already believes in evolution?

Let's see some answers to important questions such as these, rather than a discussion of what is science and what is religion. That type of discussion is entirely irrelevant. What we seek is the truth, and creationism is a far more reasonable and logical explanation of the origin of the universe, the material world, and human life.

Students: Make a copy of this CHALLENGE TO EVOLUTIONISTS and ask your teacher or professor to give you answers to these questions. If they cannot, you have a right to be skeptical that what they are teaching you about evolution is true. Also, give copies to your fellow students so that they too will be aware that there are huge flaws in the theory of evolution. And of course it is still a theory, not a "fact".

Robert H. Congelliere rhcongelliere@yahoo.com

Comments: Students: Let me know what your teacher or professor said after they looked over these questions. Did they give you any answers?