CREATION VERSUS EVOLUTION

MEMORY VERSE: Genesis 1:1—“In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.”

LESSON SUMMARY: Sound scientific evidence points toward creation, not evolution.

LESSON AIM: To give students a better understanding of the great amount of evidence that exists in the world which contradicts evolutionary theory.

Ensure that all materials are prepared for students’ use. The following materials will be required if you choose to do the sedimentation experiment: clear 2-liter bottle, funnel, sand or sugar of various size grains

EXTRA PRIMARY SOURCE: www.apologeticspress.org

When your students enter the classroom, welcome them back to vacation Bible school. You may consider briefly reviewing the material from the previous class session.

PREPARATORY CONCERNS

Be familiar with the facts in this lesson. One object of this lesson is to impress the students with the legitimate scientific data that points to the God of the Bible and not to evolution over millions of years.

Most likely, there is more material in this lesson than can be covered in one class period. Thus, you will have some latitude concerning which subjects you would like to emphasize the most.
WHAT IS EVOLUTION?
Atheistic evolution is a scientific theory which claims that the Universe is self-contained, and that everything in the Universe has come into being through random processes over long periods of time without any outside cause (such as a Creator). According to evolution, no supernatural being had any part in the origin or development of life. Evolution claims that all living things originated from an original organism composed of only one cell, which in turn arose from something non-living. Evolution states that all things originate through natural processes, and that nothing outside of nature exists.

WHAT IS CREATION?
Creation and evolution are exact opposites. According to creation, the Universe is not self-contained. A supernatural being is responsible for the origin and design of the Universe. This Being used processes that are not still in operation today to construct all things, including the various forms of life such as animals, plants, and humans.

WHICH VIEW IS RIGHT?
Creation and evolution cannot both be correct. There is no room in evolution for a supernatural being such as God, and creation has no room for a purely natural process in which a single-celled organism eventually turned into humankind. The two theories are at odds, opposite, opposed, and contradictory. Therefore, only one of them can be correct. But which one is it?

The factual evidence that is available points toward one of these two views.
As far as science knows, natural laws have no exceptions. This definitely is true of the Law of Cause and Effect, which is the most universal and most certain of all laws. Simply put, the Law of Cause and Effect states that every material effect must have an adequate cause that existed before the effect (“material” refers to anything composed of matter and energy).

Material effects without adequate causes do not exist. Also, causes never occur after the effect. In addition, the effect is never greater than the cause. That is why scientists say that every material effect must have an adequate cause. The river did not turn muddy because the frog jumped in; the book did not fall off the table because the fly landed on it. These are not adequate causes. For whatever effects we see, we must present adequate causes.

Five-year-olds are wonderful at using the Cause and Effect Law. We can picture a small child asking: “Mommy, where do peaches come from?” Her mother says that they come from peach trees. Then the child asks where the trees come from, and her mother says they come from peaches. You can see the cycle. Eventually the child wants to know how the first peach tree got here. She can see very well that it must have had a cause, and she wants to know what that cause was.

One thing is for sure, the Universe did not create itself. We know this for a scientific fact, because matter cannot create matter. If we take a rock that weighs 1 pound and do 50,000 experiments on it, we will never be able to produce more than 1 pound of rock. So, whatever caused the Universe could not have been material.

THE BIBLE SPEAKS ABOUT THE CAUSE
The Bible certainly is not silent about what caused the Universe. In the very first verse of the first chapter of the first book it says: “In the beginning God created the heavens and the Earth.” Acts 17:24 records: “God, who made the world and everything in it...He is Lord of heaven and earth.” Exodus 20:11 notes: “For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them.”

- God is undoubtedly an adequate cause, since He is all-powerful. In Genesis 17:1, God told Abraham, “I am Almighty God.”
- He came before this material world, fulfilling the criterion that the cause must come before the effect. The psalmist wrote: “Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever You had formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, You are God” (Psalm 90:2).
- And He definitely would instill within mankind the con-
cept of morality, since He is a God of morals. Titus 1:2 says that He cannot lie.

Only God fits the criteria of an adequate cause that came before the Universe.

**ACTIVITY...**
Perform a simple magic trick or rig a more elaborate demonstration to show the principle of adequate cause. Waving your hand over a top-hat cannot cause a rabbit appear. There must be an adequate explanation. An atomic explosion does not result from a child’s firecracker, and a bookshelf does not fall because a fly lands on it.

**WHY DOES GOD NOT HAVE A CAUSE?**
If we contend that every material effect must have a cause, and we say that only God could have caused the Universe, then the obvious question is: “What caused God?” Doesn’t the Law of Cause and Effect apply to God, too?

There is a single word in the Law of Cause and Effect that helps provide the answer to this question—the word “material.” Every **material** effect must have a cause that existed before it. Scientists formulated the Law of Cause and Effect based upon what they have observed while studying this Universe, which is made out of matter. No science experiment in the world can be performed on God, because He is eternal spirit, not matter (John 4:24). Science is far from learning everything about this material world, and it is even farther from understanding the eternal nature of God. There had to be a first Cause, and God was (and is) the only One suitable for the job. He is self-existent. The Law of Cause and Effect is a scientifically established law that does not have any known exceptions. It was not conjured up from the creationists’ magic hat to prove the existence of God, although it does that quite well. The evidence in this section is sufficient to show that this material Universe needs a non-material cause. That non-material Cause is God. If natural forces created the Universe, randomly selecting themselves, then morality in humans could never be explained. Why is this Universe here? Because “In the beginning, God…”
In biology, one of the most widely used laws of science is the Law of Biogenesis. “Biogenesis” is composed of two words—“bio,” which means life, and “genesis,” which means beginning. Thus, this law deals with the beginning of life. And it simply says that life comes only from previous life of its own kind. We see this law played out everyday all around the world.

Everyone knows that kittens come only from female cats, cows produce only calves, and puppies come only from dogs. A pig never gives birth to a horse, and a sheep never bears an iguana.

Over the years, the truthfulness of this law has been documented by thousands of scientists, one of the most famous of which was French microbiologist Louis Pasteur. His work dealt a crushing blow to the notion of spontaneous generation (the idea that life arises on its own from nonliving sources). In earlier centuries, the idea that life arose from nonliving things was very popular. People believed that a person could take some wheat grains, wrap them in an old rag, stuff them in the corner of a barn, and produce mice. They also believed that old meat left on a kitchen counter would spontaneously generate maggots. However, teachers and professors correctly point out that Pasteur triumphed over this “mythology” when he disproved the concept of spontaneous generation through his well-designed scientific experiments. Yet with almost the same breath, those same teachers and professors tell their students that evolution occurred as a result of spontaneous generation.

The fact of the matter is that evolution could not have occurred without some form of spontaneous generation. For this reason, many scientists have concocted experiments attempting to create life from nonliving substances. But after all these attempts, life has never been created from something nonliving. Now, let’s think critically for a moment. If thousands of scientists have designed carefully planned experiments to create life from something nonliving, and yet have failed miserably every time, how in the world can we be expected to believe that nature did it using accidents, chance, and blind forces? On the contrary, whether in nature or in the laboratory, scientists have never documented a single case of spontaneous generation. Life comes only from previous life of its own kind, which is exactly what the creation model teaches.
WHAT DO THE FOSSILS SAY?

Fossils are the remains of once-living organisms such as plants, animals, or humans that now are buried in the rocks of the Earth. They are found all over the globe, and they provide much information about life of the past. If any physical evidence exists to establish evolution, it certainly would come from the fossil record. But does it?

In order to establish evolution, its supporters must show that the fossil record is filled with transitional forms of plants and animals (and humans, for that matter). A transitional form is an organism that exhibits characteristics of two separate groups, such as a half reptile/half mammal.

Even Charles Darwin, who is often referred to as “the father of evolution,” claimed that the fossil record should show “innumerable transitional links.” In fact, he titled the tenth chapter of his book, The Origin of Species, “On the Imperfection of the Geological Record.” He thought that “the number of intermediate varieties, which have formerly existed [must] be truly enormous.” However, he went on to admit: “Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated chain; and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and serious objection which can be argued against this theory. The explanation lies, I believe, in the extreme imperfection of the geological record.”

Darwin thought that further geological finds would show millions of transitional forms. But 150 years have passed since Darwin’s day, and millions of additional fossils have been discovered. Yet the ever-illusive transitional forms are still missing. On occasion, some scientists produce alleged transitional forms (such as “Piltdown Man” or Archaeopteryx) but these are few and far between. Furthermore, on occasion they prove to be frauds, and not one has ever been proven to be an authentic transitional form. The fact of the matter is, the fossil record still lacks the multitude of transitional forms predicted by Darwin and his followers, and will continue to do so. Why? Because there were no transitional forms!

Well, what does the fossil record show? It shows millions of organisms suddenly arriving on the scene fully formed and functional, without any transitional forms.

ACTIVITY...

A sedimentation experiment. Fill a jug with water (a two-liter soda bottle works well). Mix fine sand with larger-grained sand or small pebbles (alternatively, you can use regular sugar and the larger-grained colored sugar). Pour the mixture into the water jug through a funnel. The particles should separate in the water, the smaller ones settling on top. It is likely that this occurred during the Flood: the smaller and lighter animals’ remains settled lower (though some large animals were mixed in) than the larger ones, like dinosaurs.
coming before them. Which model of origins could account for the sudden appearance of fully functional living organisms—creation or evolution?

It is true that smaller and simpler creatures are found in lower strata than larger and more complex ones. Why is that? It may have something to do with the Flood of Noah. In water, smaller particles sink faster and settle lower than larger ones. Since size is usually proportional to complexity (there are no elephant-size amoebas), they would be found lower.

POLYSTRATE FOSSILS

To the “man on the street,” one of the most impressive arguments for an ancient Earth is the testimony of sedimentary-rock layers. Scientists (and park rangers) show us examples like the Grand Canyon and present their theory so effectively that—as we observe layer after layer of sedimentary rocks piled one on top of another—the only explanation seems to be that vast amounts of geologic time must have been involved. Each division of the rocks, we are told, represents a time long ago, and an ancient world that long since has ceased to exist. Creationists, however, beg to differ, and suggest that a closer look at the “record of the rocks” shows the youth, not antiquity, for our home planet.

Embedded in sedimentary rocks all over the globe are what are known as “polystrate” fossils. Polystrate simply means “many layers,” and refers to fossils that cut through at least two sedimentary-rock layers. Probably the most widely recognized of the polystrate fossils are tree trunks that extend vertically through two, three, or more sections of rock that supposedly were laid down in epochs covering millions of years. However, organic material (such as wood) that is exposed to the elements will rot, not fossilize. Thus, the entire length of these tree trunks must have been preserved quickly, which suggests that the rock layers surrounding them must have been deposited rapidly—possibly (and likely) during a single catastrophe like Noah’s Flood.

One trunk, exposed in a sandstone quarry near Edinburgh, Scotland, which measured no less than 25 meters and, intersecting 10 or 12 different strata, leaned at an angle of about 40°. This particular tree must have been buried while falling down! Polystrate fossils are very common in coal formations.

Trees, reeds, catfish, whales, and the other organisms with which the fossil record abounds did not die and lie around for hundreds, thousands, or millions of years while slowly being turned into polystrate fossils. Truth be told, polystrate fossils testify loudly to a young Earth whose layers formed rapidly—and not very long ago!
Sometimes you might see a person with an identical twin brother or sister. It is easy to tell that they are related because they look so much alike. Mothers and daughters often look alike, as do fathers and sons (or even some cousins). Many times, things that look similar are often related to each other. Two black rabbits often have baby black rabbits, and two short dogs often produce offspring that are similarly short.

The concept that similarity often shows relationship is one of the most impressive arguments for the theory of evolution. As scientists have worked in various fields, they have learned that basic similarities exist between certain groups. Scientists call these similarities homologous structures. “Homologous” simply means similar. For instance, the wing of the bat, the forefoot of the turtle, the forefoot of the frog, and the arm of a man all have the same general structure. Evolutionists also note that the forefoot of the dog, the flipper of the whale, and the hand of man contain essentially the same bones and muscles. Therefore, evolutionists conclude that all these animals must be related.

How do creationists respond to such an argument? Well, they certainly do not deny the fact that similarities do exist. It is here, however, that a valuable lesson can be learned in the creation/evolution controversy. That lesson is this: it rarely is the facts that are in dispute—it is the interpretation placed on the facts that is in dispute. When the creationist looks at the similarities that exist, instead of claiming common ancestry he says that the evidence points to a common designer. For example, many GMC automobiles have the same wheels, body shapes, and brake systems. Why? Because they were designed by the same company. When the Creator designed a lung, brain, or nervous system that worked well, wouldn’t it make sense that He would use these features in different animals that would all live in the same environment, breathe the same air, and eat the same food? Similarity doesn’t always show common ancestry; many times it shows common design.

In fact, when you honestly look at all similarities, they obviously do not show common ancestry. For example the octopus eye, pig heart, Pekingese dog’s face, and donkey’s milk all have similar parallel structures in the human body, but even evolutionists would deny the living animals in which they are found are closely related to each other or to humans.

CONCLUSION
The facts of science say that a material effect requires an adequate cause, which comes before the effect: evolutionists have yet to come up with an adequate cause for the Universe and everything in it. The facts of sci-
ence say that in nature life comes only from previously existing life: evolution says life comes from nonliving sources. The facts show that no transitional forms of half-and-half organisms exist in the fossil record: evolution maintains that there should be millions of transitional forms. The facts show that similarities sometimes show common ancestry but also can show common design. Facts are stubborn, impartial things that refuse to budge for people of high estate or low degree. The concepts of creation and evolution stand on opposite sides, and the facts stand behind creation. All the evidence points to an intelligent Designer.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. What are several differences between creation and evolution? Why do many people clash over which one should be taught?

2. Dr. Louis Pasteur did experiments that disprove what false theory? Can you see why people might have held to that theory? How does that theory relate to evolution?

3. In order for evolution to be established, what must be found in the fossil record? What would you expect to find in the fossil record if creation is true? What do scientists actually find in the fossil record?

4. Similarities can show two things. What are they? How does the creationist answer the idea that similarities show common ancestry? What should creationists not do when answering such arguments?

5. Why does it matter what you believe about creation and evolution? Why do you think some people prefer to believe in evolution?