

# Creation Evidence and Evolution Myth

by

Matthew McGee

(unedited)

posted at [www.mennoniteisrael.org](http://www.mennoniteisrael.org)

# Creation Evidence and Evolution Myth

## Introduction

Our textbooks, televisions, and newspapers commonly teach, as though it were proven fact, that the earth is 4 to 5 billion years old. But what is not commonly taught is how the scientists determined that age. What assumptions did they make? What evidence did they use? What evidence did they discard?

We will examine these questions in this article. We will see that the scientists began with the assumptions that (a.) the general theory of evolution is correct and that (b.) creation is incorrect. The scientists did not come to these conclusions based upon an examination of the evidence. They simply made these assumptions from the beginning. We will also show that they use some of the most unreliable measurements available as evidence that the earth is very old, while at the same time they discard the overwhelming majority of the evidence which shows that the earth is very young. They also attempt to reinforce their error by claiming that various geological processes took millions of years to complete, even though there is ample evidence to prove that these processes took place very rapidly.

## Definition of Terms

Before we get into this discussion, we need to define a few terms. The **special theory of evolution** is sometimes called horizontal variation. These are minor changes in plants or animals over time, not changes from one kind to another. These minor changes can be observed, shown through experimentation, and can be reproduced. So the special theory of evolution is within the boundaries of science. But in this article, when I refer to "evolution", I will be referring to the **general theory of evolution**, which states that all life evolved from simpler forms of life, which in turn evolved from inorganic material over vast periods of time. Unlike the special theory of evolution, the general theory of evolution cannot be observed, cannot be shown through experimentation, and cannot be reproduced. The general theory of evolution is therefore altogether outside of science.

Those who believe in evolution must accept it on faith. Someone once properly summed up the situation by rewording Hebrews 11:1 for evolutionists as follows, "Now the faith of the evolutionist is the substance of fossils hoped for and the evidence of links unseen."

One other term we need to define is **uniformity**. Uniformity is an assumption often made in determining the age of the earth, in spite of the fact that it is almost always

wrong. It assumes all of the processes that we see in nature today, have always been occurring at the same rate that they do today. Since uniformity is gradual uniform change over millions of years, it is sometimes also called "gradualism".

## How Rocks are Dated

Many people think scientists determine the ages of rocks by radiometric dating. Later in this article, we will discuss radiometric dating in detail in its own section. But the fact is that the dating of rocks to a particular time period in the past is not done by any sort of objective measurement. **The dating of rocks is done by dating the index fossils which are found in the rocks!** The scientist dates the fossils by determining when he thinks those fossils best fit into the assumed general theory of evolution. Any measurement, whether done radiometrically or otherwise, that disagrees with the assumed general theory of evolution is deemed incorrect and is discarded. The scientist then finds that when the rock samples are arranged according to the age he has determined, the fossils in them progress along the time line in accordance with the general theory of evolution. But it was the assumption that the general theory of evolution was correct that was used to date the rocks in the first place. This is circular reasoning, plain and simple. But of course the scientists will conceal enough of the facts and disguise their arguments well enough so that most people will not recognize their circular reasoning for what it is.

Here is an example to show just how illogical this circular reasoning is. A person could assume that no life existed on the earth prior to one hundred years ago. He would then logically conclude that all fossils must be no more than one hundred years old. Then one could use the fossils to date all rocks that contain fossils to one hundred years or less. Then he could say that all of the rocks are evidence that no life existed on the earth prior to one hundred years ago. This argument and conclusion are ludicrous of course. One could prove anything they wanted about the earth's age by this process, but this is just the kind of thinking that is used to support the general theory of evolution.

## Evidence of the Young Age of the Earth

There are many natural processes which can be used to estimate the age of the earth. Henry M. Morris, Ph.D. of the Institute for Creation Research has an article called "The Young Earth" at [www.icr.org](http://www.icr.org). In it, he shows a table of 76 different processes in nature that can be used to estimate the age of the earth. The table includes processes such as the influx of various elements into the oceans, the decay of the earth's magnetic field, the accumulation of meteoric materials on the earth, and many other processes. Of these 76 processes:

26 show the earth to be less than 10,000 years old

15 show the earth to be more than 10,000 up to 100,000 years old  
11 show the earth to be more than 100,000 up to one million years old  
5 show the earth to be more than one million up to 10 million years old  
13 show the earth to be more than 10 million up to 100 million years old  
6 show the earth to be more than 100 million up to half a billion years old  
None of the 76 processes show the earth to be more than half a billion years old.

More than half of these processes show the earth to be less than 100,000 years old.

It should be noted that these processes assume **uniformity** and further assume that none of the daughter component (the substance being formed) was present in the sample in the beginning. If any of the daughter component was present in the sample in the beginning, then that would cause the actual age to be even younger.

The assumption of uniformity, that all conditions remained constant over the period of the measurement, is much more likely to be correct for short time periods than for long time periods. Therefore, the estimates that yield younger ages are more likely to be accurate. Yet the evolutionists say the earth is ten times older than even the longest of the estimates shown above. But they certainly do not say this by preponderance of the evidence.

## Radiometric Dating

One of the primary "evidences" that evolutionists like to point to show that the earth is very old is radiometric dating. As the table in the preceding section showed, there are many geological systems which could be used to estimate the age of the earth. But with each of them, there are potential problems that could throw off the results. Radiometric dating is no exception. Picture in your mind a simple hourglass that has half of the sand in the top half and half of the sand in the bottom half. We might assume from looking at it that it, has been sitting there for half an hour. This would be assuming uniformity, but would this really be a correct assumption?

(A.) Someone could have poured all that sand in the top shortly before you looked at it. In this case, the hourglass may have really been sitting there for several days before you looked.

(B.) Someone may have poured all of that sand in the bottom shortly before you looked at it. In this case, the hourglass may not have been sitting there but a second or two before you looked.

(C) Someone could have tampered with the opening in the middle of the hourglass, either clogging or widening it. In this case, the hourglass may have been sitting there either much longer or much shorter than is apparent.

(D.) Perhaps the hourglass has always looked just as it now appears, and therefore gives no real indication of how long it has been there.

Radiometric dating involves the process of a radioactive element, such as uranium, decaying into another element, such as lead. **Uranium-lead** radiometric dating would be a good clock for estimating the age of rocks if we knew the following.

- (A) The rate at which uranium decays into lead.
- (B) How much lead was in the rock when it was formed.
- (C) All of the lead that was not in the rock when the rock was formed came from decaying uranium.
- (D) There is no way any extra lead or uranium could have gotten into the rock from the outside.
- (E) There is no way any of the original lead or uranium could have gotten out of the rock, such as by differential leaching.
- (F) The process has always been uniform. In other words, A, C, D, and E have each always remained constant throughout the age of the rock.

However, most of these requirements are either unknown, or are known not to be true. But there is a flip-side to the uranium-lead dating method. Uranium decays into lead, which is a very common element on the earth. When the uranium decays, it also produces helium-4 as a by-product. But unlike lead, helium-4 is very rare. Rocks which the uranium-lead dating method estimates to be more than 100 million years old, contain only enough helium to account for a tiny fraction of that time. The evolutionists claim that the helium must have escaped from the rocks. But if that were the case, we should be able to find vast amounts of helium-4 in the atmosphere. But the tiny amount of helium-4 present on the earth indicates only a few thousand years of uranium decay, not 4 to 5 billion years. Even uranium-lead radiometric dating provides evidence that the earth is young when one considers the lack of helium-4 on the planet.

Another radiometric dating method is the **Potassium-Argon** method. With this method, ages found from samples taken from a single rock may differ drastically. Rocks formed from the active Kilauea volcano in Hawaii were found to increase in age as the depth of the rock increased. Lava flows known to be less than 200 years old yielded dates of up to 22 million years using this method. Part of the problem is that argon, which is abundant in the atmosphere, can be incorporated into the rocks under pressure, making the Potassium-Argon method yield older dates.

The **radio-carbon** (C-14) dating method is another very inaccurate dating method. Results differ greatly even in the same rock layer. In rocks that are supposed to be 110 million years old, dinosaur bones and wood were taken and dated to 19,000 years old and 890 years old respectively using this method. In addition, the shells of living mollusks regularly date to more than 2000 years old using the radio-carbon method. One other interesting note about C-14 is that its level on the earth is presently increasing exponentially, and is now 30 per cent short of equilibrium. It has been estimated that it would have taken less than 8000 years for the C-14 to reach its present level of concentration.

## Rapid Processes

Evolutionists also attempt to support their claim that the earth is billions of years old by saying that the earth's various rock strata each took millions of years to form. For example they say it takes 1400 to 2700 years to form a single foot of limestone. They calculate these formation rates by first assuming how many millions of years, according to the **general theory of evolution**, that the rock strata must cover. Then they simply divide by the depth (thickness) of the stone layer.

But the evolutionists ignore the overwhelming evidence which strongly supports rapid limestone formation. This includes many fossils which plainly illustrate that the rock was formed very quickly. One such fossil is of a fish in the process of swallowing a smaller fish, with the tail of the smaller fish clearly sticking out the mouth of the larger one. Now following the assumption of uniformity and the speed of limestone formation that the evolutionists calculate, it would have taken hundreds of years to cover this fish. But clearly this fish was covered in much less than one day's time at the very most, perhaps instantaneously. There are also fossils of fern leaves which did not even have time to wilt before they were covered. There are fossils of whole shrimp, dragonflies, and other insects preserved with minute detail. All of the tiny soft parts of can be clearly seen. So these tiny creatures had no time to decompose. Large dinosaurs with the soft parts preserved have also been found. One fossil shows a 30 foot long ichthyosaur (an aquatic fish-like animal) with a baby ichthyosaur visible in the womb. Yet another fossil shows the same type of animal giving birth with half of the baby out of the mother and half still inside the mother. Assuming the uniformity theory of 1400 years per foot of limestone, and a body thickness of about 5 feet for such a large animal, it would have taken at least 7000 years to cover this ichthyosaur. But obviously, that is not the case. It is as if someone suddenly dumped a whole truckload of cement on this animal, causing it to be instantaneously sealed in rock. This was a catastrophic destruction, with no time to finish dinner and no time to finish giving birth, much less time to decompose. If that is not enough evidence, trees over 40 feet tall have been found standing vertically in the limestone. The trees did not decompose in the time it took them to be covered, which would have taken more than 50,000 years by the evolutionists' uniformity processes.

There are many other processes which were thought to have taken vast stretches of time, that were actually accomplished rather quickly. For example, the formation of **coal** is supposed to have taken millions of years. However, fossils of tree trunks have been found extending vertically in the coal beds, revealing that coal was formed rapidly. If the coal had taken eons to form, the tree would have died, become rotten, fallen down, and decomposed long before the coal could cover it.

Many **rock** formations which are supposed to have been formed over millions of years actually contain flow structures that can be plainly seen, including ripple marks and swirls around internal obstructions. This is clear evidence of rapid formation.

**Stalactites**, rock-like formations that hang down from the ceilings of caves, were once supposed to have required vast stretches of time to form. Some estimates were approximately one cubic inch per 100,000 years. But now stalactites have been found to form much faster. They have even been found underneath modern man-made stone or concrete structures, such as in the basements of old buildings or underneath old bridges.

## The Geological Column

One common argument that evolutionists like to use is to say that as you dig deeper into the rock strata, you find increasingly simpler organisms. They call this the geological column. But in the real world, they cannot find such a column all in one place. So they have to correlate or piece together samples from around the world into columns.

But how do they determine the ages of the various rock strata to know where they should go in the column? By Radiometric dating? No, as previously stated, they look at the fossils that they find in the rocks to see how primitive they think the organisms look. Then they determine the age of the rock and where it should go in the column by examining the fossils themselves. So it is all based upon the beginning assumption that the general theory of evolution is correct and that any evidence to the contrary, no matter how vast, has to be wrong.

Modern human skeletons have been found with dinosaur skeletons. This is a problem for the evolutionists which say that the dinosaurs became extinct tens of millions of years before man came on the scene. But the evolutionists protest, saying that the human skeletons must have been moved or that they somehow did not live contemporaneously with the dinosaurs. However, researchers in Glen Rose, Texas have uncovered very strong, if not irrefutable, evidence that dinosaurs and humans did live at the same time. The evidence is found in and around a river bed in limestone that is supposed to be 110 million years old. The limestone contains hundreds of dinosaur tracks. But among them are many human tracks, including a path of 14 human steps which cross over and sometimes even step directly into the dinosaur tracks. Other human evidence found in the limestone includes a fossilized human finger and an iron hammer. A large cat track, nine-inches across, was also found nearby. This is significant because evidence of any large mammal living contemporaneously with dinosaurs is devastating for popular evolutionary theory which supposes that mammals came millions of years after the extinction of the dinosaurs.

The Grand Canyon presents other problems for the geological column. Along the walls are Cambrian and Mississippian rock layers, one on top of the other. This is interesting because those layers are supposed to have been formed separately with an intervening time gap of 150-200 million years. Why aren't there rocks between

those layers in that alleged huge time gap? The evolutionists theorize that that 150-200 million years must have been a period of very heavy erosion that kept that rock layer from developing. Now we know that just a few decades of water erosion can produce major signs of erosion. Yet the line between the Cambrian and Mississippian rock layers is very level for hundreds of miles with no sign of erosion at all, much less 150 million years worth. So we know that the Cambrian and Mississippian rock layers were actually formed with very little time intervening. In addition, there are some cases of alternating strata. That is, Mississippian rock sits on top of Cambrian rock which sits on top of Mississippian rock which sits on top of Cambrian rock and so forth. Now that really fouls up the so-called geological column.

The Cambrian rock is supposed to be the layer of rock in which the simplest of all life forms first began to appear. However, all of the major phyla of plants and animals may be found in the Cambrian rock strata, including the most advanced group, the vertebrates. In fact, nearly all classes and orders have been found in Cambrian rock. So the pre-Cambrian period for which there is no fossil record is far more than a missing link, but rather, it is a missing chain.

The Laws of Thermodynamics

**First Law of Thermodynamics:** This is the law of conservation of matter and energy. Matter and energy can change from one to the other. But matter-energy can neither be created nor destroyed.

Matter cannot be created within the framework of the natural laws of science. Matter therefore, could only have come into existence by super-natural means (the Creator). The general theory of evolution, the big bang, and other such theories only try to explain how life was formed out of unorganized non-living matter and energy. They provide no clues at all as to how all of the matter and energy came into existence in the first place.

**Second Law of Thermodynamics:** This law is sometimes called the principal of entropy increase. That means that the universe is constantly becoming more and more disordered.

By this law, incredibly complex life forms could never be formed from simple raw materials, even if you waited a trillion years. Some will argue that this law applies only to closed systems, and that since the earth gets energy from the sun, the earth is an open system which can become more organized. Certainly additional energy is required in order for anything to become more organized, but energy by itself is not sufficient. An increase in information is required. For example, a nuclear bomb dropped on a city adds tremendous energy to the city. Does this make the city more organized? No, it turns the city into a mass of smoldering rubble. If a tornado hits a house, it is not going to caulk the bathtub, do the dishes, and lock up when it leaves. Likewise, the sun provides no information to the earth, and is incapable of causing an increase in organization.

## No Simple Cells

In "Origin of Species", page 183, Charles Darwin wrote regarding the general theory of evolution, "If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely breakdown."

One place where his theory breaks down is in the formation of living cells. There are no such thing as simple cells. Bacteria cells, like human cells, are complex beyond our imagination. A single cell is like a huge library, astoundingly complex, not even remotely simple. Each cell contains many different systems required to keep it alive and enable it to reproduce itself. For the evolutionist to be correct, all of these various incredibly complex systems would have had to have been formed simultaneously by chance.

## Apes, Men, Frauds, and Mistakes

In attempt to develop an evolutionary chain between ape and man, evolutionists often point to many so-called "fossil men". However, when these many links in the alleged chain are analyzed it becomes apparent that they all fall into one of three groups of fossils. These three groups are: (1.) apes, (2.) men, (3.) frauds and mistakes.

**Apes:** **Ramapithecus, Oreopithecus, Limnopithecus, Kenyapithecus, and Australopithecines** were all simply various types of apes, perhaps extinct types of orangutans. Australopithecines is supposed to be a step above the others in the chain, but its skull was strikingly similar to that of a modern orangutan. Its brain was only 400 to 700 cubic centimeters, compared with the much larger 1400 to 1700 cubic centimeters for modern man.

It should also be noted that some of those listed in above may be not be legitimate, since some were only based upon teeth or a very scant amount of bones.

**Men:** The brains of the Neanderthals and Cro Magnons were 1600 to 1700 cubic centimeters, at least as large if not slightly larger than modern man. **Neanderthals** are often drawn in textbooks with primitive facial features. However, the soft parts of a face do not leave marks on the skull, so no information about the lips, nose, eyes, and ears is known about the Neanderthal. Evolutionists will draw them with ape-like features to try to support their claims, but the fact is that either chimp-like features or a human features could be placed on a Neanderthal skull. The Neanderthals were assumed to have been of stooped posture when some early skeletons of old people with arthritis were uncovered. But later, upright skeletons were also found. The **Cro Magnon** man was not only large brained but they averaged 6 foot 6 inches in height. So there is really no reason to think that the Neanderthals and Cro Magnons were anything other than men.

**Frauds and mistakes:** There are hundreds of skeletal examples of those listed above which prove only that there were apes and that there were men. But of course we already knew there were apes and there were men. Between these two groups in the alleged chain is a group called Pithecanthropines, also known as Homo Erectus. This group is composed of several frauds. (1.) The **Pitldown man** (Eoanthropus Dawsoni), named for Charles Dawson, was fabricated around 1912. It was heralded as the missing link for about forty years, until 1953 when the Pitldown was exposed as a fraud. It was put together by using pieces of human skull cap and the jaw of a chimpanzee. The teeth had been filed down and chemicals had been used to "age" the bones. (2.) The **Nebraska man** (Hesperopithecus Haroldcookii) was "discovered" in 1922 by Harold Cook and was based on a find that consisted only of one tooth. As flimsy as this sounds, the Nebraska man was taken seriously for five years. Then in 1927, a jaw-bone containing more such teeth was found nearby, and it was determined to have come from an extinct pig. (3.) There are now no known **Peking man** (Sinanthropus Pekinensis) bones in existence. The discoverers had supposedly used various bone fragments of several specimens to put together model skull of what they think the Peking man might have looked like in 1928. However all of the fossil evidence was reportedly lost 1941. (4.) The **Java man** (Pithecanthropus) was "discovered" in 1891 by Eugene Dubois. He found human leg bone about 50 feet away from the skull cap of an ape with a heavy brow ridge. He then put them together and proclaimed it to be an upright walking ape-man. But in 1937, Dubois admitted that he had also found human skulls and ape leg bones in the area, and that the skull of the Java man was really just that of an extinct gibbon-like ape. (5.) **Zinjanthropus** was found by Louis and Mary Leakey in 1950. But ten years later, they found the skull of a human child nearby. They then decided that Zinjanthropus was simply an ape.

The traditional evolutionary charts, following the idea that larger indicates "more advanced", show small apes evolving into larger apes that eventually began walking erect and getting progressively larger until we reach modern man. But the fossil record almost invariably shows that things were larger in the past. Some examples of larger animals found in the fossil records include: Pigs that were the size of Rhinos, rams with horns spanning six feet, sheep that were six feet tall, donkeys 9 foot at the shoulder, a rhino 18 feet tall, armadillos 9 times longer than those that exist today, 50 foot long crocodiles, sharks measuring nearly 100 feet long, wolves 6 foot tall, dragonflies with 20 to 30 inch wingspans, cat-tails 60 feet tall with cones 6 to 10 feet long, turtles 12 feet across, 12 foot tall birds, bison 12 foot at shoulder with 10 foot horn spans. As we mentioned earlier, the Cro Magnon man averaged 6' 6" tall, and like the Neanderthal man, had a brain at least as large if not larger than the average modern man.

## Punctuated Evolution

In absence of credible evidence of evolution in the fossil record, many evolutionists are now attempting to explain the lack of evidence with a modified theory. They call

this theory "punctuated equilibrium" or the "punctuational model". This is a move away from the idea of uniformity. This revised theory is that there are very long periods with no evolutionary change, separated by very brief periods of rapid evolution. Therefore, many evolutionists now say that the reason that no evidence of evolution can be found is that the evolution happened so fast that it left no visible record. So this theory is not based upon evidence, but rather, the lack of evidence. It has no scientific foundation.

This really just causes more problems for the general theory of evolution. If punctuated evolution were correct, then there would no longer be any need for them to say the earth is 4 to 5 billion years old, since evolution could take place so quickly. Never-the-less, the evolutionists faithfully cling to the ancient earth theory anyway. Also, they are in essence admitting that they have no evidence for evolution.

Evidence of the Global Flood

The eruption of the Mount St. Helens volcano in the early 1980's and the tremendous mud-flows that came afterward provided an excellent look at the kind of effects that the global flood had on the earth's surface. The mud-flows carved out a large gorge that is like small scaled model of the Grand Canyon. Naturally, water run-off from the hills began to flow through the gorge in the form of a small stream. Many geologists, if they had been unaware of the Mount St. Helens eruption, would have said that the stream carved out that gorge over hundreds of millions of years. But the gorge did not even exist prior to 1980. The stream did not cause the gorge, but rather, the gorge caused the stream. The many rock layers and other geological formations that we see all over the world can be explained by the global, catastrophic flood.

After such a catastrophic flood, we would expect to find vast numbers of dead animals and plants, all over the world, buried in rock formed by flowing water. That is exactly what we find. Many dinosaur graveyards have been found containing the skeletons of thousands of dinosaurs together, with their bones aligned in a uniform direction, indicating they were all killed together in one massive water flow.

All of the Egyptian pyramids have the horizontal streaks caused by thousands of years of erosion by wind-blown desert sand. But the older Sphinx which sits in their midst shows an altogether different type of erosion. Though the upper portion of the Sphinx has been recarved by various pharaohs, the lower portion still shows the deep rounded scars of erosion by water. Upon this realization, some scientists began to theorize that in the period 4500 years ago and beyond, Egypt used to receive much more rainfall than it has in the last 4500 years. But those of us who know the Bible know what really happened about 4500 years ago.

## In Closing

Psalms 14:1 and 53:1 each say, "*The fool hath said in his heart, There is no Almighty....*" The evolutionist begins with the false premise that there is no Creator.

Therefore, to explain our origins, the evolutionist has to assume that we must have somehow evolved out of inorganic material over billions of years. So basically the evolutionist pre-determines the answer from the beginning. He is convinced that the earth has to be billions of years old, and that it is just a matter of finding evidence to support it. The majority of the evidence that he finds, which suggests that the earth is much younger, must therefore be wrong and must be thrown out and ignored. However, an honest man who examines all the evidence must conclude that the earth is very young. Romans 1:20 says, "*... the invisible things of him (Elohim) from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Mightiness; so that they are without excuse ....*"

The Scriptures says in Genesis 1:1, "*In the beginning **Elohim created the heaven and the earth.***" Furthermore, Exodus 20:11 says, "*... in **six days** YHWH made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day ....*" See also Exodus 37:16-17. By counting backwards in Genesis timeline using the chronological information provided in the scriptures, it is clear that the six days of creation took place sometime around 4000 BC. When we consider the absence of evidence for evolution and all of the signs that we see of the global flood, then we are left with no reason not to simply and literally believe the Word of the Almighty.

**[www.matthewmcgee.org/creation.html](http://www.matthewmcgee.org/creation.html)**

Abraham Rempel  
905-682-1970  
avraham@cogeco.ca  
PO Box 29020, St. Catharines, ON L2R 7P9  
[www.mennoniteisrael.org](http://www.mennoniteisrael.org)

**Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people!  
Deut. 4:6**