

***Genesis 1 - 2:16: Fact, Fiction or Fulcrum***  
“Evolution and the Fossil Record”

I. A Main Tenant of Evolution

A. Upward evolution

1. Evolutionary development depicts slow upward evolving from the simple to more complex.

a. Thomas Woodward, *Darwin Strikes Back*, p. 33:

We see that the sole actor in macroevolution, according to mainstream biology, is *nature itself*, which is said to have the amazing power to mimic intelligence. ... *Selection, we are told, is the engine of macroevolution; it has been shown to have fantastic creative power, ceaselessly reshaping life from one form to another and writing megabytes of DNA “computer code” – the tens of thousands of genetic files on the cell’s hard drive.* From chemical broth, to pulsating bacteria, to darting fish, to slithering reptile, to yawning monkey, to theorizing man – all of this sweeping drama in the symphony of life was spun out by a master composer who doubles as the director with baton in hand. The composer’s name (using Darwin’s alias for selection) is “Survival of the Fittest.”

2. Darwin says, “If it could be demonstrated that any complex organism existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down.” Charles Darwin, *Origin of Species* (New York: Bantam Classics, 1999), 158.

## B. The facts

1. Douglas F. Kelly, *Creation and Chance*, (Scotland: Christian Focus Publications, 1997), p89.

The fossil record is one of the greatest empirical evidences *against* evolution, for its findings contradict the very premises of evolutionary theory, and instead speak of sudden appearances of species and lack of intermediate or gradual links. In other words, these fossil facts are concordant with the Genesis record of immediate creation and stability of the kinds.

## II. On the Fossil Record

A. There is a stark discontinuity between various species.

1. This would be expected and predicted by the Genesis account.

a. Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, p. 66:

The virtual complete absence of intermediate and ancestral forms from the fossil record is today recognized widely by many leading paleontologists as one of its most striking characteristics .... The fossils have not only failed to yield the host of transitional forms demanded by evolution theory, but ... nearly all extinct species and groups revealed by paleontology are quite distinct and isolated as they burst into the record.

He then makes the following points:

There is no doubt that as it stands today the fossil record provides a tremendous challenge to the notion of organic evolution, because to close the very considerable gaps which at present separate the known groups would necessarily have required great numbers of transitional forms...

Considering that the total number of known fossil species is nearly one hundred thousand, the fact that the only relatively convincing morphological sequences are a handful of cases like the horse, which do not involve a great

deal of change, and which in many cases like the elephant may not even represent phylogenetic sequences at all, serves to emphasize the remarkable lack of any direct evidence for major evolutionary transformations in the fossil record.

## B. The problem

1. As far back as 1979, noted researchers in the field were remarking on the lack of transitional forms, a mainstay of Darwinism, becoming a greater problem.
  - a. Dr. David M. Raup, Dean of the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago, remarked on the concern. His comments are of note because this museum holds the greatest fossil collection in the world. (“Conflicts Between Darwin and Paleontology”, *Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin*, Vol. 50, No. 1, January 1979, p. 25, as quote in Kelly, *Creation and Change*, pg. 90)

Well, we are now about 120 years after Darwin and the knowledge of the fossil record has been greatly expanded. We now have a quarter of a million fossil species but the situation still hasn't changed much. The record of evolution is still surprisingly jerky, and, ironically, we have even fewer examples of evolutionary transition than we had in Darwin's time. By this I mean that some of the classic cases of Darwinian change in the fossil record, such as the evolution of the horse in North America, have had to be discarded or modified as a result of more detailed information – what appeared to be a nice simple progression when relative few data were available now appears to be much more complex and much less gradualistic. So Darwin's problem has not been alleviated in the last 120 years and we still have a record which does show change but one that can hardly be looked upon as the most reasonable consequence of natural selection.

- b. Steven J. Gould noted on “the weight of fossil findings against evolutionary theory”: (As quoted in Kelly, *Creation and Change*, pg. 90)

The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology. The evolutionary trees that adorn our textbooks have data only at the tips and nodes of their branches; the rest is inference, however reasonable, not the evidence of fossils.... Most species exhibit no directional change during their tenure on earth.... In any local area, a species does not arise gradually by the steady transformation of its ancestors; it appears all at once and ‘fully formed.’

C. Summation of empirical evidence against fossil transitional mutation.

1. Excerpted from Kelly, *Creation and Change*, pg. 91:

- a. The imagined jump from dead matter to living protozoans is a transition of truly fanciful dimension, one of pure conjecture.
- b. There is a gigantic gap between one-celled micro-organisms and the high complexity and variety of the metazoan invertebrates.
- c. The evolutionary transition between invertebrates and vertebrates is completely missing.
- d. The evolutionary advance from fishes to amphibians is totally nonexistent.
- e. There are no connecting links between amphibians and the altogether different reptiles.
- f. There are no transitional forms between reptiles and mammals.
- g. There are no connecting evolutionary links between reptiles and birds.  
Archaeopteryx was once highly acclaimed as such a link but has since been acknowledged by paleontologists to have been a true bird.
- h. There are no intermediate or transitional forms leading up to man from an apelike ancestor. Fossil hominoids and hominids cited by evolutionists to demonstrate evolution are actually fossils either of apes or men, or neither. There is no valid scientific evidence to suggest that they are fossils of animals intermediate between apes and men.

2. Cumulative efforts to investigate the cell in recent years, to the contrary of secular researchers, continue to show the evidence for intelligent design of the universe. (Michael Behe, *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenges to Evolution*, New York: The Free Press, 1996, pg.232,233):

The result of these cumulative efforts to investigate the cell – to investigate life at the molecular level – is a loud, clear, piercing cry of “design!” The result is so unambiguous and so significant that it must be ranked as one of the greatest achievements in the history of science.

### III. What about human and “pre-human” fossils?

- A. Nothing has been found and clearly demonstrates transitional mutations between apes and man. (Kelly, *Creation and Change*, pg. 92):

Robert E. Kofahl, among many others, concludes that ‘Most of the “fossil men” were merely animals having no connection to the human race.’ An example is given by Roger Lewin: ‘The dethroning of Ramapithecus – from putative first human in 1961 to extinct relative of the orangutan in 1982 – is one of the most fascinating, and bitter, sagas in the search for human origins.’ Other examples abound.

Human remains were discovered in 1856 in a cave in the Neander Valley, which was the source of the name Neanderthal.... [T]extbook drawings ... portrayed them with bestial features, bull necks, haunched over posture, and knees which could not be straightened. In 1956 respected evolutionary scientists reexamined the bones and concluded that they were of an individual who suffered from severe skeletal malformation resulting from rickets and arthritis .... They were true men, Homo sapiens.

The Peking Man or *Sinanthropus* fossils reportedly found in 1928 and succeeding years were never permitted to leave China.... When carefully compared, these reports show that Peking Man was an animal, probably a large monkey or baboon, not a man.... There is much appearance of fraud in the history of the Peking fossils.

Probably the most famous recent fossil discovery said to be an ancestor of humankind is 'Lucy', a partial skeleton found by D.C. Johanson in Ethiopia in the early 1970s, supposedly part of the 'Australopithecine' group. Huse responds to Johanson's claims of 'Lucy's' being an ancestor of humans:

...Johanson's conclusion is pure speculation. Anatomist Charles Oxnard, using a computer technique for analysis of skeletal relationships, has concluded that the australopithecines did not walk uprightly, at least not in the same manner as humans. In this connection, it should be mentioned that the chimpanzee spends a considerable amount of time walking upright. Thus, there is no valid scientific basis for a conclusion of bipedalism in Lucy. Lucy and her relatives are probably just varieties of apes. Gary Parker discusses 'Lucy' and the 'australopithecines' in some detail in Chapter 3, "The Fossil Evidence" of *Creation: The Facts of Life*.