

Email: creationtips@talk21.com
Website: www.creationtips.ws
Copyright © 2000 Creation Tips (updated 2001)

**The *Creation Tips* classroom.
Clear, short answers on creation and evolution.
Creationology for beginners Lesson 1.**

What's the difference between creation and evolution?

This is the first of a short *Creation Tips* four-part course titled *Creationology for beginners*. The whole four lessons should take you only about 15 minutes to read, but will give you an idea of some main points in the creation–evolution debate. The four lessons have been adapted from other articles on the *Creation Tips* website, so after you have finished the course you may find the articles from which these were taken elsewhere on the *Creation Tips* site. Now let's start.

What do creationists and creationologists believe?

Creationists, creationologists, and creation scientists all believe that the universe, life, and all the basic matter these consist of were created by God. All three can actually be called creationists.

A **creation scientist** is a creationist who is a scientist, and a **creationologist** is a creationist “who studies creation or has a strong interest in it.” A young Christian child may be a creationist, as is someone who simply believes in creation but doesn't take an active interest in it. A creationologist takes an active, strong interest in it, and also in why evolution fails as an explanation of origins. The suffix “-logy” means “a subject of study or interest” — as in theology, archaeology, zoology, biology. So creationology is “the study of God's creation.”

Most creationists and creationologists today are either conservative Christians or orthodox Jews who believe that the Bible (Christian), or the Torah (Jewish), is accurate in its description of God's creation of the world and of life. They therefore believe the Bible when it says that the world, the stars, planets, and life were created over a short time (six ordinary 24-hour days). They also believe the Bible when it says that the first living things were created fully formed (that means the chicken was created before the egg: Genesis 1:20-22).

Creationologists (including creation scientists) believe that most fossils are the result of the worldwide flood described in the book of Genesis, and that the earth's surface, mountains, and terrain we see today were basically shaped by that flood.

What do evolutionists believe?

Evolution is the idea that the universe and life have formed by a process of evolution (simple things developed into complex things) over a long time — millions or billions of years. Those who believe this are called **evolutionists**.

Evolutionists do not know how the first matter appeared, or how life evolved from non-life. But they believe that a “big bang” billions of years ago started the process that formed all the stars, planets, and life. They believe that simple forms of life evolved into highly complex types of creatures such as humans, although science has never clearly supported this. They are constantly looking for “missing links,” which supposedly are creatures that link one type of organism to a completely different type.

Unlike evolutionists, creationists are not searching for “missing links” to show that fish turned into amphibians, or that reptiles evolved into birds, or that apes and humans evolved from a “common ancestor,” and so on. This is because creationologists and creation scientists believe that the scientific facts already fit the creationist idea. (That is, major types of creatures were created much in the form they are today, and major organs such as arms, legs, mouths, hearing organs, were present and fully functional from their first appearance on earth; they did not gradually develop.)

In summary:

Creationists believe that God created the universe as described in the Bible’s book of Genesis. The world was created in six ordinary days. Animals and plants were created pretty much in the form we find them today. Most fossils formed rapidly as a result of a worldwide flood.

Evolutionists believe that the universe formed from a “big bang” billions of years ago. Life formed from non-life. From the first simple life-form(s), every other living thing on earth has evolved. Evolutionists do not believe there was a worldwide flood; they believe that fossils formed slowly from local events.

Now go on to Lesson 2 in the *Creation Tips* classroom:

- [Lesson 2: Three fatal flaws in evolution](#)

Other lessons:

- [Lesson 3: Is the evidence for creation better than the evidence for evolution?](#)
- [Lesson 4: Small changes don't prove evolution.](#)

The *Creation Tips* classroom.
Clear, short answers on creation and evolution.
Creationology for beginners [Lesson 2](#).

Three fatal flaws in evolution

Evolution is full of unsolved problems. Evolutionary scientists always seem to be on the brink of making major breakthroughs in evolution, but never quite get there.

Here are three easy-to-remember fatal problems with evolution. To be honest, we believe they show that evolution could never have started. So trying to find missing links and other proofs of evolution is really wasting time unless these three problems are overcome. Unless evolutionists solve them, creation will remain the only explanation supported by currently known facts.

Fatal problem No. 1

There is no known scientific law that allows something to evolve from nothing.

If there was nothing in the universe to begin with, obviously nothing would happen to cause anything to appear. Our observations and common sense show that without a creator you won't get anything, let alone everything. Evolution fails completely on this count in the areas of science, common sense, and observable fact.

Fatal problem No. 2

No scientific law can account for non-living things' coming to life.

The dirt and rocks in your garden don't turn into trees and flowers. Plants come from seeds, cuttings, or grafts from other trees and flowers. Life simply does not arise from things that have never had life in them.

Evolutionary textbooks teach that at some time in the distant past, life arose from non-living substances. But biology has found no law to support this idea, and much against it. The invariable observation is that only living things give rise to other living things. Life could not begin if God and miracles took no part! Evolution fails to give a credible explanation for how life could begin.

Fatal problem No. 3

There is no known scientific law that would allow one kind of creature to turn naturally into a completely different kind.

Fish don't turn into amphibians, for instance, because fish don't have genes to amphibians.

The theory of evolution teaches that simple life-forms evolved into highly complex life-forms, such as fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals. There is no natural law known that could allow this to happen. The best that evolutionists can come up with to try to explain how this might have happened is to suggest that it happened by *mutations* and *natural selection*.

But mutations overwhelmingly *destroy* genetic information, and produce creatures more handicapped than the parents. And natural selection simply weeds out unfit creatures. Natural selection may explain why light-colored moths in England decreased and dark moths proliferated (because during the industrial revolution the light moths on dark tree trunks were more easily seen and eaten by birds), but it cannot show how moths could turn into effective, totally different, non-moth creatures. Neither mutations nor natural

selection explains how new genetic information could get into an organism's genetic code to produce a totally different kind of creature.

All the evidence is on the side of the Christian who believes the Bible's account of creation — that in the beginning God created the world and all the major types of creatures to reproduce “after their kind”.

In summary:

1. There is no scientific law that allows something to evolve from nothing.
2. No scientific law has ever shown that life can arise from non-life.
3. There is no known scientific law that would allow one kind of creature to turn naturally into a completely different kind.

Now go on to Lesson 3 in the *Creation Tips* classroom:

- [Lesson 3: Is the evidence for creation better than the evidence for evolution?](#)

Other lessons:

- [Lesson 1: What's the difference between creation and evolution?](#)
- [Lesson 4: Small changes don't prove evolution.](#)

The *Creation Tips* classroom.
Clear, short answers on creation and evolution.
Creationology for beginners [Lesson 3](#).

Is there evidence for creation that is better than evidence for evolution?

One of the biggest differences between evolutionists and creationists is the way in which each group believes that living things appeared on earth.

Evolutionists claim that all living things have come from one or a few original living organisms (they call it the “common ancestor”). They believe that the first living things on earth were simple life-forms that eventually evolved into very complex life-forms such as humans. The idea is that all life on earth is like a “chain” throughout time linking simple organisms of the past to complex organisms of today. Evolutionists believe that:

- single-celled organisms evolved into multicelled organisms
- which eventually evolved into fish
- which evolved into amphibians
- which evolved into reptiles

- which evolved into birds and mammals, and finally humans.

The difficulty with this evolutionary “chain” is that the links between all the major groups are missing. Evolutionists are searching for these “missing links” to try to prove their theory, and have been looking since at least the time of Charles Darwin in the mid-1800s.

Creation difference

Creationists, however, believe that God created all the major types of living things separately in the beginning.

- fish were created as fish
- amphibians were created as amphibians
- reptiles were created as reptiles
- birds were created as birds
- mammals were created as mammals
- humans were created as humans right from the beginning.

Creationists do not believe that creatures in these or other major groups evolved at all. They say the reason evolutionists can't find the missing links between these major groups is because the links don't exist.

So, a good evidence for creation would be to show that life-forms that do not have antecedents appeared on earth.

The fossil record reveals something that clearly supports this creation idea but is disturbing to the evolution idea. It shows that complex animals that are fossilized in the early rock layers of earth appeared quite suddenly.

Complex organs appear abruptly

For example, in the Cambrian (supposedly very early) rock layers we find lamp shells, moss animals, worms, trilobites, and shrimp. These creatures have complex organs: intestines, stomachs, bristles, spines, and appendages. They have eyes and feelers, which indicates that they possessed a good nervous system. Some have gills, which shows that they extracted oxygen from the water and had complex blood circulation systems. There is nothing primitive or simple about these Cambrian creatures!

Now the big question is: Where are the ancestors of these Cambrian fossils? Where are the organisms with partially formed intestines, stomachs, bristles, spines, appendages, eyes, feelers, and gills? Evolutionists have never been able to produce them. They appeared suddenly, fully formed.

Dr. Arlie J. Hoover, in his book *Fallacies of Evolution*, is just one of many who have asked: Where are all the simpler creatures that should have led up to these complex forms, if “molecules to man” evolution is supposed to be a scientific fact? This problem is so acute that even the modern “father of evolution,” Charles Darwin, admitted that it “may truly be urged as a valid argument” against evolution.

Strong evidence for creation

The sudden appearance of these Cambrian animals with no antecedents definitely suggests creation rather than evolution. It seems that animals were created with all their parts intact right from the start; they didn't evolve over a long time. That is exactly what is found in the record of the past: the fossils. Therefore this is strong evidence for creation, but leaves evolution still floundering for missing links.

In summary:

Complex organs such as intestines, gills, stomachs, eyes, legs, feathers ... all appear suddenly and fully formed in the fossil record. This fits the creationist belief and what the Bible's book of Genesis implies. But it does not support the evolutionist's idea that these structures would have evolved in animals over millions of years. This is strong evidence that the creation explanation is right and the evolution explanation is wrong.

Now go on to Lesson 4 in the *Creation Tips* classroom:

- [Lesson 4: Small changes don't prove evolution.](#)

Other lessons:

- [Lesson 1: What's the difference between creation and evolution?](#)
- [Lesson 2: The three fatal flaws of evolution.](#)

The *Creation Tips* classroom.
Clear, short answers on creation and evolution.
Creationology for beginners [Lesson 4](#).

Small changes don't prove evolution!

When you ask evolutionists for their favorite evidence for evolution, you are likely to get one of these replies:

- All dogs have evolved from an ancient type of wolf. People have bred dogs as diverse as Chihuahuas and Great Danes in a short time. If we can see so much variation occur in a short period, it is surely easy to imagine that many evolutionary changes would occur over huge periods of time.
- Finches have been studied and observed in depth, and it can be seen that their beaks change size and shape. This must be evolution in action. We can actually see these changes take place, so over a much longer time there would be enough variation for creatures to evolve into countless other creatures.

These examples in fact show only what is called "variation within kind." That is, there may be many types of dogs and wolves, but this does not explain what the first wolf, for instance, evolved from. There may be many variations in beak shapes and sizes in

finches, but this does not show that birds such as finches evolved from non-birds, as the evolutionary theory claims.

What do creationologists oppose?

Let's get it clear what creationologists oppose. Even the most dedicated creationologist and anti-evolutionist would probably accept that birds' beaks may change size, that parts of animals may change color, that eyes and ears may change shape, and so on. *Why?* Because there is ample evidence that these can happen within the normal genetic system each creature possesses.

What creationologists *don't* accept is that such small, *observed* changes are evidence of much larger, *unobserved* changes. Creationists don't accept that these creatures can turn into, or have evolved from, completely different kinds of creatures. The "little" changes are sometimes referred to as "microevolution" (they really don't deserve to be called *any* kind of evolution, because they are observable, testable, and a normal part of variation of genetic information, but that's what many people call them).

The "big" changes (such as fish to amphibian, amphibian to reptile, reptile to bird) are referred to as "macroevolution". The big changes have **not** been observed, and have not left any indisputable sequence of fossils to show that small changes have led up to really "big" changes. There is simply no mechanism to make the big changes happen and be sustained — they are not a natural feature of genetic alteration.

Whales evolving into whales? Horses into horses?

When evolutionists give you "evidence" for evolution, they usually don't realize how silly that evidence is. They may say that fossils have been found of whales with hip-joints or tiny leg-like appendages, so this proves that whales evolved from a land animal with legs. But what have they said? Whales have evolved from whales! That argument in no way shows that whales have evolved from creatures that are **not** whales.

They use the same argument for horses and all sorts of other animals. They will say there is a clear sequence of fossils that shows horse evolution. But they say the first in the series was a horse and the last in the series is a horse. So, what have they said? Horses have evolved into horses!

This is like lining up a series of clocks, with a small, simple clock at one end and a complex clock at the other end, and then saying that this proves that the last one evolved from the first and that clocks evolved from something else that isn't a clock. The fact is that they are all simply varieties of the "clock family," and they were made as individually designed clocks to start with. They didn't evolve from a non-clock! Likewise, animals that are whales, or horses, or birds, or whatever, in no way prove that these creatures have evolved from, or into, something else.

Human intervention!

Note again the example of the dogs that humans have bred.

It took human intelligence and intervention to breed the wide variety of dogs in the world, but this in no way shows that non-intelligence and non-intervention can make the huge changes required to prove macroevolution. After all, humans can make buildings, shoes, and children's toys in hundreds of variations, but this does not prove that those things

could occur in nature without human input. In each case, humans have modified and adapted available material for their purpose.

In summary:

Stop and think when you are told that small variations prove major evolution. Dogs being bred from dogs by humans, finch beaks of different shapes and sizes, horses turning into horses, whales turning into whales, and so on, in no way indicates that these creatures evolved from animals essentially different from what they are today.

Now go to our [Creation Tips website](http://www.creationtips.ws) (www.creationtips.ws) to learn more about creation science and more problems with evolutionary explanations.