

Does The Fossil Record Contradict The Bible Teaching Of Creation?

John Shafer

John and his wife Linda (Kramer) have been married since November 1968 and have three daughters. John works for the United States Postal Service, serving as a postmaster. John has spoken on lectures in Colorado and Nebraska. He has worked with the IBS lectureships in Minnesota and done overseas work in Estonia (2 trips) and India (2 trips). John shares the preaching duties at the church in Kearney, Nebraska, speaking every other Lord's Day morning and also regularly teaching a Sunday evening class and also a young boys class on Wednesday.

When I was sent me this assignment, it was suggested that we make the answer as easy to understand as possible. So here goes. NO!

Perhaps the reason I was given this assignment is because it was thought that since I live in Nebraska I was related to the "Nebraska Man" that was discovered in 1922.

In 1922 a single tooth was found in Pliocene deposits in western Nebraska. Dr. Henry Fairfield Osborn of Columbia University, head of the American Museum of Natural History, determined that this tooth had characteristics of a chimpanzee, Pithecanthropus (Java man), and man. From this he concluded that this was a missing link. In England Sir Grafton Elliot Smith, F.R.S., Professor of Anatomy of Manchester, fully supported Osborn.

At the time a politician from Nebraska, William Jennings Bryan, was campaigning in the courts against man being descended from the apes. Osborn stated: ...the Earth spoke to Byran from his own state of Nebraska. The Hesperopithecus tooth is like the still, small voice. Its sound is by no means easy to hear... This little tooth speaks volumes of truth, in that it affords evidence of man's descent from apes.



In 1922 the Illustrated London Times ran an artist's interpretation of Hesperopithecus and his wife, all from the remains of one tooth! A few years later more evidence was found and the tooth was determined to be from an extinct pig!

In this case you see some of the ingredients of the pre-man game. A discovery is made, a prominent scientist(s) interprets the data in the framework of current scientific

thinking. The popular press bridges the gap between the scientist and the lay person, and in the process "fills in" a few details. The man on the street is presented with an image, that will be retained, that man arose from apes. (Wolf)

First off I will tell you that I am not going to try and reinvent the wheel. I will rely heavily on those who have spent years rebuking this nonsense.

I believe we must take a look at the *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary* and see how the word fossil is defined.

Main Entry: fossil

Function: noun

Date: 1736

1 : a remnant, impression, or trace of an organism of past geologic ages that has been preserved in the earth's crust

2 a : one whose views are outmoded : **FOGY** b : something (as a theory) that has become rigidly fixed

3 : an old word or word element preserved only by idiom (as fro in to and fro)

Now after reading these descriptions, I'm guessing that I should speak on the first description and not the second even though I am more familiar with the "old fogy"!

WHY FOSSILS CAN NEVER DISPROVE CREATION

The fossil record (that is, the solidified remains of animals and plants preserved as fossils throughout the earth's rock layers) is frequently proposed as evidence for evolution. But here is an amazing fact: fossils are absolutely worthless as proof of evolution. This is why... Get a sheet of paper and tear off five roughly similar pieces. These will represent five fossils. Put them in front of you. Now arrange them into some sort of order, either smallest at the bottom up to largest at the top, or the most similar shapes on the bottom up to the most dissimilar shape on top, or whatever. You can make them any shape, as long as if you ask someone else they would be able to see some logical arrangement in the order you put them in.

Let's pretend these are five fossils and they are the subject of a creation-evolution debate. The evolutionist team says the fossilized creature at the bottom evolved into the fossilized creature at the top. The creationist team says they were all created as separate fossils, and none of them evolved.

Now come up with evidence to prove each side is right. The fossils cannot prove evolution!

The most interesting thing you will find is that the evolutionists have the much harder job: trying to prove that one fossil evolved into others. The reason is that all five fossils are separate now, and an unbiased observer would have to say there is no indication in the fossils (or pieces of paper) themselves that they were not always separate since the time they were made.

It becomes clear that no matter how many fossils you line up, the fact remains that they are all separate. One is not turning into, or evolving into another. They just have some similarities. So if you say one has evolved into another, you have to find a much better proof than just lining up fossils and saying one turned into another.

EVOLUTION'S FLAW

And that is the insurmountable flaw in trying to use fossils as evidence for evolution. Unless you can show that one kind of creature definitely turned into a completely different kind, you will never be able to prove from those fossils that they were not always separate just as the creationists say.

That is why fossils can never prove evolution, and it is naive to think that they can. You can line up similar-looking computers, printers, books, or pieces of furniture, just as you lined up the fossils. But you cannot show simply by looking at any of their similarities that they evolved through the sequence you are looking at.

The fossil record in the rocks confirms this. As much as Charles Darwin protested that the fossil record was incomplete when he wrote *Origin of Species*, he could no longer use that as an excuse if he were alive today. His belief that “transitional” fossils (one type of creature turning into another) must be numerous in the fossil record simply has not turned out to be true.

CREATURES ALWAYS LOOK THE SAME

The fossil record shows exactly the opposite of what Darwin believed. It shows that from the “earliest” appearance of almost any animal or plant you want to name, all the way up to the time it goes extinct or the way it looks today, it looks pretty much the same. The oldest bat looks like today's bats, the oldest spider looks like today's spiders, the oldest coelacanths look like today's coelacanths, the first *Tyrannosaurus rex* looked like the last. They did not arise in gradual transformations from different-looking ancestors. They always were fully formed and recognizable as what they were and are.

Even worse for evolutionists, their theory claims some of the most bizarre and impossible transitions, none of which seems to be documented in the fossil record. For example, bats and whales supposedly evolved from the same mammalian ancestor in a fairly short time on the evolutionists' timescale. Come on now! What sort of creature could give rise to the enormously different features in a bat and a whale?

If the “first” mammal was a smallish shrew like animal, as evolutionists have said, think of the horrifyingly huge transformations that must have taken place in an impossibly short time to get a flying bat and another gigantic, totally different type of creature (whale) that depends on the ocean for its survival. Needless to say, no such links have ever been discovered in the fossil record.

To try to show that creatures evolved, you have to look elsewhere, because fossils simply cannot prove evolution. Fossils will always seem to be better evidence for creation (Doolan).

FOSSILS SUPPORT CREATIONISM

Since we have discovered that the fossil record gives no support to the idea of species gradually changing into other species, let us see if fossil evidence is in harmony with the Bible.

In seven verses of Genesis chapters 1 - 7 we read God's decree concerning the reproduction of His creations ... "**after his/their kind.**" The word "kind" refers to species, or families. Each created family was to produce only its kind. This forever precludes the drifting, changing process required by organic evolution where *one species turns into another*.

Take note that God did *not* say there could be no changes within the family. He did not create *all* the *varieties* of dogs, cats, animals, etc. in the very beginning then. Many changes have since occurred to produce a wide assortment of varieties within the family. Cats have always remained cats. Dogs are still dogs. Men are still men. From a good gene stock, multiple inbreeding would cause diversity without doing too much damage. Subsequent interbreeding of tainted-generations would cause problems.

Mutation has only been responsible for producing a new variety of the same species, but never originating another new kind. Selective breeding has also brought tremendous improvements such as hornless cattle, white turkeys, and seedless oranges, but all the organisms continue to reproduce exactly as God decreed at Creation – *after its kind*.

The "common ancestor" that evolution demands has never existed. There is no "missing link." Man and monkeys are supposed to stem from the same animal ancestry as well as chimpanzees and many monkey groups – even though they vary tremendously. Some are smart, others dumb. Some have short tails and some long. Some have no tails at all. Their teeth vary in number. A few have thumbs and others do not. Their *genes* are different. Their blood is different. Their *chromosomes* don't jibe. Interestingly enough: apes only breed with apes, chimpanzees with chimpanzees, and monkeys with monkeys.

But when we start comparing humans with monkeys, we get even more impossible differences than those among the simian types. In fact, these differences constitute another unanswerable support for the Bible rule of "after its kind." The fact that some monkeys can be trained to smoke a pipe, ride a scooter, or even hoist a test tube in a laboratory does not prove that scientists are evolved animals, or that monkeys are retarded, developing humans.

Evolutionists expected to find fossil records to support their theory of species changes. It demands vast numbers of scaly reptiles transforming their scales into feathers and their front feet into wings. Other reptiles supposedly should be changing into fur-bearing quadrupeds. Did they find those thousands of multi-changing creatures? *Not one*.

No matter what particular strata they drifted through, all the fossils were easily recognized and classified within their own families. If evolution were true, the strata should be overflowing with hundreds of millions of transition forms with combination features of two or more species. Not only so, but there would have to be millions upon millions of observable living links *right now* in the process of turning into a higher form. Darwin confessed: "There are two or three million species on earth. A sufficient field one might think for observation; but it must be said today that in spite of all the evidence of trained observers, not one change of the species to another is on record." (Darwin 3:25)

CONCLUSION

There are many other examples that could be shown how man continually tries to prove evolution and disprove the Bible. One was in 1912, which became known as the Piltdown Man. This was a jawbone and a skull judged to be 500,000 years old. Within the period of 40 years the jaw bone was judged to be no older than about the year it was found. In fact the teeth upon further study showed that they were filed. In other words, Piltdown Man was a complete fraud! A modern ape's jaw and a human skull had been doctored to resemble an ape-man, and the forgery had succeeded in fooling most of the world's greatest experts.

Things have not changed much over the years. In a UPI press release published in 1984, revealed that a skull fragment which had been hailed by experts one year earlier as the oldest human fossil ever found in Europe had actually come from a donkey.

In his famous book, *Life on the Mississippi*, Mark Twain quipped: "There is something fascinating about science. One gets such wholesale returns of conjecture out of such trifling investment of fact."

There it was in the November 1999 issue of *National Geographic*—splashed all over the place with the flair of P.T. Barnum. "Feathers For T Rex?" Then, "New Birdlike Fossils Are Missing Links In Dinosaur Evolution." Oh, but there was more; the writers of *Geographic* were just getting warmed up.

"IT'S A MISSING LINK between terrestrial dinosaurs and birds that could actually fly," shouted a large pull-quote, right by the side of a color photo of the "dinosaur-bird" mongrel. Then, in smaller type at the bottom of the page: "With arms of a primitive bird and the tail of a dinosaur, this creature found in Liaoning Province, China, is a true missing link in the complex chain that connects dinosaurs to birds." The new discovery has been named *Archaeoraptor liaoningensis*.

It ought to have been dubbed, *Archaeo big-bigblunder!* (Jackson).

In a five-page article in the October, 2000 issue that reads like a good mystery story, author Lewis M. Simons reveals a world of intrigue, deception, pride and money in the trafficking and promoting of a so-called link proving that birds "evolved" from

dinosaurs. The article inadvertently demonstrates, if nothing else, the desperate desire of individuals to gain instant fame and fortune, and of the scientific community to grasp at any evolutionary straw that will bolster their already shaky house.

The “dino-bird” in question was named *Archaeo- raptor liaoningensis*. A Chinese farmer dug up the fossil in two separate areas of a shale pit, pasted the pieces together and sold the resulting composite clandestinely through a middle man for fear of his life (due to Chinese laws against such sales). It ended up in a gem and mineral show in Tucson, Arizona, where it was bought for \$80,000 by the director of a small dinosaur museum in Blanding, Utah.

What “stunned” the purchaser, Stephen A. Czerkas, was that the fossil demonstrated not only feathering but also a beak lined with tiny teeth and a rigid, needle-like tail. To one with evolutionary presuppositions, that could only mean one thing: incontrovertible proof that dinosaurs evolved into birds. In his haste to hatch a golden egg for his struggling museum, Czerkas rushed to have the fossil validated through contacts in the scientific and publishing community, which included the scientific journal *Nature*, and *National Geographic*. While the former ended up rejecting the fossil as having not undergone enough testing and possibly being contrived, the latter, in a classic “I-thought-he-thought” blame shifting pattern, managed to let the truth fall between the cracks despite persistent questions about the fossil’s authenticity, and went ahead with publishing the article (Answers).

Now Evolution is the substance of fossils hoped for, the evidence of links not seen (Gish).

If one truly wants to know about the origin of man, all he needs to do is turn to Genesis chapter 1. “In the beginning God created. . .”

Works Cited

Answers In Genesis Ministries (10/16/2000). “Another Missing Link Takes Flight”, <http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs2/4392news10-16-2000.asp>

Darwin, Charles (nd). *Life and Letters*, <http://www.FossilsSupportCreationism.htm>

Doolan, R. <http://www.121.com.au/rdoolan/index.html>

Jackson, Wayne (12/21/2000). *Christian Courier on the Web*, Penpoints, “Another Fossil Flub”. <http://66.33.75.203/penpoints/fossilFlub.htm>

Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. <http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary>

Wolf, John and James S. Mellet (1985). *The Role of "Nebraska Man" in the Creation-evolution Debate*, originally published in *Creation/Evolution* 16:31-43, 1985, by the National Center for Science Education, <http://www.talkorigins.org/faqs/homs/wolfmellett.html>