

BASIC QUESTIONS ON EVOLUTION

by Herbert W. Armstrong

1. Almost in its entirety the argument presented will seem logical, reasonable, plausible, and will "fit" the facts and hypotheses upon which the argument is based. This is natural, because evolution, we all admit, is the product of highly educated and intelligent men, and such men could not have produced, and accepted so universally, a theory which was not logical, convincing, and which "fits" at every point. This, however, does not prove evolution true, nor that these highly educated men have not made a mistake, or been misled.
2. Virtually all these numerous convincing arguments which will so forcefully appeal to your reason ARE ARGUMENTS ON NON-ESSENTIAL POINTS, or are BASED UPON A FALSE AND ASSUMED PREMISE, treated either as established fact or as an axiom, (in which case the argument would be logically true, were the hypothesis, or premise, upon which it is based, true), or are in the nature of an analogy or comparison, which in reality proves nothing whatever.
3. The basic fundamental points which must prove or disprove the theory will be cleverly side-tracked, lost sight of, or confused, by an intricate, tangled maze of complex details on non-essential points, or based on an assumed, unproved, and usually false premise.
4. These premises upon which such elaborate detailed arguments will be based, are usually assumed -- stated as a proved fact. The premise itself is the basic fundamental fact upon which proof must rest -- yet you will find this stated AS FACT, taken for granted, and never discussed, or proved. For example, the premise that the Cambrian and Ordovician strata, so-called, and so-named, were deposited before, and are older than, the Pleistocene or the Miocene. IF these so-called older strata ARE older, and were deposited long ages previous to the so-called later strata, then the argument based upon this premise, that the fossils found in the Cambrian lived long ages before the fossils found in the Pleistocene, would naturally be true. But you will not find any evolutionist dwelling on the basic point, or the premise -- he confidently ASSUMES this one strata to have been deposited long ages before the other, and devotes his words to an argument based upon that ASSUMPTION which will be true only provided the premise is true. HOW DOES HE KNOW that the Cambrian strata was deposited long ages before the Pleistocene? He will not answer that question -- YET THAT IS THE BASIC QUESTION UPON WHICH HIS ENTIRE ARGUMENT RESTS. If you should ask him, the author would have to reply to you, "Why, I know that the Cambrian strata was deposited long ages before the Pleistocene BECAUSE THE SIMPLEST FOSSIL FORMS ARE FOUND IN THEM." In other words, his premise is SUPPOSED, and based upon the very assumption he is trying to prove by it! An assumption cannot be proved FACT by another ASSUMPTION based upon the first assumption!

To be truly CONVINCING, any argument in favor of evolution must PROVE:

1. How life itself originated out of dead matter -- the actual first origin of life. Spontaneous generation, or some other form or method of origin of active life out of dead matter must be proved to have been accomplished through natural causes by RESIDENT forces of nature (which excludes the OUTSIDE power of God). This must be proved, and not assumed. Otherwise ORIGIN itself must be accepted as a direct creation of the outside force, God, or other supernatural outside forces other than the resident natural forces of nature and dead matter.
2. That one species not only can be made to change into or develop into, (even through many successive generations), another and different species, but that IT HAS DONE SO WITHOUT THE AID OF MAN'S SELECTIVE BREEDING, THE AID OF GOD, OR OTHER OUTSIDE OR SUPERNATURAL CAUSES. The change of one species into another different species must be proved, and by NATURAL RESIDENT CAUSES of nature alone. But man has never been able to affect this change or bridge this gap from one species into another, even with his selective breeding and all the skill of science. Is science ready to concede that blind nature can accomplish what science, with all its brains, skill, equipment, and power, has been unable to do? We define a species, of course, as one capable of continuous and indefinite fertile interbreeding. Crosses and hybrids do not come within the definition.
3. That, if there has been such change by such natural causes, the change has been steadily upward -- that is, from simple to complex physically, and tending toward constant improved and advancing intelligence -- and that in specific instances, such as that of man and higher ape, the change has not been retrogression, or degeneration. This, I say, must be PROVED, and not simply easily assumed. Some hold it possible that the higher apes are degenerated men.
4. That, since paleontology offers the sole positive proof, if any, the so-called oldest fossils -- the more elementary and simple -- have been taken from strata which can be PROVED to be the older strata -- universally and without exception. And that the more complex and advanced fossils were taken from strata which must be PROVED were deposited later.
5. If the fossil contents are to be accepted as proof of the age and order of the rock strata, then it must be PROVED by evidences other than the rock strata that:
 - (a) the more elementary fossils lived first,
 - (b) they did not exist SIMULTANEOUSLY, and
 - (c) that they did not appear in the reverse order.
6. Since Darwin and all evolutionists admit that the number of intermediate varieties -- stages of development BETWEEN KNOWN SPECIES -- must have been "truly enormous," to use Darwin's expression, and naturally much greater in number than those of well-defined distinct species, then this basic fundamental proof must be produced:

- (a) that in fossil life a great number, or a greater number, of intermediate stages or varieties have been found than of true fixed species, and
- (b) that, since evolution is continuous, vast intermediate stages or varieties exist today.

Failure to prove this basic point is failure to prove or establish the theory as fact. For,

EVEN THOUGH WE ASSUME THEISTIC EVOLUTION, (which none of the outstanding great evolutionists have assumed) AND CLAIM GOD AS THE CAUSE OF VARIOUS STAGES, AND EVOLUTION, RATHER THAN DIRECT CREATION, AS GOD'S METHOD, WE STILL MUST PRODUCE EVIDENCE OF THE VAST NUMBERS OF INTERMEDIATE VARIETIES, BETWEEN RECOGNIZED SPECIES, BOTH IN FOSSIL FORM, AND IN REAL LIFE TODAY. Isn't it, then significant, that NOT ONE REAL GENUINE exhibit of an intermediate link has ever been discovered in fossil form, or in life today? -- while thousands and thousands which have been discovered all adhere to the lines of well-defined species? Feathered wings first appear in fossil life FULLY DEVELOPED. And so it goes. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE. Evolutionists may cleverly cloud the issue with appealing and reasonable arguments on non-essential points, but they CANNOT PRODUCE EVIDENCE ON THESE BASIC FUNDAMENTAL POINTS. And the truth or falsity of the theory rests upon these basic fundamental points.

Embriology, comparative anatomy, etc., may look reasonable and may "fit" circumstances, but are mere comparisons or analogies, and do not establish anything further than that. They might add weight to a fact already established, but they do not establish a fact, and both are JUST AS READILY, IF NOT MORE PLAUSIBLY, EXPLAINED FROM THE STANDPOINT OF SPECIAL CREATION AS FROM THAT OF EVOLUTION. They prove one no more than the other.