

## A Special Creation Part 2

Now folks, I don't know if you've noticed or not, but our society today could not only give a rip about what the Bible says, but they even gone so far now as to create their own version of the Bible. For instance, you can now check out the **politically correct** version where Jesus' being God's only son is now generalized to: "No one knows the Child except the Father-Mother; and no one knows the Father-Mother except the Child." Or maybe you could read the new **feminist version** where the resurrection passage from Matthew 28 now states, "Mary Magdalene and the other Mary came to see the tomb. But the angel said to the women, 'Do not be afraid, for I know that you seek Judith who was crucified. She is not here; for She is risen.'"

And now thanks to **evolution**, we now have the "new" account of Jesus' birth. Here's a sample:

"He (Jesus) was born in a manger a long time ago, not to a virgin, but to a gorilla. What's so funny? Who did you expect his ancestors to look like, Tom Cruise? But wait. I'm not making fun of Jesus. I'm not mocking religion. In fact, from the deepest wellspring of my heart, I'm despairing something we've lost in our scientific culture.

Yes, if Jesus was alive today, he would understand that his ancestors, just like ours, were beasts. No, he wouldn't run around claiming he was born of a virgin. And, brilliant rabbi that he was, he would likely ask us to understand the miracle stories metaphorically, as morality tales, but certainly not as literal truth."

Hey, folks, it's one thing to make a monkey out of me. But to make a monkey out of my Lord? I don't know about you, but I not only find that video totally blasphemous, I find it completely ludicrous, especially when we saw in the last chapter how this whole Ape Man Evolution is based on a pack of lies! Oh, but people I'm telling you, that's just the tip of the iceberg and that's precisely why we're going to continue in our study, "**The Witness of Creation.**"

In our study so far we've seen the first **three evidences** of creation that God has left behind for us showing us that He's not just real, but that we really can have a personal intimate relationship with Him, the Creator of the universe was the evidences of **An Intelligent Creation** from very the Hand of Almighty God, as opposed to blind chance exploding from some sort of primeval blob, and then **A Young Creation**, as opposed to the long-age fairy tale time of evolution. But last time, we began a new section showing us that the **third evidence** that God left behind for us was **A Special Creation**. And there we saw the Bible clearly says we we're created for a special purpose to have a special relationship with a special God, right? But the problem was what evolution teaches. They say we came from a **simple cell**, to a **blob of gel**, to an **ape that smells**, right? Therefore, we took a look at the supposed **Ape-Man Evolution** with **Nebraska man**, **Pitdown man**,

**Neanderthal** man, **Java** man, **Peking** man, **Ramapithecus**, **Orce** man, **Lucy**, **Toumai** man, and finally **Rhodesia** man. And what we saw **in every single case** was that they were either a deliberate lie, a hoax, or had nothing at all to do with humans! Liar liar, pants on fire!

But you might be thinking, “Okay so maybe the supposed evolution of an ape into a man is a bunch of baloney, but what about the supposed evolution of **animals**? You know, like the supposed **horse and whale evolution** that evolutionists say proves that animals evolved over millions of years? What about that? Well, hey, great question! But before we look at that, let’s get reacquainted with how the Bible says animals came onto the scene.

**Genesis 2:19-23** “Now the LORD God had formed out of the ground all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the air. He brought them to the man to see what he would name them; and whatever the man called each living creature, that was its name. So the man gave names to all the livestock, the birds of the air and all the beasts of the field. But for Adam no suitable helper was found.

So the LORD God caused the man to fall into a deep sleep; and while he was sleeping, he took one of the man’s ribs and closed up the place with flesh. Then the LORD God made a woman from the rib he had taken out of the man, and he brought her to the man. The man said, This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman, for she was taken out of man.”

Now folks, according to our text, the Bible is clear. As we saw before, God not only made the animals and man on day six, **but as we saw here**, He

**specifically** brought them to Adam to do what? To name them, right? And ladies, I know we guys can take a while to finish our projects, but how many of you would say it probably didn't take Adam millions and millions of years to name those animals? But not only that, according to our text, neither did it take God millions of years to bring in those animals, did it? I mean, was Adam standing around in line waiting for millions of years for them to evolve? I don't think so! **And so here's the obvious problem.** Evolution **does teach** that it took millions and millions of years for them to evolve, right? And once again this is directly opposite to what the Bible says!

Therefore, I'd say we better take a look at not just the Scriptural evidence but the scientific evidence of this supposed **Animal Evolution** and see just whose telling the truth, how about you? But to help us do that, let's first take a refresher course in the evolutionary answer of the supposed origin of animals, starting with the **horse**. Here's the typical textbook response.

Over a period millions of years the horse grew from being a small fox-like animal that was only about 2 feet tall to the modern-day horse that stands more than 6 feet high. And along it's way it lost all its toes. (I hate it when that happens!) Therefore, the horse did not always look like it does today. In fact, it took about 60 million years for the horse to develop into what we see today.

The first one was called Eohippus, which means, "dawn horse." It was a small forest animal and looked nothing at all like a horse. It had a "doggish" look with an arched back, short neck, short snout, short legs, and a long tail.

It probably scampered from thicket to thicket like a modern deer, only stupider, slower, and not as agile. And here's a surprise. A tiger's teeth are mainly pointed and it only eats meat. Well, this first horse also had pointed teeth. So what does this tell us about what it ate? Meat! The first horse was a carnivore. (I wouldn't kick this horse too hard with your spurs...he's might eat you!)

Then many millions of years later came Epihippus, Meshippus, Miohippus, Kalobatippus, Parahippus, Merychippus, Pliohippus, Astrohippus, and Dinohippus each changing along its way until finally today we have our current horse called the Equus. It has completely lost all signs of once having multiple toes and seems to have emerged about 2 million years ago.

Now folks, how many of you were taught or heard that story of **horse** evolution or maybe even seen it on display somewhere? Of course, it's commonplace, right? **But the point is this.** Is it really true? Did this animal, the **horse**, really take millions and millions of years to evolve? I don't think so! **Why?**

Because the **first reason** why we know God created the animals is **Because this Horse Evolution is a Lie!** People, we're going to take a look at some serious problems with this supposed horse evolution and you tell me if we haven't been lied to.

**The Existence Problem:** The whole idea of this horse evolution was made up by Othniel Marsh in 1879 and famous evolutionist Thomas Huxley. They produced a diagram which attempted to show the so-called gradual stages of the horse evolving. The only problem was that Othniel Marsh picked the animals from all over the world. He did not find them in one place and he did not find them in that order. He made the entire thing up! Not only is this supposed order of horse evolution never found in the order it's presented, but there is no one site in the world where the evolutionary succession of the horse can be seen. It doesn't exist!

**The Ancient Problem:** As it turns out, the supposed first “ancient” horse called Eohippus is not a horse at all. It’s called a hyrax and it is still alive today in South America. It’s about the size of a fox and is a meat-eating animal with sharp teeth. Then the supposed “ancient” horse called Hipparion which evolutionists say has also been extinct for millions of years is also still alive today. It’s called the Okapi and lives in the northeastern rainforests of Zaire in central Africa and is not even a horse or even a relative of the horse. It’s a relative of the giraffe.

**The Genetic Problem:** If the theory of horse evolution were to be true, it has some very serious genetic problems to overcome, such as the ribs, toes, and teeth. In all cases, they are totally different and completely inconsistent. For example, the so-called Eohippus, the ancient horse, had 18 pairs of ribs, the next one had 15 pairs of ribs, the next one after that had 19 pairs, the next one after that had 18 pairs. Then the number of lumbar vertebrae goes from 6 to 8 and then returns to 6 again. What kind of evolution is that?

**The Inconsistency Problem:** There are more than 20 charts of the evolution of the horse proposed by various researchers and each are totally different from the other. Obviously, even the evolutionists haven’t reached a common agreement about this theory.

**The Fossil Problem:** If the horse evolution were true, you would expect to find the earliest horse fossils in the lowest rock strata. But the problem is, you don’t. In fact, bones of the supposed “earliest” horses have been found at or near the surface. Then, some of the supposed three-toed horses have been found with the supposed one-toed horses, showing they lived at the same time. And finally, fossils of modern horse species, the Equus, have been discovered in the same layer as Eohippus, which shows that our modern horse and its supposed ancient ancestor actually lived at the same time.

**The Size Problem:** The evolutionists assume that the horse has grown progressively in size over millions of years but what they forget is that modern day horses vary enormously in size. The largest horse today is the Clydesdale and the smallest is the Fallabella, which stands only 17 inches tall. Both are members of the same species, and neither has evolved from the other.

**The Admission Problem:** Evolutionist **Boyce Rensberger** said, “The popular told example of horse evolution, suggesting a gradual sequence of changes from four-toed fox-sized creatures living nearly 50 million years ago to today’s much larger one-toed horse, has long been known to be wrong. Instead of gradual change, fossils of each intermediate species appear fully distinct, persist unchanged, and then become extinct. Transitional forms are unknown.”

Then the well-known paleontologist **Colin Patterson**, a director of the Natural History Museum in London said, “There have been an awful lot of stories, some more imaginative than others, about what the nature of that history of life really is. The most famous example, still on exhibit downstairs, is the exhibit on horse evolution prepared perhaps fifty years ago. That has been presented as the literal truth in textbook after textbook. Now I think that is lamentable, particularly when the people who propose those kinds of stories may themselves be aware of the speculative nature of some of that stuff.”

And evolutionist science writer **Gordon R. Taylor** explains, “But perhaps the most serious weakness of Darwinism is the failure of paleontologists to find convincing phylogenies or sequences of organisms demonstrating major evolutionary change. The horse is often cited as the only fully worked-out example. But the fact is that the line from Eohippus to Equus is very erratic. Specimens from different sources can be brought together in a convincing-looking sequence, but there is no evidence that they were actually ranged in this order in time.”

And evolutionist **Prof. Herbert Nilsson** said, “The family tree of the horse is beautiful and continuous only in the textbooks. The construction of the whole Cenozoic family tree of the horse is therefore a very artificial one, since it is put together from non-equivalent parts, and cannot therefore be a continuous transformation series.”

Now folks, I don’t know about you, but I’d say based on the evidence we just saw, somebody’s been “**horsing around**” with the facts, you now what I’m saying? And therefore I’d say this supposed horse evolution is a bunch of boloney, how about you?

Oh, but that's not all. The **second reason** why we know God created the animals is **Because the Whale Evolution is a Lie!** And to show you how big of a lie it really is, let's take a refresher course in the evolutionary answer for origin of the **whale**. Here's the typical textbook response.

Call it an unfinished story but with a plot that's a grabber. It's the tale of an ancient land mammal making its way back to the sea, becoming the forerunner of today's whales. About 50 million years ago its ancestors first learned to swim. You see, whales evolved from warm-blooded, air breathing mammalian ancestors that lived on land. But in doing so, it lost its legs. (I hate it when that happens too!) Then all of its vital systems became adapted to a marine existence, probably in search of food.

First there was Pakicetus and then Ambulocetus, Rodhocetus, Procetus, Kutchicetus, Durodon, Basilosaurus, Aeticetus, Squalodon, Cetotherium, and finally Kentridon. This evolution of the whale from a land mammal was actually the reverse of what happened millions of years ago when the first sea creatures crawled out of the sea and onto the land. Now, some details remain fuzzy and are under investigation. But we know for certain that this back-to-the-water evolution did occur.

Now folks, how many of you were taught or heard that story of **whale** evolution or maybe even seen it on display somewhere? Of course, it's commonplace, right? **But the point is this.** Is it really true? Did this animal, the **whale**, really take millions of years to evolve? I don't think so! **Why?** Because just like the supposed evolution of the horse, this whale evolution thing has just as many problems. Let's take a look at some serious problems with this theory and you tell me if we haven't been lied to.

**The Version Problem:** In 1859, Darwin suggested that whales arose from bears, sketching a scenario in which selective pressures might cause bears to

evolve into whales. But, embarrassed by criticism, he removed his hypothetical swimming bears from later editions of the *Origin of Species*. Then early in the 20th century, Eberhard Fraas and Charles Andrews suggested that primitive carnivores were the ancestors of whales. Then later, W.D. Matthew of the American Museum of Natural History said whales descended from rat-like creatures, but his idea never gained much support. And then Everhard Johannes Slijper tried to combine the two ideas, claiming that whales descended from a carnivorous rat-like creature. And the current version is that whales evolved from a wolf-like creature. Obviously, the versions are not only different, but also pretty wild!

**The Design Problem:** Whales and dolphins have many unique features designed to enable them to live in water. For example: They have enormous lung capacity with efficient oxygen exchange for long dives, a powerful tail with large horizontal flukes enabling very strong swimming, eyes designed to see properly in water and able to withstand high pressure, ears designed differently from those of land mammals that pick up airborne sound waves and with the eardrum protected from high pressure, skin lacking hair and sweat glands but incorporating fibrous, fatty blubber, fins and tongues that have counter-current heat exchangers to minimize heat loss, nostrils on the top of the head (blowholes), specially fitting mouth and nipples so babies can be breast-fed underwater, filtering mechanisms for food, and a sonar system which is so precise that it can detect a fish the size of a golf ball 230 feet away.

The obvious question is, “How could this creature “slowly” change from a land dwelling animal this these characteristics? It would have to lose its shaggy hair, its backbone flexibility, its waggly little tail; its nostrils would have had to move from the end of the snout to the top of the head, the long front legs would have had to change into flippers, the back legs would have had to disappear, the external ears would have had to become internal, and the breathing, hearing, and birthing capabilities would have to change from a land based existence to an underwater one. Furthermore all these aquatic features must be fully functional and fully present if the animal is to survive. Therefore, based on the design we see, a gradual step-by-step evolution is not possible.

**The Fossil Problem:** The only fossil remains of Pakicetus was a skull yet they immediately claimed it was a “primitive whale.” However, as it turns out, the fossil had absolutely no connection with the whale and was the

remains of a four-footed creature similar to that of a common wolf. Also, it was found in a region full of iron ore, and containing fossils of other land dwelling creatures as snails, tortoises, and crocodiles making it part of a land stratum, not an aquatic one.

The same is true for Ambulocetus, which means, “a walking and swimming whale.” First of all, there is absolutely no basis for the claim that it swam in water, or that it lived on land and water like an amphibian. The fossil remains are typical of land-mammal anatomy. Also, major conclusions were made about its mode of walking and about its tail structure, but the important fibula bones, pelvis, and tailbones were not even found. Even more disturbing is the fact that fossils of Ambulocetus were found in strata at or above the levels where modern whale fossils were found.

Then there was Basilosaurus which is Greek for “king lizard.” It was actually a serpent-like sea mammal about 70 feet long with a 5-foot long skull. Even though it was 10 times as long as Ambulocetus, evolutionists drew them at the same size to help give the desired “false” impression that they are a genuine transitional series.

Also, Barbara Stahl, a vertebrate paleontologist and evolutionist points out that, “The serpentine form of the body and the peculiar shape of the cheek teeth make it plain that Basilosaurus could not possibly have been the ancestor of modern whales.”

**The Vestigial Problem:** One of the major proofs evolutionists use to say whales evolved from land walking mammals is the supposed vestigial bones that they say were the leftover remains of legs. For example, textbooks often say that the whale has a vestigial pelvis and is evidence of its evolutionary history. Also, a children’s book, *Whales & Dolphins* in the first sentence says, “Just imagine whales walking around. It’s true.” However, those bones are not vestigial nor are they remains of ancient legs. As it turns out, they are necessary bones that act as an anchor for the muscles of the genitalia and without them the whales cannot reproduce. It has nothing to do with walking on land. It has to do with getting more baby whales.

**The Imagination Problem:** Evolutionists have made a so-called complete reconstruction of Ambulocetus. However, only a handful of bones were actually found. The actual remains therefore do not include the crucial features needed to support its claim of being a ‘transitional’ creature

between land animals and whales. Or worse yet is the so-called complete reconstruction of Pakicetus, who is supposed to be another alleged transitional form between land animals and whales. The only bones that were found were a couple pieces of a skull. The whole rest of the reconstruction is pure imagination.

**The Picture Problem:** A similar problem to the imagination problem is the picture problem. A so-called skeletal structure of Pakicetus was published in the Nature magazine. A reconstruction of an upright land walking Pakicetus by Carl Buell, which was based on that structure, was realistic. However, National Geographic portrayed Pakicetus in a swimming position with its hind legs stretching out backwards, and even gave it the impression of having “fins.” The problem is, based on the evidence, none of it is true.

Then we have National Geographic’s portrayal of Ambulocetus. The animal’s rear legs are shown not with feet that would help it to walk, but as fins that would assist it to swim. However, the true leg bones of Ambulocetus possessed the ability to move powerfully on land and are real legs, not “fins.” Neither are there any imaginary webs between its toes such as National Geographic added.

**The Admission Problem:** Evolutionist **Robert Carroll** said, “It is not possible to identify a sequence of land animals leading directly to whales.”

Evolutionist and famous Russian whale expert **G.A. Mchedlidze** says he does not support the description of Pakicetus, Ambulocetus and similar four-legged creatures as “possible ancestors of the whale,” and describes them instead as being a completely isolated group.

And another evolutionary whale expert, **E.J. Slijper** said, “We do not possess a single fossil of the transitional forms between the aforementioned land animals and the whales.”

Now folks, I don’t know about you, but I’d say based on the evidence we just saw, somebody’s been making up a “**whale of a tale**,” you know what I’m saying? And therefore I’d say this supposed whale evolution is also bunch of boloney, how about you? In fact, based on this kind of track

record, I'd say this whole idea of a slow gradual evolution **of any kind of animal** is also a bunch of baloney!

But you might be thinking, "Okay so maybe the supposed slow gradual evolution of animals like the horse and whale are a bunch of baloney, but what about all the other supposed mechanisms of evolutionary change they come up with? You know, like natural selection and mutations and vestigial organs and all that other stuff they use to explain how life supposedly evolved over millions and millions of years? Well hey, great question! I guess that's why we'll take a look at that next time!"

---

To find the way to God, to understand the *truth* of God's Word, and to receive the gift of eternal *life*, begin by repentance and faith through a prayer like this:

"Dear God, I understand that I have broken Your Law and sinned against You. Please forgive my sins. Thank You that Jesus suffered on the cross in my place. I now place my trust in Him as My Savior and Lord. In Jesus' name I pray. Amen."

---