

Creation Science Evangelism Rebuttal Fossils Don't Prove Evolution



By Greg Neyman
© Old Earth Ministries (Answers In Creation)

First Published 21 March 2006
Answers In Creation Website

One of the featured articles in the fossils section of Kent Hovind's website, Creation Science Evangelism, talks about the idea that the fossil record does not prove that evolution is true.¹ This article is written by Bruce Malone.

From the most simplistic approach, Malone is right. Fossils by themselves cannot prove evolution, and here is why. Young earth creationists point to the argument that there are no transitional fossils. In other words, if organism A lived 40 million years ago, and it supposedly evolved into organism B, which lived 35 million years ago, then there should be fossils, between 40 and 35 million years ago, that show features of both organisms, or that show it "evolving" from one to another.

If we found a fossil, dated at 37.5 million years ago, with features of both organisms A and B, and called it AB, the young earth creationist would then say "There are no transitional life forms between A and AB, or between AB and B." Hence, no matter how good the transitional fossil record is, it is not good enough for young earth creationists.

Getting back to the article, Malone says that "Many people have been led to believe that the existence of fossils proves that millions of years have passed. In reality, fossils can form quite rapidly." What he fails to tell the reader is that geologists recognize that fossils can form rapidly. Geologists have found evidence of rapid burial of fossils. However, the majority of fossils do not show evidence of rapid burial. Malone attributes the rapid burial to the flood. However, if this were true, then ALL fossils would show evidence of rapid burial...they do not.

Malone continues to mislead the reader, by claiming "Yet there are mass burial sites throughout the world that are tightly packed with millions of fossils." There are very few sites with "millions", yet Malone would have his reader believe they are quite common. The only one that comes to mind is the fossil [insect beds](#) in Australia.

Another misleading statement is this one..."Geologists and paleontologists operating from a Christian worldview acknowledge the possibility that a worldwide catastrophe buried unimaginable amounts of plants and animals." Although there are some geologists and paleontologists operating from a "young earth" perspective, there are many more geologists and paleontologists operating from an old earth creationist perspective. Just because one uses a Christian worldview, does not mean that they believe in a worldwide Flood.

Another false claim is that the order of the fossils in the rocks matches what would be expected from the flood. The order does match the theory of evolution. Even if you ignore this, the order is still not supportive of a young earth. For instance, dinosaurs are buried on top of 8,000 feet of sediment that is flood deposited. How did they survive the first 100+ days of the flood? (For a complete discussion of rock layers and the young earth flood model, see the series [Stratigraphy](#).)

Malone also makes the statement "Creation geologists (and there are many of them) believe that the majority of the geologic record is a result of geologic activity during and

subsequent to the year-long worldwide flood." Just how many are there? They make up less than 1/10th of 1 percent of all geologists! Malone would have you think they are quite numerous, when in fact there are very few.²

Malone finally claims that geologists operating from an old earth viewpoint don't consider the flood a viable solution. It's not because of their fear that it would invalidate their old age thoughts...they don't consider it because NONE of the geologic evidence supports it.

He closes by saying only one interpretation is right. I agree. You can believe in an old earth, with or without evolution, and believe in an inerrant, literal Genesis, and be a Christian.

¹ Fossils Don't Prove Evolution, by Bruce Malone. Posted on the Creation Science Evangelism website at <http://www.drdino.com/articles.php?spec=13>

² Estimating the number of scientists who believe in a young earth is almost impossible. Consider the following, which we present as an rough estimate.

There are 65 scientists listed on ICR's list of young earth scientists (granted, this is not a complete listing of all scientists who are young-earthers). Limiting our numbers to geologists, ICR lists 12 people that are in Geology or related fields. By comparison the Geological Society of America has over 17,000 members (keep in mind that not all geologists are members, just like not all young earth geologists are listed by ICR). That equates to 12 young earth geologists and 17,000 old earth geologists, or .0007 percent. This is by no means a scientific determination, but can be used to give a rough estimate.

Another estimate of so-called "creation scientists" claims there are 480,000 scientists in the United States, but in the relevant fields of earth and life science, there are only 700 who believe in creationism, or less than 0.15 percent of scientists (<http://www.talkorigins.org/indexcc/CA/CA111.html>)

It could also be argued that ALL scientists accept an old earth. I use the word 'all' because young earth scientists are not scientists. By definition, a scientist makes observations, then formulates theories about those observations. By contrast, a YEC "scientist" has made the theory first (that the earth is young) and then he looks for observations to confirm it. They are performing science backwards, thus deserve the term "theorist" rather than "scientist." This is not to say that they are not smart, intelligent persons. Many have made important scientific contributions, but in the area of the age of the earth, their preconceived ideas about the age of the earth invalidates any scientific work they do in this field of research. For more, see [Creation Science Commentary: Creation Scientist?](#)