

Synopsis:

In this booklet, paper or PDF file - depending on the format you are reading, evolution and creation are examined and defined. A fundamental distinction is pointed out between variation and evolution. The reader will learn that variation only reshuffles, rearranges and recombines existing genes, while evolution – Darwinian evolution - requires that new genes be created. The paper touches on the philosophical aspects of evolutionary beliefs, what is and what isn't science, and some motivational reasons people have for believing in the theory of evolution. The origin of Darwinism, and what Darwinists believe is discussed. The belief that ALL life is related and stems from a common ancestor – Darwinian Evolution - is then refuted using observable, historic, and scientific evidence (specifically: Paleontology, Anthropology, Biology, Genetics, and Information Science).

The purpose of this paper is to supply scholarly, empirical, and scientific evidence supporting the creation position - and to present some of the evidence which one would probably not learn in a biology class at a public school - in order to give a balance. The intelligent design argument is very briefly introduced as an alternative explanation of the data (other than the theory of evolution). The Bible is also examined, but only after the scientific and empirical evidence regarding evolution is presented. This is done mostly to show theological reasons why the theory of evolution cannot be integrated with the Bible. Finally, it discusses why the creation /evolution issue is import, and why one should even care.

NOTE: Many references are used in this paper – books, magazine articles, tapes, videos, and Internet articles. Since anybody can put just about anything on the Internet these days, only reputable websites have been used. If you are reading this on paper, be advised, you can also view it online at www.emjc3.com/darwin.htm and the hyperlinks will – at least they should - work.

Introduction

"Belief in creation is nonsense." "Creation is a religious view that has nothing to do with science." "Belief in creation sets science back 100 years." "Anyone that doesn't believe in evolution is ignorant or uninformed because the evidence is there." Daily, the airwaves and newspaper racks are filled with such claims. Certainly that is what one will hear in the halls of academia. I was recently visiting with family and friends and the subject of evolution came up. I exclaimed that I did not believe in evolution and someone else said she did. She was very happy to let me *believe* whatever I wanted but claimed that her views [that evolution was a fact] were supported by science (implying mine were not). I dedicate this booklet to her and others like her that think evolution is supported by scientific evidence, but creation is only a belief without any evidence or empirical data.

We are taught beginning in kindergarten, throughout high school and then into college that evolution is a scientific fact. We watch television (often on PBS or the Discovery Channel), and read books and magazines that say the same thing.

But, is evolution a fact? National Geographic Magazine (NG) featured a 33 page cover story titled "*Was Darwin Wrong?*"¹ The answer according to NG is No. The author states that those who deny evolution are willfully ignorant of the evidence that supports evolution. "Evolutionary theory," the article stated, "is such a dangerously wonderful and far-reaching view of life that *some people* find it unacceptable, despite the vast body of supporting evidence." Actually, "*some people*," as the article acknowledges, are almost 50 percent of the American population. "That percentage," National Geographic notes with surprise, "has barely changed over the last two decades."² This is confirmed in a 2001 Gallup poll, which found that 45 percent of Americans believe God created everything no more than 10,000 years ago. Besides the general population, there are fifty to seventy thousand reputable scientists and Ph.D. professors (as will be shown) who do not believe that mutation and natural selection - Darwinian evolution - can account for the complexity of life. In fact, Darwinian evolution is under ferocious attack, not just from creationists, but within the whole scientific community, that's right, the *scientific community*.

Why Not Examine Both Sides – Isn't That What Education is All About.

In the foreword of Jonathan Safarti's book, *Refuting Evolution*,³ Dr. Ken Ham writes of a woman coming to him after a seminar and saying she was angry. She was angry, she said, with her college professors. Why didn't they tell her there was all this contradictory evidence about evolution? How come they taught her ideas that were discarded years ago (Haeckle's Embryos for example - discussed in more detail soon)? Why didn't they tell her that not everyone believes in the smooth transition of the fossil record? Why didn't they let her consider evidence put forth by creationists? The way she conducted her life was dependent on the creation/evolution issue. Why hadn't she been told about the evidence for creation and been allowed to decide for herself if she had evolved or was created—that is what education is all about, she thought.⁴

Dr. Ham goes on to discuss the possible reasons for this. He says there is/was no system in place to update teachers of the most current developments. Probably for

economic reasons, textbooks seem to take years to catch up with current theories. As a result generations of students continue to be indoctrinated in outdated evolutionary theories, not understanding that they are constantly being modified and sometimes discarded. Thus, students and teachers alike are indoctrinated to believe that evolution is a fact, but is it? Let's examine the facts.

During the last couple of decades, astonishing discoveries have been made which the general public is vastly unaware of that have shown large, sometimes insurmountable, holes and gaps in the theory of evolution.

Contrasting Religious/Creation Opinions with Scientific/Evolution Facts.

Many evolutionary books contrast religious/creation *opinions* with evolution/science *facts*. Whether deliberate or not, this implies that whenever a creationist says something it is based only on *opinion*, but when a scientist (an evolutionary scientist) says something it is based on *fact*. It is important to realize that this is a misleading contrast because in actuality, creationists often appeal to facts and evolutionists often appeal to assumptions and opinions.

Moreover, it is a fallacy to think that 'facts' speak for themselves – facts are always interpreted according to a framework. The evolutionists' framework is naturalism. Naturalism is a *philosophy*, a philosophy which holds that all phenomena can be explained mechanistically in terms of natural (as opposed to supernatural) causes. In other words, even if the evidence being reviewed suggests that the event in question has a supernatural cause, according to naturalism, a supernatural cause must be automatically ruled out and not even considered.

Don't Confuse Me With The Facts

Scott Todd, Kansas State Immunologist, has said, "*Even if all the data point to an Intelligent Designer such a hypothesis is excluded because it is not naturalistic.*"⁵ Todd has already made up his mind about a Creator, so he's not even going to look at the facts. This view is very common among scientists and believers in evolution theory.

Presumptions and Prejudices of Scientists

Scientists have presumptions and prejudices just like everyone else. As the anti-creationist Boyce Rensberger admits, "*At this point, it is necessary to reveal a little inside information about how scientists work, something the textbooks don't usually tell you. The fact is that scientists are not really as objective and dispassionate in their work as they would like you to think. Most scientists get their ideas **not** through rigorously logical processes, but through hunches and wild guesses. As individuals, they often come to believe something is true long before they have any hard evidence that will convince anyone else that it is true. Motivated by **faith** in his own ideas and a desire for acceptance by his peers, a scientist will labor for years 'knowing' in his heart that his theory is correct but devising experiment after experiment whose results he hopes will support his position*"⁶ The point I am trying to make is this: some people think that scientists are completely neutral and let the data lead them where it may, while creationists are completely biased. This is simply untrue. Scientists are just as biased as creationists. The question isn't who's biased but who's correct.

Some Background Information: Origins

There are two main views of origins:

1. **The Evolution Model:** Those who hold this view believe that matter *plus* time *plus* chance *plus* natural processes are responsible for creating life.
2. **The Creation Model:** Those who hold this view believe that life was skillfully and intelligently designed - it was created by a supernatural force or being.
3. You might say there is a third option - **Life came from outer space:** only that does not really deal with origins. It just pushes life's origin back to another place and time. We will examine which model best fits the data.

The Evolution Model

It is very important to define evolution. To some people, evolution simply means change. People speak of computers evolving, laws evolving, cars, airplanes, and societies evolving, etc... Yet in regards to biology, what evolutionists believe in is called 'The General Theory of Evolution' (GTE). The GTE has been stated this way: *the theory that all the living forms in the world have arisen from a single source which itself came from an inorganic form.*⁷ Ask an evolutionist and he will tell you an ameba evolved into a fish, a reptile into a mammal, and an ape into a human. He (or she) will also tell you that an elephant is related to a snail – that in fact, everything is related. Most evolutionists believe the universe was self-caused and just exploded into existence. They call this *The Big Bang*. Or as I like to say, first there was nothing and then it exploded!

The Miracle of Life - PBS

The Emmy award winning PBS NOVA film, *The Miracle of Life* (1986) uses the GTE to define evolution. The show begins by saying, "*Four and a half billion years ago the young planet earth was almost completely engulfed by the shallow primordial seas. Powerful winds gathered random molecules from the atmosphere. Some were deposited in the seas. Tides and currents swept the molecules together. And somewhere in this ancient ocean the miracle of life began... The first organized form of primitive life was a tiny protozoan [a one-celled animal]. Millions of protozoa populated the ancient seas... From these one-celled organisms evolved all life on earth.*"

In other words, the General Theory of Evolution – the GTE – states:

- That something came from nothing in the alleged Big-Bang.
- That life came from non-living matter.
- That multi-celled organisms came from single-celled organisms.
- That vertebrates came from invertebrates.
- That man came from ape-like creatures.
- That intelligence came from non-intelligent matter.

Equivocation

However, many evolutionists are guilty of the practice of equivocation – that is, they switch the meaning of a word halfway through an argument. Evolutionists' will say “*The evidence for evolution is all around us if we choose to look for it.*” They point to change over time or variation within a species, and say “*see, evolution is a fact,*” then use it to affirm that the GTE is proven. I have also heard statements such as “*denying that evolution is a fact is like denying the fact the earth is round,*” or “*denying the fact of evolution, is like denying the fact of gravity.*” Again, switching the meaning of evolution to simply mean change over time. Of course change over time happens, of course gravity is a fact, of course there is variation within a species. But change over time or variation within a species has nothing to do with a dinosaur turning into a bird 50 million years ago, or one genus (kind of animal) evolving into a completely different genus - **especially if there is no mechanism for it**, which is discussed in greater detail in the *microbiology* section of this paper.

The Creation Model

The creation model – in Genesis - states:

- God created the Heavens and the Earth.
- God created Plants to produce after their own kind.
- God created Fish to produce after their own kind.
- God created Birds to produce after their own kind.
- God created Mammals to produce after their own kind.

What Creationists Believe -

It is incorrect to say that creationists do not believe in evolution if your definition of evolution is change or variation. What creationists do not believe in is the GTE - *that all the living forms in the world have arisen from a single source which itself came from an inorganic form.* One poll I read recently asked the pollster to choose: “Do you believe that life on Earth was created by God and has existed in its present form since the beginning of time,” or “Do you believe in the theory of Evolution.” This totally misrepresents creationists’ beliefs. All of life (including mankind) has adapted to changing conditions and that mutation and genetic recombination has occurred, horizontal change is not the same as vertical evolution.

Each basic category of life was created "after its kind" and has either continued into the present as that kind or gone extinct. No new basic types have arisen from other basic types.

Who Is Right? Did God create life? Or are we the product of evolution? Creation and evolution are contradictory so they cannot both be right. Let’s examine the observable evidence. In this booklet we will examine three lines of evidence: ***The Icons of Evolution, The Fossil Record, and Microbiology.*** First, a bit of background.

Evolution and History

Evolution, although not a new concept, began to gain popularity in 1859 when Charles Darwin published *Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*. Darwin got many of his ideas from Charles Lyell. Up until the mid to late 1700's, the dominant view regarding Earth history was based on a literal interpretation of Genesis (creation in six days, a six to ten thousand year old Earth, a global flood, etc...). In the late 17th and 18th centuries, the Enlightenment took hold in Europe, and human reason was increasingly elevated to the supreme place of authority for determining truth. As a result, atheism, agnosticism and deism began to flourish. Many books were written which rejected the miracles and prophecies in the Bible, the deity of Christ and the inspiration and authority of the Bible. In the latter half of the 1700's, some of these skeptics began to propose astronomical and geological theories that contradicted Biblical teaching, both about the age of the Earth and Noah's Flood. Charles Lyell argued that everything in the geological record could and should be interpreted only by reference to physical processes currently operating on Earth. (This view, by the way, is called uniformitarianism). He said that mountains, for example, were products of thousands of small rises, and that time, unimaginable tracts of time, was the key.

Darwin took this one step further; He thought if small changes over time could throw up mountains, why couldn't small changes accumulate over time in animals to produce new structures? In 1831-36 Charles Darwin sailed as an official naturalist aboard a ship called the *Beagle*. On their voyage they traveled to the Galapagos Islands. Darwin noticed that there were different varieties of finches, each with its own distinct beak and ecological niche. He postulated that all of the species of finches shared a common ancestor, presumed to have arrived on the islands several million years before he arrived. From this - and other - observations, he arrived at his theory of evolution and survival of the fittest.

Darwin was somewhat motivated to find a naturalistic explanation of life. Darwin's beloved daughter Annie died, and, according to Darwin's biographer James Moore, it destroyed the truth of Christianity in his mind. How could there be a good God if He allowed this to happen? Instead, Annie was an unfortunate victim of the laws of nature, i.e. she lost the struggle for existence.

Do Darwin's finches share a common ancestor? Yes they do. Does this prove that ALL lifeforms share a common ancestor? No it doesn't.

There are many varieties of dogs in the world (e.g. wolves, collies, poodles, etc...); there are many varieties of cats in the world (e.g. lions, tigers, house-cats, etc...); there are many varieties of horses in the world (e.g. Clydesdales, zebras, toy-ponies, etc...); etc... etc... Do all dogs share a common ancestor? Yes. Do all cats share a common ancestor? Yes. Do all horses share a common ancestor? Yes. Does this prove that ALL lifeforms share a common ancestor? No.

These are all examples of variation within a genus. Change has taken place, yes, but not evolution. In each of the above examples, information in the DNA is either reshuffled or reduced and no "evolution" took place; change, yes, but evolution, no. It was horizontal change, not vertical change. In order to comprehend this better, it might be helpful to know how animals are classified.

Taxonomic Groups

Animals (plants too) are divided up into taxonomic groups. These groups are - from smallest to largest: *Species, Genus, Family, Order, Class, Phylum, Kingdom.*

Species

Animals in the same Species can breed together and produce viable offspring, but cannot interbreed successfully with individuals from other species.

Genus

Genus is a group of species that are fairly closely related - such as the genus *Equus* which includes several species, such as the *Equus caballus*, *Equus asinus* and *Equus zebra* (domestic horse, wild ass and zebra respectively).

Families

Genera (plural of Genus) are grouped into *families*. Families are major groups of generally similar organisms, such as Felidae, which includes all cat-like animals. E.g. domestic cats; wildcats; lions; leopards; cheetahs; tigers, etc... Every continent (with the exception of Australia and Antarctica) has its own genus of cat, but all are of the Felidae family.

Order

Families are grouped into *orders*, whose individuals may vary in many ways; such as the order of Carnivora - mammals that are mostly carnivorous and have teeth adapted for flesh eating.

Orders are grouped into *classes*, *Classes* into *phyla* and *Phyla* into *Kingdoms*.

So when evolutionists say that one species can evolve into another species and it proves that evolution is true, they are both right and wrong. One species can evolve (if you want to use that word) into a different species; but this is not really evolution, it is simply variation within a genus (or within a 'kind,' as the Bible states). Some would call this micro-evolution, however, a lot of micro-evolution changes do not add up to macro-evolution, which is why these terms (micro & macro evolution) should be avoided. Micro-evolutionary changes (variation) reduce the information in the organism's genes.

All living things contain in their cells the DNA molecule that carries the information (genetic instructions) for making all aspects of that creature. However, amoeba DNA has no information for making hooves, hair, tails and eyes, but horse DNA does. Alligator DNA has no genetic information for producing feathers, hollow bones and one-way lung systems, but bird DNA does. If you didn't quite get this, don't worry, it will be explained further in the *microbiology* section.

Science versus Religion

Don't fall into the common trap and believe that evolution is science and creation is religion. The debate isn't really about science versus religion. Many books have been written on the philosophical, non-scientific and religious nature of evolution. Evolution is really more of a philosophy, a world-view, and a religion which has been disguised as "science."

Science is a systematic method of investigation that is testable, observable, and repeatable. Evolution -microbe-to-man evolution - has none of those qualities. You cannot test, repeat, or observe, how a dinosaur evolved into a bird 60 million years ago

(especially if there is no mechanism for it - examined in the microbiology section of this paper). All of the repeatable and reproducible evidence for evolution simply proves variation.

It is Religion versus Religion

Rather than science versus religion, the battle is between the religion of **Humanism** and the religion of **Christianity**. The first two tenets of the Humanist Manifesto say:

1. Secular humanists regard the universe as self-existing and not created.
2. Secular humanists believe that Man is a part of nature and has emerged as a result of a continuous process.

In other words, the Big-Bang origin of the universe, & The general theory of evolution (*GTE - the theory that all the living forms in the world have arisen from a single source which itself came from an inorganic form*).

In fact, the U.S. Supreme Court in made the following statement: “Among religions in this country which do not teach what would generally be considered a belief in the existence of God, are Buddhism, Taoism, Ethical Culture, **Secular Humanism**, and others”(emphasis mine).⁸

This is consistent with what Michael Ruse (a philosopher at Florida State University) has said. Ruse is a man who is a serious candidate to pick up where the late Stephen Jay Gould left off, and one who can pack more anti-creationist propaganda into a single sentence than Huxley ever could. Ruse said, “*Evolution is promoted by its practitioners as more than mere science. Evolution is promulgated as an ideology, a secular religion—a full-fledged alternative to Christianity, with meaning and morality. I am an ardent evolutionist and an ex-Christian, but I must admit that in this one complaint - and Mr. Gish is but one of many to make it - the [Biblical] literalists are absolutely right. Evolution is a religion* (emphasis mine). *This was true of evolution in the beginning, and it is true of evolution still today. Evolution therefore came into being as a kind of secular ideology, an explicit substitute for Christianity.*”⁹ It is also consistent with what Edward Wilson said. Wilson was rightfully regarded as one of the most outstanding professional evolutionary biologists of our time, and the author of major works of straight science. In his *On Human Nature*, he calmly assures us that “*evolution is a myth that is now ready to take over Christianity,*” and continues, “*if this is so, the final decisive edge enjoyed by scientific naturalism will come from its capacity to explain traditional religion, its chief competition, as a wholly material phenomenon.*” “*Theology,*” he says, “*is not likely to survive as an independent intellectual discipline.*”¹⁰

All of this illustrates how the court’s decision to remove prayer, Bible reading, and the Ten Commandments from schools did not really remove religion, it just replaced one religion with another. It replaced Christianity with Humanism (Evolution).

The Non-scientific Nature of Evolution

Speaking at the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in San Francisco, Carl Sagan explained how science works. He said the most fundamental axioms in science must survive confrontation with observation and experimentation, and

experiments *must be reproducible*. Sagan made a statement both true and profound, he said, “*not all scientific statements can be given equal weight.*” He cited Newtonian dynamics, the First and Second Laws of Thermodynamics, and the law of Angular Momentum as being on extremely sound footing because of the millions of experiments and observation being performed on them. He was basically saying that if you’re going to say something is “scientific,” it must be observable and reproducible.

On a scale of zero to ten, it is then possible to assign relative values to various scientific statements based on the number of experiments and observations involved. If, based on Sagan's statements, we assign a value of ten to Newtonian dynamics, and the Laws of Thermodynamics and Angular Momentum, what value can we give to evolution? The answer is zero.¹¹ We see no observable evidence supporting evolution; again, all the evidence we do see supports variation, not microbe-to-man evolution.

Creation is Not Anti-science

Not only is there a lot of philosophy in evolution, but there is a lot of science (at the very least, empirical evidence) in creation. James Rice, Chemistry Professor at Rice University says, “Only a rookie who knows nothing about science would say science takes away from faith. If you really study science, it brings you closer to God.”¹²

Robert Jastro - NASA scientist - said “if we need an atheist for the debate [creation vs evolution], I’ll go to the philosophy department, the physics department isn’t much good.”¹³

Actually, Bible-believing Christians founded most of the major branches of science. In fact, five of the greatest physicists in history: Newton, Faraday, Thompson, Maxwell, and Einstein were each convinced that the universe was placed here by a Creator. Plus, four of the five were staunch Christians with firm convictions that the Bible is the authoritative Word of God.

In his book *Fast Facts*, John Ankerberg says if you count Intelligent Design researchers, Theistic scientists, and Biblical young Earth creationists, there are probably 50,000 to 70,000 scientists worldwide who believe a Supernatural being created the universe, the world, and everything in it.¹⁴

A Probable Motivation for Evolutionary Beliefs

At its core, the theory of evolution poses that life is random and purposeless, and, in fact, is an anti-God religious philosophy. As previously stated, evolution is not science; science is observable and reproducible. Listen to what some of evolution’s proponents have stated:

Richard Dawkins said, “*Darwin made it possible to be an intellectually fulfilled atheist.*”¹⁵

When Julian Huxley was asked, “Why do you think evolution caught on so fast,” he responded by saying, “*I guess because the idea of God interfered with our sexual mores*” [morals]. Aldous Huxley said, “*[if there is no God] there is no valid reason why a person*

should not do as he wants to do, or why his friends should not seize political power and govern in the way that they find most advantageous to themselves. ... For myself, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of sexual and political liberation."¹⁶

Prof. William B. Provine said, "*Evolution is the greatest engine of atheism ever invented.*"¹⁷

Basically, these people, along with many others who believe in evolution, just don't like the idea of God, because if there is a God then it means a person is accountable, responsible and answerable to Him. They believe in evolution not because of the evidence, but in spite of the evidence; they do this because the alternative – supernatural creation – is unacceptable to them. This comment from Keith Stewart Thomson exemplifies this: "We often are highly conservative and will hold to a viewpoint longer than is justified when there is no alternative or, worse, *when the logical alternative upsets the rest of our world view*" (emphasis mine).¹⁸

Having examined the philosophical and religious nature of evolution, let's move on to the actual evidence evolutionists use to prove their theory.

The Observable evidence:

Icons of Evolution

In his book *Icons of Evolution: Science or Myth? Why Much of What We Teach About Evolution is Wrong*,¹⁹ Jonathan Wells lists ten of the most famous icons evolutionists use to support the theory of evolution. Every one of them is lacking, as we shall see. Wells said: When asked to give examples of evidence of evolution almost everyone – including biologists – give the same examples.²⁰ He then lists the ten most common items and scientifically refutes them and explains why they are fallacious, incorrect, or misleading. These ten icons include:

- 1 The Miller Urey Experiment
- 2 Darwin's Tree of Life
- 3 Homology in Vertebrae Limbs
- 4 Haeckle's Embryos
- 5 Archaeopteryx: the missing link
- 6 Peppered Moths
- 7 Darwin's Finches
- 8 Four Winged Fruit Flies
- 9 Fossil Horse Evolution
- 10 From Ape to Human

We will examine some of them here, too:

The Miller/Urey Experiment - Spontaneous Generation

Evolutionists theorize that life sprang from non-life early in Earth's history. Known as spontaneous generation, this supposedly happened when a bolt of lightning struck a chemically enriched pool of water. In 1953, University of Chicago graduate student Stanley Miller conducted an experiment and tried to duplicate this phenomenon. Methane, ammonia, hydrogen and water (thought to be the components of the Earth's 'primitive' atmosphere) were mixed in a closed glass apparatus and zapped with a spark (supposed to simulate lightning). Miller got amino acids* to form.

* All living matter is made up of amino acids. Amino acids are the building blocks of proteins and proteins are the building blocks of cells

Evolutionists saw Stanley Miller's experiment as virtual proof that organic chemicals, and ultimately life, could be produced by chance chemistry. It brought a greater measure of scientific respectability to the theory of spontaneous generation and evolutionary thought. Evolutionists said, you don't need God - life can arise on its own. Evolution, according to the purists, could now be taught as a virtual certainty. Astronomer Carl Sagan once said that the Miller-Urey experiment was the single most significant step in convincing many scientists that life was likely to be abundant in the cosmos.

However, there are many reasons why 'life' was nowhere near being created. We will explore some of them.

1) Miller used methane, ammonia, hydrogen and water to simulate the Earth's early atmosphere. He left out oxygen - Miller knew oxygen destroyed amino acids.²¹ However, in the last twenty years, evidence has surfaced that has convinced most atmospheric scientists that the early atmosphere contained abundant oxygen.²²

2) If there was oxygen, it would destroy the amino acids. However, if there was no oxygen it would mean there would be no ozone, and with no ozone the UV rays from space would destroy the amino acids. It's a catch 22, either oxygen destroys the amino acids, or the ultraviolet rays destroy the amino acids.²³

3) Since both oxygen and UV rays destroy amino acids, many have theorized that the amino acids linked together to form proteins deep in the oceans. This theory does not hold up however, because amino acids won't link up in a watery environment, so it couldn't have happened that way.²⁴

4) Miller did get amino acids to form, but along with amino acids, 98% of the material he got was carboxylic acid (a gooey tar-like substance) which is toxic to life. Even if (a huge if) the amino acids had formed into proteins and then into cells, the cells could not have survived in this toxic, tar-like substance. Mark Eastman once commented that "if Miller would have drunk this yellow gooey substance, he never would have lived to publish his paper."²⁵

5) There is also the problem of *Chirality or handedness*. This is perhaps the greatest reason why 'life' was no where near being created, but something most textbooks don't mention. Amino acids come in two forms; just as we have a right hand and a left hand, amino acids do too. The Miller experiment produced equal numbers of right and left hand amino acids. However, all amino acids in proteins are 100% 'left-handed.' One right-handed amino acid will destroy proteins; there is no way you will get proteins to form from a 50/50 solution of right and left hand amino acids.

6) Plus, amino acids are a long way from living cells. A typical cell contains thousands and thousands of different types of proteins, which are assembled from amino acids in chains anywhere from 70 to 1000 amino acids long. Claiming that he generated life is completely false. A few bricks do not a building make. For further information see "*Spontaneous Generation (Biological life from Chemicals) is Impossible*" at <http://www.emjc3.com/inthebeginning.htm>.


Hank Hanegraaff adds some insight about proteins forming into a living cell. He comments: "The probability of a *single* protein molecule being arranged by chance is 1 in 10^{161} using all atoms on earth and allowing all the time since the world began." And he continues, "For a minimum set of the required 239 protein molecules for the smallest theoretical life, the probability is 1 in $10^{119,879}$. It would take $10^{119,841}$ years on the average to get a set of such proteins. That is $10^{119,831}$ times the assumed age of the Earth and is a figure with 119, 831 zeroes."²⁶ In other words, there simply isn't enough time.

(NOTE: Mathematicians say any probability beyond 10^{50} is impossible).

Researchers are now saying that the Miller Urey experiment might have been a good experiment, but it did not simulate the Earth's atmosphere and had nothing to do with the origin of life.

This buries Darwin from the start. Evolutionists talk about a tree of life; but if there are no roots (no origin) there cannot be a tree, but let's move on.

Darwin's Tree of Life




Darwin postulated how that all lifeforms could be traced back to a common more primitive ancestor. Go far enough down the tree and you'll get to a single-celled organism. He believed that the differences among modern species arose primarily through natural selection, or survival of the fittest, and he described the whole process as "descent with

modification." If all living things are gradually modified descendants of one or a few original forms, then the history of life should resemble a branching tree – hence the name: Darwin's Tree of Life. However, there are many problems with this concept – we will explore two. *First*, according to Darwin, lifeforms supposedly progressed gradually up the tree, becoming more complex as they went. Yet, if this were the case, we should see it in the fossil record, but we don't. We will cover this in ***The Fossil Record*** section. *Second*, from what we know of biology, lifeforms do not become more complex. We will cover this in the ***Microbiology*** section.

Homology in Vertebrate Limbs

Evolutionists use the word 'homology' to mean similarity (see graphic on right). Sometimes Evolutionists use the fact vertebrate limbs are homologous and say it proves a common ancestor, but other times they say they have a common ancestor, which is why they are homologous. This is clearly circular reasoning and does not



prove a thing.

In *Refuting Evolution*,²⁷ Jonathan Safarti says a common designer rather than common ancestry can equally explain the similarity. He continues by saying that genes are what is inherited not structures. So, one would expect the similarities, if they were the result of evolutionary common ancestry, to be produced by a common genetic program, but in many cases, this is clearly not so. For example, the limbs in amphibians and humans develop completely differently. The human embryo develops a thickening on the limb tip called the AER, then programmed cell death divides the AER into five regions that then develop into digits (fingers and toes). In contrast, in frogs, the digits grow outwards from buds (see picture). This argues strongly against the 'common ancestry' evolutionary explanation for the similarity.

Well's concludes his chapter on Homology by saying homology is completely useless in determining ancestry if there is no mechanism for change. And there isn't a mechanism for change. We will look at this in the molecular-biology section of this paper.

Haeckel's Embryos

Haeckel's Embryos are commonly cited as proof of evolution. Most people have heard of or been taught the idea that the human embryo goes through various evolutionary stages, such as having gills like a fish, a tail like a monkey, etc., during the first few months of development in the womb.

The idea has not only been presented to generations of biology and medical students as fact, but has also been used for many years to justify abortion. Abortionists claimed that the unborn child being killed was still in the fish stage or the monkey stage, and had not yet become a human being so aborting it was fine (see box below).

This idea (called embryonic recapitulation) was vigorously expounded by Ernst Haeckel beginning in the late 1860s to promote Darwin's theory of evolution, even though he did not have evidence to support his views.

Lacking the evidence, Haeckel set out to manufacture the data. He fraudulently changed drawings made by other scientists of human and animal embryos, to increase the resemblance between them and to hide the dissimilarities. It has since been proven that this theory is completely bogus, and that Haeckel faked his drawings. It has been shown, for example, that the "gills" that supposedly appear in the early stages of the human embryo are in fact the initial phases of the middle-ear canal, parathyroid, and thymus. The part of the embryo that was likened to the "egg yolk pouch" turns out to be a pouch that produces blood for the infant. The part that was identified as a "tail" by Haeckel and his followers is actually the backbone. To see Haeckel's faked drawings along with the real embryos, see **Fraud Rediscovered** at <http://www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v20/i2/fraud.asp>.

These pictures, though they were known not to be true, were still being printed in reputable science textbooks even as late as 1971! See footnote²⁸ to see some of them.

Embryonic Recapitulation used to justify Abortion. As an example how Evolutionists' justify abortion, consider the case of the late evolutionist, Carl Sagan. In an article titled "*The Question of Abortion: A Search for the Answers*" he argued for the ethical permissibility of human abortion on the grounds that the fetus—growing within a woman's body for several months following conception—is not a human being. Thus, the killing of this tiny creature is not murder (April 22, 1990, *Parade*).

Archaeopteryx: The Missing Link

When *Archaeopteryx* was discovered in 1861 (two years after Darwin had published his *Origin of Species*), it was widely heralded as a missing link predicted by Darwin's theory—the intermediate between reptiles and birds. However, as Jonathan Wells points out, the position of *Archaeopteryx* as a transitional form is now very much in dispute, and in fact “its own ancestors are the subject of one of the most heated controversies in modern science.”²⁹

Much is made of the fact *Archaeopteryx* had teeth. Yet *Archaeopteryx* was not the only fossil bird to have grasping teeth. Some fossil birds had teeth, some didn't. But how can teeth prove a relationship to reptiles, when many reptiles don't have teeth? Crocodiles are really the only group of reptiles that consistently have well developed teeth. Moreover, even some mammals have teeth and some don't.

Additionally, the lungs of birds are completely different than the lungs of reptiles and mammals. Michel Denton – a recognized authority in this field, says there are vast differences between bird, mammal, and reptile lungs, and they could not have evolved one from another. Denton, further reminds us of what Darwin himself said in *Origin of Species* – “If it can be shown that life proceeds without small graduated steps, then my theory would be in error.”³⁰ Furthermore, reptile scales cannot turn into feathers; the DNA required to make feathers is completely different than the DNA for scales.³¹

Archaeopteryx is more of a mosaic or chimera (like the platypus), than a transitional fossil. Alan Feduccia, a world authority on birds at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and an evolutionist himself, says: “Paleontologists have tried to turn *Archaeopteryx* into an earth-bound, feathered dinosaur. But it's not. It is a bird, a perching bird, and no amount of paleobabble is going to change that.”³² Most assuredly, *Archaeopteryx* is not a missing link.

Peppered Moths

The classic textbook example of natural selection, evolution, describes how most peppered moths were light-colored in the early 1800s. But with the Industrial Revolution, the proportion of melanic, or dark-colored moths increased near heavily polluted cities because they could now camouflage themselves on soot-covered tree trunks. This was supposedly evolution in action.

There are two problems with this hypothesis: **1)** Researchers have since found out that the experiment was faked. To document their results, researchers took photographs to show to the public; but the photographs used in the study were of dead moths that had been glued on trees. Peppered Moths do not rest on tree trunks.

2) Even if the experiment were valid, it would not prove Darwinian evolution, or tell us how a moth could evolve from a non-moth. Rather, it would simply show the variation that God placed within a species.

L. Harrison Matthews says, “*The peppered moth experiments beautifully demonstrate natural selection or survival of the fittest. But they do not show evolution in progress.*”

However the population may alter in their content of light, intermediate or dark forms, all the moths remain from beginning to end Biston betularia [peppered moths].”³³

Darwin’s Finches

Fourteen species of finches live on the Galapagos, the famous island group visited by Charles Darwin in the 1830s. The finches had a variety of bill shapes and sizes, all suited to their varying diets and lifestyles. The explanation given by Darwin was that they were all the offspring of an original pair of finches, and that natural selection was responsible for the differences.

It is true that the finches were descended from a common ancestor, but the finches were still finches. Again, just as in the dark moth/light moth scenario, all this shows is variation within a species. It says nothing about how a finch could evolve from a non-finch. Peter and Rosemary Grant studied these finches in the 1970s. In 1977 a severe drought reduced the population to 15% of its former size on the small island of Daphne Major. The Grants determined that the average beak depth of medium ground finches increased about 5%. They attributed this to the ability of such birds to crack open the few remaining harder seeds once the softer ones had been eaten. They concluded it would take merely 20 such selection events to transform the medium ground finch into another species, and that this could happen between 200 to 2,000 years.³⁴

Again, this just shows variation within a species. No new information was added to the genes, and no real evolution took place.

Four Winged Fruit Flies

In his experiments, Geneticist Ed Lewis showed that strains of laboratory mutant fruit flies could be interbred to produce four winged flies. Then concluded, voila, mutations can produce new structures. However, what he didn’t say was that the extra pair of wings had no muscles attached to them and the fly was hopelessly non-aerodynamic and could never survive nor mate in free nature. Moreover, according to Frank Sherwin, “Since 1910 geneticists have documented over 3,000 mutations in Fruit Flies, yet science journals have not documented a single fruit fly evolving into something else, no matter how often and badly they’re mutated.”³⁵ Mutations cannot produce new information and do not provide proof of evolution. Mutations are discussed in detail later in this paper.

Fossil Horse Evolution

Ah, yes, the infamous horse-evolution has been used as one of the key ‘proofs’ of evolution for a long time. It started in 1879 with the American paleontologist, O.C. Marsh and the famous evolutionist, T.H. Huxley, known as “Darwin’s bulldog.” Since then, many museums and popular books have presented a neat series of horses from small to large. They start from the dog-sized, four-toed ‘dawn horse’ or ‘Eohippus,’ which supposedly lived 50 million years ago. The next creature is usually a larger creature like *Mesohippus*, which had three toes, the next one was larger still, for example *Merychippus*, which had two of the toes smaller than the third... Finally, there is the large modern horse, *Equus*, with only one toe, while all that is left of the other toes are ‘vestigial’ splint bones. Some of the diagrams also show trends in tooth changes, with

increasing hypsodonty (high-crowned teeth). This is supposed to demonstrate a change from browsing on bushes to grazing on grass.

How clear-cut is it, really?

The biologist Heribert-Nilsson said, 'The family tree of the horse is beautiful and continuous only in the textbooks.'³⁶ Niles Eldredge, the famous paleontologist, called the textbook picture 'lamentable.'³⁷ Walter Barnhart said the 'horse series' is merely an *interpretation* of the data. In fact, he documents that *different* pictures of horse evolution were drawn by different evolutionists from the *same* data as the concept of evolution itself evolved.³⁸ It turns out that the dawn horse is probably not a horse at all. This creature was discovered in 1841 by Richard Owen. Owen saw no connection with the horse, but thought it was very much like a modern-day *hyrax* or badger. So he named it *Hyracotherium*. Other fossils of the same type of creature were later named 'Eohippus' or 'dawn horse' by more evolutionary-minded paleontologists.³⁹

Even the fossil record itself does not show the clear progression presented by the textbooks. For example, in north-eastern Oregon, the three-toed *Neohipparion* and one-toed *Pliohippus* were found in the same layer. This indicates that they were living at the same time, and thus provides no evidence that one evolved from the other.⁴⁰

Even if we grant that these horses did evolve from one another (although it is likely they didn't), it is not evidence of microbe-to-man evolution, but variation within a kind.

Icon Summary

We are going to discuss some of the alleged Ape-men in detail, but first I'd like to point out that when examined in depth, none of these ten icons demonstrate evolution. The Miller Urey Experiment, Darwin's Tree of Life, Homology in vertebrae limbs, Haeckle's Embryos, Archaeopteryx, Peppered Moths, Darwin's Finches, Four Winged Fruit Flies, Fossil Horse Evolution, From Ape to Human (discussed below), do not prove evolution. They are all either misrepresentation, misinterpretation, or variation. They actually fit the creation model better.

If biology students or the general public were to digest a book like *Icons of Evolution* or Dr. Jonathan Sarfati's *Refuting Evolution* or Luther Sunderland's *Darwin's Enigma*, they would understand there is a vast difference between variation within a kind (or genus), and evolution between kinds, and know that there is virtually no evidence proving that all the living forms in the world have arisen from a single source which itself came from an inorganic form - Darwinian Evolution.

From Ape to Human - The alleged Ape-Men.

In covering the alleged Ape-Men, I also want to introduce the reader to the bias of the media, specifically, the Public Broadcast Service.

Walking With Cavemen was a documentary shown on PBS in June 2003. The show, a five part miniseries, 'walked' you through a supposed 3.5 million years of human evolution. Another PBS Documentary was aired on the PBS Network in September 2001; it was a seven part miniseries titled *Evolution*. Both of these shows were documentaries that attempted to demonstrate evolution in action.

Accuracy and objectivity are what we should be able to expect in a television documentary—especially in a science documentary on a publicly funded network.

Unfortunately, *Evolution* and *Walking With Cavemen* distorted the scientific evidence and promoted a very biased agenda, thereby betraying our expectations and violating PBS's own official policies.⁴¹

- The makers of both shows leave viewers with the misleading impression that the evidence for human evolution is much stronger than it really is.
- They imply that the only objection to the theory of evolution comes from a religious point of view.
- They completely ignore the growing number of scientists who think that at its root, Darwinian theory is inconsistent with the latest developments in biochemistry, paleontology, embryology, genetics, information theory, and other fields.

According to these scientists, Darwin's unguided process of random variation and natural selection is insufficient to account for the highly ordered complexity found in biological systems, and actually shows evidence of directed development or intelligent design.⁴²

After the *Evolution* series stated that “*all known scientific evidence supports evolution, as does virtually every reputable scientist in the world,*” hundreds of professors, researchers, biologists, anthropologists, molecular and cellular biologists, bioengineers, organic chemists, geologists, zoologists, astrophysicists, and other scientists placed a two page advertisement in a national magazine saying they were skeptical and they wanted the world to know. Their statement was defiant and direct: “We are skeptical of the claims for the ability of random mutation and natural selection to account for the complexity of life. Careful examination of the evidence for Darwinian theory should be encouraged.” These were not narrow-minded fundamentalists, or backwoods uneducated folk, but world-class scientists like Nobel nominee Henry F. Shafer, the third most cited chemist in the world; James Tour of Rice University's Center for Nanoscale Science and Technology; Fred Figworth, professor of cellular and molecular physiology at Yale Graduate School, and others, including professors from Yale, MIT (the Massachusetts Institute of Technology), Tulane, Rice, Emory, Stanford, Cornell, Chicago, Princeton, Duke, Berkeley.⁴³ Despite the specter of professional persecution, they broached the politically incorrect opinion that the emperor of evolution had no clothes. Chemist Henry “Fritz” Schaefer of the University of Georgia, a five-time Nobel nominee, commented, “Some defenders of Darwinism embrace standards of evidence for evolution that, as scientists, they would never accept in other circumstances.”⁴⁴

In *Evolution* and *Walking with Cavemen*, there was a lot of conjecture and speculation, but very few facts. In both shows, we, the viewers, are treated to lots of wildlife photography of apes, and numerous dramatizations featuring human actors in ‘missing link’ costumes, seen from afar--like shots of Bigfoot--while we listen to stories told by people who apparently think that very little evidence can go a very long way.

While this is happening, we are supposed to take seriously the blustering scientists who said they created great science. According to its producers, one of *Evolution's* goals was to report on “areas where the science is sound.” Yet many of the areas covered by the series are far from being sound--in fact, they are highly controversial –especially in the fields listed above (e.g. Biochemistry, Paleontology, Embryology, Genetics, Information Theory, et al). In *Walking with Cavemen* they said, “*Much of what scientists know about human evolution has comes literally from only a handful of major fossil finds.*” The only thing is, there are actually thousands upon thousands of fossils, according to Marvin Lubenow et al.⁴⁵ What they really mean by this statement is that most of the hominid

[human or ape] fossils do not help them tell an evolutionary story! This in itself shows the bias of PBS.

In response to the show *Evolution*, the Discovery Institute published a 145-page book titled “*Getting The Facts Straight: A Viewers Guide to PBS’s Evolution.*” In the forward they state their purpose:

The controversy over Darwin's theory of evolution has never been more intense. The American people--and especially America's students--deserve to know what the fuss is all about. They deserve to know what the evidence shows, what scientists really think, and why--after all these years--there is still widespread opposition to Darwinian evolution.

American public television can and should be used to educate people about this important controversy. The seven-part Evolution series, produced for public television by Clear Blue Sky Productions and the WGBH/NOVA science Unit, could have been an important contribution in this regard. But Evolution is a work of advocacy, an advertisement not just for Darwinism, but for some of its more extreme manifestations. ***It distorts the biological evidence, mischaracterizes historical facts, ignores serious disagreements among evolutionary biologists themselves, and misrepresents Darwin's scientific critics in order to convince the American people that evolution is absolutely true and indispensable to our daily lives.*** (emphasis mine).

This viewer's guide has been prepared to correct this one-sided presentation. Where Evolution distorts or ignores the facts, this guide supplies them. Where Evolution ignores or misrepresents its critics, this guide lets them speak for themselves. Although Evolution promotes the stereotype that all opponents of Darwin's theory are Biblical literalists, this guide was not written to defend Biblical literalism but to defend honest science. It is simply based on the premise that the American people deserve to hear the truth--especially from the television network that they are supporting with their tax money.

I highly recommend this book. (See recommendations for further reading). It gives the reader the straight facts about evolution –facts without bias thrown in. For a couple of good reviews on the *Walking with Cavemen* or *Evolution*, see www.emjc3.com/darwin.htm

Because the show was full of conjecture and speculation, but very few facts, we will examine some of the actual hominid evolutionary facts that they didn't. Besides, Ape-to-Human is also the tenth icon that evolutionists use to prove their theory and deserves attention.

The facts, the bones, the discoveries.

Neanderthals

In 1856, a fossil skullcap and some limb bones were found in the Neander Valley near Dusseldorf, Germany. When it was discovered, scientists hailed Neanderthals as a missing link. Later it was discovered that Neanderthal man belonged to the modern species *Homo sapien* and had suffered from rickets and arthritis. Oops! I guess Neanderthal man wasn't a missing link after all.

Java Man

In 1891, Eugene Dubois found a skullcap and a thighbone on the island of Java. The skullcap looked like that of an ape and the thighbone was very human-like, and Dubois claimed that the creature walked upright. Java Man was another missing link – for awhile, that is. Sixteen years later, in 1907, further study was given to Java Man and scientists found no evidence for Dubois' claim. Oops! I guess Java man wasn't a missing link after all.

Pittdown Man

Pittdown Man was discovered in 1912 in Pittdown, England by amateur fossilologist Charles Dawson. It was hailed by scientists as the missing link between man and ape for decades. Forty-one years later, in 1953, Pittdown Man was re-examined and it was discovered to be a human skull and an orangutan jawbone which had been stained to look old and filed down so that it would fit the skull. Oops! I guess Pittdown man wasn't a missing link after all.

Nebraska Man

In 1922, a tooth was discovered in western Nebraska. Henry Fairfield Osborn, a leading paleontologist, declared that it exhibited a combination of chimpanzee and human characteristics. From this single tooth, researchers constructed an entire hominid skeleton. Nebraska Man (once again) was hailed as man's missing link. Then, shortly after the Scopes trial in 1925, three years later, more fossil bones of Nebraska Man were found. It was not human at all! It turned out to be an extinct pig. Oops! I guess Nebraska man wasn't a missing link after all.

Taung skull

In 1924, Professor Raymond Dart, anatomist at the University of Witwatersrand, in Johannesburg, South Africa, acquired a skull that had come from the lime works at Taung. After cleaning up the fossil, Dart announced to the world that he had discovered our evolutionary ancestor. Dart called this discovery *Australopithecine africanus*, and by 1960 nearly every book in this country that touched on human origins, listed the Taung skull as our oldest human ancestor – between two to three million years old.

However, in 1973, fifty-one years later, South African geologist T. C. Partridge announced that the cave in which the tang skull was discovered was only 870,000 years old.

Time for the evolutionists' to wave their magic wand.

This was obviously a problem – how could a two to three million year old hominid come from a cave that is only 875,000 years old? In order to fix this, they tried to reclassify it as *Homo habilis*. However, it just didn't fit with the other *Homo habilis* type fossils. To this day the Taung skull remains a problem – evolutionists don't know what to do with it.⁴⁶ Oops! I guess it wasn't a missing link after all.

Ramapithecus

Ramapithecus was originally discovered in 1932. The find consisted of a few jaw fragments and several teeth. The whole idea of Ramapithecus as an intermediate link was based on speculation and a desire to find something, and not on empirical science. It has now been shown that it is merely an extinct type of orangutan. Ramapithecus has been discarded as having anything to do with human evolution and has been taken out of modern textbooks.⁴⁷ Oops! I guess Ramapithecus wasn't a missing link after all.

Lucy

Lucy was a 40% complete female skeleton unearthed by Dr Donald Johanson's expedition to Hadar, Ethiopia, in 1974, and hailed by scientists as a missing link between humans and apes. But was it? Twenty-six years later, a study published in *Nature* has shown that some australopithecines, including Lucy, had wrists designed for knuckle walking.⁴⁸ Yet artists regularly depict Lucy standing erect with humanlike hands and feet.

According to Richard Leakey, who along with Donald Johanson, is probably the best known Paleoanthropologist in the world, Lucy's skull is so incomplete that most of it is imagination made of plaster.⁴⁹ Leakey even said in 1983 that no firm conclusion could be drawn about what species Lucy belonged to. To reinforce the fact that Lucy is not a creature between ape and man, Dr Charles Oxnard (Professor of Anatomy and Human Biology at the University of Western Australia), said that humans and apes are more closely related to each other than australopithecines are to either of them and therefore is not a link between them.⁵⁰ Oops! I guess Lucy wasn't a missing link after all.

Ape-man Summary

When we look at the evidence, what do the discoveries actually show?

Neanderthals - A gross exaggeration and misrepresentation of the evidence,

Java Man - A mistake filled with deception,

Pitldown Man - A fraud with a lot of imagination,

Nebraska Man - A misinterpretation with a lot of imagination,

Taung skull - A mistake based on imagination and poor science,

Ramapithecus - A mistake based on a lot of imagination,

Australopithecines (Lucy) - An extinct ape.

Each of the above cases displayed the following common elements:

- A fossil was found.
- It was immediately assumed that it was a missing link.
- Further investigation always revealed the discoverers were wrong.
- The public was misled (in some cases for many years) by false information.

So much for human ape-men.

The Scopes "Monkey" Trial

In 1925, in the town of Dayton Tennessee, one of the most famous trial cases in the United States took place. The trial is commonly called the "Scopes Trial" or sometimes

referred to as the "Monkey Trial." The trial originated in the New York offices of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU).

Tennessee had just adopted a law stating that it was illegal to teach evolution as fact in the school system. The ACLU decided to challenge this law by putting an advertisement in a Chattanooga, Tennessee newspaper, *The Daily Times*, which said in part: "We are looking for a Tennessee teacher who is willing to accept our services in testing this law in the courts." John Scopes, who was not a biology teacher but was just filling in for another teacher for two weeks, accepted the challenge.

In order to attract the greatest attention to this trial, two of the leading lawyers in the country were recruited. Clarence Darrow was to defend John Scopes, and William Jennings Bryan accepted the invitation as the prosecutor. Included in the audience were over 200 media representatives.

The important aspect to the creation evolution debate

This trial is one of the major reasons why creationism, and belief in the Bible in general, became a laughing-stock in America and places where American culture rules. It provided a huge intellectual blow to the credibility of sincere Christian belief and made 'fundamentalist' virtually synonymous with 'stupid'. Because of this event, evolution gained massive public acceptance, not just as a true theory, but as an alternative to Biblical creation and one which made belief in the Bible outdated and childish.

However, the famous Scopes "monkey trial" of 1925 holds important lessons for us today. Many people testified during the trial that evolution was a proven scientific fact. They said Piltdown Man proved evolution; Nebraska Man proved evolution; Java Man proved evolution; Neanderthals proved evolution; they said the horse family proved evolution; Archaeopteryx proved evolution; Haeckel's Embryos (recapitulation) proved evolution; vestigial organs (see below) proved evolution; and more. Yet almost all of the evidence used as proof of evolution has now been discarded (even among evolutionists themselves). Evolution is simply not true. Variation, Yes, Evolution, No.

Vestigial organs

Vestigial organs, such as the appendix or tailbone, are supposedly functionless structures left over from our evolutionary past. During the Scopes trial, there were 180 supposed vestigial organs in the human body. Scientists now know that almost all of these 180 structures, including the appendix and tailbone, have a function. Jonathan Safarti has some insight on this issue. *First*, says Safarti, it is not possible to prove that an organ is useless, because there is always the possibility that a use may be discovered in the future. This has happened with over a hundred alleged useless vestigial organs, which are now known to be essential. *Second*, even if the alleged vestigial organ were no longer needed, it would prove devolution not evolution. The creation model allows for deterioration of a perfect creation. However, the particles-to-people evolution model needs to find examples of organs which are increasing in complexity.⁵¹

Fossils

Many people think that the fossil record supports evolution. To quote evolutionist literature: *To understand evolution, humans must think in much larger units of time than*

we use to define our own lives. Evolutionary change isn't defined in weeks, month, or years, instead it is recorded in layers and layers of rock that has been deposited over 4.6 billion years. Additionally, evolutionists have openly stated:

- *'The most direct evidence that evolution has occurred is presented in the study of the fossils.'*⁵²
- *'The gradual development of life revealed by the fossil record has been called evolution.'*⁵³
- *'Fossils help to build up a connected story of the past and show the parade of life through the ages.'*⁵⁴
- *'Our knowledge of the history of life stems largely from the study of the fossils.'*⁵⁵
- *'One of the main lines of investigation that reveals the time course of past evolution is paleontology, the study of fossils.'*⁵⁶

From quotes such as these, one certainly gets the idea that the fossil record is very important to, and supports, the theory of evolution. Yet the fossil record, far from supporting the theory of evolution, actually tends to refute it.

Geology and paleontology held great expectations for Charles Darwin, although in 1859 he admitted they presented the strongest evidence against his theory. Fossils were perplexing to him because they did not reveal evidence of the gradual and continuous progression of life from a common ancestor that his theory required. In *Origin of Species* Darwin wrote: *"Innumerable transitional forms must have existed, but why do we not find them embedded in countless numbers in the crust of the earth? ...why is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain, and this perhaps is the greatest objection which can be urged against my theory."*⁵⁷

Although fossils were an enigma to Darwin because they didn't support his theory, he ignored the problem and found comfort in the idea that in the future, researchers would unearth the necessary fossils and ultimately prove his theory correct.

Now, after 140 years of the most painstaking research of every continent and ocean bottom, the picture is more vivid than it was in Darwin's time. Our museums are filled with over 100 million fossils of more than 250,000 species, yet the fossil evidence supporting evolution is even less now, than it was in 1859.⁵⁸ It is less because some of the fossils used in Darwin's day, which supposedly proved evolution, are now discounted – e.g. the horse series (discussed earlier) and many others as well.

Here is what some experts are saying.

I recently read the following: "There is much confusion in the popularized literature about the evidence for macroevolutionary change in the fossil record. Unfortunately, the discussion of evolution within the Christian community has been greatly influenced by inaccurate presentations of the fossil data and of the methods of classification."

Because of that conception – or misconception, I would like to cite from those within the evolutionary field themselves; these are citations not from pundits or those "within the Christian community," but from paleontologists, geologists, anthropologists, biologists and others.

An Abundance of Fossils

*"There is no need to apologize any longer for the poverty of the fossil record. In some ways it has become almost unmanageably rich, and discovery is out-pacing integration. Nevertheless, the fossil record continues to be composed mainly of gaps."*⁵⁹

*"Darwin... was embarrassed by the fossil record... we are now about 120-years after Darwin and the knowledge of the fossil record has been greatly expanded. We now have a quarter of a million fossil species but the situation hasn't changed much. The record of evolution is still surprisingly jerky and, ironically, ... some of the classic cases of Darwinian change in the fossil record, such as the evolution of the horse in North America, have had to be discarded or modified as a result of more detailed information."*⁶⁰

*"My attempts to demonstrate evolution by an experiment carried on for more than 40 years have completely failed. ... The fossil material is now so complete that it has been possible to construct new classes, and the lack of transitional series cannot be explained as being due to the scarcity of material. The deficiencies are real, they will never be filled."*⁶¹

Mostly Gaps – No Transitions

*"Despite the bright promise that paleontology provides a means of 'seeing' evolution, it has presented some nasty difficulties for evolutionists, the most notorious of which is the presence of 'gaps' in the fossil record. Evolution requires intermediate forms between species, and paleontology does not provide them ..."*⁶²

*"The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology."*⁶³

*"For over a hundred years paleontologists have recognized the large number of gaps in the fossil record."*⁶⁴

*"Instead of finding the gradual unfolding of life, what geologists of Darwin's time, and geologists of the present day actually find is a highly uneven or jerky record; that is, species appear in the sequence very suddenly, show little or no change during their existence in the record, then abruptly go out of the record. It is not always clear, in fact it's rarely clear, that the descendants were actually better adapted than their predecessors. In other words, biological improvement is hard to find."*⁶⁵

*"Biologists would dearly like to know how modern apes, modern humans and the various ancestral hominids have evolved from a common ancestor. Unfortunately, the fossil record is somewhat incomplete as far as the hominids are concerned, and it is all but blank for the apes... . David Pilbeam [a well-known expert in human evolution] says If you brought in a smart scientist from another discipline and showed him the meager evidence we've got he'd surely say, 'forget it: there isn't enough to go on' "*⁶⁶

*"All paleontologists know that the fossil record contains precious little in the way of intermediate forms. Transitions between major groups are characteristically abrupt."*⁶⁷

*"Given that evolution, according to Darwin, was in a continual state of motion ...it followed logically that the fossil record should be rife with examples of transitional forms leading from the less to more evolved. ...Instead of filling the gaps in the fossil record with so-called missing links, most paleontologists found themselves facing a situation in which there were only gaps in the fossil record, with no evidence of transformational intermediates between documented fossil species."*⁶⁸

David Pilbeam, of the Boston Museum, was a lifetime expert in the field of paleoanthropology (the study of fossil man). In an article written for *Human Nature* magazine in June 1978, entitled, "Rearranging our Family Tree," he reported that "discoveries since 1976 had changed his view of human origins and man's early ancestors" (Pilbeam ranked so high in the field, that he was the advisor to the government of Kenya in regard to the establishment of an international institute of the study of human origins).

In Nov. 2004, National Geographic featured a 33 page cover story titled "Was Darwin Wrong?" In the article the author stated, "*illuminating but spotty, the fossil record is like a film of evolution from which 999 out of every 1000 frames have been lost on the cutting-room floor.*"⁶⁹ **So there you have it.** Evolution appears to be 99.9% imagination!

Darwin's Enigma

Darwin's Enigma: Fossils and other problems, by Luther Sunderland, Master Books, San Diego, CA, 1984, is an excellent book in pointing out many fallacies of the theory of evolution in regards to the fossil record; here are some quotations:

"Anyone interested in how the fossil record presented in leading museums contradicts Darwinian evolution should read Darwin's Enigma." -- William Fix, author "*The Bone Peddlers.*"⁷⁰

"Mr. Sunderland has done an excellent job amassing critical opinions from the scientific community relative to the fossil record, which is the historical narrative of life on earth. Scientists and non-scientists alike should find it interesting to confront the difficult questions asked. I will certainly encourage my colleagues and my students to read it." – Robert Jenkins, Biology professor, Ithaca College.⁷¹

Michael Denton, author of *Evolution A Theory in Crisis* writes, "*Your book [Darwin's Enigma] does more than any other publication that I am aware of, to highlight the fact that leading scientific authorities in Evolutionary Biology express considerable skepticism over many aspects of evolution, while school texts present the theory as proven beyond a reasonable doubt.*"⁷²

Dr. Colin Patterson, Senior Paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History, was asked why he had included no transitional forms in his book on evolution. He replied: “... *I fully agree with your comments on the lack of direct illustration of evolutionary transitions in my book. If I knew of any, fossil or living, I would certainly have included them ... Yet Gould and the American Museum people are hard to contradict when they say there are no transitional fossils ... I will lay it on the line that there is not one such fossil for which one could make a watertight argument.*” Patterson continues, “*It is easy enough to make up stories of how one form gave rise to another, and to find reasons why the stages should be favored by natural selection; but such stories are not part of science, for there is no way of putting them to the test.*”⁷³

Sunderland himself writes, “*Researchers in the field of Evolution have provided no verifiable facts that would validate their theory conclusively. From time to time, evolutionists have admitted ignoring real facts and altering the theory to fit the data. In spite of these grossly unscientific tactics, the theory of evolution continues to be presented in textbooks, encyclopedias, and research papers as if it were a proven and verifiable fact.*”⁷⁴ Three pages later he writes, “*Hundreds of scientists who once taught their university students that the bottom line on origins had finally been settled [Evolution] are now confessing that they were wrong. They have discovered that their previous conclusions, once held so fervently, were based on very fragile evidence, and suppositions which have since been refuted by new discoveries.*”⁷⁵

These are not just one or two statements that have been taken out of context. I have hundreds more, but had to stop somewhere. So many have been included here because evolutionists often accuse creationists of taking one or two quotations out of context and making a big deal of it.

The reason there is no evidence for evolution in any of the ***Icons of Evolution***, or in the ***Fossil Record*** is revealed when we look into the biology of the cell. This is perhaps the strongest piece of evidence refuting evolution. As I have said throughout this paper, there is no mechanism for evolution. Information, as we shall discover, is the key as to why the theory doesn't hold up. A belief in evolution might have been justified years ago, but modern biology has shattered the whole concept.

Evolution and Microbiology

Recognizing Intelligence

Scientists get excited about finding stone tools in a cave because these speak of intelligence. They could not have designed or made themselves. Tools need a toolmaker.

Consider also the presidents heads on Mt. Rushmore. Nobody in their right mind would believe that they were formed as a result of millions of years of wind, erosion, and random chance. They were carefully and skillfully designed.

Or how about a wristwatch? Again, nobody thinks that the watch made itself. A watch requires a watchmaker. Today, however, a large proportion of people, including many leading scientists, believe that all plants and animals, including the incredibly complex brains of the people who make watches, carved out the presidents heads on Mt. Rushmore, or made the stone tools, etc., were not designed by an intelligent God but rather came from an unintelligent evolutionary process.

Information

Darwin didn't understand the cell or the nature of information. Ernst Heckle, a 19th century biologist and Darwin supporter, described the cell as being “*a homogenous globule of plasma.*”⁷⁶ Today we know better though, the so-called “simple” cell is actually more complicated than the Space Shuttle. There are many highly qualified scientists who believe that life is too complex to have arisen by chance; they maintain that an intelligent designer is needed. The problem why many do not believe in a designer, they say, is not due to the evidence but the *implications* of the evidence.

Information is perhaps the biggest problem for evolutionists. They cannot explain the origin of information. In *Creator Beyond Time and Space*, Mark Eastman says that “a fertilized human egg is about the size of a pin head. Yet, it contains information equivalent to **about six billion** ‘chemical letters’ [of DNA]. This is enough information to fill 1000 books 500 pages thick with print so small you would need a microscope to read them.” Dr. Eastman says, “If all the DNA letters in the human body were printed in [ordinary] books, it is estimated they would fill the Grand Canyon fifty times!”⁷⁷ In fact, according to the *May 21, 2004, Answers In Genesis Newsletter*, there is enough information in the genes from just one man and woman, that they could have more children than atoms in the entire universe without getting two that looked the same.

Where did this information come from? Evolutionists have no explanation. Researchers cannot explain how the high degree of order and specificity could arise by random processes.⁷⁸

If you go to the Biology department at most universities and ask them where the information in the cell came from, they will tell you that it arose **by chance** millions and millions of years ago. But if you go to the Computer Science department at the same university, and ask them where information comes from, they will tell you that information is created by **removing chance** (noise). That in fact, information is the opposite of chance.

Werner Gitt, information scientist, and author of *In the Beginning Was Information* says, “There is no known law of nature, no known process and no known sequence of events which can cause information to originate by itself in matter.”⁷⁹

So where did the information come from? Dr. John Baumgardner, Geophysicist at Los Alamos National Laboratory says, “The answer should be obvious -- an intelligent Creator is unmistakably required.”⁸⁰

How Did Life Become More Complex?

Not only is the origin of information a problem, but evolutionists cannot explain how life became more complex. Recall that the theory of evolution is supposed to explain how life went up the tree from simple lifeforms to more complex lifeforms.

However, the amount of information in a single cell - a protozoa - is far less than the amount of information in a person. According to Don Batten, for a typical bacterium to be transformed into a human over some billions of years, one has to add the information for an additional 100,000 genes - an impossible task for mutations to achieve.⁸¹

Natural selection is a logical process that can be observed. However, natural selection can only operate on the information already contained in genes — it does *not* produce new information. Actually, this is consistent with the Bible’s account of origins; God created distinct *kinds* of plants and animals, each to reproduce after its own kind. One can observe great variation in a *kind*, and see the results of natural selection. For instance, lions, tigers, and cheetahs have developed over time as a result of natural selection operating on the information in the genes of the cat *kind*. But no new information was produced — these varieties have resulted from rearrangement, shuffling, and sorting out, of the information in the original cat kind. One *kind* has never been observed to change into a totally different *kind* with new information that previously did not exist! As previously stated, amoeba DNA has no information for making hooves, hair, tails and eyes, but horse DNA does, and alligator DNA has no genetic information for producing feathers, hollow bones and one-way lung systems, but bird DNA does.

What’s the meaning of the phrase ‘after its kind’ in Genesis?

This phrase occurs ten times in Genesis 1. God is telling us that He created separate groups of plants and animals. These groups are not immutable (they can change) but one group or 'kind' would *not* change into another group or kind. Note: A kind is not at the Species level, but at the Genus or Family level.

If a dog kind could produce a cat kind, or an ape kind could produce a human kind, we’d have evidence for evolution. But we find that dogs only produce dogs, and apes only produce apes. Yes, there can be *great* variation within each kind—but this has *nothing* to do with evolution.

To change one kind into a different kind, new information would have to be added into the genes—but this doesn’t happen.

Scientists should admit that what we see in the animals fits with what we’re told in Genesis—God made each kind to reproduce after its *own* kind.

Without a way to increase information, natural selection will not work as a mechanism for evolution. Evolutionists agree with this, but they believe that mutations somehow provide the new information for natural selection to act upon. As Carl Weiland, from

Answers In Genesis,⁸² has said, “For evolutionists, there is only one game in town to explain the new information which their theory requires—mutations.”⁸³

Mutations are accidental mistakes as the genetic information on the DNA molecule is copied from one generation to the next.

However, according to microbiologists, mutations do not produce new information. Dr Lee Spetner, a highly qualified scientist who taught information and communication theory at Johns Hopkins University, in his book *Not by Chance* says, “All point mutations that have been studied on the molecular level turn out to reduce the genetic information and not to increase it.”⁸⁴ In a recent interview, Richard Dawkins (of Oxford University), a fanatical atheist and a leading spokesman for Darwinian evolution, was asked if he could produce an example of a mutation or evolutionary process which led to an increase in information. Dawkins was unable to offer any such example of a documented increase in information resulting from a mutation. Stephen Jay Gould, Prof of Geology and Paleontology at Harvard University, said, “*A mutation doesn't produce major new raw (DNA) material. You don't make a new species by mutating the species.*”⁸⁵ Pierre-Paul Grosse; past-President, French Academie des Science, stated, “*No matter how numerous they may be, mutations do not produce any kind of evolution.*”⁸⁶ Perhaps Don Batten can add some clarity to this topic: Mutations cause loss of information, loss of functional complexity—not an increase, as evolution requires. This is not to say that mutations are never beneficial – sometimes they are. Sometimes loss of complexity can be advantageous—for example, the loss of wings in beetles which live on a windy island would be a benefit. In this situation, flying is a health hazard, as the flying beetles could be blown into the sea, so loss of wings can be an advantage. A mutation in one of the genes controlling wing formation could easily cause the loss of wings. So such a mutation can be beneficial, but it is nevertheless a *loss* of information, not the increase that evolution requires.

No Mechanism for Change: How Natural Selection Works

Many people will say they accept microevolution, but not macroevolution. What they mean is they believe in change within a kind (of organism), but not change from one kind to another. Terms such as ‘micro’ and ‘macro’ evolution should be avoided however, because they imply that at some point in time a lot of microevolutions will produce macroevolution. This simply is not the case. While it is true that mutations in combination with natural selection will produce change and variation within a kind, these changes can never add up to produce a new kind. The ‘micro’ changes (i.e. observed genetic variation) are not capable of accumulating into macro changes.

Evolutionists teach that one-celled organisms (e.g. protozoa) evolved into more complex creatures over millions of years. However, this requires a net increase of information; A one-celled organism does not have the instructions for how to manufacture eyes, ears, blood, skin, brains, etc. So for protozoa to have given rise to a fish, or a dinosaur to a bird, or an ape to a human there would have to be some mechanism that gives rise to new information. Evolutionists hail natural selection as if it were a creative goddess. Darwin thought the process was essentially creative and virtually without limits. If ‘new’ varieties could arise in a short time to suit their environment, which he observed happening, then

given enough time, any number of new characteristics, to the extent of totally new creatures, could appear. This was how, he believed, lungs originally arose in a lungless world, and feathers in a featherless one. But, again, micro changes (i.e. observed genetic variation) are not capable of accumulating into macro changes, because no new information is added to the organism. In fact, the opposite is true, information is always reduced.

How it Works

For instance, genes for longer hair will improve an animal's chances of surviving in a cold climate; and genes for white coloring will improve the camouflage of a bear in a snowy wilderness (camouflage does not just help an animal avoid being caught and eaten; it can also help a predator to sneak up on prey). Since it is more likely to avoid starvation, a lighter-colored bear is more likely to be around to pass its lighter coloring on to the next generation. Eventually, only light colored bears will exist – dark colored bears will have all died out. In this manner, creatures can become more adapted (better suited) to the environment in which they find themselves. As a consequence, the information in the bears' genes for producing dark color or short hair will have been lost. Conversely, in a different environment the short hair dark bears, instead of dying out, would have a better chance of surviving and passing along their genes. Similarly, let's say a population of plants has a mix of genes for the length of its roots. Expose that population over generations to repeated spells of very dry weather, and the plants most likely to survive are the ones which have longer roots which can get down to deeper water tables. Thus, the genes for shorter roots are less likely to get passed on. In time, none of these plants will any longer have genes for short roots, so they will all be of the 'long root' type. They are now better adapted to dry conditions than their forebears were. But once again, information is always reduced.⁸⁷

Information Summary:

The theory of evolution tries to explain the origin of life. Not only does evolutionary theory fail to explain life's origin, it cannot explain how lifeforms became more complex.

Natural selection, an observable process, adds no information to the organism, in fact, it reduces it, but evolution requires a way to add new information.

Mutations (genetic copying mistakes) must be invoked to explain how new information arose in order for natural selection to "guide" the assumed evolutionary process.

However, mutations studied to date all appear to be losses of information—not surprising for a random process.

It is thus quite illegitimate then to use instances in which natural selection is happening (reducing the information in populations) as examples of 'evolution happening.'

Natural selection can fine-tune the way in which organisms adapt to their environment and help stave off extinction. By splitting a large gene pool into smaller ones, it can add to the amount of observed variety within the descendants of an original kind, just as with the many varieties of horse from one type.

Even new "species" can come about like that, but not new information. This helps to explain greater diversity today than, for example, on board Noah's Ark.

NOTE: When God created the animals, he instilled in them an ability to adapt. God foresaw the entrance of sin and its effect on His perfect world. God created His creatures with an incredible ability to adapt and survive in various environments.

In a Dec 2005 newsletter from *Answers in Genesis* someone asked: “*Is the comparison of DNA to CD-ROMs, and their ability to store incredible amounts of information, a valid comparison?*” Here is their response:

“It certainly isn’t! Computer components, such as CD-ROMs, are only able to store information on a flat, relatively two-dimensional surface. DNA stores information in *three* dimensions, and has a much greater capacity for storage.

For instance, a single CD-ROM can hold thousands of pages of information. Sounds like an enormous amount, doesn’t it? But the amount of DNA that would fit on the head of a pin contains enough information to fill a stack of books that would reach from the earth to the moon—500 times over!

Think of the intelligence, as well as the billions of dollars and years of research, that has gone into developing the computer. No scientist would *ever* look at a computer and think that it was a result of chance random processes. And yet, many of these same scientists look at DNA and *insist* it arose by chance!

When we stand in awe of modern computers, how much *more* should we stand in awe of the One who invented DNA—our Creator God!”

Combining Evolution and the Bible

Despite all of the problems with the theory of evolution, there are still churches that try to accommodate evolutionary dogma into their theology. However, one cannot mix evolution and the Bible and still maintain correct Biblical doctrine. There are many reasons why they will not integrate together. We will explore some of them.

Progressive Creationists and Theistic Evolutionists, for example, believe God created, but they believe He used evolution to do it. However there are a number of theological problems to be considered.

The atheistic formula for life is this:

Life = matter + chance + mutation + natural selection + time.

In the theistic formula (Progressive Creation, & Theistic Evolution) God is added:

Life = matter + chance + mutation + natural selection + time + God.

Here is a summary of what Progressive Creationist Hugh Ross* believes:

- The ‘big-bang’ origin of the universe occurred 16-billion-years ago; death, bloodshed, and disease existed before Adam & Eve.
- The days of creation were long periods.
- Noah’s Flood was a local event.
- Sin has only a regionally limited effect on the world.
- Man-like creatures that behaved much like us—and painted on cave walls, buried their dead, etc... existed before Adam and Eve, but didn’t have a spirit and thus had no salvation.

- The record of nature is just as perfect as the Word of God.
- Over millions of years, God created new species as others kept going extinct.

(*Hugh Ross is an astronomer, and author of dozens of books; he and his organization *Reasons to Believe*, is Progressive Creation’s most outspoken and well known proponent).

One problem with this:

Hugh Ross relies too heavily on his interpretation of science. Theologically, this is a problem because science and science textbooks change every year, yet God’s Word is the same yesterday, today, and forever,⁸⁸ and God cannot lie.⁸⁹ If you reinterpret the Bible based on what science says today, what happens when the science changes? You must reinterpret your reinterpretation?

Another problem: Progressive Creation misrepresents the nature of God

The Bible reveals God to us as our Father in Heaven, who is absolutely *perfect*,⁹⁰ *holy*⁹¹ and *omnipotent*.⁹² The Apostle John tells us that 'God is love,' 'light,' and 'life.'⁹³ When God creates something, His work is described as very good,⁹⁴ and perfect.⁹⁵ However, Progressive Creation says that for millennia God used death, disease and suffering to create. This is far from ‘*very good*’ and ‘*perfect*.’ (See *10 Dangers of Theistic Evolution*)⁹⁶

Yet Another Problem: Death Before Sin

Ross believes that there were millions of years of death, disease and suffering, before Adam sinned. This is plainly not what the Bible teaches. The Bible says in Rom 5:12 “*Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.*” (no death before sin).

If there was death before sin, then Jesus Christ’s death is made meaningless. 1 Cor 15:22 says, “*For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.*” Even atheists know this. In *American Atheist Magazine*, Richard Bozarth wrote, “*It becomes clear now that the whole justification of Jesus' life and death is predicated on the existence of Adam and the forbidden fruit he and Eve ate. Without the original sin, who needs to be redeemed? Without Adam's fall into a life of constant sin terminated by death, what purpose is there to Christianity? None.*”⁹⁷

In that same article he also wrote, “*Christianity is—must be—totally committed to the special creation as described in Genesis, and Christianity must fight with its full might against the theory of evolution.*”

The Order is Wrong Too

Progressive Creationists & Theistic evolutionists believe in the Big Bang origin of the universe, but the order of the events is inconsistent with Biblical doctrine.

The Big Bang	Bible says
Creation took billions of years.	Creation took six days.
The Earth formed long after the stars.	The Earth came before the stars.
Plants formed long after the sun formed.	Plants were created on day 3, before the sun formed.
The sun formed before the Earth.	The sun was created on day 4, after the Earth

Men evolved over millions of years.	God took dust and made a man.
Women evolved over millions of years.	God created women from man's rib.
Noah's flood was a local flood.	Noah's flood was a global flood.
Among other things	

More problems: Long time spans make God a liar

Mark 10:6 says, *“But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female.”* Man was made on Day 6 at the beginning, not after millions or billions of years after the universe formed. But since Progressive Creationists believe in a universe that is billions of years old, man was not created five days after the beginning, but evolved billions of years after the beginning.

According to Hugh Ross, Noah's flood was a local event: Ross says, *“But here are some reasons why the flood cannot be global. Number one is the limited extent of sin. Given that human beings had not yet civilized and inhabited Antarctica, there'd be no need for God to flood Antarctica because there'd be no sin there in Antarctica.”* He continues, *“There'd be no need for God to kill off all the penguins because those penguins had no contact with reprobate humanity, and in that case, I don't think Noah took any penguins on board the ark. ... Only bird and mammal species, according to the Levitical Law, can be impacted by sin.”*⁹⁸

Yet the Bible clearly says Noah's flood was a global flood. Gen. 6:13 says, *“And God said to Noah, The end of ALL flesh has come before me, for the earth is filled with violence through them, and, behold, I will destroy them.”* Genesis 6:17 says, *“And, behold, I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the Earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven; and every thing that is in the Earth shall die.”*

In fact, God said He would never flood the Earth again, and as a reminder of his covenant between Himself and mankind He put a rainbow in the sky after the rain. Genesis 9:13-15 says, *“I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the Earth. And it shall come to pass, when I bring a cloud over the Earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud. And I will remember my covenant, which is between me and you and every living creature of all flesh; and the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh.”* There have been thousands of local floods, and thousands of rainbows. Has God broken His promise? No! God never said He wouldn't send a local flood.

The Creation Story, According to Progressive Creation

Ross says, *“Starting about 2 to 4 million years ago, God began creating man-like mammals or hominids. These creatures stood on two feet, had large brains, and used tools. Some even buried their dead and painted on cave walls. However, they were different from us. They did not worship God or establish religious practices. In time, all these man-like creatures went extinct. Then, about 10 to 25 thousand years ago, God replaced them with Adam and Eve.”*⁹⁹

Dr Ross accepts and defends the evolutionist radiometric dating methods, so all evidence of humans of more than 25,000 years old (eg., The Neanderthal cave sites), must be redefined as related to spiritless hominoids' which the Bible doesn't mention.

But many people groups, using these dating methods, have been able to date their ancestry back beyond 30 or 40 thousand years. Herein lies the problem. We know that

only descendants of Adam can be saved (this is why Jesus is called the second Adam). We also know that according to the Bible, all human beings are related.¹⁰⁰ So if we follow this argument to its logical conclusion, according to Progressive Creation, nobody can be saved.¹⁰¹

Being able to pick and choose what to accept and what to reject allows Hugh Ross, and others like him, to make statements like the one he did at an address that he gave at Dallas Theological Seminary in 1997. Ross said:

‘Therefore it allows me to make an interesting paraphrase of John 3:16, if you’ll permit — “For God so loved the human race that He went to the expense of building a hundred billion trillion stars and carefully shaped and crafted them for sixteen billion years so that at this brief moment in time we could all have a nice place to live.”

Nothing about sin, or redemption, or Jesus saving us or anything. The real John 3:16 says:

“For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish, but have eternal life.”

Evolution contradicts the plain teaching of the Bible and provides a slippery slope to allow a person to choose what to believe and what not to believe. If you can believe the Bible in one part, but not in another part, you can then choose which parts to believe and which parts to reject. In fact, this is what is happening in some churches in America and throughout the world:

- The Presbyterian Church in America has held serious debates over whether to allow practicing homosexuals to pastor churches.
- The new Archbishop of Canterbury believes that same-sex unions are okay.
- More than a quarter of the Church of England clergy do not believe in the virgin birth of Christ - 31%,
- 21% do not believe in Satan,
- 12% do not expect Christ to return,
- 5% do not believe that Christ performed miracles while on earth,¹⁰²

None of these beliefs can be Biblically supported, but these churches have allowed evolutionary beliefs to creep in and have decided what to keep and what to throw out.

Additionally, Bishop Hugh Montefiore, editor of the 1994 Confirmation Notebook for the Anglican Church said, “The Garden of Eden is a myth, from the viewpoint of anthropology it is exceedingly unlikely that there ever was a First Man and Woman. Human beings are the result of evolution, and shaped by natural selection. Self-centeredness and aggression were essential at every stage of evolution. Human beings naturally inherit this self-centeredness (‘original sin’). *What the Cross is not: The Son standing in my place to take the punishment that I ought to have. Such a view is immoral. In any case no one person could suffer the whole world's punishments*” (emphasis mine).¹⁰³

I cannot think of a more blasphemous statement than this. That *IS* the very reason Jesus came. To die, shed his blood on the cross to forgive the sins of the world. The amazing thing is that this isn’t coming from an atheist or an unbeliever or even agnostic, but from a bishop of the Anglican Church. Hasn’t this guy ever read the bible? “*For God so loved*

the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.” (John 3:16-17).

For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; for the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. (Rom 3:23, 6:23, 10:9).

Michael Denton comments, “As far as Christianity was concerned, the advent of the theory of evolution...was catastrophic. Despite the attempt by liberal theology to disguise the point, the fact is that no Biblically derived religion can really be reconciled with the fundamental assertion of Darwinian theory... the decline in religious belief can probably be attributed more to the propagation and advocacy by the intellectual community of the Darwinian version of evolution than to any other single factor.”¹⁰⁴

Why Is It Important?

You may be wondering, why it matters, or who cares about the creation / evolution issue? This is why it matters: the overriding issue is the authority of God's Word versus man's opinion. Either we were created by God or we evolved. As mentioned earlier, there is no third option, (if life here on Earth came from outer space, then the aliens were created or evolved). Is the Bible true or is it a myth? That is the six million dollar question.

If evolution is true then you are an animal accountable only to yourself, you can set your own rules; you can do whatever you want – believe whatever you want. You are free from those annoying little decrees outlined in the Bible. But on the other hand if creation is true and God created you, then you will be held accountable to a prescribed set of rules God laid out in the Bible. (This will happen regardless if you BELIEVE in God or not). This ‘make-our-own-rules’ belief is epitomized in the following quote by Jeremy Rifkin who said: “*We no longer feel ourselves to be guests in someone else’s home and therefore obliged to make our behavior conform with a set of pre-existing cosmic rules. It is our creation now. We make the rules. We establish the parameters of reality. We create the world, and because we do, we no longer feel beholden to outside forces. We no longer have to justify our behavior, for we are now the architects of the universe. We are responsible to nothing outside ourselves, for we are the kingdom, the power, and the glory for ever and ever*” (emphasis mine).¹⁰⁵

The Declaration of Independence says, “**We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable**

rights, among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Christians founded America, and America's laws were based on the Bible. Will America remain under the "Law of God," or will America, like Mr Rifkin, try to determine truth on its own and turn to the "Law of man?"

(NOTE: *Unalienable rights* are rights that cannot be taken away or revoked).

Do your rights come from God or from governments? If society makes the laws, a person's rights are no longer unalienable, and you can end up with dictators like Hitler, Marx, Stalin, Pol Pot, Mao Tse-tung, or others. This is why conservative Christians get so upset by liberal judges exceeding their mandate by making laws or reinterpreting the constitution according to their own biases.

Speaking about Hitler, Marx, Stalin and others, Professor Paul Johnson remarked "what is so notable in the Twentieth Century, and a principal cause – I think the primary cause – of its horrors is that great physical power has been acquired by men who have no fear of God and believe themselves restrained by no absolute code of conduct."¹⁰⁶ I would highly recommend this article by Prof Johnson. It is called *The Necessity of Christianity*; it can be read at <http://www.leaderu.com/truth/1truth08.html>

Nazism openly proclaimed its dependence on Darwin. Sir Arthur Keith wrote: '*The German Führer, as I have consistently maintained, is an evolutionist; he has consciously sought to make the practice of Germany conform to the theory of evolution.*'¹⁰⁷ Hitler believed it was right and moral for the strongest race to survive; to have pity for the weak was to defy nature's laws. As a result, six million Jews died in the Holocaust.

Communism also took evolution to its logical conclusion. If everything simply evolved naturally and there is no God, then man's opinion, not God's Word, determines what is right and wrong. Communism's death toll far outranks the Nazis' by probably more than 90 million worldwide.¹⁰⁸

Mao's reign of terror and lies resulted in the deaths of tens of millions. It is no coincidence that his two favorite books were by the evolutionists' Darwin and Huxley. With millions dying from his forced famine, his physician records that Mao said, '*We have so many people we can afford to lose a few.*' His successors have since persecuted and killed hundreds of thousands more.¹⁰⁹ Right here in America over a million and a half human beings are being killed through abortion every year.

A Barna research poll showed a significant difference in the beliefs of those who had an evolutionary viewpoint versus those with a biblical viewpoint. Those with an evolutionary viewpoint were:

- 100 times more likely to endorse abortion,
- 80 times more likely to say exposure to pornography is morally acceptable,
- 31 times more likely to believe living together before marriage is morally acceptable,
- 15 times more likely to believe homosexual sex is acceptable,
- 18 times more likely to endorse drunkenness,
- 12 times more likely to accept profanity,
- 11 times more likely to say adultery is okay.¹¹⁰

This is not to say that everyone who believes in evolution has these values, but suggests that there is a statistical correlation between these values and evolutionary beliefs.

We wonder why morality in America seems to be crumbling. Many people, including myself, think it is because fewer and fewer people believe the Bible to be true or follow its precepts (and sometimes even those who do believe the Bible is true, reinterpret it according to evolutionary beliefs). Why is it they don't believe the Bible is true? In a survey conducted recently the number one reason people gave for why they don't believe the Bible is true is because they "*thought the Bible had been disproved from its very first page by the theory of evolution.*"¹¹¹

We have separated religious truth from historical truth. If someone wants to learn about God they go to church. But if they want to learn history or biology or geology they go to college, or university.

The problem is that what the schools teach contradicts what the Bible teaches.

So what happens?

If you learn real history in school, but it contradicts the Bible, eventually you come to the conclusion that the Bible can't be trusted. Which is what has happened.

Conclusion:

People today who criticize Darwinian evolution are often thought of as people who want to bomb science back into the Stone Age and replace it with the Bible. The purpose of this paper was to show that science - real observable science (not science mixed with philosophical naturalism) – supports the Bible.

Many things refute evolution and point towards creation, I have only covered a few. All of the ***Icons of Evolution*** discussed earlier - The Miller/Urey Experiment, Darwin's Tree of Life, Homology, Haeckle's Embryos, Archaeopteryx, Peppered Moths, Darwin's Finches, Four Winged Fruit Flies, Fossil Horse Evolution, when examined in-depth, don't prove evolution. Furthermore, all of the so-called ***Ape Men***, are either fully ape, fully human, mistakes, frauds, hoaxes or misinterpretations.

If you listen to what the experts are saying – the geologists, the anthropologists, and the scientists in that field, the ***Fossil Record*** does not, contrary to popular belief, support evolution. In 1859 Darwin himself admitted that fossils presented the strongest evidence against his theory. But he thought he would be vindicated at some future date when the Earth was more fully explored. However, 140 years of exploration and 100 million fossils (of more than 250,000 species) have not shown one kind of creature evolving into another.

Perhaps most importantly, ***Microbiology*** and what we know about the cell does not support evolution. There is no mechanism by which evolution can take place. A fertilized human egg is about the size of a pinhead, and contains information equivalent to about six billion "chemical letters" of DNA. Evolutionists have no valid explanation for the origin of this information. Matter by itself cannot give rise to information. Besides the origin of information, evolution requires organisms to become more complex and increase in information. But the only possible mechanisms for this increase of information are mutations, and mutations do not produce new information.

When it comes down to it, there are only two possibilities for our origin – natural or supernatural, evolution or creation, and evolution simply cannot adequately explain life’s origin or complexity. The only other option is that God created us supernaturally. If people choose to reject God’s existence it’s not because of the lack of evidence but in spite of the evidence. As Aldous Huxley once wrote, “*we don’t know because we don’t want to know; it’s our will that determines what subjects we examine with our intellect.*”¹¹² If you have been given part of the evidence and make a decision, you have been indoctrinated, but if you have been given all the evidence and make a decision, you have been educated. Many people today who believe in evolution, have been given only part of the evidence. Clearly, if one uses their intellect to examine the evidence - all the evidence, not just selected portions of it, it is much more reasonable to believe in creation than evolution.

In light of the overwhelming amount of evidence, perhaps it isn’t the Christian who believes myth and superstition, it is the evolutionist. Christian beliefs are supported by observable, empirical, and scientific data. And frankly, this author wonders why people don’t *want* to believe in God, especially since He is a good and loving God who only wants the best for us, and has sent his Son to die on a cross to prove it.

Perhaps the evidence in this booklet made some people uncomfortable, but it is real scientific and empirical evidence; it is not made up or fabricated. Christians are not trying to bomb scientific thought back to the 18th century, nor are they ignorant, they have not closed their eyes. On the contrary, they have their eyes wide open, and, as previously stated, are joined, according to a 2001 Gallup poll, by 45% of the American population who believe “God created everything no more than 10,000 years ago.” Moreover, they are joined by 50 to 70 thousand reputable scientists and Ph.D. professors who believe it too.¹¹³ Not narrow-minded fundamentalists, or backwoods uneducated folk, but world-class scientists and Professors from some of the most prestigious universities in the world: These are smart people.

The Bottom line:

I cannot emphasize this enough. Understanding your true origin is essential in determining your final destiny. Today, a vast number of people don’t believe the Bible is true, nor do they go to church. The concept of salvation is lost on them because they don’t know that they are sinners to start with. They have been taught by a secular-humanistic education system that they are the product of evolution. Furthermore, they think that this is an intellectually logical position because it is supposedly supported by science. This is why I spent a considerable amount of text pointing out the philosophical nature of evolution.

However, the truth is, people did not evolve, they were created by God, and are sinners in need of salvation. The Bible is true, is supported by real science, but for theological reasons, it cannot be harmonized with evolutionary beliefs. There is a literal hell and a literal heaven, and the only way to enter heaven is to accept Jesus Christ as your Savior.

Want to go to heaven? Just being a ‘good person’ won’t do it, Jesus didn’t die to make bad people good, but to make dead people alive (John 3:3 says “*unless you are born again you cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven.*”); the requirement isn’t that you are good, but that you are forgiven. Pray this prayer: *Lord Jesus, I confess I am a sinner in*

need of salvation. Please forgive me, help me, and reveal yourself to me. Then check out the evidence for yourself. The Bible says that we are to carefully investigate the matter. It says to love God with all your “heart, soul, *and mind*” (Matt 22:37). You don’t give up your intellect when you become a Christian. Science – real science, not philosophy masquerading as science – harmonizes with the Bible completely.

Get a Bible and read it (many people recommend starting with the Gospel of John) and start attending a good Christian church that teaches sound doctrine.

Recommended for further study:

I have hundreds of books, articles, tapes, and videos in my library on the creation / evolution subject, but I feel the few listed below are among the best.

“A Question of Origins” video, *Institute for Creation Research*; www.icr.org (Orders 800 628- 7640); viewable for free @ <http://www.creationists.org/aquestionoforigins.html>

Eastman, Mark, Dr.; *Creator Beyond Time and Space*; Word for Today; Costa Mesa, CA; 1996.

Getting the Facts Straight: A Viewer's Guide to PBS's Evolution available at www.amazon.com (or you can download the pdf version for free at <http://www.reviewevolution.com/viewersGuide/viewersGuide.pdf>)

Lubenow, Marvin; *Bones of Contention*; Baker Books; 1992.

Meyer, Stephen, Dr., Missler, Chuck; *In The Beginning was Information*; Koinonia House, PO Box D, Coeur d' Alene, ID, 83816; (800) 546-8731, www.khouse.org

‘Origin of Life’ www.marshall.org, click on ‘Origin of Life – Dr Mark Eastman,’ (free download).

‘Origin of the Universe’ www.marshall.org, click on ‘Origin of the Universe – Dr Mark Eastman,’ (free download).

Sarfati, Jonathan; *Refuting Evolution*; 1999; Master Books, Inc., Green Forest, AR, 72638; Available at Answers In Genesis (800) 778-3390 www.answersingenesis.org, click on ‘Bookstore.’

Strobel, Lee; *Case for a Creator*; Zondervon; 2004; Grand Rapids, MI.

Sunderland, Luther; *Darwin's Enigma*; Master Books; 1998.

Wells, Jonathan; *Icons of Evolution: Science or Myth? Why Much of What We Teach About Evolution is Wrong*; Regnery Publishing; 2002.

Four good websites for evidence regarding creation include:

www.emjc3.com

<http://christiananswers.net>

www.answersingenesis.org

<http://christiananswers.net/creation>

See www.emjc3.com for additional material on the subject.

Bibliography and Endnotes

- ¹ David Quammen, “Was Darwin Wrong?” National Geographic; Nov 2004, p 4.
- ² *ibid.*
- ³ Safarti, Jonathan, *Refuting Evolution*, Master Books, May 1999.
- ⁴ Safarti, Jonathan, *Refuting Evolution*, pg 10.
- ⁵ Correspondence to *Nature*, 410(6752): 423, Sept 30, 1999.
- ⁶ Boyce Rensberger, *How the World Works*, William Morrow, NY, 1986, pp. 17–18..
- ⁷ Kerhut, G.A., *Implications of Evolution*, Pergamon, Oxford, UK, p. 157, 1960.
- ⁸ The Supreme court case was: *Torcaso v. Watkins* (1961).
- ⁹ Ruse, M., “How Evolution Became A Religion: creationists correct?” National Post, pp. B1, B3, B7, May 13, 2000; Cited by Brad Harrub, Ph.D. – see ref below.
- ¹⁰ Edward Wilson, *On Human Nature*, pg. 1524; Cited by Brad Harrub, Ph.D. in “Is Evolution Ready To Take Over Christianity?” www.apologeticspress.org/inthenews/2003/itn-03-04.htm - This is an excellent article which everyone should read, as is *The Necessity of Christianity* available at <http://www.leaderu.com/truth/1truth08.html>
- ¹¹ Marvin Lubenow; *Bones of Contention*; Baker Books; 1992. Pgs.18-19.
- ¹² Lee Strobel; *Case For Faith*, pg. 111.
- ¹³ *ibid.*, pg. 140.
- ¹⁴ J. Ankerburg; *Fast Facts*; 2002; pg. 22.
- ¹⁵ R. Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*; 1986.
- ¹⁶ Aldous Huxley; *Ends and Means*, pp. 270.
- ¹⁷ Prof. William B. Provine, University of Tennessee Knoxville TN, 1998.
- ¹⁸ Keith Stewart Thomson, “Ontogeny and Phylogeny Recapitulated,” *American Scientist* 76:274, May – June 1988.
- ¹⁹ Regnery Publishing; January 2002.
- ²⁰ Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, Regnery Publishing; January 2002, pg 6.
- ²¹ See chap 3 *Creator beyond Time and Space*, Mark Eastman.
- ²² *ibid.*
- ²³ *ibid.*
- ²⁴ *ibid.*
- ²⁵ Mark Eastman, Chuck Missler, *Creator Series*, Audio CD, 2000.
- ²⁶ Hank Hanegraaff; “The Failure of Evolution to Account for the Miracle of Life;” CR Journal; Feb, 05.
- ²⁷ *Refuting Evolution*; Master Books, 2000; Chapter 6.
- ²⁸ Here are several of them: Edward O. Dodson, *Evolution* (1960), pp. 46-47; William Bloom and Carl Kerkeler, *General Biology* (1962), p. 442; Tracy Storer and Robert Usinger, *General Zoology* (1965), p. 244; Tracy Storer, Robert Usinger, and James Nybakken, *Elements of Zoology* (1968), p. 216; Claude Ville, Warren Walker, Jr., and Frederick Smith, *General Zoology* (1968), p. 677; Richard Leakey, *Illustrated Origin* (1971).
- ²⁹ Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, pg 112.
- ³⁰ See *Blown away by design, Michael Denton and birds’ lungs*, Creation ExNihilo 21(4):14–15, September–November 1999 – available at http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs/4217cen_s1999.asp.
- ³¹ See: Bird Evolution Flies Out The Window, Creation ExNihilo16(4):16–19, June–August 1994 – available at <http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs/1352.asp>.
- ³² “Archaeopteryx: Early Bird Catches a Can of Worms,” *Science* 259:764–65, February 5, 1993.
- ³³ L. Harrison Matthews, D.Sc, FRS; *Intro to Origin of Species*, Dent, London, 1971
- ³⁴ See *What Biology Textbooks Never Told You About Evolution* at http://www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/magazines/tj/docs/tj_v15n2_icons_review.asp
- ³⁵ Frank Sherwin, M.S., “Fruit Flies in the Face of Macroevolution,” Institute for Creation Research, Newsletter, Jan 2006, <http://www.icr.org/index.php?module=articles&action=view&ID=2602>
- ³⁶ Heribert-Nilsson, *Synthetische Artbildung*, Gleerup, Sweden, Lund University, 1954; cited in Luther Sunderland, *Darwin’s Enigma*; Master Books, Santee, CA, p. 81, 1988.
- ³⁷ *Darwin’s Enigm*, Pg. 78.

- ³⁸ Walter Barnhart, 'A critical evaluation of the phylogeny of the horse,' M.Sc. Thesis, Institute for Creation Research, Santee, CA, 1987.
- ³⁹ Safarti, Jonathan; "The non-evolution of the horse;" Creation Magazine 21(3): pg. 28–31, June 1999.
- ⁴⁰ ibid.
- ⁴¹ Discovery institute Press, *Getting The Facts Straight: A Viewers Guide to PBS's Evolution*, 2001, pg 9.
- ⁴² ibid
- ⁴³ "A Scientific Dissent From Darwinism," Weekly Standard, October 1, 2001.
- ⁴⁴ Strobel, Lee; *Case for a Creator*; 2004, pg 31.
- ⁴⁵ Marvin Lubenow et al (*Bones of Contention*: Baker Books; 1992. pp.28-32)
- ⁴⁶ Marvin Lubenow; *Bones of Contention*: Baker Books; 1992. pp.49-51.
- ⁴⁷ See *Is there really evidence that man descended from the apes* at <http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs/263.asp>
- ⁴⁸ *Nature* issue# 404, 2000;382-385.
- ⁴⁹ *The Weekend Australian*, May 7-8, 1983, Magazine section, pg 3.
- ⁵⁰ Dr Charles E. Oxnard, "Fossils, Teeth and Sex -- New perspective on Human Evolution," University of Washington Press, Seattle and London, 1987, p. 227. See "Did you Know" at <http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs/1261.asp>.
- ⁵¹ Safarti, Jonathan; *Vestigial Organs: What do they prove?* – www.answersingenesis.org
- ⁵² *Zoology* - W. Stephenson p.249.
- ⁵³ *Biological Science - The Web of Life*. Student book p.885. 3rd Edition 1981.
- ⁵⁴ *Modern Science for Second Year* by F.T. Barrell, p.43, 2nd Edition 1971.
- ⁵⁵ *Biological Science – The Web of Life*. Student's Manual Part 2 p.289, 9th Edition 1981.
- ⁵⁶ *The Science of Biology* - by Paul B. Weisz, p.551, 4th Edition 1911.
- ⁵⁷ Charles Darwin, *Origin of the Species*, 1859, chap 10.
- ⁵⁸ Sunderland, L; *Darwin's Enigma*; Master Books, San Diego, Ca, 1984; pg 9.
- ⁵⁹ George, T. Neville, "Fossils in Evolutionary Perspective," *science progress*, vol. 48 January 1960, pg 1-3
- ⁶⁰ David M. Raup, Curator of Geology Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago; "Conflicts Between Darwin and Paleontology" *Field Museum of Natural History*; Vol. 50, No. 1, Jan, 1979, p. 25.
- ⁶¹ Prof N. Heribert Nilsson, Lund University, Sweden; Famous botanist and evolutionist; As quoted in: *The Earth Before Man*, p. 51.
- ⁶² David B. Kitts, PhD Zoology, Head Curator, Dept of Geology, Stoval Museum; *Evolution*, vol 28, Sep 1974, p 467.
- ⁶³ S.J. Gould, Evolution's Erratic Pace, *Natural History* 86(5):14, 1977.
- ⁶⁴ Cracraft, in Awbrey & Thwaites, *Evolutionists Confront Creationists*, 1984
- ⁶⁵ Raup, David M., "Conflicts Between Darwin and Paleontology," *Bulletin, Field Museum of Natural History*, vol. 50, 1979, p. 23.
- ⁶⁶ Richard E. Leakey, *The Making of Mankind*, Michael Joseph Limited, London, 1981, p. 43.
- ⁶⁷ Gould, Stephen J. *The Panda's Thumb*, 1980, p. 189.
- ⁶⁸ Schwartz, Jeffrey H., *Sudden Origins*, 1999, p. 89.
- ⁶⁹ National Geographic; "Was Darwin Wrong?" Nov 2004; pg 25.
- ⁷⁰ Luther Sunderland; *Darwin's Enigma: Fossils and other problems*, Master Books, San Diego, CA, 1984; pg. 2.
- ⁷¹ *Darwin's Enigma*, pg. 1.
- ⁷² ibid, pg. 1.
- ⁷³ Personal letter (written 10 April 1979) from Dr Collin Patterson, Senior Paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History in London, to Luther D. Sunderland; as quoted in *Darwin's Enigma*, p. 89.
- ⁷⁴ ibid, pg. 5.
- ⁷⁵ ibid, pg. 8
- ⁷⁶ Ernst Heckle; *The Wonders of Life*; 1905; pg.. 111 - quoted in Lee Strobel; *Case for Faith*; Zondervon; 2000; pg 98.
- ⁷⁷ Dr. Mark Eastman; *Creator Beyond Time and Space*; Word for Today; Costa Mesa, CA; 1996; pg 84.
- ⁷⁸ Luther D. Sunderland; *Darwin's Enigma*; Master Books, San Diego, USA, 1984, p.9.
- ⁷⁹ Werner Gitt; *In the Beginning Was Information*; p. 107
- ⁸⁰ J. Baumgardner, *Highlights of the Los Alamos Origins Debate*.
- ⁸¹ see Don Batten; *Answers in Genesis*; <http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs/1404.asp>

-
- ⁸² www.AnswersInGenesis.com
- ⁸³ Mutations are accidental mistakes as the genetic information on the DNA molecule is copied from one generation to the next.
- ⁸⁴ Lee. Spetner, *Not by Chance*, The Judaica Press Inc, Brooklyn, New York, pg. 139; et al
- ⁸⁵ Stephen Jay Gould; "*Is a New and General Theory of Evolution Emerging?*" Lecture at Smith College, Feb 4, 1980.
- ⁸⁶ Pierre-Paul Grosse; *Evolution of Living Organisms*; Academic Press, New York, 1977, p 88.
- ⁸⁷ See "*Muddy Waters*" at www.answersingenesis.org.
- ⁸⁸ Hebrews 13:8, John 1:14
- ⁸⁹ Titus 1:2
- ⁹⁰ Matthew 5:48.
- ⁹¹ Isaiah 6:3.
- ⁹² Jeremiah 32:17.
- ⁹³ 1 John 4:16; 1:5; 1:1-2.
- ⁹⁴ Genesis 1:31.
- ⁹⁵ Deut 32:4.
- ⁹⁶ See *10 Dangers of Theistic Evolution* - www.answersingenesis.org/docs/1305.asp
- ⁹⁷ G. Richard Bozarth, "The Meaning of Evolution", *American Atheist*, 20 Sept. 1979, p. 30.
- ⁹⁸ Hugh Ross, Toccoa Falls Christian College, Staley Lecture Series, March, 1997
- ⁹⁹ Reasons to Believe Web Site, July 8, 1997.
- ¹⁰⁰ read Acts 17:26.
- ¹⁰¹ See: <http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs/4077.asp>.
- ¹⁰² London Telegraph, Dec 23, 2002.
- ¹⁰³ See Answers In Genesis: <http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs/522.asp>, Jan 8 1997.
- ¹⁰⁴ Dr. Michael Denton, molecular biologist, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, 1985
- ¹⁰⁵ Jeremy Rifkin, *Algeny*, Viking Press, New York, p. 244, 1983.
- ¹⁰⁶ Paul Johnson, *The Necessity of Christianity*, <http://www.leaderu.com/truth/1truth08.html>
- ¹⁰⁷ *Evolution and Ethics*, Putnam, New York, p. 230, 1947
- ¹⁰⁸ Black Book of Communism, *The Courier-Mail* Weekend, Brisbane, p. 8, 13 December 1997.
- ¹⁰⁹ The Great Dying, *The Sunday Mail*, Brisbane, pp. 59–60, 2 February 1997.
- ¹¹⁰ *Maranatha Christian News*, 12/05/03 <http://www.mcjonline.com/news/03a/20031205b.shtml>.
- ¹¹¹ Tom DeRosa; *Evidence for Creation*; 2003; pg. 7
- ¹¹² Cited in *Fast Facts*; J. Ankerburg; 2002; pg. 22.
- ¹¹³ J. Ankerburg; *Fast Facts*; 2002; pg. 22.

Evolution Defined and Examined by Keith Mason

The author, Keith Mason, has a Bachelor Degree in Information Systems, has taken geology, biology, anthropology, and other college-level science classes. He has been a Christian for over 20 years and devoted over 20 years researching the creation / evolution / Intelligent Design issue. His findings are presented in this booklet. Mr. Mason reserves all rights to this booklet. Copies may be made provided that this booklet is reproduced in entirety and no modifications are made to it, and it is not sold.